



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FIFTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Volume L

FIRST SESSION

Number 56

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Derek Bennett, MHA

Wednesday

May 18, 2022

The House met at 10 a.m.

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

Good morning everyone.

Government Business

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Speaker.

Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL, that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 52.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

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

Committee of the Whole

CHAIR (Warr): Order, please!

We are now considering Bill 52, An Act To Amend The Petroleum Products Act.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Petroleum Product Act." (Bill 52)

CHAIR: Any further speakers to clause 1?

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

CLERK (Barnes): Clause 2.

CHAIR: Shall clause 2 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 2 carried.

CLERK: Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6.

CHAIR: Shall clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 carried.

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

CHAIR: Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

CLERK: An Act To Amend The Petroleum Products Act.

CHAIR: Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, title carried.

CHAIR: Shall I report the bill without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

CHAIR: The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

I move, seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader, that the Committee rise and report Bill 52.

CHAIR: The motion is that the Committee rise and report Bill 52.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay and Chair of the Committee of the Whole.

B. WARR: Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill 52 without amendment.

SPEAKER: The Chair of the Committee of the Whole reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report Bill 52 without amendment.

When shall the report be received?

S. CROCKER: Now.

SPEAKER: Now.

When shall the bill be read a third time?

S. CROCKER: Presently.

SPEAKER: Presently.

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

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Speaker.

Speaker, I call from the Order Paper second reading of Bill 62.

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

J. ABBOTT: Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health and Community Services, that Bill 62, An Act To Amend The Child And Youth Advocate Act, be read a second time.

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that Bill 62, An Act To Amend The Child And Youth Advocate Act, be now read a second time.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Child And Youth Advocate Act." (Bill 62)

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

J. ABBOTT: Speaker, thank you.

I'm pleased to speak today to Bill 62, An Act To Amend The Child And Youth Advocate Act. This is an important piece of legislation, as the Office of the Child and Youth Advocate represents the rights, interests and viewpoints of children and youth receiving government programs and services.

This statutory office also provides advocacy in four areas, which include individual advocacy, systemic advocacy, reviews and investigations, and education and promotion. I think we would all agree that the Child and Youth Advocate has an extremely valuable role to play in our province. The Advocate and their office provides both recommendations and advice, which has and continues to help improve services and programs for children and their families throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

In fact, the Child and Youth Advocate, through both individual and systemic advocacy, play a critical role in identifying areas where improvements can be made in the best interest of children and youth. It is for this very reason the provincial government takes all recommendations of the Child and Youth Advocate seriously. Further, we are committed to ensuring the ongoing and effective operation of this critical office to ensure a voice for children and youth throughout the province.

To that end, Speaker, the first amendment to Bill 62 is to repeal subsection 8.1(2) of the act which states: "Where the office of the advocate becomes vacant and an acting advocate is appointed under paragraph (1)(b) or (c), the term of the acting advocate shall not extend beyond the end of the next sitting of the House of Assembly." In this case, we're talking about this particular sitting of the House. The second proposed amendment is to incorporate gender-neutral or gender-silent language.

Let me now take this opportunity to speak in more depth on the first proposed amendment. The former Child and Youth Advocate retired in December 2021. While the process continues to

fill this important position, a senior official from the Office of the Child and Youth Advocate is currently acting in that Advocate position. As we are all aware, the House of Assembly is set to close in short order on June 2. Since the appointment process is still ongoing and will not be concluded by then, it is essential that we implement the proposed amendment in order to extend the acting appointment of the Advocate's position.

To do this, we are proposing to allow the term of the acting Child and Youth Advocate to extend beyond the end of the current sitting of the House of Assembly. To enable this section 8.1(2) of the *Child and Youth Advocate Act*, which limits the term of an acting Advocate to the end of the sitting that follows their appointment, it has to be repealed. By implementing this amendment, it provides us with the opportunity to continue the acting appointment. Speaker, I'm sure we would all agree that the level of expertise and experience required in this position is significant and, for this reason, we need to be sure this recruitment process has the time needed to do it right.

While we are waiting to confirm the new Advocate, we have the acting Advocate, who has all the same powers under the act, and has been and was a senior director in the office before her acting appointment, so is very familiar with the files and process of that office. Therefore, she is certainly able to continue the good work of the office without interruption.

With regard to the second proposed amendment, we are proposing to incorporate gender-neutral or gender-silenced language. This is a best practice and will align with the overall direction for all legislation within this hon. House. With all this being said, I want to let this hon. House know that the Office of the Child and Youth Advocate continues to work diligently to ensure the best interests of children and youth throughout the province.

My department is in constant contact with the office to ensure we work and co-operate with that office in current investigations and in implementing past recommendations, and I'll refer to those in a moment. This is important work and today's proposed amendments will allow the office to maintain its acting Advocate

while carrying out its function to help ensure protections for the children and youth of this province.

Speaker, I just wanted to refer to some of the work of the office and where we are so that people here in the House have an understanding of how the work is progressing. The Child and Youth Advocate's most recent status report, issued in 2021, notes that as of March 31, 2020, the office has issued a total of 243 recommendations since 2002. Forty-four of these recommendations were issued during the 2019-2020 fiscal year, with 33 of the 44 contained in *A Long Wait for Change*, which is the review of the child protection services for Inuit children. The Advocate, at the time, noted that this review outlines critical issues that need to be addressed for Indigenous children in this province. My department continues to work on those recommendations.

Since the release of the '20-'21 status report, the Office of the Child Youth Advocate has released three reports. With the addition of these new reports, the office has issued a total of 179 recommendations specific to the Department of Children, Seniors and Social Development. Of these 179, 64 per cent of them are implemented; 24 per cent are partially implemented; 2 per cent are not implemented to date; and 10 per cent are new recommendations which have not been assessed by the office for implementation status.

The four Government of Newfoundland and Labrador recommendations outlined in *A Long Wait for Change* are included in these statistics, as my department is responsible for leading these recommendations, in collaboration with the Office of Indigenous Affairs and Reconciliation.

There have been six investigative reports released with recommendations for my department, which have outstanding recommendations in the most recent status update. We have *A Stolen Life*, November 2016, which has two recommendations for my department, and the themes include working with Indigenous governments and communities to change adoption legislation and ensure consistent provincial standards of care for children.

The report released in January 2019 around chronic absenteeism has two recommendations for my department to be implemented in collaboration with other government departments in relation to chronic school absenteeism.

The report in April 2019, *Seen But Not Heard*, has six recommendations for my department. Themes of this investigation were: improving prevention; in-home parenting supports; collaborating with the Department of Health and Community Services on mental health and addiction services; training on working with parents with complex mental health diagnosis; policy compliance and permanency planning. My department is working with the Department of Education and Health and Community Services, internally, to address these recommendations.

The report in May 2019 was entitled *Trans Youth in Newfoundland and Labrador*. There were two recommendations for my department and the recommendations were offering training on gender diversity and ensuring gender-diverse youth have access to safe shelter space. My department has partnered with Memorial University on children's gender-diversity training and the training was offered in 2018. My department is also working with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation on ensuring safe shelter spaces for gender-diverse youth.

In *A Long Wait for Change* the independent review of child protection services to Inuit children in Newfoundland and Labrador, released in September 2019, there were 28 recommendations for my department; four for government overall; one for the Department of Justice and Public Safety. Themes include working with Indigenous governments and communities to address issues such as permanency, family placements, cultural continuity plans, integration of Inuit values and healing practices and ensuring Inuit children and youth maintain important relationships. My department is engaged with Nunatsiavut Government on the implementation, which is requiring ongoing collaboration with multiple other government departments.

