

# PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY



Speaker: Hon. Francis (Buck) Watts

Hansard, Published by Order of the Legislature

Third Session of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly

Thursday, 5 April 2018

SPEAKER'S RULING (1) .....	1320
APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT SERGEANT-AT-ARMS .....	1320
MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE AND RECOGNITION OF GUESTS .....	1321
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS .....	1325
VERNON RIVER-STRATFORD (MacPhail Homestead) .....	1325
MONTAGUE-KILMUIR (Souris Harbour Authority) .....	1325
SOURIS-ELMIRA (Home Care Workers) .....	1326
SPEAKER'S RULING (2) .....	1326
ORAL QUESTIONS .....	1326
LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (Changes to home care delivery model) .....	1326
LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (Expansions of private home care delivery) .....	1327
LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (Access to new home care model) .....	1327
LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (Deal signed with Medavie on privatized home care) .....	1327
LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (Medavie contract and public tenders) .....	1328
GEORGETOWN-ST. PETERS (Director at Medavie prior to Premier) .....	1329
GEORGETOWN-ST. PETERS (Discussions with former premier re: home care agreement) .....	1329
GEORGETOWN-ST. PETERS (Untendered contract with Medavie) .....	1330
MORELL-MERMAID (Needs assessment prior to proposal) .....	1330
MORELL-MERMAID (Discussions with frontline workers) .....	1331
MORELL-MERMAID (Discussions with public sector unions) .....	1331
LEADER OF THE THIRD PARTY (Employment rights stripped from young athletes) .....	1333
LEADER OF THE THIRD PARTY (Tabling of documentation) .....	1333
CHARLOTTETOWN-PARKDALE (Employment rights stripped from young athletes (further) .....	1334
CHARLOTTETOWN-PARKDALE (Employment standards for major league hockey players) .....	1334
TIGNISH-PALMER ROAD (Rapid Response Unit locations) .....	1334
TIGNISH-PALMER ROAD (Effects of rapid response paramedics) .....	1335
TIGNISH-PALMER ROAD (Privatizing home care services) .....	1335

WEST ROYALTY-SPRINGVALE (Chief of Staff conducting strategy meetings).....	1336
SOURIS-ELMIRA (Public consultations on changes to home care services).....	1337
SOURIS-ELMIRA (Consultations with senior groups) .....	1337
SOURIS-ELMIRA (Continuity of services).....	1338
SOURIS-ELMIRA (E-gaming put to bed and cancelled) .....	1338
STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS .....	1339
FINANCE (Prince Edward Island Economy).....	1339
EDUCATION, EARLY LEARNING AND CULTURE (Openness and Transparency) .....	1340
WORKFORCE AND ADVANCED LEARNING (Trauma-related Conditions and Worker’s Compensation) .....	1340
TABLING OF DOCUMENTS.....	1343
INTRODUCTION OF GOVERNMENT BILLS.....	1344
BILL 2 – An Act to Amend the Workers Compensation Act (No. 2).....	1344
BILL 5 – An Act to Amend the Conflict of Interest Act (No.2).....	1344
MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT.....	1345
Motion 34 – Adopting consensus government option on electoral reform referendum ballot.....	1345
LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION .....	1345
GEORGETOWN-ST. PETERS .....	1348
RUSTICO-EMERALD .....	1356
ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT .....	1357
BILL 112 – An Act to Amend the Conflict of Interest Act .....	1357
MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT.....	1357
Motion 31 – Divesting from Fossil Fuels.....	1357
LEADER OF THE THIRD PARTY .....	1358
RUSTICO-EMERALD .....	1360
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS.....	1361
BILL 20 – Registered Professional Planners Act .....	1361
ADJOURNED.....	1393

The Legislature sat at 2:00 p.m.

### Speaker's Ruling

**Speaker (Watts):** Good afternoon, members and welcome back to the continuation of the Third Session of the 65<sup>th</sup> General Assembly. I want to welcome back all Assembly staff, including the Pages, of course. The media, as well; we can't do without the media. I look forward to working with you all in participation of a productive and informative spring session.

Hon. members, this being the first opportunity, I feel compelled to offer some comments on the events that happened in this House on the last sitting in the fall, 2017 session.

As members will recall, late on the sitting day on December 20<sup>th</sup>, the Leader of the Third Party used the word 'farce' in debate in reference to the work of this House and some members. In the context in which the context was used, I found it to be unparliamentary, and I requested that the Leader of the Third Party retract the word. He refused to comply and as a result was unanimously suspended from the service of this House for the remainder of that sitting day for disregarding the authority of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

Now, hon. members, I am aware that the word 'farce' has been used in this House and has not been deemed unparliamentary in the past. However, given the context in which the word was used in this case, it caused considerable disorder and more importantly it maligned the work of members in this House in the conduct of their serious, legislative responsibilities.

Given the use of the word in this context, and after consulting with the Clerk, I found it to be unparliamentary. While, I did not reference the parliamentary authorities that day, I feel it is important to draw your attention to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules & Forms, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*, citations §484(3) and §491. I invite you to review them in an effort to avoid a repeat performance. In fact, I may read them to you shortly.

I want to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to provide clarification. I

consider this matter closed. However, I deemed it important to provide the relevant parliamentary authorities. Members may well hear the word 'farce' in debate during this, or some future session of the Assembly, and it may not cause intervention from the chair. Should the word be used, however, in the context which offends the parliamentary authority cited, members will have my assurance that I will, once again, be intervening.

I will just take a moment to read the citations to you.

Citation §484(3), "... a Member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself as a political institution; or to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case; or use any profane or indecent language; or to question the acknowledged and undoubted powers of the House in a matter of privilege; or to reflect upon, argue against or in any manner call in question the past acts and proceedings of the House, or to speak in abusive and disrespectful terms of an Act of Parliament."

Citation §491; "The Speaker has consistently ruled that language used in the House should be temperate and worthy of the place in which it is spoken. No language is, by virtue of any list, acceptable or unacceptable. A word which is parliamentary in one context may cause disorder in another context, and therefore be unparliamentary."

So that simply is the explanation of the citations. I want to thank you very much for listening.

The hon. Premier.

### Appointment of Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the following motion:

WHEREAS Ms. Amy Unwin was appointed as Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms of the Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island on November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017;

AND WHEREAS Ms. Unwin resigned as Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms effective January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2018;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Mr. Shane R. Carr of Stanhope be appointed Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms of the Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island effective immediately.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

Are there any members who would like to speak to this motion?

Shall it carry? Carried.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Speaker:** I, personally as Speaker, I certainly want to congratulate Shane Carr as being named Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms today and while we're at it, I also want to give special mention to Paul Gormley. Paul Gormley has also been named Assistant Director of Security, so we're glad to have Paul on board too.

Congratulations, Shane.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Speaker:** Hon. members, before we get into Recognition of Guests, there's – I don't know how to say this – there's some unrest or something about the welcoming of guests, so I just want to give everybody an explanation as to what the intent of this is.

Hon. members, as discussed with House Leaders yesterday, the purpose of the routine, Recognition of Guests, is to recognize visitors who are present in the public or in the Speaker's Gallery. As all members know, in the past considerable flexibility has been provided to allow other recognitions of viewers and statements and, more appropriately, should fall under the routine Statements by Members.

Beginning today, I will certainly re-accord some leeway for leaders of the recognized parties in the House to recognize viewers not present in the galleries and to make some very brief statements relating to provincial events – that's for the leaders of the parties.

Other members will continue to be permitted to recognize visitors in attendance in the galleries; however, some discretion is expected of members to not repeatedly recognize visitors who have already been recognized.

Also, members other than party leaders, will not be permitted to make statements under this routine. Statements by Members are to be made under the routine Statements by Members and a rotation has been established for this purpose.

On occasion, I may allow members an opportunity to recognize a viewer of proceedings not present in the gallery – like somebody at home who may be watching it on TV, but this should not occur regularly, and with the assistance of the house leaders, should be limited as much in number each sitting day.

I want to thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this regard and, once again, just to put it in my own terms – the gist of this whole thing, the main reason, is to prevent members statements during Recognition of Guests. It's as simple as that, really, is what it is.

**An Hon. Member:** (Indistinct)

**Speaker:** And there's no singing allowed.

#### Matters of Privilege and Recognition of Guests

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Welcome to colleagues and to everyone joining us in the House today to the spring sitting of the Third Session of the 65<sup>th</sup> General Assembly.

Particular recognition to you, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk and staff, Pages; everyone who makes our work here successful and peaceable, and ensures that people are well served; the media, welcome, some new faces indeed.

I want to welcome a group in the gallery from the Prince Edward Island Nurses Union. Mona O'Shea is the president, and a

group of RNs joining Mona with the nurses union, and a group from the Union of Public Sector Employees with the leadership of Karen Jackson as the UPSE president, the leadership of the union, and some home support workers, licensed LPNs and social workers who are joining Karen today. We appreciate the work that our frontline workers do and all of the ways that you deliver successful healthcare throughout our province.

Taking your permission to reach beyond the rail, I'd like to acknowledge two Paralympic athletes who were celebrated on Tuesday night; Mark Arendz and Billy Bridges. Mark Arendz, who won medals in six of six events at the games in Korea; a great achievement for him, for Prince Edward Island and for Canada, and a great example of athleticism and character. We can say the same thing for Billy Bridges and the silver medal that our Canadian para-hockey team brought home.

There were big smiles; a lot of Islanders taking pride from that and I think what stood out was the comment that Mark Arendz made, that this is an example to all of us of how anyone from a Mighty Island, a small place, can do well on the world stage and how we can all be and do our best.

This is also, of course, Burger Love month and I'm sure members don't require any reminding of that because we all had at least one. We better not say too much while we've got our healthcare workers present on that front.

Again, to all viewers on the EastLink television or on the Internet platforms, welcome to our proceedings. It was telling as in the lead up to today's return to our sitting that Prince Edward Islanders do indeed look to this institution to do good work for them and they do follow what we do, and we appreciate that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to echo some of the Premier's sentiments that he just made as well and

welcome the tremendous healthcare workers that have joined us here today, in particular Mona and your members, and Karen as well, and a couple of individuals that I know personally that actually are neighbours of mine in the Stratford area of course; Lori Kelly and Shelly Heron and I sit on a very active community committee over in Stratford and we enjoy a lot of great fellowship at the church that we attend together.

I'd also like to welcome those as well that are tuning in on EastLink today or watching online. I'd like to send out a special personal greeting to my mother at Beach Grove home. I know that many members in that care facility look forward to the procedures every day and tuning in.

Also, I would like to thank the many Islanders over the last couple of months that came out to the public consultation meetings that the official opposition held across Prince Edward Island. I want to assure them that the presentations were heard, were duly noted, and I thank them for their input.

Just in closing, Mr. Premier, I'd also like to congratulate the two Paralympians, Mark Arendz and Billy Bridges. But in addition to that, I'd also like to say that I did have the honour of attending the public event that took place in the Kingston Legion last week. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to be at the Rodd Royalty on, I believe, it was Tuesday evening, due to one of the public consultations that I was hosting in Montague. But I would like to congratulate the Premier for bestowing the tremendous awards that he announced that night to honour these two particular gentlemen.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party.

**Dr. Peter Bevan-Baker:** Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

Welcome back and welcome back to all of my colleagues and to everybody present here in the House. I know that there were not enough seats in this room to accommodate everybody who I walked through downstairs on my way up from our office down there. I know that there were a

number of people also – largely health care workers with us here today – but there were other people who were there. I want to make special mention of Joe Byrne, one of the candidates for the leadership of the New Democratic Party, whom I saw downstairs. He's probably sitting in one of the overflow rooms.

But I do want to welcome Mona O'Shea and the nurses from the PEI Nurses Union and Karen Jackson, Cathie MacKinnon, Doris MacKinnon, Nicole Rogers, Becky Ryder, Cindy Mullens, Barb Paynter, Sandi Cameron, Margaret Darrach, JoeAnne Shaw, Peggy King, Michelle Walker, Alena MacKinnon, Matt Spate and Shelly Herron, who are all with us and many others, of course.

I also want to make special mention of the media. We have with us today Ryan Ross from *The Guardian*, a new arrival, although he's been in the House many times before as a reporter. I want to take the opportunity to congratulate and thank Teresa Wright for her years of service here as the political reporter for *The Guardian* newspaper. I think on behalf of all of us, I can wish her well in her new post in Ottawa where she's working for Canadian Press; had her first (**Indistinct**) on yesterday and a very exciting time for her in her life.

I also want to take the opportunity – like the Leader of the Opposition – I was unable to attend the event the other night but I was in New Haven at the Kingston Legion for Mark Arendz initial celebration and that was a wonderful event. Both Mark and Billy are fantastic ambassadors for this Island, not just spectacular good sports people, but they are wonderful gentlemen and a real honour for us to have them as representatives of our Island.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member for West Royalty-Springvale.

Before you get up, hon. member, I just want to explain, just for the benefit of all members and anybody that may be listening.

The hon. Member from West Royalty-Springvale is now sitting as an independent member. Hon. member, on a daily basis, you

will be introduced as the Member from West Royalty-Springvale; I just wanted to make that known on day one so there's no confusion.

The hon. Member for West Royalty-Springvale.

**Mr. Dumville:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to take advantage of my role as the new leader of the fourth dimension.

I'd just like to give a blanket welcome to you, your legislative staff, the Pages, fellow MLAs and the media here today, plus our guests here today. Just a blanket invitation; it's great to be here with all of you doing the work of the people of Prince Edward Island.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a pleasure to rise today and I'll do my utmost best to abide by the new rules of welcoming those to the public gallery today.

But as minister responsible for health, I truly would like to welcome all the nurses that are in the room today and other home care support workers that are with us today. Obviously, I'd like to welcome Mona O'Shea as one of our union leaders and Karen Jackson, both in the gallery today.

It goes without saying, that this is a group that plays a vital role in health care on Prince Edward Island and I'd go as far as to say, they're our cornerstone of front line service of health care in PEI. It's really great to have them in the room today. I had an opportunity to meet with them on several occasions over the last few weeks and I look forward to talking to them, not only today, but as well, into the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Lewis Point.

**Ms. Casey:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a pleasure for me today to welcome Mike MacLeod and Dillon Power of Enactus

UPEI. They are a social entrepreneurship group on campus that focuses on making positive change on campus and around Prince Edward Island. They recently presented an innovative project in Halifax and shortly they'll be off to Toronto representing the Mighty Island and UPEI.

I want all members to join me in wishing them the very best of luck as they travel.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Finance.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a privilege to rise today as finance minister and first acknowledge the health care workers and one in particular, which I'll refer to as a neighbourhood nurse when our kids were growing up, but also there's a couple of gentlemen that are in the overflow that are not inside here today with the UPEI business society. President Alex Dunn and vice-president Andrew Chapman. They won multiple society awards from the UPEI Student Union, including community award, most community involvement, collaboration award, working collaboratively with other societies, and overall society of the year award.

Their executive consists of 14 business students ranging from different backgrounds. As well, they hosted the 41<sup>st</sup> annual business society luncheon in March with over 300 in attendance. They host the luncheon every year and is a great event for allowing students to network with local businesspeople. The longest running and most active society on campus has been a powerful force since 1969, and our business society going forward is in good hands.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I follow along the new rules, I won't say hi to my mom who is in Florida watching along.

I will, however, say hello to the people that are in the gallery here. I want to welcome, in particular, the health care workers, the nurses and the home care workers. I've been

following along closely on your plight with government and with great interest, and hopefully later today we can get some answers that maybe nobody has gotten yet out of this government.

Particularly in the crowd I'd like to – I mentioned Karen Jackson who is, as Ronnie MacKinley would say, is married to my cousin.

**Some Hon. Members:** [Laughter]

**Mr. Myers:** And Peggy King, whose brother, Dennis, is in the Four Tellers – and for any of you who think that Dennis King will tell you what's on his mind real quick hasn't had a conversation with Peggy because she'll tell you twice as quick. So if you think Dennis is sharp, have a conversation with Peggy before she leaves.

Anyways, I want to welcome everyone back and look forward to this spring session; all fired up for it and we'll see how things go.

Thank you.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

As well, I want to welcome everybody back and welcome everyone into the gallery, all the nurses.

We have a little bit of an overflow over at the J. Angus MacLean Building and I'd like to welcome, today, members of the UPEI Student Union; William McGuigan, who was just elected as president not that long ago, Taya Nabuurs, who is finishing up her term as vice-president of academic external; Emma Drake, who was just elected to succeed Taya in the position of VP of academic external; and Mike Ferguson, who is finishing up his term as board of governors representative.

These students are true leaders on and off their campus and are an extraordinary vision for the future of Prince Edward Island.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member of Vernon River-Stratford.

**Mr. McIsaac:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to welcome two people from my riding, Wendy MacPherson and of course the rest of the nurses as well, and also Michael Ferguson, as mentioned, is the UPEI student who is in the overflow; very happy to have you here and I hope you enjoy the session.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

#### Statements by Members

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Vernon River-Stratford.

#### **MacPhail Homestead**

**Mr. McIsaac:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to recognize a piece of Island heritage located in Orwell, Prince Edward Island. The MacPhail Homestead was built in 1856 situated on over 143 acres of land and was owned continuously by the MacPhail family from 1864 up until 1961, when it was donated to the Province of Prince Edward Island.

The homestead is an outstanding example of a preserved 19<sup>th</sup> century Prince Edward Island farmhouse and is also a Provincial Historic Site. It is open to the public from May until October with hiking trails open all year long.

The homestead was home to one of Canada's and the Island's most illustrious sons, Sir Andrew MacPhail. He was a doctor, a scholar, a journalist and professor, and as well was a medical officer during the First World War. He was an author of many books, most notably *The Master's Wife*, which is a moving tribute to his childhood home in Orwell, PEI.

Although he lived primarily in Montreal during his adult life, he spent many summers at the homestead where he practiced scientific agriculture and pioneered the way for a better way of life in rural communities.

In 1989, the Sir Andrew MacPhail Foundation was created with the purpose of restoring the property and to continue the legacy of the MacPhail Homestead. Since then, it has served as a terrific heritage site and a must see destination when on Prince Edward Island.

We are so incredibly lucky to have a piece of both Island and Canadian history in Orwell, and I am optimistic that it will continue to be a popular spot for years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Montague-Kilmuir.

#### **Souris Harbour Authority**

**Mr. Roach:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I would like to stand before the House and recognize a great organization located in Souris, PEI.

The Souris Harbour Authority is a conglomerate of different holdings all in the same region, consisting of the Souris Port, Souris Marina, Historic Lighthouse, Eastern Cold Storage, and the Vessel Top Side Storage. They are doing a great job of driving the local economy and creating jobs for Islanders. The different holdings act as a great place to work or to visit during the summer months and really portrays what good things are happening in eastern Prince Edward Island.

Last fall, especially, there was a great demand to expand the cold storage facilities and with the help of the federal government, the Harbour Authority was able to create much more space. Local demand was high and at times they were forced to turn away customers from lack of space. With these upgrades, we are able to store PEI produce and fish on PEI before exporting it all around the world.

It is businesses like those at the Souris Harbour Authority that strengthen rural PEI through creating jobs and tourist destinations, which in turn, stimulates our economy. I am proud to stand and recognize their successes and am optimistic that they

will continue to grow as they cater to the needs of Islanders.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Souris-Elmira.

### Home Care Workers

**Mr. LaVie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's my pleasure to rise and recognize the outstanding work of home care providers on a daily basis. The home care program supports seniors and their caregivers so that they can remain in their home safely, with independence and quality of life for as long as possible.

Keeping seniors in their homes where they want to be is a benefit to everyone. However, this wouldn't be possible without our first-class home care workers. They provide a service that is superior for our seniors.

Very often, these workers get to know their patients on a one-on-one basis and develop a personal relationship with them. There is nothing more important when providing care than a personal relationship.

I know many of these workers and seniors, and they are fighting with the new changes coming. Seniors fear for the care they will receive, and home care workers are concerned as well. We shouldn't just brush aside the care our home care workers provide on a daily basis, and replace them with something else. They deserve respect for the care they provide. They take pride in their work every single day and always want the best for their patients.

Again, I thank them for their hard work and I always will be there to support them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Speaker's Ruling (2)

**Speaker:** Hon. members, before I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to start off questioning, I just want to remind all members about the 40-second rule. It still applies; 40 seconds for the question, 40 seconds for the answer. That applies also to

the Third Party, government members, and the independent members. Your first question is 40/40. Your number one and number two supplementaries are 25 seconds each with no preamble; no preamble on your first and second supplementary, and 25 seconds for the question, 25 for the answer. I hope that's fairly plain.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

### Questions by Members

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

As we all are aware, or should be aware, home care is an essential service for Islanders and it's government's duty to provide quality healthcare to those who need it in the comfort of their homes, maintaining their independence as long as possible. The existing public home care service is effective, but unfortunately is chronically underfunded.

### **Changes to home care delivery model**

Question to the minister of health: Why did government choose to change the delivery model for home care without public consultation?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure to rise and again welcome those that work in the home care field that are with us in the gallery today. As I said earlier, I've had several occasions now to have conversations with them about this particular issue of home care.

This is a result of a few weeks ago where we signed our bi-lateral health accord funding with the federal government which laid out fairly stringent criteria of moving forward with our 10-year bi-lateral funding agreement, which had a primary focus on home care and on mental healthcare, as well with, as I said, criteria that was established by them for their own accountability measures.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Without public consultation, government decided to expand private delivery of home care services rather than strengthening the existing public system.

### **Expansions of private home care delivery**

Question to the minister of health: What convinced you and your government that expanding private delivery of home care was better than making the existing public system stronger?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The decision to use advanced care of paramedics from Island EMS was a decision that was made to add another layer of enhancement to home care. There were some issues being looked at in regards to rapid bridging on our palliative care side of things, as well as rapid bridging on home from hospital, where we all know and understand that families want their loved one to be recuperating, to be living in an environment where they want to recover quicker. That's where individuals recover faster, so this is part of a process of enhancing home care; adding one more layer.

There are a lot of professionals that work there now and many of them in the room today, whether it's RNs, LPNs, RCWs, occupational therapists or nutritionists. This is another layer added to their overall work.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Good home care services takes pressure off our overflowing emergency rooms. In fact, 4,500 Islanders accessed home care in 2016, which shows how great the need is.

### **Access to new home care model**

Again, question to the minister of health: How many more Islanders will be able to

access home care services through your new home care model?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I indicated earlier, I know full well the work that these individuals do and the value of this work. I know this because I know it firsthand from my family using the services of these wonderful folks, and the great work and the vital work that they do.

Many on the floor of this Legislature may have family members that have used the service of home care, and we all know that individuals that we all love and care for, including my wife's grandmother today at 97-years-old, is living home in her own (Indistinct) where she wants to be because of the great care that's received from these home care individuals.

We are looking to enhance home care overall for all Islanders from tip-to-tip to make it the best service it can be.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, government had been working in secret on this new model, raising many questions about what this will look like for all Islanders. Again, I go back to, there was absolutely no public consultation on this.

### **Deal signed with Medavie on privatized home care**

Question to the minister of health: Will you publicly release the home care deal signed with Medavie as New Brunswick did when they privatized home care?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The lead up to this new method of going forward there was a significant number of meetings. There was management of

healthcare teams, there was Island EMS, there were members of the department and there were members of Health PEI. There was a significant amount of discussion going on.

When it moves forward, that's when we look for more and in-depth input from the frontline service. I've indicated to all the workers that now is the time that we want to hear from them. We want to hear their thoughts on how we can make it the best program it can be. At the end of the day, it's all about the very best care for that client that is home in their own environment where they want to be and making that better, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Trivers:** Will you release the contract?