In October 2020, the report released was entitled *A Soft Place To Land* and had five recommendations for my department. The recommendations were in relation to enhancing access to supportive housing options for youth; seeking youth input into housing decisions; offering training on trauma-informed care; and collaborating with regional health authorities when youth are seeking emergency medical treatment.

One of the recommendations for my department has been transferred to the Department of Health and Community Services for further investigation and an interdepartmental working group is in place to implement action plans for the remaining four recommendations.

There were three reports issued in December 2021, as the former Advocate was concluding her work. The first one was *No Time to Spare*. It had five recommendations for my department and the recommendations were primarily focused on kinship programing, more specifically, the need to assess the relationship between the caregiver and birth parents in the kinship home assessment; ensuring kinship care agreements provide verification that caregivers have an understanding of their roles and responsibilities; developing enhanced planning and monitoring for kinship care specific to complex relationships; policy compliance regarding supervisory documentation; and collaborative consultation regarding service planning.

The second report was entitled *Blanket of Insecurity*. There were five recommendations for my department, specifically they included: verifying the history of extended family when determining placements suitability; identifying steps to mitigate risk to a child when a kinship agreement is terminated due to safety risks; having my department review and clarify its commitment beyond financial support when kinship placements and out-of-home safety plans are engaged; undertaking an audit of all long-term out-of-home placements; and giving greater consideration to reports from school authorities when protection concerns exist.

The third and final report issued in December of '21 was *A Special Kind of Care*. There were four recommendations for my department. The main

themes of which were around staffed residential care including the requirement to share information necessary for the planning and care of children and youth in staffed residential care; the importance of child and youth care workers in Level IV residential care, having training specific to a child's needs; conducting an audit residential care providers; and ensuring residential programming meets the needs of children and youth in care.

Speaker, you can see that the work of the office is very comprehensive, covering all aspects of children and youth in care, and that work continues under the acting Advocate. My department is in constant communication with the office and that will continue under the extension, if this amendment is approved.

Speaker, I look forward to debating these two amendments to the *Child and Youth Advocate Act* in this House of Assembly today.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Any speakers to the bill?

The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn debate on Bill 62.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

I call third reading of Bill 51.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice and Public Safety, that Bill 51 be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act Respecting Access To Health And Educational Services. (Bill 51)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Access To Health And Educational Services," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 51)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board, for third reading of Bill 54, An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act, 2000.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act, 2000. (Bill 54)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act, 2000," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 54)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL, that Bill 55 be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Life Insurance Act. (Bill 55)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Life Insurance Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 55)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL, that Bill 56 be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Condominium Act, 2009. (Bill 56)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Condominium Act, 2009," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 56)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL, that Bill 57 be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Income Tax Savings Plans Act And The Pension Plans Designation Of Beneficiaries Act. (Bill 57)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Savings Plans Act And The Pension Plans Designation Of Beneficiaries Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 57)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, that Bill 58 be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Urban And Rural Planning Act, 2000. (Bill 58)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban And Rural Planning Act, 2000," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 58)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice and Public Safety, that Bill 59 be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Access To Information And Protection Of Privacy Act, 2015. (Bill 59)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Access To Information And Protection Of Privacy Act, 2015," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 59)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister Digital Government and Service NL, that Bill 52 be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Petroleum Products Act. (Bill 52)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Petroleum Products Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 52)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader, that pursuant to Standing Order 11(1), this House not adjourn at 5:00 p.m., today, Wednesday, March – May 18. I got lost there in the days of the week for a second, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER: That's all right; none of us knows what day it is.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I call from the Order Paper second reading of Bill 61.

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

D. BRAGG: Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, that Bill 61 be now read a second time.

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that Bill 61, An Act To Amend The Forestry Act, be now read a second time.

Motion, second reading of a bill, “An Act To Amend The Forestry Act.” (Bill 61)

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

D. BRAGG: Thank you.

Speaker, it’s my pleasure to introduce a bill to abolish the Timber Scalers Board by amending the *Forestry Act* and the timber scaling regulations and authorizing the Department of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture to appoint a chief scaler to fulfill the requirements and duties of the board.

The Timber Scalers Board has not been active since 2008. Since this time, the duties of the board have been fulfilled by the chief timber scaler for Newfoundland and Labrador. This amendment will formally incorporate the duties of the chief timber scaler into the *Forestry Act*.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Forestry Industry Association has been consulted and have no concerns with this amendment, as it will have no impact on timber harvesting operations or any other components of the province’s forestry sector.

Where there have been no costs associated with the board since 2008, eliminating the Timber Scalers Board from the *Forestry Act* we are eliminating operating costs if the board is not to be reactivated.

Speaker, there are currently 175 certified scalers in this province who have been issued timber scaling certificates for a five-year period. These certificates cost \$50. As a result of this amendment, the chief timber scaler will be responsible for performing the duties of the board as outlined under the act.

These duties and responsibilities will include: determining ability and knowledge of a person to apply to be certified to be a timber scaler; issuing certificates and renewing of certificates to this person found after examination to be qualified as a timber scaler will be their

responsibility; as well as revoking, suspending or refusing to renew certificates; hearing appeals following the scaling disputes will be another responsibility of this person; and to review and to make recommendations relating to new scaling methods and technology.

Mr. Speaker, this is a job that really needs to be done with the human eye. It is all about the quality and the volume, and it is about the personal touch. So, Speaker, this amendment will see the *Forestry Act* better reflecting the administration of timber scaling activities in the province. I am also confident consolidation of timber scaling operations within the Department of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture where there is ready access to forest management experts who can provide long-term support and guidance to our province’s forestry industry and will be a positive move.

This amendment also supports the government’s commitment to reduce the number of agencies, boards and commissions – ABCs incorporated – where possible to government. We are taking this opportunity to realign and create a greater accountability.

Mr. Speaker, since this board has not been in effect since 2008 and the chief scaler has been doing this job, it just makes sense that we incorporate this into our new *Forestry Act* and make the amendment.

I know I have 56 minutes left on the clock but this is not a contentious amendment or a contentious change at all. So after that, I guess I would remain seated and look forward to the next speaker on this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: Thank you, Speaker.

It’s a pleasure to speak on Bill 61, the *Forestry Act* to amend the Scaling Board. Like the minister said, it’s not a big move. The board hasn’t been operating since 2008. The chief scaler has been doing most of the operations. So to have the chief scaler take over that job, initially, and remove the scaling board is good.

I will certainly support the move with regard to the Scaling Board, because it gives the opportunity for the timber scaler to work directly with the minister to be more transparent in actions of what is happening in the forestry and what is happening in the scaling operations which needs to be done.

Ever since 2008, since Abitibi shut down, the Stephenville plant and also four machines in Corner Brook, there has been really no use for the board itself. So one chief scaler will operate as the board did to operate for their scalers. There will be some questions when we get to Committee. To have one chief scaler take the responsibility of a full board will certainly leave some questions of how the board operated and what responsibilities are put to the chief scaler. But I know it's important. I mean, all the scalers are important to the forestry industry, especially with the transformation of cubic metres being into play with regard to pay. So the scalers are very important and they need somebody to oversee that, no doubt.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, with regard to approving the bill, we'll certainly approve the bill. Some of the language there with regard to the gender-neutral language is appropriate at this time, no doubt. That's another good part of it.

We'll wait until we get into Committee and we'll certainly have some questions. Other than that, it's nice to speak on Bill 61.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Lake Melville.

P. TRIMPER: Thank you, Speaker.

I won't speak too much about this, but my background is in forestry, and very proud of the education I got at UNB. So when we have a forestry bill, I go back to my time in university and some of those great lessons that I learned at that time. I just wanted to say a couple of things. First of all, I appreciate the staff, and Steve Balsom and company, for their briefing with us.

I wanted to point out a couple of things. First of all, the district within Lake Melville District 19 is extremely important. The actual allowable cut that the scalers would be working towards, and where I'm going, is some 200,000 cubic metres, but through an agreement with Innu Nation and the province that was established over 20 years ago, we actually have a very sustainable approach to forest harvesting in our district.

I think we have set aside some allocation of 100,000 cubic metres. I'm bringing up these numbers because in the discussion that we had recently with the minister's department, talking about the conversion that scalers bring to the situation – so essentially, at roadside, as the wood is being stacked for further processing, it's the scaler's job to evaluate exactly how many cubic metres of wood are sitting there. Regardless of whether it's used for pellets, for firewood, for sawlogs or for other applications, we still need to understand how much volume was removed. So we're working in cubic metres.

But I want to now go to a point I made one year ago, on my feet here, and that is the fact that those that own the wood – essentially for most of the land in this province, it is owned by the Crown – we sell at the ton. So what we have to do is, the scaler actually does a conversion from the cubic metre to the mass in terms of how many tons and that is what goes up.

Why this is important and what I'm advocating – I was speaking to the minister's staff and I just wanted to put it into the record because I am very pleased to hear this, the department is actually looking at applying what is known as residual value royalty regime.

One year ago I was advocating, as lumber prices were soaring in all those lumber stores across our province and we were facing great frustration, I was talking about the nimbleness of jurisdictions such as Alberta who were realizing that those that own the wood that scalers are working with in terms of what is harvested and then goes off to the next step, which is with the processor, it's the processors that were making great profits last year.

The retailers that we were all hearing from – that wood that the scalers actually had evaluated and then was put into, let's say, lumber – were

enjoying great profits. I was advocating at that time that the province consider entering into what is known as residual value royalty regime. Much the same as I have been talking about windfall profit tax legislation for oil and gas companies when they're in production mode and making great profits.

So the scalers are at the front end of this, Speaker, and it is really important to recognize the professional service they do. That is how we know how much wood is taken from our lands, whether it is owned by the Crown or by the private woodlot owner. They play a very important role. I am looking forward to seeing these other pieces in the very important aspects of the forest industry come together and get us caught up with the rest of the country.

I compliment the minister on this. While it's small, it's extremely important to support this part of the entire industry.

Thank you very much.

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

We, too, will be supporting this. The only concerns that we might have are ones that are echoed by my colleague from Exploits and it probably has to do with the point of one person making the final decisions. Certainly that's a question that will come up during the Committee.

We understand, as well, that there hasn't been anything referred to the chief scaler for arbitration of the past five years; however, the one thing with an arbitration board, at least there is an element of balance, different perspectives. It's not related to one person. As well, putting the control on one person, there is always that risk of bias, of having someone who is pro-logging, pro-business and who may not be giving the workers their due consideration.

So with that, we'll wait until Committee but otherwise we will support this.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Seeing no other speakers to the bill, if the minister speaks now he will close debate.

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

D. BRAGG: Thank you very much.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to Committee and the questions that would follow. I have nothing further to add, just to thank the Members opposite who spoke on this. It is very important, as they said, so I look forward to the questions in Committee.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The motion is that Bill 61 now be read a second time.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Forestry Act. (Bill 61)

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

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

S. CROCKER: Now.

SPEAKER: Now.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Forestry Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole presently, by leave. (Bill 61)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 61.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

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

Committee of the Whole

CHAIR (Warr): Order, please!

We are now considering Bill 61, An Act To Amend The Forestry Act.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Forestry Act." (Bill 61)

CLERK: Clause 1.

CHAIR: Shall clause 1 carry?

The Chair recognizes the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: Thank you, Chair.

We do have a couple of questions regarding Bill 61 and the changing of the act. First of all, the position of the chief scaler: Would this go through competition or will this be appointed by the minister?

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

D. BRAGG: So that would be a current employee within the department, right now. It

will be a senior official within the Department of Forestry.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: With the great deal of responsibility being placed on one person, rather than a board, what checks and balances are in place to ensure impartiality of the chief scaler?

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

D. BRAGG: As I said, the chief scaler will be someone that is in our department and that is very qualified to hold the position of scaler, would understand it. I guess the similarity I could use is that it is much like a driving instructor when you go out and do your test. You pass your road test based on your ability and the driver instructor helping you out. This is based on your ability to measure and grade wood. This is done by a senior official.

Should that senior official be off for sick leave, if we need it, we could have someone else fill it but it would be internal. Our own government employees could do it; we have been doing this since 2008. The last time there was ever a dispute on this was – well, we checked back to 2014, we couldn't find anything so it is pre-2014.

It is not a contentious – it doesn't seem to be – job. There are 250 commercial operators in this province and we have, I thought I said, 175 certified scalers.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: Thanks for the answer.

Furthermore, what checks and balances are in place to ensure impartiality of the other 35 scalers as well?

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

D. BRAGG: I'm not sure – the other 35 scalers?

P. FORSEY: Seventy-five, sorry. Do you say 75 or 35?

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

D. BRAGG: So there are 175 certified scalers right now. Most of these would have been certified or recertified by our chief official who has been doing this job. The board has been non-existent since 2007-2008.

This has been a job that's been done, that's been accepted by industry as the way. I guess as long as there's no conflict and there's no dispute, there's no need of a board. If there hasn't been a need for 14 years, we don't see a need right now, nor does industry.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: What procedures are in place to ensure compliance with operators that can scale their own lumber?

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

D. BRAGG: Thank you very much there, Mr. Chair.

I could provide you with the criteria that they use to evaluate some for scaling. Would that be of any assistance to you if I gave you their test structure and what they would use to certify someone? I can provide you that information. I don't have it at my fingertips, but I can provide it if that would help.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: If the department is going to increase stumpage rates, what assurances can we have that the producers will not pass this on to the consumer?

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

D. BRAGG: So increase of stumpage rates is not something that's on our radar right now. I mean, we're talking to industry about future development. We just did an RFP on the Northern Peninsula, in which there was a

successful bidder, but we haven't looked at increasing any stumpage rates. I think it's been clear in our budgets that there's no increase in fees this years, so there's no increase in stumpage rates.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: How does the chief scaler account for water-weight variances when mass-scaling timber and wood chips?

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

D. BRAGG: Again, thank you very much, Chair.

That's information that if you want detail, very intricate details like that, like how the scaling is done, what method, what they use, the metric system or the old standard system, I can give you the full list of their criteria they use and how they would calculate water, whether it's recently cut. I'm not a timber scaler myself nor do I hold that position, but the person in that position would have all that information.

So I can give you their binder, for lack of a better word, of the criteria that you need to meet and what you need to understand. Because this is a job, from my understanding, that can't necessarily be done by a computer, it has to be done with the human eye and with a measure stick or tape. Is that any help at all?

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: Yes, that's good; we'll accept that, Minister. Again, like I say, with regard to cubic metres to tonnage, if we can get that done.