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The minister talked about some of the groups that he met with and consulted with behind closed doors, but my question was about public consultation, which there was zero. I also asked the minister if he would make public this secret agreement with Medavie, which he refused to answer that question, so I'm going to move onto the Premier.

### **Medavie contract and public tenders**

Question to the Premier: Why wasn't this work publicly tendered to make sure taxpayers were getting the best deal possible?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, there has been a relationship with Island EMS since back, I believe, it was 2005. I would think that all Islanders have a great respect for this facility of workers at Island EMS. We all know the reputation they have and we all know the reputation they have when they respond to emergency calls. The fact that they are located from tip-to-tip across PEI makes them the most

obvious choice to do this new service with their advanced paramedics, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I didn't know home care workers didn't work tip-to-tip on Prince Edward Island. My understanding was they did. That's quite a surprise. Forty-five hundred Islanders use home care services every year on Prince Edward Island and many more could.

Question to the Premier: How many other multi-year, multi-million dollar contracts has your government entered into without any public consultation and no public tender besides this Medavie contract?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to see if I can come back with an answer to that, but it's not something that I have at the tip of my fingers. I know that if you go back in time, you can find previous PC governments that did that kind of thing.

As I understand it, this is a one-year contract with Island EMS.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's really strange, and Islanders would find it really strange for government to enter into a contract of this size without having any sort of public consultation or even any public awareness it was going on.

Question to the Premier: What was the justification for no public consultation and no public tender for this multi-million dollar side deal of yours?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Well, it may be that the minister of health can take that question if I'm wrong on this, but my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that this runs on the order of \$400,000. I don't know

where the multi-million dollar reference comes in.

Thank you.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's good to hear the Premier admit has broken his own procurement rules because even \$400,000 is well beyond what – so you broke the rules. We're going to have to call in somebody to investigate because you broke the rules. Maybe your ethics commissioner that answers to you should hear about this. Maybe we'll ask her.

Anyways, there's no public tender, no public consultation, all kinds of money being thrown around. Sounds like the Bell Aliant deal. We'll always wonder is somebody somebody's friend here?

#### **Director at Medavie prior to Premier**

Question to the Premier: How long were you a director at Medavie before you became Premier of Prince Edward Island?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker, I'm glad this question has come up; give me a chance to clear the air on it. I served for six or seven years as a director of Island EMS and – which is a subset of Medavie. Over time, leading members of the Island community have served in a role there. My predecessor was Wayne Gray, before that it was Michael Farmer, who served for many years. Maybe the longest anyone ever did including as chair of that board. I was proud to serve in that capacity, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Six years is a long time. For the record, I've been elected for six years. For some people it may seem like I was around forever, so six years is a pretty long time to have a relationship inside an organization.

In the Premier's original conflict disclosure, did say he received income from those Medavie directorships, along with the Premier's two pensions from UPEI and other investment sources that he had. Question to the Premier: Were your close business ties with Medavie helpful when your government negotiated this multi-million dollar contract with them?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker, I resigned from the board of Medavie, as well as chair of the Medavie Health Foundation, which, at the time was the – still is the largest health foundation in our region. I was involved in, in fact, establishing that. My relations with Medavie would have ended at that time when I entered public life. Indeed, it's part of the role that we play; the responsibility we have, and you might say the price we pay for participating in public life. I'm very happy to do that, and that was where my relationship with Medavie ended.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Everyone knows business relationships don't ever end. That's not the way they work; they just come up somewhere else down the road. Luckily, for Medavie, this one came up down the road and they had a cozy little relationship with you.

In 2016, former premier Robert Ghiz joined the Medavie board of directors; the same Robert Ghiz, by the way, who was added to the \$50 million lawsuit last week, which you are defending him for.

#### **Discussions with former premier re: home care agreement**

Question to the Premier: Did you have any discussions with Robert Ghiz about business opportunities for Medavie before entering into this multi-million dollar home care agreement with them?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** No, Mr. Speaker, I did not.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You'll have to forgive me for finding the relationship a little bit too cozy. I'm sure lots of other Islanders are finding the business relationship a little cozy, too.

The Premier has a six-year relationship where he made money from the board of directors of Medavie. Former premier takes over his job to make money from the board of directors of – isn't it funny how former premiers or soon-to-be-premiers find a job at Medavie and all of a sudden there's boatloads of money handed with no contracts, no public consultation, no public tender.

#### **Untendered contract with Medavie**

Question to the Premier: Did Medavie's close business ties with you and Robert Ghiz help or hurt Medavie score an untendered contract for a multi-million dollars worth of home care work on Prince Edward Island?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker, let me be clear: I ended my business relationship, my role with Medavie in 2014 when I entered public life. Further, I played no part in the determination of this contract.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, to go back to your words at the beginning of the session, I think we have a responsibility to stick to the facts; to not be trying to create conspiracies, or to make allegations where there is nothing, no reason whatsoever. People play a role in public life. People play a role in private life. It's a good thing, frankly, that we attract people into public life who come with some experience.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was down at the wharf this morning and the guys and girls down there were asking me who I was going to be asking questions to. I said, the minister of health. They said: I hope you get a straight answer because on *Compass* last night we couldn't get a straight answer on mental health funding; simple questions like: is it going to be increased or not. We're hoping that that's going to change here today.

Although, the Leader of the Opposition started asking straight questions: Will you table a document? Still no answer. Let's try again.

#### **Needs assessment prior to proposal**

Question to the health minister: Was there a needs assessment completed prior to submitting proposals to the federal government on this Medavie deal?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I indicated earlier, this mobile integrated health initiative came out of discussions with management from home care, Island EMS, department, federal government because it was a federal initiative with their criteria that was fairly stringent that it had to be a new initiative.

That it would be a 10-year program; that we would run it out in the first year with a \$750,000 budget, 450,000 would go to Island EMS, 300,000 would go to three new home care nursing positions that would be the coordinators for the positions between Island EMS paramedics and home care staff that exist today.

This is where this all began under the direction of federal government.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I didn't ask for a history of the deal. I asked: Was there a needs assessment done and will the minister table it?

**Mr. Trivers:** Yeah. Answer the question.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, there was significant amount of work that went on prior to the time I took the chair. As I said, this is a process that will enhance home care service across the Island. It's another layer that will allow paramedics to transition to home those individuals that want to be home. It also allows a stream for paramedics to drop in on clients, or clients can call them to come in so that they're not waiting in ER rooms or even having to be admitted because they're not being seen.

This is the overall goal. It's about client satisfaction. It's about client health and it's about good, positive outcomes for those individuals.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This isn't an AGM, this isn't in a conference; we're asking straight questions. This is why Islanders get frustrated. It's a simple question about a needs assessment. If you didn't do one, say 'no', if you did do one, say 'yes.'

Same question, Mr. Speaker. Was there a needs assessment done and will he table it?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And certainly I don't have all the information that was discussed at those meetings prior to my becoming the minister, but I certainly would go back and check to see what was available, either in document form, or in discussion form, and certainly I would bring those things back to the House, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

He doesn't know. That's telling.

The minister also said earlier in response to the Leader of the Opposition, he said: we're going to talk to the frontline workers now. We're going to hear what they have to say.

### Discussions with frontline workers

We have a lot of frontline workers here today. Why didn't you talk to them before we signed this deal?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly this is work that had gone on for a significant amount of time. Now is the time for the input for the frontline workers. I've indicated that –

**Mr. Fox:** After the deal is done.

**Mr. Mitchell:** – at several meetings that I've had with the individuals, many of them that are in the room today. I welcome the fact that they're here today. I welcome the fact that they would like to come back to my board room again and further those discussions. I did learn a lot about the services that these folks provide today and I did learn a lot about the shortfalls that they encounter in their daily work – not only today, but in years past. Those are things that I'm going to look at – making improvements on towards them and I committed to that at meetings with them and I will continue to do that in the future, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We learned today there were no public consultations; there was no consultation with the frontline workers. We know that there's chronic underfunding of home care in this province for quite some time.

### Discussions with public sector unions

What kind of conversations, Minister, did you have with the public sector unions about

how the health accord dollars could be used to improve services for Islanders?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Part of the discussions that I've had with the home care individuals that are sitting in this room and probably in the overflow room today was about: What does this mean to them in the future? What does this mean to home care in the future? I guess anybody that looks at it big-picture, it's probably going to expand. I think that would be the case. And when that happens, we will have a good argument to go back to the federal government in years two and three to look for other avenues and enhancements – that we could hire different health care workers that need to be part of the service and expansions where they need to be. This is what is before us today: a new initiative under the criteria of the federal government, but I see great expansions for home care on Prince Edward Island in years two to 10.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This home care deal – the money was for new, innovative ideas. You've decided to go this route with Medavie.

Did the minister talk to the unions about their innovative ideas – about what they could have done with this type of federal funding? Was that discussed and was Medavie's option better than the union's ideas?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously the criteria that was established was the criteria that we had to work under and we did a good job and we came up with a good plan to move forward with advanced paramedics that are very well trained – that can handle those situations – to transition patients to home until home care providers will be there. The three coordinating RNs at

the top of the chain will be the providers of the information and the traffic flow.

This is going to be a good system and it will only get better as we grow it and more people remain home in their own homes – out of hospitals, out of institutions all across Prince Edward Island. This is a good day for home care – it'll be expanded because of this new interaction, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't doubt for a second that the folks at Island EMS, they're going to do a fantastic job and they're going to try and do everything to the best of their ability – they're great. But what we're asking about here today is: we don't know what else was out there. It's supposed to be for new, innovative programs. The Leader of the Opposition talked about putting out a proposal – do we know if it was the best deal? I don't think we even talked to the unions about what all the great ideas they could have probably done with this. Why didn't we do those things? Why didn't we find – maybe there was a deal with this money that could have gone three different ways. Why was it just the sole-source deal? Why didn't we talk to the unions about their new, innovative ideas before this deal happened?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly we are talking to unions and we're talking to the health care professionals that we need to be talking to, hon. member and Mr. Speaker. Those conversations will continue – they're very valuable and there's been some great information came forward that they've been dealing with for the past number of years that I think we can make some good progress on.

I certainly do hope – as I offered to all those health care professionals – to give me a phone call, come on into the office and we can have more discussion about it, because that is where some of these things will come

to the table and good things will come from, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

On the 17<sup>th</sup> of October, 2017, Cabinet created the *Employment Standards Act* exemption regulations which exempted, and I quote, "...athletes while engaged in activities related to their athletic endeavors..." from certain sections of the act.

### **Employment rights stripped from young athletes**

A question the Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning: Could you let us know exactly which employment rights your government has stripped away from young athletes?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the hon. member for the question. At this point the answer would be: there wasn't any rights stripped from any athletes. The athletes were – there was some discussion and the athletes were being reimbursed for their duties and there wasn't any rights stripped from them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party, your first supplementary.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Almost a year before you created these exemption regulations, government introduced a bill – Bill No. 43, *An Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, which contained a similar exemption. The bill was never brought forward to this House for second reading and therefore it died on the paper. That tells me, or suggests to me, that you did not want to have public debate on the issue and have to justify your actions.

A question to the minister: Do you think it shows openness and transparency for government to take away the rights of certain citizens in the privacy of the fifth floor?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our department and the different departments do great work in this field – in *Employment Standards Act* and I don't have a copy of that act that you're referring to, hon. member, so I'd have to get that and look at it and bring an answer back to the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party, your second supplementary.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point is that that act actually never made it through the House – it died on the order paper – and the changes that were suggested in the act were implemented through regulation, which were decided outside the debate of this Legislature.

### **Tabling of documentation**

In the interest of retroactive transparency and openness, will the minister table all the documentation related to the decision to exempt athletes – including, who was lobbying for the exemption, who was consulted, jurisdictional scans on similar exemptions, and what evidence to support, both the advisability and the legality of making these changes in regulation?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will certainly table anything that I am able to table, hon. member.

Thank you.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have to assume that the exemption regulations referred to by my leader here were requested specifically by the major junior hockey teams in response to the million dollar class action lawsuits that are currently before the courts.

### **Employment rights stripped from young athletes (further)**

A question to the Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning: If the courts are in the process of determining whether or not these young athletes are employees, wouldn't it be more prudent to wait for the court's decision before you strip them of their rights?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To answer the question – you're talking about court proceedings – well, we haven't had any court proceedings here in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale, your first supplementary.

**Ms. Bell:** According to the CBC, the minister met with Randy Gumbley of the Canadian Hockey League Players' Association on April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017. At that time, Gumbley said that after his meeting with the minister, he felt confident that the bill would not go any further. I guess on that score, he was correct, but I doubt that you told him at that time that the intent was that the bill would go forward in regulation instead.

Again, to the minister: How is this consistent with open and transparent government?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I did, indeed, have a meeting with the individual and he misinterpreted any indication that I didn't indicate that we would do that at that point in time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale, your second supplementary.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate that for many young athletes the major junior hockey leagues are a necessary training ground for them to pursue their NHL hockey dreams, but without the players there would be no league. The crowds come to see these incredibly talented young players, and it strikes me as bizarre that everyone involved in the business from coaches, managers to the concession stand vendors and the Zamboni drivers are protected under employment standards, but not the people who actually play the game.

### **Employment standards for major league hockey players**

Minister: Will you commit to repealing these secretive exemption regulations that unfairly exploit these young athletes?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'll certainly look into it and take it under advisement.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Tignish-Palmer Road.

**Mr. Perry:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In keeping with the theme of home care today my question is to the Minister of Health and Wellness.

### **Rapid Response Unit locations**

Minister, there's concern that expanding the geographical boundaries for the Rapid Response Unit with Island EMS that they have one stationed in West Prince at the present time. With the expansion or the enhancement of the program, there's a possibility that it could result in the Tignish and area, in the case of an emergency, having that unit too far away, and then

putting more pressure on the Tignish volunteer fire department.

Is that the case? Would that be possible?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, that is absolutely not the intention, hon. member. What is going on with the rapid response team is actually, it's an increase of two new vehicles. It's actually taking a five-day service to a seven-day service. And with the use of Island EMS' computer-assisted dispatch unit that they have, that computer system, their own GPS system and historical data. They will assign these vehicles in the best possible place.

It's certainly not to take away or mean that the fire departments will have to step up and do more work; hopefully, to the contrary where there's more vehicles to be able to assist other vehicles and overlap and overlay so that all Islanders are well served by this rapid response team, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Tignish-Palmer Road, your first supplementary.

### Effects of rapid response paramedics

**Mr. Perry:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Minister: How are these changes going to affect the day-to-day activities of the rapid response paramedics, and with the increase in hours will be additional level 2 and level 3 paramedics hired, especially to help with the afterhours?

**Mr. LaVie:** No.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Although, as minister of health or department of health, we don't get into the hiring of Island EMS. They have indicated that to obtain the service they want under this rapid response team they will have to hire some new individuals, hon. member, yes.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Tignish-Palmer Road, this is your second supplementary.

**Mr. Perry:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Privatizing home care services

Regards to these changes, there's a lot of speculation out there that home care may become privatized even more than it is, or as other jurisdictions in Canada already have in place. I want you to be clear: Is it the intent of your department or of government to privatize more of home care services here on PEI?

**Mr. Myers:** It's so honest (Indistinct)

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thanks for the question, hon. member.

I've done my upmost best to this point to assure home care workers that this is not a privatization of home care. It is not today, nor is it in the future privatization of home care. It's simply using another layer in combination with those that exist today, be it RNs, LPNs, RCWs, social workers, nutritionists, OTs, to just enhance the health outcomes for individuals staying at home so that that's where they stay longer.

We all know that we have an aging population, but our seniors are living longer. So, in the homes, where they want to be, with their family, surrounded by the love of the family. We want to do our upmost best to keep them there, as well, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Souris-Elmira.

**Mr. LaVie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We're talking about home care here today –

**Speaker:** Excuse me. My mistake. I have to go to the hon. Member from Member from West Royalty-Springvale for a question. Sorry about that. Then, I'll get to you.

**Mr. Dumville:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier: Premier, the opposition repeatedly, in the past, has accused your government of subverting the interest of the Public Accounts committee.

### **Chief of Staff conducting strategy meetings**

**Premier:** Do you have personal knowledge that your Chief of Staff, Robert Vessey, conducts strategy meetings with Liberal members of the committee before each meeting of Public Accounts to influence the outcomes of committee decisions?

**Some Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker, I do not have personal knowledge of that. But, let me say that our caucus, our members work as a team and we're proud of that, and indeed we call on, as a team, we call on what resources we have. I'm glad to say that we continue to work as a team.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from West Royalty-Springvale, your first supplementary.

**Mr. Dumville:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is your chief of staff directing the committee on your orders or is he acting alone?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Mr. Myers:** Boy, when they –

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker –

**Mr. Myers:** – fall apart they fall apart.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** – as I said in response to the previous question, I'm sure that members on all sides of the House understand what it is to work as a party, to work as a team and to conduct ourselves accordingly. Indeed, that is what we do, and I'm happy to say that when it comes to committees, as leader, I do not make it my business to help committees what to do.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from West Royalty-Springvale, your second supplementary.

**Mr. Dumville:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017, your Chief of Staff, Robert Vessey, in a meeting with Liberal committee members and others on the second floor of the Coles building made the following statement and I quote: The Premier wants e-gaming put behind him.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh! Oh!

**Mr. Dumville:** Premier: Did you give this instruction to your chief of staff or was he acting alone?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Mr. Myers:** (Indistinct)

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what happened to the preambles to those supplementary questions –

**Mr. Myers:** Oh (Indistinct)

**Premier MacLauchlan:** – but there was a long preamble there and some insinuations, of course, that I know nothing about or the factual base for it.

I will say again that our committee members, our caucus members work as a team and we are moving forward as a government and, indeed, I expect we will find, in this sitting that indeed e-gaming has been put behind us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. member –

**An Honourable Member:** No, keep going with that.

**Speaker:** – from Souris-Elmira.

**Mr. LaVie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We're talking a lot today about home care. What it's all about is the people, the people that use the home care and the people that deliver the home care.

**Public consultations on changes home care services**

My question is to the health minister: Did you consult actual Islanders who use home care services before you signed the Medavie deal?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I stated earlier, I know full well the value of home care on Prince Edward Island. I have a vase experience within my own family on the usage of home care, home care providers, the great work that they do. When I look at these workers that are in here, and they know the lady that I am speaking of today. She could not be where she's living today at 97 years old without the great assistance from those that are in this room and then the overflow gallery.

The work that they do all across Prince Edward Island to keep Islanders at home – and you're right, hon. member. It is about the people. It's about those clients they serve. These folks are dedicated to the jobs they do. We just want to make that a better system for them, as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Souris-Elmira.

**Mr. LaVie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well over 4,500 Islanders use home care every year. That's a lot of firsthand experience from patients' perspective.

My question is to the health minister: Don't you think that patients' perspective should have been heard from before making any changes to home care?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am aware of the vast number of Islanders that are serviced by home care. Would I anticipate seeing that rise? Absolutely, I would as we see our aging population, our

seniors that are wanting to live at home. I'm sure that number will increase well above the 4,500. That is why we are using this federal bi-lateral health accord to enhance home care systems.

Year one, we're doing the rollout for that now, but we will be reassessing that in the following year to say: Is this the best process? Or just where the process has gotten to, and look for further advancements in the area of other staff, other enhancements, other requirements in years two through 10.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Souris-Elmira.

**Mr. LaVie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Out of 4,500, a lot of those are seniors.

**Consultations with senior groups**

My question is to the minister of health: Did you talk to any senior groups across Prince Edward Island before you made your decision?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess since I have taken the chair, I've spoken to lots of seniors in Prince Edward Island that want to be able to have the best health care at home, in health care facilities. We look at the overall picture – and we know that there are a lot of families that are able to support those when they're at home, but there are a lot of families that aren't.

We're looking at another method that will allow those – especially the ones that have no other supports at home – to enable them to move home until the workers from the home care system are able to come in and take over their health care needs with a great transition from the three RNs that will be leading and coordinating from Health PEI.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Souris-Elmira.

**Mr. LaVie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Health care services are being rolled back in rural communities right across Prince Edward Island, by this government it is. It makes home care services even more important to residents in communities like ours.

### **Continuity of services**

Question to the health minister: How will a continuity of services be kept for home care clients with these changes?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, as others, hear from seniors on a recurring basis about the need to have to show up and go to ERs. It's difficult for them. Some, they don't drive. Some, they don't have any family. This new method of using advanced EMT paramedics to come into the homes to take care of those, what I will call, those basic needs that keep these seniors from having to go to ERs, from having to maybe try and find neighbours to get them there. It's a welcomed service and one that will be enhanced.

Anything that keeps them home is valuable, and even some of these clients that aren't part of the home care system now may become identified as those that do need the full service and then that's another opportunity for the health care providers that are in the room today to take on those urgent needs of those seniors all across Prince Edward Island.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Souris-Elmira.

**Mr. LaVie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, home care clients build up a good relationship with their workers. They become familiar with each other. The home care workers learn about the needs of the patients. It's especially true with our seniors.

Question to the health minister: Did you consider the importance it'll have on seniors having new health care workers coming in and out of their home, disrupting continuity of their care?

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If there's anything I learned since taking my chair as minister of health, I learned that through meetings with folks like that are sitting in the gallery today, the home care servers, they are probably the best advocates for the clients they serve. The information that they brought to me is so vital to how we can help to enhance some of the needs that are before them today, with our without this program.

In the past, they have struggled with challenges before them and we're trying to find ways to open new methods of doing things that will definitely provide bridge systems for the client, but will make the roles of the health care provider that much better. They are great advocates for the clients they serve.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Souris-Elmira, this is your final question.

**Mr. LaVie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### **E-gaming put to bed and cancelled**

My next question is to the Premier: Premier, is it true that you wanted e-gaming put to bed and cancelled, covered up like Robert Vessey told Liberal committee members?

Is it true?

**Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Premier MacLauchlan:** Mr. Speaker, I think that we'll likely find that e-gaming will go to sleep by itself from repeated questions that we get in this House and indeed, the Auditor General put it to bed in her report, most recently recognizing that we have acted on all 15 of her recommendations and she was very positive about how we have dealt with her report on e-gaming.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** You're living in a different universe than the rest of us. That's your answer.

**Leader of the Opposition:** The only way it's going to go away is (Indistinct)

**Mr. Myers:** It'll go away at the polls (Indistinct)

Statements by Ministers

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Finance.

**Mr. MacDonald:** As soon as I can find it.

**Speaker:** Take your time, hon. minister.

**Prince Edward Island Economy**

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday I had the privilege of attending the Greater Charlottetown Area Chamber of Commerce's launch of the new PEI Network – a program that connects Prince Edward Island's newest residents and graduates with careers through networking.

It was a terrific opportunity to see our growing business community build relationships and help connect Islanders with jobs. PEI businesses are diversifying into new areas of activity and producing world-quality products and services. The PEI Network program will connect talented recent graduates and new Islanders with business owners who can help them build great long-term careers.

Prince Edward Island's economy is growing and there are jobs available for Islanders. In fact, there are 2,300 new jobs over last year. Our population is growing quickly and is higher than ever, and younger. This is thanks to the entrepreneurial spirit and dedication of our Island businesses and sectors.

Our business owners work hard every single day and are the reason our communities and province thrive. The sweat and financial equity they pour into their businesses creates jobs, grow the economy and benefits all Islanders. It is truly a labour of passion.

I want to thank the chamber and our entire business community for their efforts.