Other than that, if they can't, we'll ask the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay who has been a scaler. I'm sure he's got lot of experience that he can pass along to us. So other than that, we're done with the questions, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR: I'd be more than happy to help you out, Mr. Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: Just a quick question: With timber royalty payments due to the province, how does the regime for Newfoundland and Labrador compare to other provinces when it comes to timber royalty payment regimes?

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

D. BRAGG: So we've done a comparison of that, and I don't have it at my fingertips. I can give it to you. I know we are on the low end of what we charge, compared to other provinces. But if you look at our cost of getting things to the border, there are some different factors. So we may look low, but the cost of, say, Sexton or Philpotts to get their lumber to the American border – and we have to be so careful because trade barriers and all that come into play.

We're not the highest; we are on the low side of the scale. But I can provide you with these exact numbers.

CHAIR: Any further questions?

The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Chair.

I know nothing to do with the fisheries portfolio, but just more curiosity. You had mentioned that the job needs to be done with the human eye. Do we have technology now where you can take the weight of the load and convert that to cubic metres, that can be done from that transition? I just ask that now for curiosity and to see where we are.

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

D. BRAGG: So the technology in wood, I guess, fibre production – I viewed the sawmill or the factory I would call it now, more so than a sawmill, that Sexton has. That may be in your district or just outside of your district. I would certainly encourage you to go there, because the most modern technology known in that industry is in that plant. I can't vouch for the other ones in the province, but I did see it first-hand. It's amazing, when a piece of wood goes in there's a big rotating cup that grabs it, a set of claws,

spins it around. There's an electronic eye that tells it exactly how to best cut that log.

So there is a lot of great technology. Yes, there's always the computer, but you need it in the woods most times where you can't access that. You need the timber scaler to be able to tell you what's on the ground by the side of the road so the company would know what's there for their production.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Yeah, just a follow-up. They've got wonderful technology there at Sexton. That is in my district, I'm proud to say.

I'm just thinking about an empty truck proceeds to pick up wood, they drop in to the weigh scales, they pick up the wood and then they turn and bring it back to the producer or the factory, as you had mentioned. That is where I was thinking that the basis of my question – I wonder if any conversion on that weight scale could be converted to cubic metres to give an accurate indicator?

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

D. BRAGG: I guess the scales and the volume that a truck can take would depend on what the quality of the wood is; whether it is birch; whether it is aspen; whether it is spruce, fir; whether it is dry; whether it is wet; whether it was cut for the last two years. The scaler would really have to assess the wood and I am sure there is a matrix that can tell, but the most reasons that we have a weight limit is because of the restrictions on our roads and our highways.

I mean it is generally accepted, I think, that most tractor-trailers are going to come with 10 cords of wood or 16 cords of wood and sometimes you will see a B-train that is coming, different types of trailers that carry – some have got just like tubing and some may be a flat deck. So I am sure there is a matrix but the obvious thing that the scaler would do is they would measure what is on the truck or what is on the side of the road.

CHAIR: Any further questions?

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

CLERK: Clauses 2 through 46 inclusive.

CHAIR: Shall clauses 2 through 46 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clauses 2 through 46 carried.

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

CHAIR: Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

CLERK: An Act To Amend The Forestry Act.

CHAIR: Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, title carried.

CHAIR: Shall I report the bill without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

CHAIR: The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Chair.

I move that the Committee rise and report Bill 61.

CHAIR: The motion is that the Committee rise and report Bill 61.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay and Chair of the Committee of the Whole.

B. WARR: Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them

referred and have directed me to report Bill 61 without amendment.

SPEAKER: The Chair of the Committee of the Whole reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report Bill 61 without amendment.

When shall the report be received?

S. CROCKER: Now.

SPEAKER: Now.

When shall the bill be read a third time?

S. CROCKER: Tomorrow.

SPEAKER: Tomorrow.

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

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Motion 1.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader, the following:

WHEREAS subsection 6(3) of the *Independent Appointments Commission Act* provides that members of the Independent Appointments Commission are to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council on a resolution of the House of Assembly; and

WHEREAS subsection 7(1) of the act states that a commissioner may be reappointed; and

WHEREAS the appointment of the following commissioners expires on June 22, 2022: Peggy Bartlett and Gerald Anderson; and

WHEREAS it is proposed that the said commissioners be reappointed as commissioners for a term of 3 years from the date of the expiry of their terms; and

WHEREAS the appointment of Philip R. Earle expires on May 24, 2022, and is not eligible for reappointment; and

WHEREAS the chairperson, Earl Ludlow, has resigned as chairperson and as a commissioner; and

WHEREAS subsection 6(4) of the act provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council designate one of the members of the commission to be chairperson;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following persons be appointed or reappointed as members of the Independent Appointments Commission for a term of 3 years: Karen McCarthy, chairperson; William Mahoney; Brendan Mitchell; Jamie Schwartz; Peggy Bartlett; and Gerald Anderson.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

It's great to have the opportunity this morning to highlight the six individuals who we hope will receive unanimous consent of this hon. House for reappointment or appointment to the IAC.

The *Independent Appointments Commission Act* provides an open and accessible appointment process for agencies, boards and commissions. The IAC acts as an independent, non-partisan body and has a responsibility of applying a merit-based process to recommended individuals for appointments.

Mr. Speaker, on March 14, we made two appointments to bring the IAC up to seven members with the appointments of Mr. Earl Ludlow and Cathy Duke. On May 16, both were reappointed for a three-year term and the IAC then consisted of five members and two members seeking reappointment, Gerald Anderson and Peggy Bartlett.

One of the current members, Mr. Philip Earle, is not eligible for reappointment, given that he has served the two consecutive terms. I want to take this opportunity to thank him for his service to the Independent Appointments Commission over the last six years. Subsequently, Mr. Earl Ludlow has confirmed his intent to resign upon the appointment of a successor.

We are recommending today, other than the reappointments that I mentioned earlier: William Mahoney, Brendan Mitchell, Jamie Schwartz and Karen McCarthy are our recommendations today for appointment.

William Mahoney is the owner of a group of companies in Newfoundland and Labrador related to real estate and tourism sector. He served for 27 years in the Royal Canadian Air Force holding a number of staff and command positions, retiring in 2004. He is national chair of the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association and the national vice-chair of the Canadian Forces Liaison Council. He is a former chair of the board of Commissionaires for Newfoundland and Labrador, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary Historical Society, the St. John's International Airport Authority, the St. John's Downtown Development Commission and he serves as director on a number of charitable organizations. He completed the Directors Education Program in 2020 and earned a designation with the Institute of Corporate Directors.

Chief Brendan Mitchell has held the distinction of being chief of the Qalipu First Nation for seven years, serving three consecutive terms on its council. He worked with Corner Brook Pulp and Paper Limited for 27 years and he has extensive work experience in the areas of project management, materials management, transportation and procurement management. His organizational involvement, as many would know, served on many local, provincial and national committees, including chairing the Newfoundland and Labrador marine advisory board for five years and chair of the Corner Brook Economic Development Corporation. Chief Mitchell holds a Bachelor of Science in Biology and an advanced Bachelor of Business Administration degrees from Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Jamie Schwartz retired as president and CEO of the Deer Lake Airport Authority after serving 20 years with that organization. He is currently a director with the Dr. H. Bliss Murphy Cancer Care Foundation and a member of the 2025 Canada Summer Games Host Society Board of Directors. He served as president and chair of the Atlantic Canadian Airports Association from 2014 to 2016 and was a director of the Canadian Airport Council for four years. He has also served as chair of the Marble Mountain Development Corporation for three years. Mr. Schwartz holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in physical education and recreation management from Acadia University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia.