Since 2015 our government has worked with the business community to support their efforts and help them grow. As members of

this Legislative Assembly know, tomorrow I will introduce a budget with a focus on connecting Islanders with job opportunities.

We value our small businesses. I look forward to continuing to work with them on new initiatives that reflect the opportunities for our business community to help them grow and succeed, and that recognizes the investments that they make in their operations.

Thank you.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, minister. I think that is a very good statement and indeed, this network is serving a great purpose. I believe at one of the standing committees meetings we talked about it as well, and one of the suggestions that came up was that perhaps this is a way to help Island businesses actually grow their market; by connecting with contacts across Canada and indeed, the world.

These are indeed the sort of initiatives that we need to take hold of. As you mentioned, our Island businesses are the life blood of our economy. Any money that government spends really has to come from a private business, so keep that in mind and make sure that you do keep supporting Island businesses.

You mentioned the budget that the Premier has announced is coming tomorrow, and kind of gave us a sneak preview. It'll be your budget, minister, but hopefully in that budget we will see real, true supports that are going to help Island businesses compete and locate on the Island because, as we know, we have the highest taxes for small business in Canada.

I'm looking forward to the budget to see some of these promises put in black and white. We know the budget is just, basically, a political document. Until we see the blue books, we don't know whether it's true or not. But, I'm looking forward to seeing this budget delivered tomorrow –

**Mr. MacEwen:** Wes Sheridan said that.

**Mr. Trivers:** – and we're going to have some fun.

Thank you.

**Mr. LaVie:** (Indistinct)

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm really excited to hear about a program that recognizes the importance of mentoring and networking for helping existing businesses develop new contacts and also, for helping new businesses and new entrepreneurs, whether they are Islanders, graduates or immigrants, to build those networks that are so essential for their success.

I would also caution from my own professional experience that ongoing investment support for programs like this are critical. They require a long time to build and grow. They require investment, in terms of being ensured that they're supported financially so that there are staff in associative organizations that can do the work that's required to make them happen. They don't happen organically.

I know that there's been an investment of \$100,000 towards this initial program, of which the government has contributed. I would like to hope that they will gather some great data from this, and some great feedback and then look to that support for this kind of program being made longer term and sustainable, so that it will reap rewards further than, perhaps, a single election cycle. Thanks so much.

Thank you, Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

### Openness and Transparency

**Mr. J. Brown:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Openness and transparency is a central theme of our government. Rigorous, efficient, and timely access to information is an important pillar of accountability. We have been proactive in making information

on the work of government available to the public. We've done this through routinely making a greater range of provincial government information public, including; open data sets. We've expanded disclosure expenses of ministers. We've expanded many of our disclosure policies to include senior staff and we've introduced public interest disclosure legislation and we're reviewing the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

As another step forward we are introducing amendments to the *Conflict of Interest Act*. The *Conflict of Interest Act* sets out rules aimed at preventing members from engaging in conduct that furthers, or appears to further, private interest in conflict with public duties.

These amendments implement recommendations made by the Conflict of Interest Commissioner in his 2015 annual report. These amendments, Mr. Speaker, are supported by the Standing Committee on Legislative Management, as you would well know.

In particular, this bill amends the act to clarify certain provisions of the act in accordance with the commissioner's recommendations to ensure consistency with the provision of the MLA pension plan, to lower the dollar threshold at which a member is required to disclose gifts to the commissioner and to require mandatory review of the act by a standing committee of the Legislative Assembly.

These amendments are another step in this government's work to strengthen transparency and accountability and good government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Borden-Kinkora.

**Mr. Fox:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just like to indulge, for a second, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to acknowledge Jason Woodbury, who is downstairs in the gallery somewhere. Welcome to the Legislative Assembly, Jason.

I find it quite ironic that we have the minister of justice talking about openness and transparency, and what I've heard over the last 35 to 40 minutes during Question Period by the hon. members, is that we're talking about untendered contracts, but the minister talks about openness and transparency.

We're talking about secret deals, or deals made now with companies that are untendered without public consultation, with companies that used to have direct involvement with members of this government going back to the previous premier.

**Mr. Myers:** Wow.

**Mr. Fox:** We're talking about open data. If we had truly open data then we wouldn't have secret contracts or agreements that are not made public to members of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Trivers:** Check out the corporate registry if you want to see the (Indistinct)

**Mr. Fox:** Let's go back to the minister's statement a second ago. The Minister of Justice and Public Safety, who is supposed to, above all, in my idea, or my world, is supposed to take care of the people of the Province of Prince Edward Island, above everything else. You're the minister of justice, the Attorney General and the minister of public safety, but you're talking about conflicts of interest, and then I'll reference back to untendered contracts; contracts that can't be put out there, tenders that aren't put out to the public, no consultation with the unions and the health care workers.

Public disclosure. It's very simple: we disclose to the public what we're doing. If we enter into an agreement, put the agreement out there. If we buy a hotel in Summerside, let's put the agreement out there, and talk about it. No, we reward our friends. We make sure they get jobs in Medavie, or wherever. I think the minister of justice should really think very strongly about what he talked about; openness and transparency.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We were surprised to hear about the proposed bill from the government this morning. The third party, after all, is also tabling a bill to amend the *Conflict of Interest Act* this afternoon. We have been open and transparent about our work on this bill over the past few months.

In fact, we wrote to the minister of justice in January to let him know that we were intending to do this work and to invite him to work collaboratively with us on the bill. We even posted about it in our newsletter *From the Cellar*, that's actually the name of the newsletter: *From the Cellar*.

We are disappointed that despite our attempts to work collaboratively with government they've chosen not to do so and as a result, we now have two amendments to the *Conflict of Interest Act* bills on the table.

We are, however, looking forward to comparing two bills and assuming there are significant differences in the two enjoying a vigorous and well-informed debate, as clearly, this is a priority for the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

### **Trauma-related Conditions and Workers Compensation**

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Our government appreciates the many Island workers in communities across our province who work to improve the lives of all our residents. Prince Edward Island is known for its dedicated workforce and I truly believe that as Islanders we go above and beyond everyday in our jobs and our commitment to our province.

As a government we are working to improve the lives of workers, including through new initiatives at the workman's compensation board. We expanded coverage to the farming industry. We lowered assessment rates to \$1.60 per 100 of payroll; the lowest

rate in the Atlantic region. The workman's compensation board maintains high levels of satisfactions rates, for both workers and employers.

Today, I'm proud to announce that our government is building on this progress and taking another important step to protect workers in our province. Today, I am tabling amendments to the *Workers Compensation Act* that will expand coverage for Island workers.

I am incredibly proud to say, with this legislation, Prince Edward Island becomes only the second jurisdiction to help anyone who is suffering from traumatic-related disorders. This coverage will help those suffering from conditions incurred at work like PTSD, anxiety and depression. It is essential that first responders, nurses and all Island workers get the support they need from their government and through workers compensation.

I want to acknowledge our first responders' community and the member opposite from Borden-Kinkora for their attention to this issue. We believe this comprehensive piece of legislation provides better coverage for first responders, nurses and other professionals affected by trauma in their workplace.

This will mean that coverage for all trauma-related conditions incurred at work, including PTSD, is entrenched in law. This coverage will apply to all professions including; paramedic, firefighters, and nurses. Currently, WCB policy provides coverage for trauma and stress-related disorders as a result and acute reaction to a traumatic event.

We believe that this policy has been comprehensive and responsive to the needs of Island workers. This legislation entrenches this effort, this effective policy into law. It's important that government get it right when it comes to legislation that affects Island workers. We have consulted with the medical and legal professionals on these amendments. We believe these amendments will make for strong legislation for the benefit of all Islanders.

The government thanks the first responders, nurses, and other workers who advocated so

passionately to have trauma-related conditions covered in these three important amendments. I am confident that these new amendments will accomplish these goals.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Borden-Kinkora.

**Mr. Fox:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm actually very glad that we have so many of the health care workers here in the audience today and the people downstairs in the overflow galleries.

What I was hoping, just to hear from this minister, that he was going to stand up and he was going to proclaim Bill No. 102 in support of PTSD services for every worker in PEI. No, I never. I never heard that. We got to take care of our workers, we got to take care of frontline services and we've got to make sure that the *Workers Compensation Act* and the Workers Compensation Board has all the tools necessary to support every worker in PEI.

The minister said he's working to improve benefits. Well, if we were truly working to perfect benefits and to help all workers, then the Premier would have signed and proclaimed Bill No. 102, which would have – and the words from the minister was – expand coverage and services.

So, what we heard was: we are acknowledging first responders; however, we're not yet proclaiming Bill No. 102. Everybody in this House agreed unanimously during second reading and during third reading that Bill No. 102 was important to every worker on PEI and truly helps everybody through the Workers Compensation Board. That needs to be done and that needs to be done by the end of this week.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, Minister for the announcement.

I look forward to seeing the details of the amendments to Bill No. 102 as presented by my friend from Borden-Kinkora last sitting.

I spoke during that debate on December the 5<sup>th</sup> – Committee of the Whole – regarding the bill as it was then presented to this House and I had two concerns: One of them was a very minor one, it was to do with a drafting irregularity or an oversight and that was easily amended and there was no issue with that.

But the second concern that I had with the bill was a more substantive one and it was unclear to me from the minister's statement whether the second concern will be dealt with with the amendments that will be in this act before the House.

The concern I had was that the mover of the Bill No. 102, original mover, had suggested he had followed the template of Manitoba where all workers, regardless of your profession, were going to be covered. It's more typical in provinces to cover those workers who are repeatedly and cumulatively exposed to trauma and those are first responders; those are paramedics; firefighters, whether they be professional or volunteer; they are nurses.

I made a specific note that day – because it was not clear in the original bill – whether nurses were going to be included in that bill. I wanted to make sure that if we were going to amend this bill and just make it for first responders that nurses would be included in that, so I look forward to seeing the details of this bill.

It's important that we do note that there is a significant difference in the work experience of first responders and the rest of us. First responders are, by the nature of their jobs, routinely exposed to traumatic incidents. The rest of us may experience a single and deeply traumatic incident in our lives, but it's very difficult to make that a presumption of PTSD. But when it comes to first responders, we have to have that legislation in place. I'm glad to hear this from the minister and I look forward to seeing the details.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Presenting and Receiving Petitions

### Tabling of Documents

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By leave of the House, I beg leave to table documents supporting a motion that was tabled earlier today on ostomy supplies and I move, seconded by Hannah Bell, that the said document be now received and do lie on the Table.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Oh, I can't use your name.

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct).

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** – by the hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale, my apologies, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct)

**Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By leave of the House, I beg leave to table petitions calling for better road maintenance on Highway 19 and Highway 19A in my district, District 17 and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale, that the said documents be now received and do lie on the Table.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

The hon. Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

**Mr. Palmer:** Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I beg leave to table answers to written questions 1225 to 1238 of the Second Session and the answers to written question 46 of the Third Session and I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Communities, Land and Environment, that the said document be now received and do lie on the Table.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By leave of the House, I beg leave to table a written question to the minister of health and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Georgetown-St. Peters, that the said document be now received and do lie on the Table.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

The hon. Clerk.

**Clerk:** Mr. Speaker, please be advised that pursuant to Rule 80(k) of the Rules of the Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island, there were 17 command documents and a number of responses to written questions from both the Second and Third Sessions of this General Assembly tabled intersessionally since the House last met.

This report itemizes all intersessionally tabled documents received since December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017, with a full listing to be included in today's journal.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

Shall that carry? Carried.

Reports by Committees

Introduction of Government Bills

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg leave to introduce a bill to be intituled *An Act to Amend the Workers Compensation Act (No. 2)*, and I move, seconded by the hon. Member from Charlottetown-Lewis Point, that the said bill be received and read a first time.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

**Clerk:** *An Act to Amend the Workers Compensation Act (No. 2)*, Bill No. 2, read a first time.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Workforce and Advanced Learning.

**Mr. Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

These amendments to the *Workers Compensation Act* will expand coverage to all traumatic related conditions incurred at work, including PTSD. Currently, workman's comp board's policy provides coverage for disorders due to a trauma at work. This policy has been comprehensive and responsive and this legislation transitioned into law.

There are also amendments related to who can diagnose these disorders for the purpose of workers compensation and amendments to ensure their diagnosis criteria remains up-to-date.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Education, Early Learning and Culture, and Justice and Public Safety.

**Mr. J. Brown:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg leave to introduce a bill to be intituled *An Act to Amend the Conflict of Interest Act (No.2)*, being Bill No. 5, and I move, seconded by the hon. Member from Vernon River-Stratford, that the same be now received and read a first time.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

**Clerk:** *An Act to Amend the Conflict of Interest Act (No.2)*, Bill No. 5, read a first time.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Education, Early Learning and Culture.

**Mr. J. Brown:** Sure, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to my ministerial statement, this bill amends the *Conflict of Interest Act* to implement recommendations made by the Conflict of Interest Commissioner in his 2015 annual report, and supported by the Standing Committee on Legislative Management, again, as you would be well aware, Mr. Speaker.

In particular, this bill amends the act to clarify certain provisions of the act in accordance with the commissioner's recommendations, to ensure consistency with the provisions of the MLA pension plan, to lower the dollar threshold at which a

member is required to disclose gifts to the commissioner, and to require mandatory review of the act by a standing committee of the Legislative Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I beg leave to introduce a bill to be intituled –

**Mr. Myers:** Motion.

**Mr. Trivers:** The motion?

**Mr. Myers:** (Indistinct)

**Mr. Trivers:** Pardon me.

**Speaker:** Do we have unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Yes.

**Speaker:** Yes?

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, members.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct)

**Mr. Trivers:** A bill to be intituled *An Act to Amend the Municipal Government Act*, and I move, seconded, by the hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters, that the same be now received and read a first time, with unanimous consent.

**Speaker:** Hearing no ‘nays,’ go ahead.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Clerk Assistant R. Reddin:** *An Act to Amend the Municipal Government Act* No. 2, Bill No. 111, read a first time.

**Speaker:** Hon. member, would you give us an explanation of what this bill is about?

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill will change the *Municipal Government Act* to help ensure that all those impacted, whether they are both incorporated or unincorporated areas, may

have their voices heard during the establishment and restructuring of municipalities whether it be via annexation and amalgamation or both.

It will require government to both hold a public hearing and consider a plebiscite on proposed municipal changes, and it will also require that the minister seek and follow the will of the Legislative Assembly on decisions regarding establishment and restructuring of municipalities.

**Ms. Compton:** Mr. Speaker?

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Belfast-Murray River.

**Ms. Compton:** I move, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that we revert back to Motions Other Than Government and Motion No. 34 be now read.

**Speaker:** Do we have unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Yes.

**Speaker:** Yes?

Hearing no ‘nays,’ (Indistinct)

#### Motions Other Than Government

**Clerk:** Motion No. 34, moved by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters, the following motion:

**BE IT RESOLVED** that this Legislative Assembly supports consensus government as one of the ballot options for the upcoming electoral reform referendum.

**Speaker:** The mover of the motion, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just for a moment – I would just request the podium.

Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To say the least, it has been very interesting since I have introduced the idea of bringing consensus government here to PEI. I've been called desperate, disruptive, out of touch, and out of mind.

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct)

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Leader of the Opposition:** It's good that I have a support group here in the room because I'm sure many of the members who were clapping their desks are used to being compared to that as well.

I've been accused of throwing a Hail Mary, which is rather ironic because I have been also told to say a few extra Hail Marys for writing and promoting this idea. I don't dismiss those comments out of hand. I respect those views and as representatives of the people, we cannot, and must not, dismiss their views in this important discussion.

But, each and every one of us and those comments has come from people that live in, work in, or benefit from the status quo. Those comments have come from those who have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. There are many people outside of the political bubble who have called me, texted me, or talked to me in person who have said that they believe the idea of a consensus government is a discussion worth having, and a style of government worth pursuing.

In fact, one farmer told me last week that it should have been done 25 years ago. But then again, that is too much common sense for government to follow. Think about that for a moment, an Island farmer with so much disappointment and so little expectation of this government and the members of this Legislative Assembly. Sadly, this is what we've become. How can we possibly accept that?

What those inside the bubble don't seem to understand is that the vast majority of people outside of the political bubble have lost faith in the status quo. They do not feel as if any level of government works for them or acts in their best interest. They feel the system actually works against them. The system and the government in charge of the system, regardless of what colour it

represents, is seen as being against the people.

Jobs and budgets get cut without care or consequence. School groups are forced to fight the very government that is supposed to serve them. Communities are pitted against each other and forced into processes they want no part of. The very government, again, that is supposed to serve them is forcing this upon them. Successive governments over successive years have put party agendas ahead of Island interests, disenfranchising more and more Islanders.

I would have to gather to guess that there would not be one member in this Legislative Assembly who hasn't run into an Islander, likely many Islanders, who say: You're all the same; every one of you is just in it for yourselves. That is the sentiment that is out there, and it's rampant.

Politics in PEI, as well as throughout Canada and beyond, has truly become toxic. It has turned people off and it's turned people away. In here, the pressures of partisanship prevent us from putting our best foot forward. There is ranting and raving, heckling and belittling, and some days our behaviour in here is downright embarrassing.

Quite often, a member will ask a question about one issue and in return, they will get a long, convoluted rant about something else as an answer. The opposition, of course, gets upset. The government simply laughs, and the media shrugs. Then, we're told: It's called Question Period, not answer period. That's the Legislature, they say, and that's what they do.

Our system of governing is broken and Islanders are seeking true change. Change has always been disguised in colour. When we tire of one side, what do we do? We change the colours. When we tire of that side, we choose a different colour. It's always been that way. The next election, whenever it will be, will be a little bit different because there is now a new colour in the mix. The election will come with big promises, slogans, mudslinging, and in the end, we will choose colours. But, our broken system will remain; frustrating Islanders and MLAs. One colour will govern; the other will oppose and we will remain divided.

Because of this broken system, colour of party trumps the interest of people. The power of the leader of the party that wins has all the power. The power stifles debate, handcuffs democracy and paralyzes progress for Islanders. Take a look at our current situation. Look at an issue like e-gaming. Reflect on the questions that were asked here today from the independent member about the Public Accounts committee and how that was set up and orchestrated to disallow witnesses to be called in to testify on such an important issue.

We had one Public Accounts meeting where we had consensus that yes, we were going to call in witnesses, the very of next week. One of the sitting government members on that committee was not there. He was conveniently replaced. The motion came forward again and it was completely reversed, so no longer were those witnesses allowed to come in. That sadly is not the way government should work. We're truly not working for the people.

Now, you can think what you want about that issue. You can say it's horrible, egregious abuse of government power to serve our party faithful, or you can say nothing bad happened at all. Who's right? We don't know why because the government in power that created the issue won't allow the standing committee of MLAs elected by, and for Islanders, to question witnesses in pursuit of the truth. The government in power has decided to put the interests of their party first to protect the brand, to protect the colour.

It was the same with the previous government when it came to Polar Foods. Rather than join in the public interest to ask questions and get to the bottom of another issue, another government put the interest of the party ahead of the best interests of the province, and more importantly of the people. Protect the colour; protect the brand.

Now, some of you will say there is a new colour, a new colour we haven't seen before, and they'll be different. Well, history would suggest otherwise. That party has been promoting the idea of proportional representation. Now, PR is a really good option, but it's only one of the many options out there. When I mentioned another option,

in the span of four days there were two letters to the editor: one from the Leader of the Third Party and one from the president of the Green Party, although she did not identify herself as the president of the Green Party. What did they say? Essentially they said: The only idea that we should pursue is our idea, only our idea; thanks for your input, but we know best.

If that sounds familiar, it's because it is. PR in a nutshell is a mathematical equation that allows for the division of the percentage of seats in the Legislature using the percentage of overall votes received by the party, by the colour. PR, if it is instituted, will give us more colours. It will make for a prettier Island political quilt. It may even, for a time, change the tenor and tone of the Legislature, which in itself would be a great thing; but it will, sadly, not change the system. For as long as we separate our Legislature by colour, we are separating our citizens and we are further encouraging a process and a system that fails those we are supposed to serve, Islanders.

Imagine for a moment the Members of the Legislative Assembly sitting around the Chamber, working only for the taxpayers: just members, working together, to give good, responsible, fair and honest government to the people. No name-calling, no catcalling; meaningful debate that is designed to improve legislation and the lives of citizens, rather than designed to score political points and perhaps injure political opponents.

This is PEI. There are no great philosophical differences between Islanders, just as there are no great philosophical differences between the political parties in the province. Yet we allow colours to divide us. We allow ourselves to be separate. We allow ourselves to serve parties over citizens.

Well, I am proud to stand here today to not only ask why, but to propose a different option: true change, if you will.

I'm not naive. There are those who point out consensus government is bold and is vastly different from the system we have been governed by, and they're right. Some will point out that consensus government is not perfect; it has flaws. They, too, are right. Perfect should not be the enemy of the good;

but those who can say we can't do it, I refuse to accept that. I know we can. I believe we should. I know Islanders believe we have to.

Islanders will begin to regain their faith and belief in their political process if we give them a system of government that operates on consensus: a system without parties, focused on solutions, working with each other, with communities, for Islanders.

This is PEI; we are the birthplace of Confederation. Bold political movements start here. If we are truly serious about really giving government back to the people, we can work together and we can easily implement consensus government here on Prince Edward Island.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** I will now call on the seconder of the motion to speak to the motion, the hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I start, I just want to welcome Billy MacKendrick to the gallery. Billy's a business success story here on Prince Edward Island, grew his business here on Prince Edward Island out of his own hard work and no handouts from government, and that's the type of business that we should be celebrating here on Prince Edward Island every day.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Myers:** So the no parties system: you know it's been talked about much. I've heard several people talk about it over the years. The most recent and most insistent one has probably been Dennis King, who talked it about it on numerous occasions that I've heard through the political panel and stuff.

It's an interesting proposal, because as we all know, we are in a position where the Premier's going to have a second vote on electoral reform because he didn't like the results of the first one. Now we need to make sure that the questions that we have on this ballot are reflective of what Islanders want.

I talk to a lot of Islanders like every other politician here on Prince Edward Island. You spend your time talking to people. The most excited I've seen people is after the Leader of the Opposition brought forward the idea of no parties. Boy, are people sick of partisanship; and boy, are they ever sick of political parties and favours to their friends and all that that comes with it.

Interesting today, is a day that we hear that political orders were given by the chief of staff of the Premier to Liberal committee members about how the proceedings were supposed to proceed in Public Accounts. This is something that we've been complaining about over here for a long time, the fact that government, at its will, just shuts down any discussion.

The job of the Public Accounts is to be an oversight committee for government. They're supposed to be an oversight committee for the spending of government. In order to do that, it can't have partisanship. Partisanship will only deter that from happening. The Premier's response today was: Well, we're a team and we're supposed to work together as a team. He basically said everybody's supposed to do what they're told and protect each other at all costs.

I think his answers to the questions today best exemplify what people are sick of when it comes to politics on Prince Edward Island: partisan backroom deals and an inordinate amount of protection amongst yourselves – or ourselves, for that matter – and in the process, not doing the job that you were elected to do, which is to be the representative for your district.

The members that sit with me here will tell you straight up that my district is first, without a doubt. It doesn't matter what the discussion is. They are first. Twice they've put me here. Twice they've given me the opportunity to do this job. It's their seat. It's not mine; and it certainly isn't the seat of the PC Party of Prince Edward Island. It belongs to the people who put X's on ballots, even the ones that didn't vote for me. It's their seat. So anything I do in here needs to be reflective of their needs and their concerns.

For me, party politics is completely secondary; and for those of you who work over there know that as well, that when I

come looking for things they're for my district and they're for the right reasons.

I'm going to talk more about the partisanship in a minute, but I want to talk about the response to the letter that the Leader of the Opposition sent to *The Guardian*. So, while on the street I was getting an outpouring of people – who I didn't even think cared about politics anymore, quite frankly, and probably they didn't – who were suddenly saying: This is what we wanted, this is what we finally wanted to hear, I'm going to vote for your leader now because of that. It's like something that we've all ignored, finally recognized and acknowledged by the leader of our party.

CBC ran the story. They had the Leader of the Opposition out there for an interview and, what, a couple of days later they brought in an expert to refute it, why it wouldn't work. That's CBC, and they do that to us all the time, by the way. Anytime the Tories have a good idea CBC will haul an expert in. They did it to me. They took somebody from Toronto to prove that I was wrong. Imagine. Somebody from Toronto; you had to go all the way to Toronto to find somebody who could prove me wrong. But, they did it. CBC did it. I'll tell you.

Then, *The Guardian*, who ran the thing, ran an editorial not that long afterwards throwing all kinds of shade and questions on it. And you're like: What is this? What is this that the media don't even want to talk about this. Yet, everybody on Prince Edward Island is happy about it? People I talk to on the street are happy about it?

Paul MacNeill throws shade on it this week, wondering is it for real or is it just-a-this, or a just-a-that? Paul, who has probably taken on the job as the election-readiness for the Green Party by the sounds of him. He was wrong the last time he picked a premier. The last time he said a premier was good, he was wrong. It's this guy over here. The last time Paul MacNeill said somebody will be great, he was wrong. I think his track record speaks for itself and Paul knows where Islanders sit on his viewpoint.

So, I asked the question: Why would all the media on Prince Edward Island be so against something that all Islanders have seemed to

accept and open their arms to. The people that I've talked to are super excited. And why is the media so against it? Then, I got thinking: Who has got more to lose than the media if we're not all in here fighting. What would be on the front page tomorrow if we didn't all fight with each other in here. What would they write about? Who'd buy ads? Who'd buy ads in *The Guardian*? Pages and pages of ads, where would all the money come from? The media has more to lose in this than anybody. Maybe it's about time people started talking about that.

Islanders deserve a vote on this. They deserve to have their say on it. They don't need to be told by the media how to think. They don't need to be told by me how to think, or the Premier or the Leader of the Green Party or anybody. They need to have their chance themselves.

This is one of the ideas – look, I went through the whole plebiscite thing. There was a lot – I felt like the people in my area were confused. Like, I explained it over and over again and I didn't even really understand it because you know, I thought there were way too many options.

I know there was a committee come up with that option. I'm not going to rehash that whole thing. But, if this is an option that people seem favourable to, why wouldn't we put it on and see? It's effectively proportional representation without parties; is what it is. It's a consensus government.

Like the Leader of the Opposition said: with PR you're still going to have people making the news by swinging the party baton and pointing the finger across and saying; you Liberals, or you Tories or you Greens or you NDP. That stuff is all going to happen. We all know it. There's nobody in here who thinks that that's going to go away, even if we work together.

You know what? There's times when we work together. I remember going door-to-door in 2015 and having people say: I wish you could just work together. Well, I could tell you tonnes of great times that we worked together. It doesn't make news because it's not media-worthy. A bunch of politicians agreeing on something isn't media-worthy. A bunch of politicians

saying; yes, that's good and what's best for Prince Edward Island.

How many bills in the seven years I've been here have passed this floor unanimously? More than haven't. The majority of the bills that come to this floor are passed unanimously because the minister sits right there and says, here's why it's good. Here's who I've consulted with. Here's why we need to do it. So, as it's our job in the opposition parties, we ask questions. We'll say: Well what about this or what about that? And we say okay that's good. I think that's a good answer. Generally, those bills go through.

There's contentious ones. There are contentious ones where government's trying to bring massive change forward. I remember when this government cut the public sector union's pensions. We held that on the floor for quite a while because we were disappointed in the manner that they were doing it. Yet, there was no discussion at all about changing the MLA pension. That was one that we had talked about extensively and I voted against that one. I voted against it because, at the time, I didn't feel like government was treating themselves the same way they were treating their own employees.

I think there's an opportunity for us to do better. You know, as far as consensus governments maybe don't work someplace else, we aren't someplace else. We want to be leaders when we want to be leaders, but when we don't want something to work we cherry-pick places where things don't work and we say; well, it doesn't work there. It doesn't work here. It doesn't work.

There's times when city councils are dysfunctional and they are effectively a consensus model with no parties, but there's time when they're not, too, where they're able to work together and bring forward the great of Prince Edward Island.

I've sat here in this Legislature and anybody who sits in the opposition side has done the same side. We've brought amendments to bills. Amendments that we thought we were really good. The odd time we get one through. The member from Rustico has got a few through because of his persistence, but generally, they just get voted down, out of

hand. They just get voted down out of hand because, of course, the opposition parties can't have good ideas because we don't represent people or we don't wear the crown of government. The crown of government suddenly makes you 50% smarter than somebody who is in opposition or something.

I'll tell you, for anybody who has sat in opposition, the Minister of Communities, Land and Environment has, he knows that you talk to a lot of people. When you're in opposition, every single day there's a different party in front of talking about a different thing. They're not all in a portfolio; they would be quite broad. So you end up knowing a lot of the issues that are happening on Prince Edward Island. Sometimes, when a minister comes to the floor you'll be like, well, I think that may impact something else that's kind of outside of the scope of your department, but we think that it should be brought to your attention. Nobody over here is trying to derail bills. We actually want them to be good and strong so that they're the best for all Islanders.

But when voting goes on party lines – never once since I've been here have I seen a Liberal member break ranks. Never once have I seen them break ranks and vote – well, finally did, thankfully, for him. But, never once, it's always party lines. I look forward to more questioning by the hon. member through this session. He can probably talk more, in more detail of why politicians on the Liberal side don't break ranks. Maybe there's some great insight that we can have that can help us all understand why parties are poisoning the Legislature here on Prince Edward Island.

E-gaming. So we found out – no, read the e-gaming, like read who is named in e-gaming now. It's official; it's going forward. As of last Thursday this is going forward. This is the real deal. You have Robert Ghiz, you have the Minister of Finance's deputy is named, Melissa MacEachern. You have all these great, big powerful Liberal insiders. Why is it going to court? Why hasn't government taken responsibility? Why hasn't government tried to settle this? Why is government paying millions and millions and millions of dollars in lawyers to defend this? I know why. Wait for it: because all the

people that are being defended are Liberal elites. The party system is spending your money today protecting Liberal elites down at the courthouse on a \$50-million lawsuit that this government made – quite possibly have to pay anyway because a bunch of Liberal insiders got their hands in the cookie jar and got caught. That's e-gaming in a nutshell.

You know what? You're paying for it both ways. Those Liberal insiders who got greedy, those Liberal insiders that got greedy, are being defended by government; your money. Because they're Liberals and they're being defended because they're Liberals because of the party system. They probably donate – who knows all the reasons why. They're probably friends. They're probably friends of friends –

**Mr. Trivers:** (Indistinct) bodies are buried.

**Mr. Myers:** – I don't know. They know where the bodies are buried. I don't know.

On top of that there's \$50 million of government money on the line. That's money that won't go to home care. That's money that won't go to roads. That's money that won't go to hospitals. That's money that won't go to schools. That's money that won't go to anything, but settling a lawsuit and this government put us there and party politics put us there. Read down the list. Read down the list and tell me, it's not completely filled with party insiders.

Latest deal on the gravy train is Medavie. We talked about it extensively here in Question Period today. This Premier spent six years as a director on Medavie. That's a cozy relationship. Six years isn't a couple of dates; six years is long old time. He got paid by them. His public disclosure said Medavie paid him money. Medavie paid him money. So when he leaves who comes in? Robert Ghiz; the former premier. Is Medavie filled with party politics? It's full of politicians or want-to-be politicians.

Power and politics shouldn't go together that way. Power and politics should be with the people because remember they own this seat. The people own this seat. The people own this House. Not the five or six people who paid \$5,000 to listen to the Premier speak about the GDP last year. It's not for

those people. That's not what power is. Power belongs to the people. It doesn't belong to the elites and it doesn't belong to the rich. This Legislature owes it to the people of Prince Edward Island to give the power back to the people and this is the clearest, cleanest way to make that happen.

**Mr. LaVie:** It's true.

**Mr. Myers:** It's true. Secret Medavie deals where the Premier clearly is in a position where he knows all the warm bodies in Medavie, including his predecessor in that exact seat.

I always believe in consensus. I know that I'm a partisan politician. It's the role that I actually have here but it's not the role that I even had in my life. Out of all the things that I've done and I'll of the boards that I've done and all the community work that I've done, it's all been based on consensus. It's boards of just people. No one has a stripe, so there's no party lines in a minor ball boardroom meeting. There's lots of fighting. There's lots of fighting around the boardroom table in sports organizations. That's okay. But, it's about ideas and independence and at the end of the day, I don't think I've ever sat around a boardroom table in my community where people actually walked away because a decision didn't go their way. Everybody understood that, look this is what the majority wanted and everybody had their say, but there was no special voting patterns. They always went in different directions.

The people that I spent time on those boards with, we always made time to make sure that after it was over that everyone was okay because sometimes it got rough. That's just the nature of – sometimes when you're arguing your position, everybody would be like; all right, let's go have a beer and then, you know, everybody kind of – those models are happening right across Prince Edward Island every day, in every church, in every community, in every rink, in every ball field, every soccer field, every organization; decisions like that are being made. Very few times would there be some sort of a special group trying to control the agenda by voting together, but it happens here. It happens here all the time.

This is my seventh year and I'm less frustrated with it now than when I started, only because I know what to expect. When I started, there were times where I was like outraged leaving here because I couldn't believe how a group of smart people couldn't work with good ideas as they were put forward.

We have motions here all the time. It'll happen this session, too. We put a motion on the floor. For those of you who aren't familiar with the Legislature, a motion is a non-binding document. We'll talk about it. It's an actionable item calling on government to do something. They don't even have to do it. We would have a motion like this right here. It's not binding. Government doesn't even have to do it. We're using it to try to talk some sense into them here today.

So, when this gets voted on, if it's voted yes, the government doesn't have to even follow the yes. But what they do is they'll make some amendment to it that'll change it around in some little cat and mouse game that'll make it look like if we vote no, that we're voting against our own motion. It's like – is that what we're about? High school head games where we want to spend our time – the taxpayers of Prince Edward Island pay everyone here a base salary of what? \$72,000 a year? That's a base salary. That's not including anybody who gets paid anything extra for any other role they hold in government or Cabinet position. I would expect more than playing head games in this environment. If you don't think it's a good idea, be upfront and honest and say it's not a good idea. Have free votes and allow all the hon. members to say for themselves how they feel about this.

Let's talk about this Premier. Early in 2015, this Premier's coronation happened. Nobody was allowed to run against him. It was one of his stipulations for him running was he wasn't going to be contested. Because, as you see, he doesn't like being asked question or he doesn't like being held to the mat for the decisions he makes. I love it myself. You can ask me anything. You can tell me anything. You can tell me that you don't like me or don't like what I'm doing. No problem. No problem at all because this is your seat, it's not mine. I sit here because the people allow me to. If you need me to do

better you can tell me. If you don't agree with things that come out of my mouth you can tell me, 100%. That's just the way I work. I'm not going to get too bent out of shape over it. I may have a discussion and tell you what – I may just say; yeah, you're probably right, I never thought of it that way because I probably never thought of it that way. It's the great part of having feedback from people. People who aren't in this political bubble look and say: Well, why would you do that? And then tell you what it looked like to them. And I'd be like; yeah, I guess I can see why it would look like that to you. I think that those things are important.

To the Premier, he doesn't like to be questioned. I'm going to question here, a few things.

When he came in he did an interview with CBC. In that interview he talked about, he was going to clean everything up. The first thing he was going to clean up was e-gaming; no rock wasn't going to be unturned, e-gaming was going to be cleaned up and all the perpetrators were going to be taken right to the mat for it. If right to the mat is paying millions of dollars worth of lawyers to defend a lawsuit in downtown Charlottetown, two years later, three years later, then boy-oh-boy he certainly lived up to that promise. But, party politics got in the way. Because when he actually got elected, I'm sure that somebody set him down and said: You can't do that. We got to protect them; they're Liberals. This is the way it works, Premier. They had to be protected; they're Liberals. If only that kind of protection was there for other Islanders.

Do you need to have a Liberal card, or, do you need to donate money? Do you need to do both? Do you just need to be a friend? No one knows the perimeters by which you would get such protection from government. Millions of dollars worth of legal work to protect you from wrongdoing; things that you did wrong.

The Premier talked about how the Auditor General's report cleaned up e-gaming. Number one, in the very early stages of the report she says that she didn't have access to all the documents. Right off the bat she didn't feel like she was able to do a full audit because government withheld

information from her. Premier doesn't talk about that.

What he also doesn't talk about was his original defense to the original lawsuit was nearly entirely refuted by the auditor's report. The lawsuit that he first defended that got thrown out of court because the judge said that it was all unsubstantiated and agreed with the Liberal lawyer's defense; all of his defense was proven wrong by the auditor's report and that's why it was filed again. Now, it's back in court. Government has refused to file a defense over a year.

For over a year, and have paid big-city lawyers like Rob Ford's lawyer Gavin Tighe to come down here and defend Liberal buddies. And for what? Because he can't file the same defense, that's why. Because the Auditor General has – so what does he do now? Does he file a different defense? Does he say: well some of this is true, and we didn't tell the truth last time? Did the Government of Prince Edward Island file a document with the court of Prince Edward Island that wasn't true? The auditor says they did because the auditor's report directly refutes what this government put in as their defense. That's what party politics gets you.

This Premier, also, before he became elected last time, he said he was going to bring electoral reform to Prince Edward Island. Interesting. He was going to bring in big changes. He had great ideas and he fully supported it and fully endorsed this idea of moving forward. Somewhere along the lines –

**Ms. Compton:** So did Trudeau.

**Mr. Myers:** – and so did Trudeau –

**Ms. Compton:** (Indistinct)

**Mr. Myers:** – and the same thing happened to Trudeau. Somewhere along the way party politics came along and said: whoa, you can't do this to the Liberal Party. What if we can't win majority governments for 12 years at a time under this new system? Because you wouldn't have last time; you didn't have a 50% vote. You didn't even come close. The majority of Islanders, about 60% of Islanders didn't want you. That's what gave rise to the electoral reform vote, is that 60% of the people didn't feel like they got the

government they wanted because they didn't. They didn't vote for you.

Somewhere along the way, somebody inside the party said: you can't do this to the party. You can't. How will we feed our friends? How will we make sure that the MacLauchlans get to pave \$50 million worth of road every two years? How will we get to ensure that the Murphys get more and more money to sell beer? The important things, right? Roads and beer. These are the types of things that party politics has given.

Another thing the Premier promised: campaign financing. So he came in here. He was going to do all this stuff, this great opportunity he was going to do; campaign financing, and he was going to change the way it was and there was going to be no corporate donations. But, after he was elected somebody in the party got a hold of him and said: hold it now; you can't do that because we won't be able to raise money. That \$50 million-road that we gave MacLauchlan; they gave us back \$10,000. How are we going to get that \$10,000? Their workers can't afford to pay it. So where is that money going to come from? Oh, wait, well let's protect the party politics first. Let's make sure that party politics come first and I'll make that go away.

This Premier also promised, for the last election, to reduce the size of Cabinet. He was going to have the smallest Cabinet you could have. I think it's nine. You're out of luck. It's the biggest it's ever been. The Cabinet is the biggest it's ever been. Why? Because of party politics. It's hard to keep some happy campers over there when you're doing such a terrible job as Premier that they're all calling for your head on a daily basis. You had to put them in Cabinet. Because what? It's \$120,000 a year and a car paid for by taxpayers. So what's that equal out?

**Mr. LaVie:** A credit card.

**Mr. Myers:** What would the guess-timate be on that? It would be 130,000, \$140,000 a year depends on how far away you live; you get all your gas and stuff. I don't question the cars. I once did. I know how much time you guys (Indistinct) – but what I'm saying is, it's cheaper than probably paying for mileage; giving you a car. What I'm saying

is, to keep everybody happy, you keep everybody a good team player, as the Premier talked about in Question Period. A good team player; remember that one. You've got to be a good team player –

**An Hon. Member:** Consensus.

**Mr. Myers:** – to win favour from this government. You've got to be a good team player. There's a member over here that could tell you all about it and hopefully in the coming days, he will. The independent member will be able to shed some light on what it means to be a good team player under this Premier. I'm looking forward to that, actually. I'm really looking forward to it. I think it's a great opportunity for Islanders to see just how broken the system is. And unfortunately, it'll always be that broken as long as we have parties, because people like this Premier believe in good team players. Where people like me believe that this seat belongs to the people who put Xs on the ballot for me. It actually does. This is the people's House. Every seat here belongs to the people. You should do your very best to represent those people instead of those people. Those people are leading your astray, folks.

The Bell Aliant deal. What was it that made this Premier and this government drag their feet on the Bell Aliant deal? Two years, where they were going to – they said: no, we can't give it to you and it's protected and it's this and that.

Okay, number one, why is any contract with government protected? If you do business with government, if you borrow money from government, if you have contracts with government, why wouldn't that just be public? There's nothing in it. From working on the inside of government and doing contracts with contractors, there's nothing in it. It basically says, you've agreed to do the work for X number of dollars. It doesn't even have – most of the contracts don't even have any extreme detail of what the work is. They're usually a response to an RFP that's signed by the vendor that says they'll do the work.

Any Islander should have access to that without seeing it. You know what? Most of them, there wouldn't be any issue with. Government knows that. They can plow a

bunch of them out tomorrow and most of them would just be simple little things; somebody provided X to the hospital because the hospital needed it. Most of them would be very harmless little pieces of work or tenders or appliances or those types of things. But there's the small per cent, there's the very small per cent that are filled with backroom deals by the government. I'd love to know how some of them happen.

I remember the last – I guess it was last spring when the Mill River deal had hit. We asked, on a daily basis, for the contract. Because why wouldn't we? We're giving away a government property to somebody. Why wouldn't it be important for us to see that? Why wouldn't it be important for Islanders to see that? What was the harm in it? At the end of the day what was the harm in them seeing it? Really nothing, you know. Was there stuff in there that were special deals that other people couldn't get? Only other people could tell me because only other people who have tried to do business with government could say, well, I wasn't offered that, or I wasn't given that type of deal.

That type of secrecy wouldn't need to exist if there were no parties; there's no one to protect. Everybody's here doing their job for their district and putting their district first. There's no secrets to hide and no bodies to bury.

The education minister talked about, in a member's statement, earlier today he talked about transparency and how much transparency that government has brought here. I'm like; I'm afraid I just don't see it. The government – the Premier admitted today and I'm going to have to go and do some research over lunch today – but the Premier admitted today that he broke procurement rules in bringing in Medavie. He said: It was only \$400,000. The procurement rules, that's way beyond what you can put out untendered under the PEI government procurement rules. So they broke the procurement rules.

I don't know if I have to report him to the ethics commissioner, who actually reports to him. So, his ethics commissioner reports to him. Now, I have to say; do I report the Premier to one of his subordinates? Do I report him to the Conflict of Interest

Commissioner? Like, I don't know? Is he in conflict? I guess he's three-years out since he's been Premier. But who do you report the government to when they break their own rules. With no parties, you report them right here. This very House and every person in here stands for themselves and takes the Premier to task.

In the party system, I could bring a motion. I could bring action right here on the floor. I could ask that he get sent to the rules committee, or whatever the appropriate action is, but it would get voted down. I could waste my whole supper tonight, and I probably will because I love researching rules, but to bring forward action on this Premier, just to have it shut down because the party system will put the party first. The party system won't allow the Premier to be taken to task for the things that he has done and he's admittedly said he's broken the procurement rules.

I feel like we're at an important stage here and I think the editorial in *The Guardian* said that nobody endorsed the idea – so, *Guardian*, I endorse the idea. I'll clear the air on that one for you and thanks for calling me and asking me if I did or not. I don't know what I was supposed to do to endorse it. I'll go put a sticker on my car with an 'X', or I don't know, but next time I'll be more clear when we come up with an idea that I endorse it, I guess.

Also, to Paul MacNeill, we're very serious, case in point here today. You may not want to accept that we're a party with good ideas. You may not want to accept that we're a party that is in tune with the electorate, but you're dead wrong – as you also found out on amalgamation down there.

Islanders are fed up and the brightest I've seen them about any of this was when no parties was brought forward. Somebody asked me if I would run under no parties, I'm like: Sure, of course I would. It's the exact same thing, you're just going door-to-door and talking about what your beliefs are and what you're ideas are. I'm going to do that the next election, whether the Premier calls it tomorrow, or June, or whenever he wants to play around with the date.

I want to touch on that for a second too, about the Premier playing around with the

election date. We have a fixed election date, so that's fine. The Premier doesn't think rules are important to him because we found out earlier today he broke them, which is fine. The Premier said he was going to be the chief optimist – that was his election promise; he's going to be the chief optimist. Well, here he is; the chief court jester because he wants to amuse Islanders with his musings on when an election might happen. This is the type of stuff that wouldn't happen if there was no parties because it's not convenient to play around with the election date. Why is it convenient for the Liberal Party to play around with the election date right now? Because they think they can still win. I don't, but they think that they can and that is why it's convenient for the Premier to play around with the election date and throw some balloons out there to see what people think.

Under the no party system, there is a fixed election date. Boom. Municipal elections don't change. The mayor doesn't say: Well, I think I can win now. Let's go. Let's go now because I can win now. That's what the Premier does – and premiers before him have done.

Robert Ghiz supported fixed election dates because of that exact reason. He said, and I read it in an article here the other day, he said that basically: It's convenient for political parties when they're in power to play around with the date so they can go when it's convenient for them to win. Also, they can do things like drop a budget and balance it and offer a bunch of goodies and do a whole bunch of giveaways and then call an election.

Boy oh boy, if it was 1950, this party over here would be 75% in the polls because that stuff really worked in 1950. You know what Islanders know now? Islanders know it's their money. So, this money that you're throwing around – not talking about the money that you're throwing around defending a bunch of liberal bigwigs down at the courthouse on e-gaming, not talking about that money – but the money that you're throwing around is their money. They can see that.

The days are long-gone when they think you're doing them a favour. When everybody's hoping that they just got their

last oil bill this month – hoping it's their last oil bill – and looking at it and saying: I don't have any money and I'm broke. I'm glad winter's over. I could hardly feed myself. Oh, but the government is taxing me to death. Government doesn't mind taxing me to death because it's convenient. They need the money for political reasons. They need the money to protect party politics. They need the money for a big lawsuit where they're defending their liberal buddies down in the courthouse.

Anyway, I'm going to wrap up and I'm basically going to say that I feel like the time has come and I feel like, at the very least, Islanders deserve to tell us. Put it on the ballot. If it's three options, it's three options. There were five last time.

If this is binding, and I think all party leaders have said that they will implement the results of the referendum, so if this is binding, then why not put it on and everybody here will live with it – whatever it is – because it's binding. If you don't put it on, then we're left forever wondering whether or not this was the right way – or, have to find another way to ask people.

I know some of you didn't like when I organized my own vote on amalgamation, but 1,250 people sure liked it and came out and had their say. Maybe people have to start organizing their own votes and show government that this needs to be on the ballot. Maybe they need to petition for it. I don't know. Certainly government will come to their senses because we're here working together for the betterment of Islanders. We're not here to protect the brand. We're not here to protect the party. We're not here to protect anybody but our constituents. We're here to put them first. That's the job that we all signed up for.