Karen McCarthy is vice-president of communication and corporate affairs for Fortis Inc. She joined Fortis Inc. in 2016 as director of communication and corporate affairs and was appointed to her current role in 2018. She was previously president of the Atlantic Canadian Public Affairs Consulting Firm for seven years and spent 15 years in the Newfoundland and Labrador provincial public service, with senior roles in communications, Cabinet operations, energy, labour relations and intergovernmental affairs. She holds a Bachelor of Public Relations from Mount Saint Vincent University, a Master of Education Leadership from Memorial University and was rewarded a ICD designation from the Institute of Corporate Directors. She is currently pursuing a Doctor of Business Administration at Athabasca University, with a research focus on corporate governance and social responsibility. She is past chair of the ICD, Newfoundland and Labrador chapter, is a regent and chair of the Governance Committee at Memorial University and serves on the board of Newfoundland Power.

Gerald Anderson has over 30 years experience working with the Marine Institute, most recently as director of development and engagement. Mr. Anderson was the designated lead for all work with Indigenous stakeholders in regions across Canada throughout his career with Marine Institute and from 2016 to 2018 was appointed as vice-president (Indigenous) with the University of the Arctic – UArctic – a network university with 180 members worldwide, including Memorial University. In his position, Mr. Anderson is responsible for ensuring

Indigenous inclusion in all activities undertaken by UArctic. Mr. Anderson earned a Bachelor of Arts in political science and economics from Memorial University in 1980.

Peggy Bartlett has over 22 years of experience as a successful owner/operator of five McDonald's restaurants in Central Newfoundland, with stores in Grand Falls-Windsor, Lewisporte and Gander. Prior to this, she spent 15 years as a community health nurse with the Janeway children's health centre. In recent years, she has served as a town councillor with the Town of Grand Falls-Windsor, where she currently resides. She has significant volunteer and board experience, including current membership on the board of the Gander International Airport Authority, the Grand Falls House Foundation and she serves as central director on the board of the Newfoundland and Labrador Organization for Women Entrepreneurs.

She is a graduate of the General Hospital School of Nursing Registered Nurse program, the Memorial University Community Health Nursing program and the Small Business Management program with the College of Trades and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all the Members will agree that these candidates are more than qualified to undertake the role that we are asking for them to be appointed to and I look forward to continuing to further work with the Independent Appointments Commission with all of our boards and agencies as we fill them with qualified candidates.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

P. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no problem with the individuals who have been selected here. I listened to the minister reading out some pretty impressive résumés. I don't think any Member in this House of Assembly would dispute the qualifications of the

individuals that are being appointed or reappointed to these positions.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note, once again – and this has been raised in the past – that if we are going to ask the people such as these people to serve on the Independent Appointments Commission, then I think it is important that any work that they undertake in selecting people for positions is not in vain, and that is an important point to make.

That is where, once again, I have to say for the record, I have a problem with this whole concept that these individuals that we are going to select that they can go out and do all of this work, interviewing people and everything, taking a lot of time to do it, bring forward three names and the minister can decide, I don't like any of those three names, and the minister can appoint whoever he or she sees fit.

It is not fair to these people who are being appointed to the Independent Appointments Commission. It is not fair to the people who took the time and the effort to apply for positions, very important positions, within the public service and to go through the whole process and then to learn that somebody got appointed to a position that never even applied for it.

Imagine, people apply for a position within the public service and go through the whole process and not even get a response back to say you're successful or you're not successful. And to turn on the news and hear that someone was appointed to a job, who, according to what I was told, never even applied for it, because the minister wanted that person. So that's the kind of thing that can happen under this.

Under this legislation, the minister can put whatever person they want there. They don't have to pick someone off the list and they don't have to let the House of Assembly or the public know that there was three names came forward but I didn't like any of them and I decided to pick who I wanted. And there's no mechanism for that openness and transparency and accountability.

So if we're going to select these people – I'm glad that these people have put their names forward. They sound like great people, but if they're going to be expected to put the time and effort in to do this job, then as far as I'm concerned whoever they select, whoever these three names are that they think are the best people, those are the people who should be chosen from, and the government and the ministers need to stay out of it and leave it as an impartial process. If not, this whole process is nothing but a big farce.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Lake Melville.

P. TRIMPER: Thank you, Speaker.

I'm not going to debate what my seatmate and colleague – he makes points there that, obviously, there are opportunities to introduce, what would I say, maybe some bias. However, on the other side, I welcome this over what we had before.

Having been in Cabinet and familiar with the process and watched it come into the floor, I am a big fan and promoter of the opportunity. Not just in a particular aspect, but in all agencies, boards, and commissions and other appointments, I have seen this to be an incredibly important way to provide transparency, accountability and, most importantly, by the way, opportunity for so many of our constituents.

So I'm going to just make a little appeal to all of my colleagues here on the floor to recognize, and I would invite you to sit down with your constituents. What I do is I go into the Tier 1, Tier 2 opportunities and I sit down with folks, and walk them through it, talk about the opportunity, what they could do, and encourage them.

I know in Lake Melville and even throughout Labrador, we are often looking hard to try to encourage people to step forward. We need that regional representation. We need the gender representation. We need the cultural representation, as well as the experience around that boardroom table.

So I would just invite all my fellow MHAs here to think about that. It's certainly an opportunity and a way that you can make some good friends in your constituency by promoting somebody in a great opportunity. My colleague for Mount Pearl - Southlands makes a point, however, if there are good folks stepping forward and they're being turned down, well that's something else we can get to the bottom of.

But right now in terms of the structure and the people who have overseen that structure, I do have great confidence in them. To that point, and the main reason why I wanted to stand up is, I just wanted to extend a great deal of appreciation to all those who have served, who are coming on, but, in particular, Mr. Philip Earle who lives right around the corner from me. He's a good friend, vice-president of Air Borealis and well known throughout Labrador. I feel he deserves a big thank you on behalf of the people of the province for what he's done.

This is a very time-consuming position; stepping forward to sit on the IAC is not a subtle matter; there's a lot of responsibility and a lot of time that is required. Philip, I just wanted to say on behalf of everyone and myself, thank you for stepping forward and getting involved, I really appreciate all that you've been able to do and look forward to seeing you and others continue to guide us in the future.

Thank you.

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

T. WAKEHAM: Thank you, Speaker.

I feel obligated as well to stand in the House and speak to this with some of my colleagues. First of all, congratulations to the people that have been appointed, because my comments will not be about the people who are appointed, these are all excellent people and we certainly congratulate all of them on their appointments. However, I will speak to the independence of the Independent Appointments Commission because, clearly, examples provided by my colleague suggest that the minister is independent of the Independent Appointments Commission and that is a cause for concern, at times.

I also believe, fundamentally, in the principle of the Public Service Commission because I truly believe that a person qualified for the job should apply for the job and whoever has the best qualifications, those are the ones that should get the job. So I would be suggesting that we understand why this was put in place.

But at the end of the day, if we truly had an independent Public Service Commission, would we need another Independent Appointments Commission? Is it really fulfilling a mandate if the three recommendations that come forward from an Independent Appointments Commission still have the ability to be ignored by a minister?

That's the question. It's not about the integrity of the people on the commission. It is about whether, in fact, the names brought forward are truly brought forward and how the decisions get made after they are brought forward.