I can't imagine there's a soul here that went to a door and said: I'll stick up for you second. Second. I'll stick up for you after my party. Are you okay with that? Are you okay that I stick up for you second to my party? None of you said that. Of course you didn't because you would have got chased out of a yard, had you said that. So, don't act like that when you're here. Put them first. Yes, sometimes it's hard standing up against the powers of government, or sometimes it's hard going against the grain – it still works.

If you're putting the people first, it still works every single time. It's time to put the people of Prince Edward Island first. Put this on the ballot and let them tell us what their system should look like.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald and hon. member, about three-four minutes.

**Mr. Trivers:** Okay.

**Mr. R. Brown:** That'll just get him fired up.

**Mr. Trivers:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a real pleasure to rise and support this motion from the Leader of the Opposition. If there's one thing that our discussion around electoral reform needs is the input of the people. The people need to have a voice.

With all due respect to the Standing Committee on Democratic Renewal, I stood up and said this after the report was presented on the floor of the Legislature by the minister of education and early learning. Really, that plebiscite had too many options with the five options. I mean, the minister likened it to a board game of Snakes and Ladders or something like this and I refer to it as a game of Mouse Trap that's going to end in a game of Sorry!, if I remember correctly and that's exactly where we are today.

Really, it's so important that we look at options like consensus government that removes parties from the system. I agree with so much of what's been talked about on this motion already. For example, every MLA in this House really was elected because they work for their constituents and I believe every MLA in this House really does work for their constituents very, very hard. It's only when partisan politics gets in the way that you end up with these dilemmas and I know – I'll give credit to the longest serving MLAs in this House – people like the Minister of Communities, Land and Environment – how many times has he been in and out of Cabinet, right?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Every time.

**Mr. Trivers:** It's because he plays a partisan role, he's a long-term member of

the Liberal Party, but he fights for his constituents first and sometimes, if that doesn't align with the party goals: See you later. You're back on the backbench again. But, he's back in Cabinet now, so we're going to have some good times there. If we didn't have parties –

**Mr. LaVie:** (Indistinct) put there this time.

**Mr. Trivers:** – then we wouldn't have to worry about that because everyone would fight for the constituents all the time and they would be accountable. Some refer to me as being naïve and optimistic and I remember when I first ran in –

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh! No.

**Mr. Trivers:** – I know – when I ran in 2011 and I was going door-to-door, I mean, fairly energetic and fairly excited about running to be an MLA. It really amazed me the number of people that said: Look, you're a politician, get the heck out of my house. Right? And that was in 2011, yeah.

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct)

**Mr. Trivers:** No, no.

Then, of course, before the election in 2015, we had a premier, a person who became premier, who wasn't an MLA and had never had a single vote cast in their name and they became premier. This would never happen under a consensus government system. You would have to be an MLA before you could become the premier. That's a flaw in our current democratic system.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll adjourn debate at this time and look forward to carrying on in the future.

**Mr. LaVie:** Can't wait to get him back on.

#### Orders Other Than Government

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale.

**Ms. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent of the House, I beg leave to introduce a bill to be intitled *An Act to Amend the Conflict of Interest Act* and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member

from Kellys Cross-Cumberland, that the same be now received and read a first time.

**Speaker:** Do we have unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Speaker:** Yes? Okay, go ahead.

**Clerk Assistant (R. Reddin):** *An Act to Amend the Conflict of Interest Act*, Bill No. 112, read a first time.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

These amendments will implement all of the recommendations made by the Conflict of Interest Commissioner in his 2015 annual report. These include defining private interests; lowering the allowable – amount of allowable gifts from \$500 to \$200, allowing private citizens to make a complaint to the commissioner, extending the cooling-off period for ministers from six months to 12 months, and implementing a mandatory review of the act after each general election.

#### Motions Other Than Government

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I've lost my piece of paper. Too many pieces of paper, today.

I would like to call Order No. 31, a motion for the divestment of fossil fuels, which was presented by the hon. Member from Kellys Cross-Cumberland.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry?

Carried.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Clerk Assistant (E. Doiron):** Motion No. 31.

The hon. Leader of the Third Party moves, seconded by the hon. Member from Tignish-Palmer Road, the following motion:

**WHEREAS** climate change is a crisis that will deeply affect Prince Edward Island;

**AND WHEREAS** Prince Edward Island should continue to show leadership in combatting climate change;

**AND WHEREAS** there is a growing global movement calling for governments and institutions to shift investments to companies that are not heavy emitters of greenhouse gasses;

**AND WHEREAS** the province, as of 31 December 2015, had \$154,630,358 invested in fossil fuels;

**AND WHEREAS** renewable energy and other non-greenhouse gas emitting investments can offer comparable or superior return on investments;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Legislative Assembly urge Government to examine the feasibility of divesting from all fossil fuel;

**THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Legislative Assembly encourage Government to establish guidelines for ethical investment to ensure that government investments align with provincial priorities.

**Speaker:** I will call on the mover of the motion, the hon. Leader of the Third Party, to speak to the motion.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

Before I start may I recognize some guests in the gallery?

**Speaker:** Yes, you may.

Matters of Privilege and Recognition of  
Guests (II)

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you.

I'd like to recognize three of my friends in the gallery; Darcie Lanthier is here, Jordan Bober and Eryn Sylvester, who is visiting us from Ontario. Nice to see you all.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a pleasure to rise today to talk to this motion on a very important issue on divestment.

It's important for many reasons, but it's particularly important here on Prince Edward Island because we are so very vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Because of that, we may be small and our contribution to the global emissions is almost insignificant, but the effects of climate change on our province are far from insignificant; they are profound. We need to show leadership in how we move forward to invest in creating a safe climate, not just for the world, but specifically here for Prince Edward Island. Of course, those two things are inseparable.

I want to summarize a couple of things about the dangers of climate change to Prince Edward Island. Rising sea levels are, of course, the number one problem. All around the Island we're fully aware of coastal erosion here. It happens everywhere. I walk my dogs in Hampton almost every morning along the beachfront there. On some days, it's clearly apparent from one high tide with a strong wind to another that erosion has taken place. It's that's evident. It's that obvious.

People everywhere are spending significant amounts of money armouring the shorefront in order to protect their very precious investments of houses, of cottages, of land dotted along the shorefront of Prince Edward Island. Rising sea level present the most present and, perhaps, economically, at least, damaging problem to Prince Edward Island.

We also have incidents of more extreme weather. We've already seen that. This was a weird winter, but it's not right. I'm willing to say this about climate change. I was watching CPAC last night where a panelist stood up and talked about the fact that, oh, we're having snow in Toronto in the middle of April, so climate change must be a whole bunch of hooey, and it can't be true. That is not what we're talking about with climate change. That's weather. Weather is inherently unpredictable and changeable. Climate change is looking at the long-term incidence of weather patterns. It's absolutely undeniable that climate change is with us.

It's real, and that human beings are the principle cause of that.

The more extreme weather events that we are having are evident. We feel that every year here on Prince Edward Island. We have stronger storms, whether it be windstorms or rainstorms or various other things will happen, but that idea of more extreme weather is happening and it will become more extreme as time goes by. That's a threat. It's a threat to our land, principally our agricultural land, which for so much of the season, particularly when it rains hard, is open land. We've all watched run-off from fields across our province during a torrential rainstorm. It's quite awful to watch. Where does that topsoil, that silt, end up? Of course, it ends up in our rivers, in our waterways, in our estuaries, and it carries with it whatever is on the soil, as well. More extreme weather is also a real problem for Prince Edward Island.

Things are just getting more unpredictable and they're getting more potentially damaging. Because we are a small Island state, we need to be leaders in stopping this from getting worse. If you look around the world you'll see places like Madagascar and Tuvalu and the Antilles; little islands, really not much different than us in terms of their global clout when it comes to changing emissions, but they recognize that their future is more vulnerable than anywhere else in this world. We should be joining them. They're world leaders when it comes to combating climate change.

We are doing well here on PEI. I don't want to pretend that we haven't tried. We're doing extremely well here, particularly when it comes to wind energy, but we could do so much more. We are, in some respect, leaders here, but we can't be complacent and we can't sit back and expect that everybody else is going to carry the load.

One of the tools that we can use in our toolbox in promoting combating climate change is divestment. Divestment is getting rid of investments that you have. One might assume here on Prince Edward Island that since we have no oil, no gas, no coal industry, no fossil fuel industry here, at all, that the province would have little or no interest in any fossil fuel companies. That's not true, at all.

We have found out – and it was in the motion, I believe, that the Clerk just read – the province has over \$150 million invested in fossil fuels. That was at the end of 2015. I don't know whether that's gone up. I don't know whether it's been divested. I don't know. But, two years ago, two and a half years ago, that's how much money the province had invested in fossil fuels, and what message does that send?

The message that I read into that is that we are in favour of fossil fuel development and investment, and that we're okay promoting and funding greenhouse gas emitters as long as we can make money from those investments. That, to me, is hypocritical from an Island that should be, and at times this government claims to be, world leaders in combating climate change. Our investments say something about our priorities and money talks, as they say, and PEI's past investments in renewal energy absolutely send a positive message that we take climate change seriously. You see that all over the Island increasingly. When I'm driving across the bridge, as I did just the other day, you can see the windmills in Summerside turning away there and to me, it gladdens my heart as I return home to the Island, to see such a very visible sign of our commitment to combating climate change.

But, we need to do more than that. We need to put more of our money where our mouth is. Unfortunately, by maintaining investments in fossil fuel companies we are tacitly approving the activities of those companies, encouraging more greenhouse gas emissions and ultimately delaying our transition to clean energy.

In order to avoid even more severe climate change, the world is going to need to leave most existing fossil fuel reserves in the ground. There was a wonderful series of articles done by *The Guardian* – not *The Guardian* here, not the best guardian in the world, but *The Guardian* in Britain. They did a famous series of articles called Leave it in the Ground, where they looked at the math of – well, we know where the (Indistinct) of carbon dioxide that we can belch into the atmosphere before we produce irreversible climate change is and essentially, we have to leave almost all of the carbon of the fossil fuel deposits that we have discovered – never mind those that are

yet to be found – but we have to leave them in the ground.

If we dig them up and we burn them, we are going to create a situation where our children and their children are going to be faced with irreversible climate catastrophe. Essentially, we have to leave those things in the ground and that's one of the reasons why this province should be divesting itself from fossil fuel companies because as things stand now, some of them are moving. I have to say that. Some of the fossil fuel companies recognize that in order for them to survive economically and to be financially viable into the future, they themselves, are going to have to get out of the fossil fuel industry and you see companies like Shell and British Petroleum and Beyond Petroleum, excuse me, starting to divest themselves from fossil fuels and investing in clean energies.

We need to transition to a low carbon or a carbon-neutral economy, and fossil fuel investments such as the ones this government conceivably still holds, I'm almost certain they do, increasingly become risky, what are called, stranded assets. As the move away from fossil fuels happens, and it's happening with increasing rapidity, those assets that the value of those fossil fuel investments is going to decrease.

We should instead be getting rid of those investments and putting them in places, where not only is it good for our province in terms of the message it sends regarding our commitment to climate change, but for strictly from an economic and financial point of view, to invest in emerging businesses and industries rather than dying ones. It's surely the thing that we should be doing.

Government can indeed influence markets, because they deal in such large sums and many governments the world over are divesting from fossil fuel investments. We should be doing the same thing. We should be doing the same thing. We should be divesting from fossil fuel investments and we should be investing instead in clean energy; the sort of thing that is perfectly suited to life here on Prince Edward Island.

By joining the global movement towards divestment, we will send a clear message

that climate change is important to this government, it's important to Islanders, and that we're serious about tackling it and that we're not afraid to lead.

I look forward to others speaking to this motion and for unanimous support at the end of the afternoon.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hon. Member from Tignish-Palmer Road.

**Mr. Perry:** I wasn't on the list to speak. It doesn't matter.

**Speaker:** Are there any other members who would like to speak to this motion?

The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was looking forward to hearing the comments from the Member from Tignish-Palmer Road as the seconder of the motion.

**Mr. Perry:** (Indistinct)

**Mr. Trivers:** I think this is a very interesting motion, and I do want to thank the Leader of the Third Party for bringing it forward. I think the key here is in the first resolution clause where we urge government to examine the feasibility of divesting from all fossil fuel.

At the very least, we should know what the feasibility is because it is clear that climate change is threatening our world and it is clear that climate change needs to slow and be stopped if we're going to protect all the assets that exist on our Island and most of the coastal areas of the world, especially, because of the rising sea level that's going to cover them.

Now, I have to admit that I would like to see a breakdown further of what the investments are in fossil fuels that the province has up to date and current and I would agree that it shouldn't be a big stretch for the province to take those investments and move them to something outside of fossil fuels.

Now, one thing I do disagree with on this motion is it's sort of mixing, I think,

ideology with action here and that's where it talks about ethical investment. The assumption of the motion is that investment in fossil fuels is unethical. I think I can definitely agree that investment in fossil fuels can – it doesn't contribute to the decrease or the stop of climate change. I think that to call it unethical is an ideological stance that I'm not sure we really should be taking in a motion in the Legislative Assembly, potentially, and I do have a little bit of a problem with that wording.

But, I do, of course, believe that provincial investments should align with government priorities. This motion has a couple of different parts and I agree with, definitely, the whereas clauses.

Climate change is definitely a crisis that will deeply affect Prince Edward Island, and we should show leadership on Prince Edward Island combating climate change, and we should shift investments to companies that are not heavy emitters of greenhouse gases. I agree 100% with that. I also, especially, agree, that renewable energy and other non-greenhouse gas emitting investments can offer a comparable or superior return on investments.

This is particularly important when we're talking about business development on Prince Edward Island. The City of Summerside is a great case in point. I believe if was Gordon MacFarlane who recently posted to Facebook about some of the work that Summerside has done in that area, and the great return on investment they're getting. The Minister of Finance has talked about a budget that's coming up that's going to be business-focused and focused on helping businesses on Prince Edward Island.

I certainly hope it's forward-thinking in terms of when it comes to helping –

**An Hon. Member:** (Indistinct)

**Mr. Trivers:** – industries that –

**Ms. Biggar:** (Indistinct)

**Mr. Trivers:** Pardon me?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Buckle up.

**Ms. Biggar:** Buckle up.

**Mr. Trivers:** Buckle up?

It's going to be fantastic, yes. I'm filled with budget enthusiasm, to paraphrase a lady that I was talking to earlier today.

At any rate, renewable energy; I certainly hope that the Budget does talk about that and how the province is going to move toward it, and the great opportunity there is for business development in that area within the province.

I do agree with the government examining the feasibility of divesting from all fossil fuel. That's a stake in the sand that we need to know that. We have to know if we get rid of fossil fuels completely, how much is that going to cost and what impacts is it going to have before we make any other moves forward?

**Ms. Biggar:** Call the hour.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** The hour has been called.

**Speaker:** Hon. Members, this House will recess until seven o'clock this evening.

**The Legislature recessed until 7:00 p.m.**

#### Government Motions

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Communities, Land and Environment, that the 1<sup>st</sup> order of the day be now read.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

**Clerk Assistant (E. Doiron):** Order No. 1, *Registered Professional Planners Act*, Bill No. 20, ordered for second reading.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Communities, Land and Environment, that the said bill be now read a second time.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

**Clerk Assistant:** *Registered Professional Planners Act*, Bill No. 20, read a second time.

**Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health and Wellness.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Communities, Land and Environment, that this House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to take into consideration the said bill.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

I will now call upon the hon. Member from Charlottetown-Lewis Point to come and chair the Committee of the Whole House.

**Chair (Casey):** The House is now in a Committee of the Whole House to take into consideration a bill to be intitled *Registered Professional Planners Act*. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the bill now be read clause by clause?

**Mr. Trivers:** Yes.

**Chair:** Thank you.

Permission to take a stranger on the floor?

**An Hon. Member:** Granted.

**Chair:** Thank you.

Good evening. Could you introduce yourself and your title for the record?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** My name is Christine MacKinnon. I'm the Acting Director of Municipal Affairs and Provincial Planning in the Department of Communities, Land and Environment.

**Chair:** Welcome.

Hon. members, before I start reading the bill I would just like to draw your attention to the gallery and welcome a longtime friend and the godfather of planning: Kingsley Lewis has joined us in the gallery tonight, so welcome, Mr. Lewis.

He happens to be a member from Charlottetown-Lewis Point, so I'm particularly glad that he can see me working. Perfect.

All right; Minister, do you have an opening statement?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah.

I just want to recognize Alex Forbes, president of the association, and he's the town planner with the City of Charlottetown. That'd be one of the hardest jobs in Prince Edward Island, I'd say; and I want to recognize Danielle Gillan and Janice Harper, both departmental staff. They do a great job in the planning area. It's a hard area. They're all over the province.

I must say that I found the other day permits are up over 35% in PEI, so they're extremely busy. They're doing the same amount of work with a 35% increase in permits than a few years ago.

So, on to the bill.

Thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you, Minister.

1. Definitions

In this Act

(a) "Association" means the Prince Edward Island Association of Planners, as it existed immediately before the coming into force of this Act;

(b) "bylaws" means, except where otherwise stated, the bylaws of the Institute made by the council pursuant to section 7;

(c) "candidate" means a person who is registered pursuant to subsection 11(2), or deemed to be registered under subsection 50(2), as a candidate;

(d) "council" means the council of the Institute, established in accordance with section 6;

(e) "Institute" means the Prince Edward Island Institute of Professional Planners, continued under section 3;

(f) “Minister” means the Minister of Communities, Land and Environment;

(g) “person” means a natural person;

(h) “planning” means the process of organizing, managing, allocating and using land, resources, facilities and services to support the social and economic efficiency, health and well-being of communities and regions and the maintenance, improvement and protection of the developed and the natural environment;

(i) “Professional Standards Board” means the Professional Standards Board for the Planning Profession in Canada;

(j) “register” means the register kept in accordance with subsection 8(2) and the bylaws;

(k) “registered professional planner” means a person registered pursuant to subsection 12(2), or deemed to be registered under subsection 50(1), as a registered professional planner;

(l) “registrant” means a registered professional planner or a candidate;

(m) “registrar” means the person appointed as the registrar pursuant to subsection 8(1).

**Mr. Trivers:** Chair?

**Chair:** Do you have a question on that section?

Hon. members, maybe we’ll get the guidelines as we’re back for the first day. I’m going to read a full section and then I’ll open questions to that section which I just finished.

**Mr. Trivers:** Okay, (Indistinct)

**Mr. LaVie:** That’s a good idea.

**Chair:** So the hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald has a question on section 1.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

I was wondering, and maybe just because we’re at the beginning here, how many planners are there in the PEI Association of Planners right now?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** There are about 15 members, give or take. There’s students, some retired members. Some are candidates for membership; so about 15.

**Mr. Trivers:** Is the scope of the association, just to be clear, is the entire Island of Prince Edward Island?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** Entire province? Okay.

I would guess that – or I should just ask – the association would be very interested in land use planning across the entire Island, is that correct?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** This legislation is to establish the profession –

**Mr. Trivers:** Yeah.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** – of land use planners. We’re one of the last jurisdictions to recognize land use planners as a professional group, so it’s a voluntary association at the moment. This is to give it a regulatory aspect.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** Okay, thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you.

## 2. Purposes

The purposes of this Act are:

(a) to establish the Institute as a professional association and a regulatory body;

(b) to regulate the practice of registered professional planners and the use of associated designations;

(c) to regulate the participation of candidates in mentorships and responsible professional planning experience;

(d) to provide for the transition of members of the Association to membership in the Institute, and in some cases, registration under this Act.

Shall the section carry?

I have a question from the Leader of the Third Party.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you, Chair.

I think, Christine, you may have somewhat answered this in your response to the last question, but how is the planning profession currently governed on the Island. You'd mentioned a voluntary situation, but what is the current governing status or structure?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Currently there is a professional association, but it's voluntary and this legislation would introduce regulatory requirements. So, it's to add a regulatory component to a professional association. It's very similar to self-regulating professions such as engineering, or chartered accountants, or law.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Or dentistry.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Or dentistry.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Why at this time did – and did the impetus from this come from the planners or was it from government or was it a mutually beneficial thing?

**Mr. R. Brown:** In 2014, the Handrahan Report by the Task Force on Land Use Policy recommended that the provincial government move to and adopt legislation recognizing the title and the practice of the professional planners and land use planners. The Prince Edward Island Association of Planners formally requested the legislation in 2014 – and I want to acknowledge Alex Forbes again for a leader in this. They have consulted with other professionals such as the engineers, architects, and surveyors and no objections were received.

You know that we've introduced a new *Planning Act* and the MGA and the *Provincial Building Code Act*, so we want consistency across Prince Edward Island and professionally registered people that will be out there reviewing and planning decisions and things like that. PEI is under an extreme amount of pressure, especially in the rural areas with building permits and

developments, so its time has come that we have a professional association of planners in order to administer this.

**Chair:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you, Minister. I appreciate that answer and I can see the obvious benefits of making this a regulated profession.

I'm wondering – you cited the three pieces of legislation: the *Planning Act* and the building codes that's being adopted and the MGA. With all of this new legislation coming in place in Prince Edward Island, are you imagining that there's going to be an influx of planners in the future to cope with the perhaps increased demand for their services?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Well, only being on the job for six or seven weeks – eight weeks, I've noticed there's a tremendous amount of work in the department. Like I said earlier, the permits were up in rural PEI alone by 40%. They've gone from 800 a year to close to 1,100 a year and they're complicated issues now.

There's high pressure for development in rural PEI and we want to make sure that it's done right, it's done carefully, and you need a professional organization behind that kind of thing in order to make sure that the right things are done because there's a lot of people wanting to change the use of their land to another use and we are under pressure on our farm community – I don't think anybody would say no to that. There's a tremendous amount of pressure on agriculture land now to be converted.

There was a tremendous report done by the BC government on land and land use in BC. They have a phenomenal report on their website now talking about the loss of agriculture land. Not only will the loss of agriculture land reduce the industry, it'll reduce the communities in the area too because their report indicated quite rightly, that if you don't have agriculture and a good agriculture base – agriculture links the communities together which links the province together, so we have to be very careful what we're doing nowadays in terms of farmland and conversion of properties and this association will help us do that.

Thank you.

**Chair:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you, Chair.

Currently much of the land use planning decisions and authority falls essentially here in the province. If the changes suggested in the *Municipal Government Act* come about and we end up with more authority and responsibility being delegated to a number of larger municipalities across the province, are those municipalities going to have to hire, for example, their own land use planner to accommodate the responsibilities that they may be left with?

**Mr. R. Brown:** I think with the evolution – with the *Municipal Government Act*, the province will work with municipalities right across Prince Edward Island. We're going to outreach to them right now and see what we can do to assist them in their planning needs. Personally, I think it hasn't been a decision of government yet, but if a municipality wants the province to do the permitting and inspections and they just do the planning and the planning approval – there could be some sort of hybrid system on Prince Edward Island. It's not necessary that every area has to have their own planning, but some areas would need a direct planner because of the tremendous amount of pressure for development in those areas. You can see it all across PEI.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Of course there will be costs associated with the services provided by land use planners and in some of the smaller municipalities now there's no obligation for them to take on the responsibilities of land use planning, but that may well change.

Do you have any sense – and I realize it will vary depending on the size of the municipality, the demands of the people who live there, but any sense of how much the services of land use planners might cost municipalities?