So, again, I question that piece of this. I am concerned about it and would think that if we were to move to a truly independent Public Service Commission, we wouldn't necessarily need an Independent Appointments Commission.

But comments and concerns brought forward by my colleagues are certainly of concern to all of us in the House. Is the Independent Appointments Commission truly independent?

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Seeing no other speakers, if the Government House Leader speaks now he will close debate.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

I thank the Members opposite for their contribution to this motion this morning. I look forward to having the new members of the IAC start their role.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I will take my seat.

SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favour to adopt the motion, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

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

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do recess.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

This House stands in recess until 2 p.m. this afternoon.

Recess

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

Admit strangers.

Before we begin, I would like to welcome in the public gallery today members from the Housing and Homelessness Coalition from Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Statements by Members

SPEAKER: Today we will hear statements by the hon. Members for the Districts of Stephenville - Port au Port, Burin - Grand Bank, Baie Verte - Green Bay, Ferryland, Labrador West and Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune, with leave.

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

T. WAKEHAM: Thank you, Speaker.

“You’re never too old to try something new.” Jack White of Port au Port East is a living testament to this statement.

In March 1983, the fastest men and women from across the world had gathered in Labrador City for the World Cup cross-country skiing championships. Jack, 43 years old at the time, was working in Wabush and attended the races. His decision to watch these races changed his life.

Fast-forward 40 years, Jack White is a legendary name in skiing. Jack’s passion for skiing has taken him to competitions to the skiing capitals of the world: Austria, Germany, France, Sweden, Norway and Denmark.

In the past 40 years, White has achieved many medals and awards for his success in the sport. In March of this year, White celebrated three gold medals at the Masters World Cup of Cross-Country Skiing in Canmore, Alberta: first place in the five kilometre, 10 kilometre and 15 kilometre for the age 80-to-84 category. Jack is looking forward to the Masters in France in three years’ time.

Jack participates in other sports such as cycling, running and long-distance hiking. Jack’s greatest cheerleader is his wife, Margaret, who supports and encourages him all the way.

I would like for the Members of the hon. House to congratulate Jack on his past

accomplishments and wish him well in his upcoming tournaments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

P. PIKE: Speaker, volunteers make a real difference in their communities and the people they serve. This is so true for Charles Penwell of Fortune in the District of Burin - Grand Bank. Charles dedicated much of his life to helping others unselfishly, offering his knowledge, skills and talents.

Charles spent his working career as an educator in this province for 33 years before retiring in 2009. He spent 28 years as a member of the Fortune Lions Club, served as chair of the action centre committee for youth, vice-chair of the College of the North Atlantic, member of the Burin Peninsula Waste Management Board, founding member of the Feller From Fortune festival committee and the chairperson of the Age-Friendly Committee.

Charles is best known in his community and on the Burin Peninsula for his career in municipal politics. He was elected to council in 1985 and served his community until 2021. Yes, you heard it right; he served council for 36 years and 22 of those years he was mayor. During this time, Fortune maintained its place in the fishery, made great strides in tourism, upgraded municipal infrastructure and secured developments to accommodate the St. Pierre ferry service.

I ask all Members to recognize Charles’s contribution as a volunteer and an elected official.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

B. WARR: Thank you, Speaker.

I rise to acknowledge a constituent, Greg Roberts, a well-known and respected businessman from Triton Island.

Desiring to be self-employed, Greg chose a career path as a chartered accountant. Soon after articling, he operated his first restaurant, Spencer's Diner, on Pilley's Island. Having a keen interest in the restaurant business, Greg kept a close eye on the Mary Brown's franchise, as he believed it had tremendous potential.

Since purchasing the Mary Brown's brand in February 2007, Greg has expanded the franchise to be recognized as one of the fastest-growing restaurant chains in the country. Greg has over 170 restaurants across Canada, and plans to expand globally.

In November 2021, Mary Brown's Chicken acquired naming rights to the former Mile One Centre in St. John's to be rebranded as the Mary Brown's Centre. The partnership includes sponsoring local sports teams who play at the centre and a Mary Brown's Express.

On April 6, 2022, Mary Brown's announced a five-year partnership with Canada's only major league baseball team, the Toronto Blue Jays. The first-ever Mary Brown's Chicken concession at the Rogers Centre began on opening night.

I ask all hon. Members to join me in congratulating Greg Roberts and thanking him for being an inspiration to us all.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

L. O'DRISCOLL: Thank you, Speaker.

I rise today to recognize and congratulate two individuals and an organization in the District of Ferryland who were recipients of the Recreation Newfoundland and Labrador Awards in November of 2021. These awards are presented in recognition of an individual or a group of volunteers in honour of their outstanding efforts

and invaluable contributions to the development of recreation.

Both Kelly and Rodney Joyce of Bay Bulls received Volunteer of the Year awards. Kelly and Rodney play a major role in sports and recreation in the Bay Bulls to Bauline area. They both give freely of their time whenever required.

The Kinsmen Club of Witless Bay & Area were also presented with the Volunteer Group of the Year award. This group provides much-needed assistance and are very active and supportive of all recreation groups both young and old. The Kinsmen offer great support in a number of other recreation activities in the region.

Speaker, I ask all Members of this House to join me in congratulating Rodney and Kelly Joyce, and the Witless Bay Kinsmen Club on their awards.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

Today I rise to give recognition to Ducks Unlimited chapter in Labrador West. Ducks Unlimited Canada is known for their conservation efforts.

I recently had the opportunity to attend a Ducks Unlimited event where a wetland conservation agreement was made between Tacora Resources for a 30-year agreement which will result in 22 acres of Tacora's wetlands being reserved for wildlife and waterfowl breeding.

Ducks Unlimited Labrador West has been successful in other ventures in the conservation efforts to support the duck population in Labrador West. In 2019, the committee took on the challenge of building 100 nesting boxes, which had a successful usage rate. Ducks Unlimited will be adding 90 more nesting boxes to the area this year. They've been able to do this through fundraising and raffling efforts.

Ducks Unlimited has also acquired several educational signs which will be found along popular trails in Labrador West and there will be more to come in the future.

I ask all hon. Members to join me in congratulating Ducks Unlimited Labrador West for their conservation efforts to protect wildlife in the area.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune with leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Leave.

SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

The hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

E. LOVELESS: Thank you.

Speaker, high school sports, whether it's volleyball, hockey or other sports like badminton, is fun and part of the lasting memories created in our schools.

This past weekend Bay d'Espoir Academy in St. Alban's hosted the School Sport NL Badminton provincials. Ten teams from all over the province came, and to say excitement was in the air is an understatement. Many participated and lots of fun was had and memories created.

The tournament took place in the new state-of-the-art school in St. Alban's that opened earlier this year. There's a lot of pride in that building and surrounding communities. And after this weekend even more pride as the hosting team, the Bay d'Espoir Academy Predators – and they include: Shawn Walsh, Amber Roberts, Tia Cox, Braden Collier, Marcus Hoskins, Ryan Harding, Brooklyn Framp, Noah Nugent, Mark Wilcott, and Peyton Howse – won gold, along with the provincial championship banner that will proudly hang as the first banner won in their new gymnasium. I'm sure there will be many more to come.

I ask all hon. Members to join me in congratulating the winning team and all teams, coaches, parents and all that made this possible.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Statements by Ministers.

Statements by Ministers

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

G. BYRNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Newfoundland and Labrador once again became a guiding light to the international community when our province welcomed 166 Ukrainian refugees on the first state-sponsored airlift to North America since the Russian invasion of that peaceful country on February 24.