**Mr. R. Brown:** We haven't determined that yet, have we?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** There are many different factors. There are some land use planners that work for government; there

are others that offer consulting services. We have consultants that come to PEI to work and we have some consultants that live here and offer their services. As more of the province comes under an official plan, there would be more work for land use planners and this legislation would ensure that qualified people are doing that work.

**Mr. R. Brown:** And I think some of the costs would be bore by the people wanting the redevelopment – wanting rezoning. We don't call it rezoning yet, but I've said to the department, basically that: we're looking for a zoning map. Whatever the property is used for right now, that's the zone. So if it's agriculture, I'm going to define it as agriculture. It may not be in legislation or any plan now. If somebody wants to change the use of that, that, to me, will trigger a rezoning – as it was in the city. So, we're revising some of our procedures that – an analysis have to be done, public notice – a lot of it's done now – and public meetings have to be held. I think that it's extremely important for neighborhoods. If somebody wants to change something in their area, that the neighbors be notified and the neighbors be given an opportunity for a public discussion on this – I'm a firm believer in that.

**Chair:** The hon. Leader of the Third Party.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you.

I absolutely agree, Minister, and I think that's one of the problems with the current situation, is that that zone adjacent to a proposed development or rezoning is very small currently. It may be appropriate for a more urban setting, but rurally, the 100 meter zone where people –

**Mr. R. Brown:** I agree with you.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** – have to be notified is – you may include one neighbor there and if they're not entirely – if they're not concerned about it, things get by. I appreciate your comments on it.

**Mr. R. Brown:** And I agree with you – extending the notice zone.

**Dr. Bevan-Baker:** Thank you.

Thank you, Chair.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

I have a number of questions, but I wanted to continue along the line of questioning of the Leader of the Third Party. I wanted to find out how many planners are there on staff with the department right now?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Four.

**Mr. Trivers:** Are they members of the PEI institute of professional planners?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** So, I just want to be clear: We have four planners to look after land use planning for all of the unincorporated areas of the entire province?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Although we employ professional land use planners, many of them are working in municipal affairs at the moment and providing advice to municipalities and reviewing municipal plans for compliance with the *Planning Act*.

**Mr. Trivers:** We, in fact, do not have any dedicated planners –

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** – looking after land-use planning in unincorporated areas?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes, we do. Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** How many –

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** How many specifically?

**Mr. Trivers:** – planners would be looking after unincorporated areas in this province?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** I make the distinction between provincial planning authority and municipal planning authority. We have, right now, three professional

planners that are working on provincial planning.

**Mr. Trivers:** Based on the *Planning Act*, I mean the authority, or the responsibility of land-use planning for unincorporated areas does fall on the provincial Department of Communities, Land and Environment, is that correct?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** Do you feel that we have land-use plans in place for all the unincorporated areas on PEI? You mentioned zones earlier; these sorts of things?

**Mr. R. Brown:** You know, its time is coming here on Prince Edward Island. We've been able to get away with it for many, many years without proper planning for Prince Edward Island, political parties – sorry, are you guys still a party?

**Mr. LaVie:** Don't get smart.

**Mr. Myers:** Question, question.

**Mr. MacEwen:** I'd also like to get on the list.

**Mr. Myers:** Is that the bat signal (Indistinct)

**Mr. R. Brown:** Sorry.

Its time has come –

**Mr. MacEwen:** (Indistinct) our party.

**Mr. R. Brown:** – for an official plan for PEI. That's my opinion. I think the quicker we can get onto it the better it is.

**Mr. Trivers:** Is the – getting the *Registered Professional Planners Act* in place one of the steps you're taking to make sure you do proper land-use planning for the entire Island, including unincorporated areas? Is this one of the steps in that process?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** If we're going to have a *Registered Professional Planners Act* and presumably ramp up on the number of professional planners in the province, and the province is going to take on the task of doing the land-use planning across the province, including unincorporated areas,

why would we want to encourage a second layer of government through municipalities to do land-use planning primarily?

**Mr. R. Brown:** That's the intent of the MGA.

**Mr. Trivers:** Sorry –

**Mr. R. Brown:** The *Municipal Government Act* –

**Mr. Trivers:** – I think you're missing my point. We don't –

**Mr. R. Brown:** No, no –

**Mr. Trivers:** – need a second level of government –

**Mr. R. Brown:** – it's (Indistinct)

**Chair:** Just one person –

**Mr. Trivers:** – if we have planners at the provincial level that are doing the land-use planning.

**Chair:** Minister of Communities, Land and Environment.

**Mr. R. Brown:** What did he say?

**Chair:** Could you repeat your question? And can we just have one person speaking at a time?

Thank you.

**Mr. Trivers:** If we're going to do land-use planning at the provincial level; we're going to ramp up, we're going to have a *Registered Professional Planners Act*, we're going to have the association. The institute, I should say. Why do we need to have a second layer of government –

**Mr. R. Brown:** Oh, okay –

**Mr. Trivers:** – that we're basically legislating through the *Municipal Government Act*?

**Mr. LaVie:** Exactly.

**Mr. R. Brown:** I thank you for your question.

This is the debate that we should be doing in the Legislature. If people want all the development decisions being made in Charlottetown with one provincial authority and taking it away from the area's residents, then that will be their decision. They have an opportunity now, if they want to take control of their neighbourhood or their area to incorporate into a municipality and have a say at what goes on in their area. Under a provincial authority, they'll have a say, but they'll have a say through town hall meetings.

It's time, I believe, that we start provincial planning on a provincial-wide basis across Prince Edward Island. Our land is under extreme amount of pressure, right now. I'm proud to announce that I've ordered IRAC to do a detailed non-residents report as recommended in the Carver report. I want that report out as soon as possible in order for Islanders to see how much non-residents there is on Prince Edward Island. It has been a question.

Thank you.

**Mr. Trivers:** Your assumption seems to be that if you do land-use planning at the provincial level that it's all done out of Charlottetown? Which I don't understand would be the case. I would like to see, perhaps, a provincial employee spread out across the province.

And (b) more importantly your assumption seems to be that you will only engage communities through some sort of town hall meetings, when, in fact, we have elected representatives who are MLAs for the unincorporated areas, who, I believe, the province should be engaging today on matters of land-use decisions.

For example, there's a case in my district right now, on Rustico Bay, and there's a land-use decision being made. As the MLA for the area, I mean the department has never contacted me and made me aware of it; to engage with the constituents as the elected representative, come to public meetings and help the department liaison with the community. After all, as the elected representative of the area, I think that would be a good thing to do.

Do you – would you agree with that?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes, I would. I would. I think it's a great idea.

**Mr. Trivers:** All right –

**Mr. R. Brown:** And, you know, you could chair the meeting.

**Mr. Trivers:** All right.

**Mr. R. Brown:** No, no, if that's what you want. Look, we're here for a debate.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

No, sorry, the hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** I must be heating things up in here.

I guess if I did decide to hold a public consultation for any sort of land-use planning in my district as the representative, would you commit to sending a representative from the provincial department to help, as a representative, at that meeting. And, also helping the permit applicants come out to the meeting.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah. I think you're onto an idea here. If the rural MLAs want to know about the permitting and the issues that are being done in their districts, and if they want to lead the process, you know, we could look at making you involved. If there's going to be a public meeting you'll be notified. I don't see anything wrong with that.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you for that, minister.

I think it's a good start. I know that the problems with the Rustico Bay development, I believe, are mostly because of just misinformation amongst the residents and just not understanding or having all the information. I will take you up on that offer and I will schedule a public consultation. I will rely on the department to send a representative, as well as to advise the permit holder that they would like them there at the meeting.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Chair.

An interesting discussion here on the planning and stuff, and the member from Rustico kind of turned my thoughts to some of the ideas and things I see going on in my area.

Do you have any planning concerns about the monks in Kings County?

**Mr. R. Brown:** They are the monks – there is a lot of discussion about the monks in Kings County. They are within their land limits. They are residents of PEI and they have a right to acquire land like any other Islander.

**Mr. Myers:** Have you had specific concerns expressed to you about the monks?

**Mr. R. Brown:** We were at the National Farmers Union meeting, the other day, and there was a report presented. The National Farmers Union have a number of concerns. That's why I have ordered IRAC to do a study of properties on Prince Edward Island to make sure that Islanders know the facts on what is occurring.

**Mr. Myers:** There's a big concern amongst farmers, but it's really – it's impacting more than just farmers. I mean, the price of houses out there has gone out of control. The price of land out there has gone out of control. What once was a place you could live out of the city and away from the hustle and bustle and affordable, is becoming not so affordable anymore.

**Mr. R. Brown:** That's not only because of the monks.

**Mr. Myers:** It's the Amish, too.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Pardon?

**Mr. Myers:** Land doubled. Farmland doubled in two years out there. The price of farmland doubled.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah.

**An Hon. Member:** (Indistinct) in Cornwall.

**Mr. Myers:** It quadrupled in Cornwall.

The problem is, is that the only way a young farmer can get into farming is if they're a millionaire. If they're a millionaire, why would they bother farming? What would be the sense of buying farmland if you already had a million dollars? It doesn't make any sense. You're forcing young farmers out of farming. Now, it's an impossible dream. If you're born into a farm family, great, you'll inherit a farm maybe. But, if you're not, there's absolutely no – or if there's a bunch of siblings who want to farm, they really can't afford to buy it. The land prices out there – and to be honest, the monks don't lose a bidding war. They come with cash.

**Mr. R. Brown:** It's like the fishery. The member from Morell could probably tell you; eight or nine years ago a license was 300,000. Now they're going for a million dollars. We cannot control the transactional price of a transaction, unless you want to legislate the price of land. Then you'd have the seller complaining: Well, this is my retirement package, I'm selling my land, my property's worth this, the open market has given me this.

I recommend we all look at the BC report. PEI is a beautiful place to live. The population is growing. The world is getting smaller. People are looking for new places to live, and we're one of the most – I'd say – one of the most popular areas to come to.

We're under a lot of pressure. The planning department will tell you that: over a thousand permits. We're under a lot of pressure and we're at a pivot point, I think, in Prince Edward Island. (Indistinct)

**Chair:** Hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters, do you have another question?

**Mr. Myers:** Yeah, I do.

**Mr. R. Brown:** It's good discussions.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Chair.

I guess regardless, land-use planning is important because over your tenure in government you've basically let half of Kings County get eaten up by the monks. That's who lives there now is them. There's no one else. To me, there's a big issue. I hear it all the time, so I hear it –

**Chair:** Do you have a question, hon. Member?

**Mr. Myers:** Yeah.

**Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Myers:** If I could speak for five seconds, I'll ask it.

I hear it all the time. There's people that are concerned, and they're like: How is this all happening? I don't have an answer. I guess if I had the opportunity to sell my property on the water in Brudenell, I'd sell it for three times what it was worth, too –

**An Hon. Member:** Yeah.

**Mr. Myers:** – if the monks came along with a briefcase full of cash. You can't blame people for selling their land when it's –

**Mr. R. Brown:** I agree.

**Mr. Myers:** You can't blame them.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah.

**Mr. Myers:** Some of the land that was bought was for sale for a long time and the locals didn't come and buy it. There's a large, large segment of concern out there, and nobody wants to talk about it. Nobody wants to talk about it because they don't want to be seen as being unwelcoming or uninviting or racist or any of those things; but they're concerned, because I hear it all the time. You walk into any coffee shop in Kings County –

**Mr. R. Brown:** (Indistinct)

**Mr. Myers:** – they will tell you about it, and I don't know how else to address it other than address it. So I don't know how else to talk about it other than to put it out in the open, and I think we should have an open discussion on it.

**Mr. R. Brown:** I agree with you and I think it's a good discussion tonight. The perception is out there that there's a tremendous amount of pressure put on lands, and that's why I asked IRAC to open their databases up so Islanders can see what is actually going on there. Because I'm getting

calls every day and letters to the editor that people are calling IRAC and they can't get at this information or that information.

We're at a point in our history today, I think, that all of this information should be put out. What I could say is good land use planning would protect farmland; and I'm adamant, we have to protect farmland. If we don't have farmland, we don't have rural communities, we don't have an economy here on Prince Edward Island – and I'm a boy from the city.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Chair. I just have one more.

So that being what it is, then, and IRAC is going to open that up, what is the threshold in your opinion where it's gone too far? Is it when a third of the land belongs to offshore interests? Is it when half of it does, when three-quarters, or when all? At what point do we say – and it's one thing if you're even here all the time. A lot of the properties that – Stratford's full of empty houses that are owned by people who aren't living in them, but they're PNP. That's a whole different thing.

But the issue is, when is the breaking point and when is the point when government has to step up and say: Okay, and if you remember, land protection has been around for a lot of years. Horace Carver brought in –

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah.

**Mr. Myers:** – something that had never been done before at the time. At what point does government start to address that there is a concern? If we look at the IRAC database and it's at 33%, do we say: Uh-oh, that's too far; or do we wait till it gets to 50 or 60? Because then it's really too far.

**Mr. R. Brown:** I think that government has taken some bold steps here in terms of the *Planning Act*, the building code, the national building code being applied all across Prince Edward Island. I've sat in this Legislature for a number of years. Anytime anybody ever talked about a building code outside of the City of Charlottetown, it was no; but

we're beyond that now, and I'm proud of this House for saying that.

We've taken the bite because it's protection of people out there, the building code. You've got to build buildings that are going to not fall down. I'm not saying anything about the past, but I'm just saying proper codes have to be put in place. They're being instituted now. Proper planning has to be put in place to protect neighbourhoods – and when I say neighbourhoods, communities – and if communities want to organize to protect or to be in charge of their area, then they have an option, too, under the Municipal Government Act.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Montague-Kilmuir.

**Mr. Roach:** Just following up on a couple of questions by the hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters: Minister, could you tell us if – and again, I recognize that the term is being used very generously and I'm not sure exactly what group that the member's talking about – but in terms of the monks, if I could say the religious sect part of that where we have the monks who are building a school for teaching and learning, and then we have the nuns who are also in the stages of building a school for teaching and for learning, could you tell us, do those two groups, do they own half of Kings County as was suggested by the hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters?

**Mr. R. Brown:** No.

**Mr. Roach:** Could you give us an indication that you had said that they, that particular groups were well within their limits?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah. We did a – you know, government is hearing the concerns and we've asked IRAC for an opinion, and IRAC has said they're within their land limits; and you know, either we believe IRAC or we don't. We're going to get – we're asking IRAC to publicize their information so – I don't disagree with the member. There is a lot of concern out there; but I think once we get the information out, I think people will realize –

**Mr. Roach:** Thank you, Minister, for those clarifications. I think it's important,

especially coming out of the Legislature, that we be as accurate as we can.

Again, to follow up on a question by the Member from Georgetown-St. Peters; is there a threshold now – we look at different areas of PEI where we look at the percentage of land that's purchased by non-Islanders. Is there a threshold there now where government says: You know what, it's up around 25, 26, 27%; and do they turn requests when it gets to that area? Do they actually turn down, say: No, you can't buy that property; does that happen, Minister?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes. In the review of purchases, there is a review to determine what the non-resident ownership is within the area, and there have been situations where transactions are denied because it would lead to too much non-resident ownership within a community.

**Mr. Roach:** Do we have a percentage or an acreage, or how is that kind of determined? Is there a percentage of acreage in a particular area?

**Mr. R. Brown:** About 30%.

**Mr. Roach:** About 30%?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah.

**Mr. Roach:** And that's when the province starts saying no?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Well, IRAC starts.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** There are a range of situations that lead to changes in the percentages. As an example, if a property owner on PEI dies but then the land is deeded to the children who are non-resident, that transaction proceeds. It's not impeded by the process; however, it can lead to changes within a region. However, when a big parcel of land is for sale, it's part of the decision-making process to review how much is owned by non-residents before the transaction is recommended or denied.

**Mr. Roach:** Thank you, Chair. That's all the questions I have for now.

**Chair:** The hon. Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

**Mr. Palmer:** Thank you, Chair.

Maybe my question has already been answered, but around the land limits that are in place today for farming, do those kind of land limits also apply to the monks?

**Mr. R. Brown:** There are land limits for corporations and there are land limits for individuals. It's not who you are, it's what you're going to use the land for.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes, there are limits in place in PEI. There are limits on how much land anyone in PEI can own; the 1,000 acres for an individual and the 3,000 for a corporation.

**Mr. Palmer:** So are the monks a corporation or are they listed as an individual as far as land holdings are concerned.

**Mr. R. Brown:** There are corporations.

**Mr. Palmer:** A corporation?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Even the churches are corporations, the other religions. Everybody is incorporated, so they fall under the same rules as a corporation. But individuals that move here and reside here, they're Islanders and they're allowed 1,000 acres, each one; each person that is a resident of Prince Edward Island. Once they get their residency, they fall within the residency.

**Mr. Palmer:** Good, thank you.

Thank you, Chair.

They're all falling within the guidelines that we have set in Prince Edward Island to help protect local land ownership? Is that correct?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah. IRAC keeps a really close eye on that and I've been around when IRAC has ordered the vestiture of some properties of some corporations, and when they – you have to – every corporation has to send their land holdings to IRAC every year or every –

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** (Indistinct) there's an annual (Indistinct)

**Mr. R. Brown:** Every year and there are audits done and if they find out that you're

over the limit, you're ordered to sell anything over the limit, which is good for Prince Edward Island.

One of the good things in the early '80s, Horace Carver and I commend Horace Carver and the government of the day when the first round of constitutional hearings were being held, the constitution of 1982, land was in there as a right and they were there to ensure that it was taken out because land is so important for Prince Edward Island and the community. We owe a lot to people like Horace Carver and that who does that.

**Chair:** Hon. members, I'm wondering if I could have your assistance. As the Chair, I'm hearing a lot of questions that are bordering on the *Municipal Government Act*, not the act related to registered professional planners.

**Mr. LaVie:** The minister's bringing it up so we're asking questions on it.

**Chair:** I'm just asking if – I've read the section and if we could focus our discussion on this section –

**Mr. R. Brown:** I won't anymore.

**Chair:** What we're trying to do is, to establish the institute as a professional association, a regulatory body. That's all we're trying to do with this act so I'm wondering if we could refocus and bring back our focus to the act that we're discussing now, and the next person I have on the list is Belfast-Murray River.

**Ms. Compton:** Thank you.

So my parameters have been narrowed.

**Chair:** Well, I'm just trying to bring the focus back to the right act.

**Ms. Compton:** Yes, so just on that note; representing three municipalities in my district, two of them are extremely small geographically. One of them is extremely large geographically, but none of them have the critical mass that supposedly we want for municipalities. I'm just wondering when we're talking about land planning, we're talking about having professional planners being mandatory versus voluntary, how does

that tie into rural communities that are incorporated, with unincorporated areas, and is it still going to be something that we look to the province to make the decisions?

**Mr. R. Brown:** I think with the municipalities we could probably work out something with the incorporated areas now, but there's a shared responsibility between a professional planner in the department – and maybe that planner could take in the surrounding area of that municipality, also, instead of having a small municipality who couldn't afford one of their own, but if they probably could contract to the province. It's just an idea that we could think of and they would take in the greater area also.

You'd want some consistency in the planner that's there. You don't want a planner coming in for this little area and a different planner coming in, and that's one of the reasons for the professional organization that the planning standards would be consistent. The association would ensure that they're consistent, and I think with the new institute that Prince Edward Island will be a much better place in the years to come because professional planning would be done. Professional discussions would be placed, and I think this institution or this act would allow for a better Prince Edward Island.

**Ms. Compton:** Thank you for that.

I'm just wondering – let's go back to the monks. We have a monastery in district four right now that is in an unincorporated area and we talked about the monks – and we know it's an issue. It doesn't matter what is said here in the House. We hear it all the time. It's an issue. I happened to meet with the monks and the nuns yesterday, and we know that neither of those groups have the 1,000 acres each – I think there's 600 and 700.

But, that's not just the issue. The issue is we have a number of the families of monks who are coming here to study who are buying up properties in our communities and that is driving up the value; great that they're coming, but they're not staying here year-round. They're here to visit their children who are at the monastery studying and could be here for eight to 12 years.

Back to the professional planners that we're going to have in place here for incorporated and non-incorporated areas, small municipalities by geographic size or by population; how do we find a planner that is going to take the bull by the horns and say: Enough is enough? We have to have some sort of plan for these communities.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah, and you're right.

That's why the *Municipal Government Act*, the building planning act, and the *Building Codes Act* are the foundations of three foundation documents that allow local communities to take charge of their community.

**Ms. Compton:** Chair?

**Mr. R. Brown:** If a community wants to gather and put a zoning plan together and put a – well the building code will be provincial, and put zonings in their areas and get it approved, that's up to the area.

**Ms. Compton:** So, the onus and expense of that will be on the municipality?

**Mr. R. Brown:** On a planning – if they want to zone their properties and – it's like the City of Charlottetown. There's R1 zone, R2 zone, commercial, industrial. When I was on city council, you had people coming in and saying: Well, why can't I do what I want with my land? Well, when you live in a community you have to be part of the community and the community decides this is the way the community is going to be laid out, then you should be expected to abide by the policies and the bylaws of the community that you live in.

**Ms. Compton:** I agree with that, but we're talking about communities that are fairly small that do not have the resources in place even to have an office open for 20 hours. That's a huge jump in itself. Now we're talking about professional planners, which I agree; we need to have some planning across Prince Edward Island and I know I'm of the understanding that there are limits for non-residents in Point Prim, or there always was because there was just too much land sold to non-residents who – so we have a bunch of vacant properties most of the year.

I'm not saying the monks or the Asians – and I think all Asians are getting painted with that same brush regardless of whether they're here because of the monks or not, and it's good if they're coming here to live and contribute to the economy, but if it's just buying up properties, raising the property values for the people that are here, then we have a concern and there has to be some kind of regulation in place to deal with that I think. That's what I'm hearing.

**Mr. R. Brown:** I agree with you, and I think there are tools in place now for communities to do that. If you need some services of the province or share services with other areas in your area; a group of areas get together to share services, there's that capacity there too.

It's all about empowering the local area. If they want central planning – if an area wants central planning and central decision-making, well that's what you get when you don't want to share in services or come together as a community and say: Here's how we want to lay out our area. Here's where we want our industrial, here's where we want our commercial, here's where we want our residential, and this is the kind of community I want to build and this is the kind of community our neighbors want to live in and if you want to be a part of that community, you'll abide by the laws that the community came up with. But if people don't want to do that and depend on a central agency to do it, well that's the choice they make.

**Ms. Compton:** It'll come down to a matter of dollars and cents then (Indistinct) communities.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Well, you know sometimes it may cost an area a little bit of money to make their area better. We all have to cut our grass. It costs money to cut your grass, but to make your house look good and to make your property look good. But if you want your community to be vibrant, you want your children to grow up, you want your schools, and your playgrounds, and your rinks, and your place for your community to come together, well, there's a cost to that.

**Ms. Compton:** I'm well aware of that, it's just I represent a rural area, so how do we

make this professional planners fit into the municipalities act, fit into the building code, make it all work, keep our rural community vibrant – we still want to do that, but it's always a struggle to make all the regulations we have put in place work for a community that's partially incorporated, partially unincorporated –

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Ms. Compton:** – with a bunch of different municipalities. That's the concern that I have.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Mr. R. Brown:** And I think this legislation is one of the building blocks that the government has put in over the last two years in establishing a better Prince Edward Islander, a better Prince Edward Island for all Islanders. The *Registered Professional Planners Act* will bring the professional planners, professionalize the institute and I see this organization of getting together and saying: Here's some of our ideas on making Prince Edward Island better; here's some zoning issues we could have or planning issues we could have; this is how we, from a planning point of view, could make PEI a better place to live.

Thank you.

**An Hon. Member:** (Indistinct)

**Chair:** Yes, I have you on the list.

Excuse me, Christine.

Just a moment, members. I'm just going to talk with the table.

Hon. members, again, I'm going to remind you we're talking about regulating professional planners. I'm trying to keep the focus on this act that we're discussing now, so we're not talking about municipalities, we're not talking about zoning, we're talking about establishing an institute of professional planners. So, I'm going to use my discretion in the next set of questions so that we're talking about the institute as a professional association and a regulatory body. We're not going to talk about zones or anything like that –

**Mr. R. Brown:** Okay.

**Chair:** We're not going to talk about the monks. I'm trying to keep the focus on the act, so if there's anybody watching outside of this room and they're following along that they'll know that we're talking to this act and not the *Municipal Government Act*. So, I would ask if you could accommodate me in my request to keep the focus.

Thank you.

The hon. Member from Georgetown-St. Peters.

**Mr. Myers:** Thank you, Chair.

**Chair:** You're speaking to this act, right?

**Mr. Myers:** Yes. I think it's a really good discussion, actually, and it's a discussion that's long overdue. For me, I want to clarify what I said. All I was asking was, it wasn't just about the monks, it was about land ownership of non-Islanders and what's the threshold. When I talked about the threshold, I wanted to know: Is there a concern? I'm not saying that there is. Is there a concern when it gets to a certain degree? I think it's something that we all kind of have to face. That was my point on that.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Mr. Myers:** It wasn't just the monks. The monks are the most prevalent one in my area. Yes, maybe they're not the religious organization, but they're all the same people and the member over there sold his house to them and he can defend them if he wants because he probably made big bank on them, but I think –

**Chair:** Hon. member –

**Mr. Myers:** But I think that –

**Mr. Roach:** Chair?

**Mr. Myers:** – it's worth having a conversation about it because it is a serious concern to Islanders. So, my point was to clarify what I meant was total land ownership, what's the threshold, and at what point does government become involved from a planning standpoint?

Thank you.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

I have a question related to the number – what's the expected number of members of the institute in the future? Because I know you're wrapping up with planners in the province and you're going to do land use planning across the province and in unincorporated areas. How many – 15 now, but are we looking at 50, 60, 100?

**Mr. R. Brown:** I guess we will take the advice of the registered professional planners on what they think is required here on Prince Edward Island. If areas are needing planners, then that will go up. If areas don't need planners, planners won't be hired. But we're going to depend on this organization to help PEI, help rural PEI – all of PEI, I could say, is to become an even better place to live than it is now.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** So when you talked with the current association and developed this act in cooperation with them, did they have a certain target number? Did they say: We think we're going to be able to grow our association or now our new institute by a certain number over the next years? Is that really not the approach they were taking? Did they say: We expect it to grow to 100, so we really need to be an institute and we need this legislation?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Christine.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** No, there's no specific target and people aren't assigned on the geography. It's almost like the chicken and egg situation. There would be more planners here if there was more work for planners. For the most part, this legislation establishes consistent standards across the country. One of our barriers to attracting professional planners has been the lack of professional registration here, so people have to leave a place where they are registered and have their experience recognized to come to a place where there is

no professional recognition. So, the lack of legislation has been a barrier to free movement of professionals. Part of this is to address provincial mobility standards and to enhance the portability of professional planner credentials across the country.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Chair:** Rustico-Emerald, are you good?

The hon. Minister of Transportation, Infrastructure and Energy.

On this act, thank you.

**Ms. Biggar:** I guess bringing it back to this and making sure my question pertains to this – I guess what we're talking about here is, similarly as was said, if we didn't have a law society here and we had a lawyer that wanted to come and practice here and there were no regulations or no official councils, or to look at their qualifications – that's what we're talking about here. Around that, and perhaps Christine, you might be more intimately knowledgeable about the fact that – what are the credentials that are required to be a professional planner? Can anybody just come in and say: Oh, I'm a professional planner? I guess that's the purpose – that's the purpose, I guess of this is to make sure –

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Ms. Biggar:** – and would you be able to have any explanation, if you don't mind, Madam Chair, minister, asking your assistant that question?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** The Canadian Institute of Planners establish and accredit universities across the country.

**Ms. Biggar:** Yes.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** So, to start with, there must be graduation from an accredited university with a degree, there's also a requirement for experience and mentoring and that's all spelled out in the legislation.

There would be more detail also developed in the bylaws that the group would develop themselves. But, it's basically the same standards for professional registration across the country. So, it's a national certification process, a national accreditation.

**Ms. Biggar:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Just for clarification –

**Chair:** The hon. Minister of Transportation, Infrastructure and Energy.

**Ms. Biggar:** Thank you. Sorry, Madam Chair.

Minister?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Ms. Biggar:** So, for clarification, this bill is to lay out how that association would be formed, what their rules are, what their makeup is, and that's all this bill is really about?

**Mr. R. Brown:** That's all this bill is about and it's like the engineering bill and the lawyer's bill and –

**Ms. Biggar:** Okay.

**Mr. R. Brown:** – and it gives mobility to the people that are planners on Prince Edward Island to go away and it gives us the ability to recruit planners here –

**Ms. Biggar:** Yeah.

**Mr. R. Brown:** – from away.

**Ms. Biggar:** Right. Okay.

Thank you.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale.

**Ms. Bell:** (Indistinct) we are in the bill?

**Chair:** Yes. We've read section 1, and we haven't carried it, yet.

And we've read section 2 and we're at section 2 and it hasn't been carried yet. So we're currently under the discussion of purposes of the act.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you.

Speaking to that, Madam Chair, as many of you already know I love planning –

**Chair:** Me too.

**Ms. Bell:** – it's one of my favourite things.

On that basis, there's a couple of questions I have regarding the – just some things that have come to light looking at the structure, the set-up of this new association. Is there an application fee, currently for planners to register?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes, there would be a membership.

**Ms. Bell:** A membership fee?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Ms. Bell:** Okay. The reason I'm asking is, is when you've only got 15 that's probably, unless that's a very, very high application fee, probably not a lot of revenue. I'm wondering, with this needing to be an arms-length, a new organization, you know, with, obviously, very rigorous structure, and only a small initial membership, how is that organization going to be operationally managed? Is it going to continue to be done by volunteers, or is there a point where that's going to need to be operationally funded?

**Mr. R. Brown:** I understand it's going to be – continue to be run with volunteers at the current capacity they're at. They have a great organization now. This is just formalizing their structure. I know some of the members and they're really dedicated to their profession. They're really dedicated to Prince Edward Island. They want to see this be a success.

**Ms. Bell:** That's great to hear. I know, certainly, I just mentioned with other professional organizations that do this kind of work, this is often a part of the volunteer capacity of those professionals to do so.

One of the things that rises my concern when you have a very clear requirement for management, in terms of council representation within the organization, and potentially a disciplinary process. And you have a relatively small membership, that can create some challenges.

I was wondering if there had been any consideration around potentially expanding who can serve of that council, particularly

when have a great resource like Engage PEI, for example, that can allow you to access that skill set.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** That was a consideration in the bill. There is provision to bring in people from out-of-province if there is that need for –

**Mr. R. Brown:** Oh, right, for discipline.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** – for discipline or investigation when there's a potential conflict of interest. Clearly, that is a concern with a small organization, but that provision exists in the bill.

**Ms. Bell:** Thank you for that.

Again, I can – I'm still looking for some things that could sort of make this stronger. In terms of the structure and the purposes, it's very clear. You have indicated that this legislation is to fill a gap that isn't being met. In terms, in a province here, one of the things I am really interested in is the portability of that, not only for the potential of people moving around and coming from other provinces, but also the potential portability for people, who have a qualification here that could then go elsewhere with it as well. So, professional development is an aspect –

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Ms. Bell:** – of this.

Perhaps, Madam Chair, I could ask another question to that point, which is: How does this work for recognition of international designations?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** I believe there's a national agreement or guidelines on how to recognize credentials internationally.

**Ms. Bell:** Okay.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** As in many other professions, there are reciprocal agreements and recognition of equal credentials. But, there is always a reassessment when someone moves to Canada to make sure that the credential required by a new immigrant is the same, or recognized as equivalent to the Canadian accreditation.

**Mr. R. Brown:** The federal government has a big program on foreign credentials, and foreign credentials recognition. They're working extremely hard on making sure that all associations across Canada, you know, that their credentials are identified and the people that are coming to Canada, there's a process in place to recognize their credentials under a national, and then under a provincial.

**Ms. Bell:** Madam Chair, possibly my last question.

On that basis, I think it would be encouraging for us to think about, you know, when you spoke potential need for and growth in this area, that with a strong set of regulations like this that are – or some piece of legislation that allows us to sort of hit to the same level as the other provinces –

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah.

**Ms. Bell:** – that that's something that we can think about, in terms of, you know educational opportunity and growth opportunity for Islanders who would like to remain here and give back to their province, or to engage those who are coming from away.

Even as a volunteer organization, there's (Indistinct) community connections that could allow us to think about how we can engage with the university and connect. I'm sure you've thought of that, already. I would be interested to see, sort of, what those future plans look like.

I noticed that the by-laws did allow for that kind of flexibility to sort of determine that future application.

And other than that, that would be the end of my questions for today. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Kensington-Malpeque.

**Mr. MacKay:** Thank you, Chair.

A couple of quick questions; the first one, I just want a bit of clarification: How many professional planners are in the province? Did you say four?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Fifteen. Oh, there's 15 in the volunteer organization, four in the province employed by the department.

**Mr. MacKay:** The professional planners that work for the province now, they're the ones that make the rules and regulations or recommendations now, or no?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Go ahead.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Land-use planning is governed under the *Planning Act*. The planners that we employ in government apply their skills within the framework that's allowed in the *Planning Act*. There's no requirement, at this stage, that they be registered or not because that's a provincial – that's what we're trying to do with this legislation is to ensure that people are working here are professionals in their field.

**Mr. MacKay:** Which, you know, I think it's great. Don't get me wrong here, one concern I have, and I just don't know who makes the decisions on it, or who is going to make decisions on it in the future, we certainly need rules and regulations in place for the *Land Protection Act, P.E.I.*, are these professional planners, like what I would like to see, and I don't know if it has been discussed amongst the four now, is regulation set from tip-to-tip on PEI? So, people follow the same rules with – and it doesn't matter what community you live in – have a standard set of rules and regulations for Prince Edward Island. Has that been discussed with the four planners now?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** That's what the *Planning Act* does for us. It provides that uniform legislation across the province. It provides for municipal planning, but also for provincial planning.

**Mr. MacKay:** I've certainly seen, over the last 10 years, lots of communities and rural areas, especially, operate differently.

We'll give you an example. We'll use my district for example. You never see a 100-acre parcel of land sold to an off-Island resident in my district. But, every second week, when I look at Executive Council, it is sold in Souris, Tignish, Wellington, it – so, my concern is that we don't have a guideline

for the whole province as a whole. It's almost, we're picking winners and losers, right? Over time people have picked one area because it's – they've liked it or it's attractive in their family, and we've almost devalued some of these, I guess, farms and so forth that, that was their retirement. There's no set of regulations that people are following Island-wide.

I'm just wondering if it's been discussed that there's, over time, a set of rules that everyone follows Island-wide; it doesn't matter what community or what district you're from.

**Mr. R. Brown:** We are reviewing the policies in the department now to be consistent right across Prince Edward Island in terms of application process, application information require, what the process is and going to be developing a set of regulations in that area (Indistinct)

**Mr. MacKay:** Final question,

I guess what I'm asking though, is what you're developing now going to be the same set of rules for everyone to follow?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes. Like, I said; applications over the last four years here on Prince Edward Island for development, development permits on Prince Edward Island have skyrocketed to over 30% increase on Prince Edward Island. There's a tremendous amount of activity going on all across PEI.

There's an economic boom. There's a population boom. And it's being spread right across Prince Edward Island. We need some consistency and speeding-up of the process.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Montague-Kilmuir.

**Mr. Roach:** Thank you, Chair.

I've read section 2, the purposes of the act; I've probably read it a half a dozen times now. So I'd like to move that that section be carried.

**Chair:** Anybody else on the speaking order feel we've exhausted section 2?

**An Hon. Member:** (Indistinct)

**Chair:** You're on the speaking order. Thank you for that, hon. member.

I have the Premier next, Morell-Mermaid and then Rustico-Emerald.

Premier?

**Premier MacLauchlan:** I'd be happy to carry section 2, but I'll make a comment, Chair.

I was part of a local council that went through a planning process and developed an official plan. In fact, our planner's here in the gallery, Janice Harper. We couldn't have gotten the job done without her. In fact, the province helped to fund it, so that answers something we heard earlier and I'm sure that would be the case on a going-forward basis.

Very simply, I think that the essence of this act is we can't have dental health without dentists and we can't have laws without lawyers and this province and people, and you can hear it from all the comments tonight, we know in our core that our land and our landscape and our environment are some of the most valuable things that we have to look after. Kingsley Lewis is here who was doing this in the '70s.

We can't pretend that of all the things we need, that we're going to do this act without professional help. Having been part of the process, there are lots of points at which it can kind of fly apart or go off course or whatever, just in the nature of some of the points that we're making here; and that's exactly what a professional planner does, is assist communities and then, in turn, the communities as things develop, to have a vision, make rules and steward this most valuable resource.

I'm in support of the entire law, and of course to recognizing that this will be a critical step in dealing with issues that people care about.

**Chair:** Thank you.

The hon. Member from Morell-Mermaid.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Chair.

Minister, you said earlier you're ordering IRAC to start releasing some of this information. Last fall, October 26<sup>th</sup>, November 2<sup>nd</sup>, myself, the hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald, the hon. Leader of the Third Party, we had put forward a number of requests at that standing committee; everything from land owned by nonresidents, land purchased in the last three years by nonresidents, percentage of subdivision development permits that have been used, parcels over five acres; a whole wealth of really good information that could have dispelled all kinds of this debate.

But, you're telling me you just ordered this now, and we asked for this back on October 26<sup>th</sup>?

**Mr. R. Brown:** I asked IRAC to implement the recommendation of the Carver report that said do up an annual report on nonresident ownership.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Minister, when you asked for that, did nobody in your department talk about the multitude of requests that the standing committee put forward last fall? We had amazing discussion at two different meetings with four different ministers on this. Did nobody think to say, like: Yeah, we're supposed to get back to standing committee?

We could have had all this stuff. The Member from Montague-Kilmuir over there, I heard you in a previous standing committee talk about all these things. If we had just had that information way back when, all of this could have been dispelled.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah, and we're taking the advice of the committee and we've asked IRAC for the information.

**Mr. MacEwen:** You take such a –

**Chair:** Morell-Mermaid, are we focusing – I'm asking everybody to focus on this act and not the line of questioning that you're going down. This is about the fourth time now that I've asked that, so I would ask if you would respect the Chair and ask the questions pertaining to the act for the Prince

Edward Island Institute of Professional Planners.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you, Chair.

**Chair:** Do you have a question related to that?

**Mr. MacEwen:** Yes, Chair.

Minister, not 15, 20 minutes ago you said: I ordered IRAC to do this. It certainly wasn't by respect or to that committee. What I'm trying to say is whether it's these professional planners, whether it's anybody on the Island, we could have dispelled a whole lot of this stuff if we would actually honour the request of that committee.

Now, that's one request that you've made. Could you promise me today as the new minister that you'll go back and look at all those requests and bring all that information back to us, not just the one request that you made to IRAC, that you demanded they bring this back?

**Mr. R. Brown:** We're finalizing their response for you.

**Mr. MacEwen:** Thank you.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

I'm curious as to the wording of 'institute' as opposed to 'corporation' and why that was chosen. I thought this would be – section 2 is the appropriate place for that question.

**Chair:** Thank you.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** It's simply a choice of wording. The association is named an association of planners now. It will be named the Prince Edward Island Institute of Professional Planners and it does have the powers of a corporation under the act.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah, under the corporation (Indistinct) –

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Under section 3(2).

**Mr. Trivers:** Okay, so I guess you decided that was a good name. Perhaps there are other planning institutes across Canada and that's a convention that's used across Canada?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** Ah, okay, great. Thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you.

Shall the section carry? Carried.

It's been brought to my attention that we didn't carry section 1.

Shall that section carry? Carried.

Thank you.

**Ms. Biggar:** Carry the bill.

**Chair:** Thank you.

**Ms. Biggar:** Carry the bill.

**Mr. MacKay:** No, the bill's not been carried.

**Chair:** 3. Association continued as Institute

(1) The organization known as the Prince Edward Island Association of Planners is hereby continued as a body corporate to be known as the Prince Edward Island Institute of Professional Planners.

(2) The Institute has the same general powers as a company incorporated under the Companies Act R.S.P.E.I. 1988, Cap. C-14, except where those powers are inconsistent with this Act.

(3) The membership of the Institute consists of the following persons, until they cease to be members in accordance with this Act and the bylaws:

(a) the persons who, immediately before the coming into force of this section, were members of the Association; and

(b) the persons who are admitted as members of the Institute pursuant to this Act and the bylaws.

(4) Upon registration as a candidate or a registered professional planner under this Act, the registrant becomes a member of the Institute.

**Mr. Trivers:** Chair?

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

Is there any fee associated with becoming a member of the association of professional planners?

**Mr. R. Brown:** They will determine that. (Indistinct) –

**Chair:** That question was already asked.

**Mr. Trivers:** Was it? Oh, sorry, I didn't hear the response.

**Chair:** Shall the section carry? Carried.

**Mr. Trivers:** What was the answer?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes.

**Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** How much was it?

**An Hon. Member:** New rule?

**Mr. R. Brown:** They will determine that as the association.

**Mr. Trivers:** No, I – sorry, Chair, (Indistinct) all my questions.

**Chair:** Sorry.

The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

My question was: For the current association, is there a fee and how much is it?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes, there is a fee. We'll get you that. Three dollars?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Three hundred.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Three hundred dollars.

**Mr. Trivers:** Did you foresee the fee in the future to be approximately the same amount with the institute?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** The reason I ask that is I'm just kind of curious because when you're moving from an association to an institute into a corporation like this, and you've got fees associated – not that that would happen with this particular institute, the association with planners; but for example, if the fee is going from \$300 to \$50 or if it was going from \$300 to \$1,000, it'd be advantageous for people to quick buy up their memberships under the association so when it comes over under the corporation they get in under the wire and saved the money, that sort of thing.

I'm just curious because it's an interesting way to do it, where all the members of the association become part of the corporation. So what exactly are they under the corporation? Do they become like shareholders of the new institute corporation?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** No.

**Mr. R. Brown:** No.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** They're just members.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Members, as any organization. The company acts allows for this.

**Mr. Trivers:** As a corporation under the *Companies Act*, would they actually have shareholders as well?

**Mr. R. Brown:** No.

**Mr. Trivers:** Okay, thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you.

Shall the section carry? Carried.

**Ms. Bell:** Chair?

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale.

**Ms. Bell:** Could we potentially address this section by section rather than clause by clause?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Ms. Bell:** Is that an option? Can I move that we do the bill section by section?

**Chair:** Okay, sure.

Are we okay with that?

**Ms. Biggar:** Agreed.

**Mr. Trivers:** I wasn't (Indistinct) –

**Chair:** No, (Indistinct) –

**Mr. Trivers:** – we go clause by clause but –

**Chair:** But we can do –

**Mr. Trivers:** – but if everybody else but me wants to go –

**Mr. Myers:** No, I like it clause by clause.

**Chair:** Let's have a show of hands. Who would like to go section by section? Raise your hands, section by section.

Those who would like to go clause by clause, raise your hands.

The majority will go with section –

**Mr. Myers:** Chair, can I ask a question? Is that the actual rule? If a member wants it read clause by clause, I believe the rule of the House is that you (Indistinct) clause by clause.

**Chair:** Hon. Member, I think the –

**Mr. Myers:** Because it infringes on my right, actually, as a member of the Legislature.

**Chair:** Hon. member, I think, as we discussed all day today about consensus, that we –

**Mr. Myers:** I'd like to speak to the Speaker about it then, perhaps.

**Chair:** We talked all day about consensus and I think this is a –

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct)

**Chair:** I'm looking to continue –

**Mr. Myers:** (Indistinct) vote on this.

**Chair:** I'm looking to continue on with going by section by section, as the majority of the members of the House –

**Mr. Myers:** That's not the way it works.

**Chair:** During a committee of the whole meeting, if somebody makes a request to go clause by clause we do that. There's often times we will say we're going to read sections four to 27 –

**Mr. MacEwen:** That's when (Indistinct)

**Chair:** – and then everybody agrees to that.

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct)

**Chair:** Well, we had a request –

**An Hon. Member:** Chair?

**Chair:** Hon. members, we had a request from the hon. Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale. I asked the House how they would like to proceed with that. The majority of the House agreed that we go section by section and so therefore, working as a consensus –

**Mr. MacEwen:** Chair, the majority of (Indistinct) government party would shut this thing down (Indistinct)

**Leader of the Opposition:** Chair?

**Mr. Myers:** It's infringing on my rights.

**Mr. MacEwen:** They would vote to (Indistinct)

**Chair:** Would you like to withdraw your comment and we'll go clause by clause?

**An Hon. Member:** Yeah, go ahead.

**Chair:** So we could –

**Mr. Myers:** You already voted. Apparently the vote mattered to you.

**Chair:** Would you withdraw that so we don't infringe on his rights?

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct)

**Ms. Bell:** I thought it was my right (Indistinct)

**Chair:** Yes, I thought it was your –

**Mr. MacEwen:** It is your right (Indistinct)

**Some Hon. Members:** (Indistinct)

**Ms. Bell:** In the interest of reaching a consensus, I think perhaps that may be best in this instance, Chair.

**Chair:** Well, thank you for being – I'd actually like to commend the Member from Charlottetown-Parkdale for being reasonable with this.

Thank you.

**Mr. Myers:** It's not that I'm being unreasonable (Indistinct) infringe on my (Indistinct) I need to (Indistinct)

**Chair:** Section 4. Objects.

The objects of the Institute are

(a) to protect the public and serve the public interest in relation to planning conducted by registered professional planners;

(b) to protect and maintain the integrity of the planning profession;

(c) to regulate the practice and professional conduct of registrants in accordance with this Act, the regulations and the bylaws;

(d) to promote and increase the knowledge, skill and proficiency of registrants;

(e) to promote and contribute to awareness about the values and methods of planning in Prince Edward Island; and

(f) to provide for the professional association and support of its members.

Shall that section carry?

The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

I really like the objects of this act and it's really great to have that enshrined in legislation, in particular, to protect the public and serve the public interest in relation to planning conducted by registered professional planners.

I was wondering if that would pertain specifically or include the scope of doing planning in both municipalities and unincorporated areas of the province.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes. The standard is one, no matter urban or rural, or incorporated or unincorporated. The institute and the people that are members of the institute have a code, and that code means on land planning and no matter where the land is; in an incorporated or non-incorporated area, the same standards will be followed.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

I really like (e) as well, under objects: to promote and contribute to awareness about the values and methods of planning in PEI.

I was wondering what sort of activities would the institute undertake to do that sort of thing? Where would their budget come from to undertake these activities?

**Mr. R. Brown:** I think the institute would do like any other professional organization on Prince Edward Island; the engineering or anything like that. They would promote their professional body through their fees and the good work that they'd be doing, and the work that they do on behalf of Islanders. They'd be doing it through their association and that's what the clause says: to promote and contribute to the awareness about the values and the methods of planning in Prince Edward Island.