On May 9, children, women, men and families disembarked from an aircraft in St. John's after travelling thousands of miles to come to a new land that, until recently, they may have had little knowledge of. They came because they needed a new home. They came because they learned of this place and the wonderful opportunities that awaited them. They came after developing trusted relationships with a dedicated team of professionals from the provincial government, including those from the Office of Immigration and Multiculturalism. We are so proud of the work of this small but mighty team.

Speaker, while the welcome since their arrival has been overwhelming, it is not unanticipated. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador have embraced our new Ukrainian neighbours as family. In fact, many Ukrainians who landed in other parts of Canada are now actively considering relocating to Newfoundland and Labrador. We are building a new community, a Ukrainian community, within our province.

As part of the supports we are offering, tomorrow my office along with the Association for New Canadians and TaskforceNL are offering a job fair for Ukrainians. The fair will take place in St. John's at the College of the North Atlantic's Prince Philip Drive campus.

Last Monday, people with experience in resort management, medical technology, trades, accounting and finance, carpentry, among many other skilled professions, arrived on our shores. They are eager to go to work.

Speaker, I would like to thank Gannet Construction, Rambler mines, Eastern Health and several others who are already employing Ukrainians now. Our strength is in embracing diversity and, once again, Canada and the world are taking notice of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

C. TIBBS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the hon. minister for an advance copy of his statement.

Speaker, I join with the minister in welcoming our Ukrainian friends to our beautiful province and thank our local businesses for doing what they can to provide them job opportunities. Groups like Association for New Canadians and TaskforceNL are doing tremendous work in providing supports and making our new friends feel welcome.

On behalf of the Official Opposition, I would like also to extend my gratitude to Gannet Construction, Rambler mines, Eastern Health and others who are already employing some of our Ukrainian friends. Let's continue to do what we do best here in Newfoundland and Labrador, open our hearts and open our homes.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Speaker, and I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement.

We welcome these refugees and compliment the government on this initiative. We certainly

welcome these refugees for taking steps to become part of our communities and active members of our society. We certainly hope they will make this province their home.

However, we once again encourage this government to support all newcomers and refugees by providing adequate housing supports and smaller class sizes in schools so that their children will have the individualized attention they deserve.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Further statements by ministers?

The hon. the Minister Responsible for Women and Gender Equality.

P. PARSONS: Thank you, Speaker.

On behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, I would like to recognize yesterday, May 17, as the International Day Against Transphobia, Homophobia and Biphobia.

This day was created in 2004 to draw attention to the violence and discrimination experienced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender people and all of those with diverse sexual orientations, gender identities or expressions and sex characteristics.

Speaker, the provincial government will not stand for discrimination, persecution or violence towards any person based on their gender identity, expression or sexual orientation.

As a government, we are committed to working collaboratively with the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community to ensure Newfoundland and Labrador is a safe, accessible and inclusive place for all people throughout our province.

Speaker, as an indicator of our ongoing commitment to gender equality in our province, Members of the House of Assembly today are wearing pins of the Progress Pride flag. The Progress Pride flag features the iconic rainbow

flag, with the addition of black and brown stripes to represent marginalized LGBTQ+ communities of colour, along with the colours pink, light blue and white, which are used on the Transgender Pride flag.

I was informed by my staff that, for those who are wondering, the pin is to be worn with the arrow pointing toward our hearts.

Speaker, I ask all hon. Members in this House to join me in recognizing May 17 and every day as the International Day Against Transphobia, Homophobia and Biphobia.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: I thank the minister for an advance copy of her statement.

Speaker, International Day Against Transphobia, Homophobia and Biphobia is about freedom. Freedom to express your truth without fear. Freedom to love who you love. Freedom to simply live your life on your own terms. We wear our Progress Pride pins today as a show of support, but also a recognition of more work needed right here in Newfoundland and Labrador to ensure we move beyond the outdated notion of tolerance and into full acceptance of the supports needed for the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community to live equally in our society.

Textbooks in our high schools must be updated to give a comprehensive education on gender expression in all its forms. The transgender community needs an end to the classification of their identity as a mental disorder in our health care system. Such a designation is an insult to the transgender community. They don't have a disorder. They don't need to be fixed. They need the support of our health care system to live their truth to its fullest.

Together we must stand against transphobia, homophobia and biphobia in our society. It's easy to be afraid of what you don't understand. It's easy to be a bully to those with a different experience in life than your own. It takes courage to listen and to understand.

I challenge everyone in the House, and everyone in Newfoundland and Labrador, be courageous. Stand up and listen to our 2SLGBTQQIA+ siblings and end discrimination in all its forms in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

L. EVANS: I thank the minister for the advance copy of her statement.

The Pride movement, first and foremost, advocates for equality and inclusivity in society, regardless of gender identity, expression and sexual orientation. Aside from recognizing days like this on the day that they happen, one clear way to support this movement is to build an equitable society by ensuring equal pay across genders and identities.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Are there any further statements by ministers?

Oral Questions.

Oral Questions

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

D. BRAZIL: Thank you, Speaker.

Yesterday, the prime minister had time for high tea with the Premier but we've yet to hear about any results of that meeting.

Can you table specific agreements signed from that meeting, or was it simply another photo op?

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

S. COADY: Thank you very much, Speaker, for the question.

As Members of the House know, and as members of all of Newfoundland and Labrador know, yesterday's visit was a royal visit in honour of the Queen's 70th Jubilee, 70th year on the throne, which is an amazing feat and an amazing moment. It was wonderful to be able to welcome, not just His Royal Highness and the Duchess of Cornwall but also our Governor General, as well as our prime minister.

We took the opportunity yesterday, the Premier did – as he does any opportunity – to sit down with the prime minister. They discussed very important issues to Newfoundland and Labrador. They made sure they discussed the Canada Health Transfer, cost of living and the cost to providing services in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

D. BRAZIL: Thank you Speaker.

And as we welcome the carbon tax prime minister, the people of this province are looking for action, not for the Premier to smile in front of the camera.

Did the Premier reach an agreement with the prime minister to pause carbon tax increases to give the people of Newfoundland and Labrador a break at the gas tanks?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

S. COADY: Indeed, Speaker, we have spoken about this in the House over the last number of months, the Council of the Federation, all of the premiers across this country have interceded with the prime minister to put a pause on carbon tax increases. The prime minister, as it is his

policy, has determined that he will not be doing that at this point in time.

I know the Premier took the opportunity yesterday to again reiterate about the impacts of the cost of living and the cost of carbon tax. But the prime minister has made this a policy for the country of Canada to address climate change and, as such, has already been very forthright in saying that at this time he will not do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

D. BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So you invited your Liberal cousin to the party and they didn't bring a gift to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

D. BRAZIL: While the people of Newfoundland and Labrador struggle to make ends meet during the cost of living crisis, the Premier is caught up in the pomp and circumstance.

If the Premier can't deliver specific results from a meeting with the prime minister, is the Premier out of touch with the concerns of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians?

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

S. COADY: Indeed, Speaker, in this year alone we received \$5.2 billion from the federal government to address the challenges of Muskrat Falls. So, indeed, the prime minister is listening to the concerns and the impacts of the Muskrat Falls –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I can't hear the minister speak.

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

S. COADY: I appreciate that. I appreciate your protection, Speaker.

As I said, \$5.2 billion. Yesterday, was an opportunity to, again, speak to the prime minister about the cost of the Canada Health Transfer and how we, as well as all other premiers in this country, feel it needs to go up.