This organization will be a big asset towards a better Prince Edward Island.

**Mr. Trivers:** I do agree, minister, because one of the big problems I think are a lot of the myths surrounding the land use and planning on the Island and what's in and what's out, and where zones exist and where they don't.

I want wondering – I think it's a big job out there to promote this, and really there's a lot of resistance out there, especially in unincorporated areas, to land-use planning. This is my property and I'm going to build what I want on that property, you guys can't tell me that to do kind of thing. I understand that. I sympathize with that.

I was wondering if there had been any discussions with the province to consider providing any funding to this new institute to help with promoting the understanding of good, and the value of good land-use planning throughout the province.

**Mr. R. Brown:** We would work with the planning association and if they have come up with a campaign in conjunction with the province to promote planning across Prince Edward Island, we'd definitely work with the association and what they see as good for Prince Edward Island and good for making PEI a better place to live, work and play.

**Mr. Trivers:** Based on the budget of the association, what is the projected yearly budget for the institute?

**Mr. R. Brown:** There are 15 members at \$300 a member – \$200 a member, it already went down. So, the association will set the fees and do the budget, and they will do these through annual meetings.

**Mr. Trivers:** What sort of activities are undertaken by the association right now to work towards these objects in the institute? I'm just curious.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** They've established a number of education and training requirements. From time to time, they host regional conferences. They put on training courses and workshops. They have an annual awards program where they recognize community initiatives that demonstrate good planning. There are a range of activities that they're involved with on an ongoing basis as volunteers seeking to enhance the understanding of their profession. There are programs in schools. There are a wide range of activities.

**Mr. Trivers:** I wanted to thank the association for the work they do, and I look forward to maybe attending some of your

annual general meetings in the future as an institute.

Thank you.

**Chair:** Shall the section carry? Carried.

#### 5. Annual general meeting

The Institute shall hold an annual general meeting of its members, in accordance with the bylaws.

Shall the section carry? Carried.

#### 6. Council

(1) The affairs and business of the Institute shall be under the management and control of a council consisting of

(a) at least three members of the Institute who are residents of Prince Edward Island, the majority of whom are registrants, elected in accordance with the bylaws; and

(b) two public representatives who are residents of Prince Edward Island but not members of the Institute, appointed by the Minister.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Chair?

**Chair:** Hon. member, as we've been doing – I've been reading a full section and then I'll entertain the question.

**Leader of the Opposition:** (Indistinct)

**Chair:** Thank you.

#### Term

(2) The term of office for a member of the council is three years and a member shall not hold office for more than two consecutive terms.

(3) A member of the council ceases to hold office if

(a) the member of the council ceases to be a resident of Prince Edward Island;

(b) where the member of the council is a member of the Institute, he or she ceases to be a member of the Institute;

(c) where the member of the council is not a member of the Institute, he or she becomes a member of the Institute; or  
 (d) where the member of the council is a registrant, his or her registration is suspended or cancelled.

Vacancy, elected member of council

(4) Where a member of the council who was elected ceases to hold office before his or her term expires, the council may appoint a member of the Institute who is a resident of Prince Edward Island and, if necessary to maintain the ratio described in clause (1)(a), a registrant, to the office for the unexpired portion of the term.

Vacancy, appointed member of council

(5) Where a member of the council who was appointed by the Minister ceases to hold office before his or her term expires, the Minister may appoint a resident of Prince Edward Island who is not a member of the Institute to the office for the unexpired portion of the term.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you, Chair.

Chair, I have a question in relation to 6(1)(b) where it states: Two public representatives who are residents of Prince Edward Island but not members of the institute appointed by the minister.

Could the minister tell us where those names potentially would come from?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Engage PEI.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Engage PEI?

Would there be any financial compensation for those two individuals that would be appointed?

**Mr. R. Brown:** No.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Sorry, I couldn't hear the answer.

**Mr. R. Brown:** No. Sorry.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Okay, thank you.

**Chair:** Shall the section carry?  
 Sorry, Rustico-Emerald had a question.

**Mr. Trivers:** Yes. It's under the automatic termination of office, (3)(a): The member of the council ceases to be a resident of PEI.

Along the lines of the member from Charlottetown, district 11, would there be provisions in place so that the membership of that member would automatically, potentially, transfer to a different institute in another province when they moved away from the Island? Is that the sort of thing that would be considered?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** Okay. That's good to hear.

**Chair:** Shall that section carry? Carried.

#### 7. Administrative bylaws

(1) The council, with the approval of not less than two-thirds of the members of the council, may make bylaws not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations relating to the management and operation of the Institute, including bylaws

(a) respecting the rights and obligations of members of the Institute in relation to the management and operation of the Institute, including voting rights and participation in committees of the council;

(b) establishing the seal of the Institute and governing its use;

(c) providing for the holding of an annual general meeting of the members of the Institute, quorum requirements and the conduct of the meeting;

(d) providing for the holding of special meetings of the members of the Institute, quorum requirements and the conduct of those meetings;

(e) respecting the election of members of the council under clause 6(1)(a);

(f) respecting the governance procedures of the council;

- (g) respecting the appointment of the registrar, and other officers, agents and employees of the Institute;
- (h) respecting the qualifications, terms of office, powers, duties, remuneration and resignation or removal of the registrar and other officers, agents and employees of the Institute;
- (i) providing for the holding of meetings of the council, quorum requirements and the conduct of meetings, including
- (i) fixing the time and place for regular meetings,
- (ii) determining who may call meetings,
- (iii) regulating the conduct of meetings,
- (iv) providing for emergency meetings, and
- (v) regulating the notice required in respect of meetings;
- (j) respecting the establishment and operation of committees of the council, including
- (i) determining the composition, powers and duties of the committees, and
- (ii) providing for the holding of meetings of committees, quorum requirements and the conduct of meetings of committees;
- (k) establishing the duties, remuneration and allowances of members of the council and committees, and providing for the payment of necessary expenses of the council and committees;
- (l) providing for the execution of documents by the council;
- (m) respecting the banking and financial dealings of the Institute;
- (n) respecting the management of the real and personal property of the Institute;
- (o) establishing and governing scholarships, bursaries and prizes;
- (p) respecting collaboration by the Institute with any educational institution, person, group, association, organization or

corporation having goals or objectives similar to those of the Institute;

(q) providing procedures for the making, amending and revoking of bylaws;

(r) setting requirements to obtain and maintain membership in the Institute;

(s) establishing categories of membership;

(t) providing for the transition of persons, other than registrants, from categories of membership established in the bylaws of the Association;

(u) respecting the form of, and procedures for making, an application for membership in the Institute;

(v) respecting the information to be provided with an application for membership in the Institute;

(w) providing for the appointment of fellows of the Institute; and

(x) requiring the payment of fees for membership in the Institute and for services provided by the Institute and setting out those fees.

**An Hon. Member:** (Indistinct)

**Chair:** I'm not finished reading this section, hon. member.

**Mr. Trivers:** Well, I thought –

**Chair:** No, it's still section –

**Mr. Trivers:** (Indistinct) section 7.

**Chair:** Yes and it's another page, if you don't mind.

**Mr. Trivers:** Yes, no problem.

**Chair:** I am going clause by clause, as requested.

(2) The council, with the approval of not less than two-thirds of the members of the council, may make bylaws not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations relating to the regulation of candidates and registered professional planners, including bylaws

- (a) respecting the form of, and procedures for making, an application for registration under this Act;
- (b) respecting the information to be provided with an application for registration made under this Act;
- (c) respecting procedures for registration;
- (d) providing for the council to enter into an agreement with a person or entity respecting the evaluation of applicant qualifications;
- (e) respecting the register, including the form and content of the register and the information to be provided by registrants for the register;
- (f) setting out the minimum amount of liability insurance coverage required for a registered professional planner;
- (g) setting out fees payable under this Act, including fees for registration, annual registration and the reinstatement of registration;
- (h) setting out penalties for late payment of fees;
- (i) setting out the requirements for continuing professional development for registered professional planners;
- (j) specifying the date by which a registered professional planner or candidate shall, each year,
- (i) submit a report and declaration respecting his or her continuing professional development activities, and
- (ii) pay the annual registration fee;
- (k) establishing or adopting requirements for mentorship and responsible professional planning experience;
- (l) establishing or adopting standards, codes or rules respecting practice, professional conduct and ethics;
- (m) respecting the suspension of a registration, on the request of the registrant, for a temporary absence from participation as a candidate or practice as a registered professional planner;

- (n) respecting actions or omissions of registrants that constitute professional misconduct or professional incompetence;
- (o) respecting information or wording that is to appear on the professional seal or stamp of a registered professional planner and the use of that professional seal or stamp.

(3) A bylaw made under subsection (2) that adopts requirements, standards, codes or rules may adopt such requirements, standards, codes or rules published by another professional body or government agency by reference, in whole or in part and with such changes as are considered necessary, and as amended from time to time.

(4) A bylaw made under subsection (2) and any requirement, standard, code or rule established or adopted by such bylaw shall be made available by the council for public inspection on request and shall be posted on the Institute website, if one has been established.

The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

I was wondering: Have any of the administrative bylaws been written yet for the new institute?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** No.

**Mr. R. Brown:** No.

**Mr. Trivers:** Have any of the professional bylaws been written for the new institute.

**Mr. R. Brown:** No. It's pretty hard for them to get bylaws ready before the act is approved, so once the act is approved, they will work on the bylaws.

**Mr. Trivers:** So, I'm guessing that the *Registered Professional Planners Act* was probably based on another professional registered professional act like professional engineers or these sorts of things. I was wondering – especially this section on the bylaws – must be very, very similar when it comes to a registered professional act from act to act.

I was wondering if any consideration was made to breaking that out into a separate

piece of legislation that could just be referenced by all the different registered professional acts. It's the sort of thing – I'm thinking as a software developer, that's the way I would do it. I would break it out and then I could just include that piece as needed and then when I wanted to make a change, it would apply to all the other acts – when you make a change in one spot and having to make and amend every single act.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** In some jurisdictions, that is the model for self-governing professions. For example, in Quebec, there is one global professions piece of legislation with addenda.

Under the structure we have today we have individual profession legislation, so we did not undertake to rewrite everyone's legislation. We have just added one more profession to be –

**Mr. Trivers:** Is that something that is being considered for the future? To try and, you know, basically shrink down each one of the individual acts and then deal with common pieces in a separate place to actually improve efficiency for the future?

**Mr. R. Brown:** I think they did that under the *Regulated Health Professions Act*. They made it under one act, to put all the associations. That's a great idea that I think government will take a look at for all other professional organizations. Great idea.

**Chair:** Shall the section carry? Carried.

#### 8. Appointment of registrar

(1) The council shall appoint a registrar who shall hold office at the pleasure of the council. Register

(2) The registrar shall keep a register in which he or she shall keep a record of all registrants. Available to public

(3) The registrar shall make the register available to the public on request.

**Mr. Trivers:** Chair?

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald.

**Mr. Trivers:** Again, and I'm thinking of commonalities between all the different registered professions. For example, making the register available to the public upon request and keeping a register.

I'm assuming that that's generally done in an electronic form in this modern age. So, what we're looking at is probably a duplication of effort –

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** – across each one of the professions.

I was wondering, again, if, as a service to registered professions, the government has ever looked at, you know, providing a central application where it would serve all registered professions, including the ability to make the register available to the public; publish information online, these sorts of things. Instead, of, of course, duplicating the time and the cost and the effort for every individual association to duplicate that functionality.

**Mr. R. Brown:** These are individual associations and they – we tend to allow them to govern themselves under particular laws. I guess in a future date, we're – a number of organizations want to get together and cooperate and share services that would be done by them. They would come to government and maybe with a suggestion for changes to the legislation.

**Mr. Trivers:** Just for the record, I think that'd be a great offer for the government to make to registered professionals, to help them out with that so it's yet another piece they don't have to worry about and pay for necessarily within their organizations.

Thank you.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Thank you.

**Chair:** Shall the section carry? Carried.

9. (1) The council may delegate to the registrar one or more of the council's powers or duties under this Act related to the registration of persons as candidates or registered professional planners.

(2) The council may impose terms and conditions that it considers appropriate on a delegation of its powers to the registrar.

(3) Where the council delegates a power or duty to the registrar pursuant to subsection (1), a reference in this Act or the regulations to the council in relation to that power or duty shall be read as a reference to the registrar.

Shall the section carry? Carried.

10. (1) Where the registrar is unavailable or unable to act, the council may appoint a person to act in the place of the registrar.

(2) Where the council appoints a person to act in the place of the registrar pursuant to subsection (1),

(a) the person acting in the place of the registrar may exercise the powers and shall perform the duties of the registrar under this Act and the regulations, or as delegated by the council, for the duration of the appointment; and

(b) a reference in this Act or the regulations to the registrar shall be read as a reference to the person acting in the place of the registrar.

Shall the section carry? Carried.

11. (1) A person may apply to the council, in a form approved by the council, for registration as a candidate.

(2) The council shall register a person who applies under subsection (1) as a candidate, if the person

(a) satisfies the council that he or she is employed in planning;

(b) satisfies the council that he or she

(i) has successfully completed an undergraduate or graduate degree program in planning at a post-secondary institution accredited or recognized by the Professional Standards Board,

(ii) has successfully completed a prescribed combination of education and experience, or

(iii) is a certified member, without restrictions, of an international professional planning organization with which the Canadian Institute of Planners maintains a formal reciprocal membership agreement;

(c) pays the registration fee set out in the bylaws; and

(d) meets any other prescribed requirements.

(3) The following terms and conditions apply to the registration of a candidate:

(a) subject to the bylaws in respect of the suspension of a registration for a temporary absence from practice, to maintain registration as a candidate, the candidate shall

(i) maintain coverage or ensure he or she is covered under professional liability insurance in the amount specified in the bylaws,

(ii) meet the requirements set out in the bylaws respecting continuing professional development and submit a report and declaration to this effect each year, in the form required by the council, on or before the date specified in the bylaws, and

(iii) pay the annual registration fee set out in the bylaws each year no later than the date specified in the bylaws;

(b) the candidate may not be registered as a candidate for more than seven years;

(c) the candidate is subject to bylaws establishing or adopting requirements respecting mentorship or responsible professional planning experience;

(d) the candidate is subject to bylaws establishing or adopting standards, codes or rules for registrants respecting practice, professional conduct and ethics;

(e) the candidate is subject to bylaws respecting actions or omissions of registrants that constitute professional misconduct or professional incompetence;

(f) the candidate is subject to any terms or conditions imposed by the council on the candidate's registration pursuant to section 13.

The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald has a question.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

Under the qualifications for registration as a candidate, 2(a): Satisfies the council that he or she is employed in planning. I'm wondering, what if it's someone who, for example, moves to Prince Edward Island and is a planner that is seeking employment, would they not be allowed to apply to be a member of the institute?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yes.

**Mr. Trivers:** Just to be clear, until a person is actually working as a planner in the province, even though they may have work experience and be certified as a planner, they won't be allowed to join the institute?

Did you feel that this is an acceptable thing?

**Mr. R. Brown:** They can still be a member and seeking employment.

**Mr. Trivers:** I'm just worried that that clause limits – it might be relatively rare case, but, you know, if the interest of details and covering all scenarios, I'd hate to have somebody who moved to the province and couldn't join the institute because they couldn't find a job. To suggest that that, I won't make an amendment, but it might be an area that, potentially, might arise and have to be looked at in the future.

I have another question, Chair?

I was wondering on section 2(b)(i), it's "...undergraduate or graduate degree program in planning at a post-secondary institution accredited or recognized by the Professional Standards Board". Where would you find that list? Does the Professional Standards Board publish that somewhere?

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** Yes, it's under the Canadian institute of planning. There's a national accreditation process.

**Mr. Trivers:** Okay, thanks. I was just curious about that.

**Chair:** Shall the section carry? Carried.

**Ms. Biggar:** Chair?

**Chair:** Oh, sorry hon. Minister of Transportation, Infrastructure and Energy, you had a question?

**Ms. Biggar:** Actually, Madam, I have a motion. You know, we have these people sat in the gallery who are part of this profession and I would like to make a motion to carry the bill.

**Chair:** Okay. Everybody good to carry the bill?

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Chair:** Okay. Sorry.

**Mr. Myers:** The legislation takes as –

**Chair:** 12 –

**Mr. Myers:** – (Indistinct) as it takes.

**Chair:** Number 12.

(1) A person may apply to the council, in the form approved by the council, for registration as a registered professional planner.

(2) The council shall register a person who applies under subsection (1) as a registered professional planner, if the person

(a) is either

(i) a candidate who satisfies the council that he or she has successfully completed the prescribed

(A) mentorship,

(B) responsible professional planning experience,

(C) ethics and professionalism course, and

(D) professional examination, or

(ii) a professional planner who

(A) is legally authorized to practise as a registered professional planner, or a designation considered equivalent by the council, and to use associated titles in

another Canadian jurisdiction, without restriction, and

(B) is in good standing with the organization or body governing practice as a registered professional planner, or a designation considered equivalent by the council, and the use of associated designations in that other Canadian jurisdiction;

(b) pays the registration fee set out in the bylaws; and

(c) meets any other prescribed requirements.

(3) The following terms and conditions apply to the registration of a registered professional planner:

(a) subject to the bylaws in respect of the suspension of a registration for a temporary absence from practice, to maintain registration as a registered professional planner, the registered professional planner shall

(i) maintain coverage or ensure he or she is covered under professional liability insurance in the amount specified in the bylaws,

(ii) meet the requirements set out in the bylaws respecting continuing professional development and submit a report and declaration to this effect each year, in the form required by the council, on or before the date specified in the bylaws, and

(iii) pay the annual registration fee set out in the bylaws each year no later than the date specified in the bylaws;

(b) the registered professional planner is subject to bylaws establishing or adopting standards, codes or rules for registrants respecting practice, professional conduct and ethics;

(c) the registered professional planner is subject to bylaws respecting actions or omissions of registrants that constitute professional misconduct or professional incompetence;

(d) the registered professional planner is subject to any terms or conditions imposed by the council on the registered professional

planner's registration pursuant to section 13.

Shall the section carry?

**Mr. Trivers:** Question.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald has a question.

**Mr. Trivers:** Thank you, Chair.

I'm looking at 3(a), so this covers the case where, you know, a member has a temporary absence from practice, and so their registration is suspended, but –

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** It's the case of a maternity leave or an illness where a professional practitioner may be absent from the workplace for some time.

**Mr. Trivers:** I guess, I'm a little confused by the clause. So, they have a suspension of registration because of a temporary absence, but they still have to maintain registration as a registered professional planner while they are temporarily suspended. The two seem mutually exclusive. If you're temporarily suspended, then you're no longer registered, or temporarily absent and you have a suspension of registration, how can you maintain your registration? I'm just wondering about the wording. It doesn't make sense to me.

I do, I think I understand the intent here, but.

**Christine MacKinnon Director:** It's simply in the wording that the following conditions apply if you maintain registration, but it recognizes that there may be the case, subject to the by-laws where there is a temporary suspension provision. That's later on.

**Mr. Trivers:** All right, Chair. I'm not entirely sure that the wording makes sense to me, but if you're satisfied with that.

**Mr. R. Brown:** Yeah.

**Mr. Trivers:** I'm not prepared to make an amendment at this time so –

**Chair:** Thank you.

Shall section carry? Carried.

13. (1) In addition to the terms and conditions that apply to a registration under this Act, the council may impose any terms and conditions that it considers appropriate on the registration of a registrant.

(2) The imposition of terms and conditions on a registration pursuant to subsection (1) is not effective until notice of the imposition is served on the registrant affected by it.

Shall the section carry?

Carried.

14. (1) The council may refuse to consider an application for registration by an applicant who has an outstanding charge for an offence or is under investigation by the council or another professional regulatory body, until the matter has been resolved.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the council may refuse to register an applicant who has been found guilty of an offence or disciplined by the council or another professional regulatory body for conduct that, in the council's opinion, renders the applicant unsuitable to practise as a registered professional planner.

(3) The council may refuse to register an applicant where the council determines that the applicant does not meet the eligibility requirements for registration under this Act or the regulations.

Shall the section carry? Carried.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you, Chair.

I'm just wondering, with regards to that, is there an appeal process for Canada to follow?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Section 19, appeals.

**Ms. Biggar:** Next page.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Okay –

**Chair:** We're getting there.

**Leader of the Opposition:** – all right. We'll get there.

**Chair:** Shall the section carry?

Carried.

15. (1) The Council may immediately suspend or cancel the registration of

(a) a candidate who contravenes subclause 11(3)(a)(i), (ii) or (iii) or clause 11(3)(b); or

(b) a registered professional planner who contravenes subclause 12(3)(a)(i), (ii) or (iii).

(2) The Council may immediately suspend or cancel the registration of a registrant who is found guilty of an offence or disciplined by another professional regulatory body, for conduct that, in the Council's opinion, renders the registrant unsuitable to practise as a registered professional planner.

(3) The suspension or cancellation of a registration under this section is not effective until notice of it has been served on the registrant.

Shall the section carry?

**Mr. Trivers:** Question.

**Chair:** The hon. Member from Rustico-Emerald, has a question.

**Mr. Trivers:** Yes, under the suspension or cancellation effective on notice. I'm just wondering what it means – what are the different methods of serving notice to a registrant?

**Mr. R. Brown:** Registered mail; personal delivery, come to the office, like that, so put it in the hands of the person.

**Mr. Trivers:** I'm wondering, what if I'm a resident on Prince Edward Island, but I'm working on a long-term contract, let's say, somewhere else in Canada, and I've been hired on that contract because I'm a member of the institute and that was one of the clauses within the contractual agreement. But, I've actually needed to be suspended or cancelled because I don't comply with the bylaws.

Would I be able to keep working until someone actually visited me, or is it enough just to post a letter, just curious about that scenario?

**Mr. R. Brown:** I would assume that most national organizations would know where you're working. If it's not within the jurisdiction or any other jurisdiction they'll get the jurisdiction that you're working in probably to forward you the suspension or cancellation.

It's a national organization and if you're not working in an area that doesn't require registered professional planners, then, I guess you can continue to work.

**Mr. Trivers:** Okay, thank you.

**Chair:** Shall the section carry? Carried.

16. (1) A registrant may request, in writing, the suspension of his or her registration for a temporary absence from participation as a candidate or practice as a registered professional planner, and the council may grant the request.

(2) A registrant may request, in writing, the cancellation of his or her registration, and the council shall grant the request.

Shall the section carry? Carried.

17. The council may, in accordance with the regulations and upon payment of applicable fees set out in the bylaws, which may include a reinstatement fee, late payment fee and registration fee, reinstate the registration of a suspended registrant or former registrant whose registration was suspended or cancelled, as the case may be, under this Part.

Shall the section carry? Carried.

**Mr. Roach:** Call the hour.

**Chair:** Hon. members, the hour has been called.

I need you to read something.

Shall it carry? Carried.

Mr. Speaker, as Chair of a Committee of the Whole House, having under consideration a

bill to be intitled *Registered Professional Planners Act*, I beg leave to report that the committee has made some progress and begs leave to sit again. I move that the report of the committee be adopted.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

The hon. Member from Vernon River-Stratford.

**Mr. McIsaac:** I move, seconded by the hon. Member from Tignish-Palmer Road, that this House adjourn until tomorrow morning, April 6<sup>th</sup>, at 10:00 a.m.

**Speaker:** Shall it carry? Carried.

The Legislature adjourned until Friday, April 6<sup>th</sup>, at 10:00 a.m.