I will remind the Members in this House and the people of the province, that to address the serious concerns around cost of living, we have already provided \$142 million to put cash back in the people's pockets and we will continue to look to do more.

SPEAKER: The minister's time is expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

D. BRAZIL: Thank you, Speaker.

I remind the minister that not one cent of that \$5.2 billion was given back to us of the money that is owed to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador from the royalties from the Hibernia Development Project, Mr. Speaker.

One resident in this province copied me on an email to the Premier. I would like to read this – and I quote – I live within my means, but these weekly inflationary spikes are causing me and others like me to make very tough choices. Listen to the people of the province. Listen to the Opposition parties. Everyone is being hurt by your lack of action and it's time for you to get to work for us.

So I ask the same question this individual asked, you say you are doing everything to address the cost of living in this province, may I ask you: Can you believe that this is true for the people of this province?

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

S. COADY: Indeed, in Newfoundland and Labrador, as it is in Canada, as it is around the world, there is a lot of concern, a lot of anxiety, a lot of stress being caused by the increase in the

price of fuel and the increase then that trickles through our society, the price of food, the price of transportation, et cetera.

I can say that we have provided the \$142 million to the people of the province that we had to borrow, so it's on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. We are considering what more we can possibly do. This is very difficult times for people.

As I said, we have provided \$142 million; we're looking to see what more we could possibly do within the finances that are available to government on behalf of the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

D. BRAZIL: Thank you, Speaker.

I just want to ask another couple more questions here.

Speaker, throughout Question Period today, you'll hear stories from our Members hearing from their constituents every single day. They're difficult stories and they highlight the need for action to support the people of our province.

Now I offer the Premier a chance: Will you tell us a story you have heard from one of your constituents about the struggles they are facing every day, and offer a solution to improve the lifestyle of those individuals?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We're all hearing the stress and anxiety of families across this province, Mr. Speaker. We all recognize that this is an anxious time, as we emerge from the pandemic and the forces at play across the world when it comes to inflation, the push and pull of inflation, the energy crisis around the world, Mr. Speaker.

I've heard stories from my constituents about the cost of their home heating, Mr. Speaker. I've heard concerns about the cost of gas and how

that trickles down, not just from domestic consumption but for local business consumption. I've equally heard some gratitude, Mr. Speaker, about how we controlled the electricity rates, Mr. Speaker.

We are all working together, Mr. Speaker. Again, we've said that we're all looking at creative ways to try to address this, but we have to realize that a lot of the forces are well outside our reach, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

D. BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We'll offer, again, as we have many times in this House, to work with government to find solutions to the crisis that people are facing now in this province with the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier or his office aware of a report related to the conduct of an Officer of this House? If so, when was the report submitted?

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The question is not in order. It doesn't fall within the purview of the administrative competence of the Executive Branch. I ask you to –

The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

L. PARROTT: Thank you, Speaker.

Speaker, an individual who has experience with the former mental health crisis line used the new 811 line recently and said – quote – when my call was answered, I wasn't made aware initially that I was speaking with someone who was not qualified to help. I was speaking with someone in some kind of a dispatch centre, who, after taking all of my information, told me that somebody would call me.

When we last raised this issue in the House, the minister stated: "It's not a matter of callback. It's not a matter of waiting."

Minister, why did this person have to wait for a callback?

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

J. HAGGIE: Thank you very much, Speaker.

The company that provides the 811 service has considerable expertise in dealing with mental health and addictions calls. They have been providing this service in the United States and other parts of the world for many years; it is a Newfoundland and Labrador company.

We have a system now in place where mental health calls, if they identify as that to the initial responder on the phone, are taken care of immediately. If that information is not conveyed to the person who takes the call, then the next option is discussion with another health care provider. It all relies on the informant, the caller, providing accurate information initially on the call.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

L. PARROTT: It is pretty sad, Speaker, that you put it back on the caller who was facing a mental health distress right at that moment. That is pretty sad the Minister of Health just did that – shame.

Speaker, this person said – quote – I did get a call and was asked a lot of questions pertaining to my identity before getting to the heart of the issue. There is comfort in anonymity when speaking on matters so personal as a mental health crisis. Any comfort in those situations is huge. I didn't feel as safe as I had in the past when I had called.

I ask the minister: Is this person's experience acceptable to you?

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

J. HAGGIE: Thank you very much, Speaker.

As I say, there are trained professionals, both mental and physical health professionals, available 24-hours a day through Fonemed. If the Member opposite has a particular call he would like investigated, I would be delighted to do that. I simply need the date and the time of the calls because these are monitored and it can be checked. I'd be happy to get back to him and his constituent.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, I would argue that what we need the minister to do is to make sure that the program that he has put in place is working the way it is supposed to work, because that doesn't sound like it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, this is the people's House. So on behalf of the people of Stephenville - Port au Port and the people of 40 districts of this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, I ask the minister: Will you commit, not just consider, to additional support to help people with the cost of living in this province?

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

S. COADY: Thank you very much for the question.

I think I have been very clear in this House, as has the Premier been to the people publicly, in that we are looking at, working on providing, obviously, more supports based on the fact that the price of fuel continues to rise, the price of food continues to rise, considering what we can do – and I know the Member didn't want me to use the word “consider,” so I will say working on programs that we may be able to put in place, based on the fact that the price of fuel, the price of food, cost of living, continues to increase. I made that commitment to the people of the province. The Premier's said that publicly, so indeed we are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, while the minister considers it, the people of the province are the ones that are truly suffering right now, and they need help immediately. Speaker, now is not the time for the Liberal government to take more money out of people's pockets. It's the time to put money back in people's pockets.

So I ask the minister: Will you postpone the sugar tax?

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

S. COADY: Thank you very much, Speaker.

We've talked about that in this House before. I've heard the Member opposite and I heard many Members in this House talk about the impacts of diabetes, the impacts on health of sugar, the concerns that people have.

There is choice when you choose to drink a beverage. You can drink one that's laden with sugar or you can drink one without sugar. What we're trying to do with this tax is to change behaviour so that you choose a soft drink that would not have as much sugar.

Speaker, it is very, very concerning the impact of diabetes on the people of the province. We're working very hard to have a healthier society as quickly as possible.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, I thank the minister for the answer, but the reality of it is they've actually budgeted \$5 million in additional revenue by hoping people will not choose the unhealthy drinks. So at this point in time we had simply asked that this tax be postponed.

Speaker, for as long as it takes, we're going to continue to stand in this House and speak on behalf of the people of the Newfoundland and Labrador when it comes to the cost of living.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I ask Members not to be talking across the floor; it's hard to hear the speaker.

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

T. WAKEHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to quote a resident from my hometown of Kippens. She spends \$200 a week on gasoline just to go to work. She said – quote – the cost of gas and groceries have backed us into a financial corner.

I ask the minister the question she asked me: Do I quit my job or do I continue to spend 30 per cent of my paycheque on fuel just to be able to go to work?

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

S. COADY: First of all to the preamble, I will say to the Member opposite we on this side of the House are happy to stay here as long as it takes to debate the current issues and the issues that are facing Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

S. COADY: That's what I signed up for and I'm happy to spend my entire summer here, Speaker, if I need to.

What the Member opposite just said speaking on behalf of his constituent is a very, very difficult situation and everyone in this House recognizes how difficult and stressful and hard this issue is.

I say to the Member opposite, that's why we have done what we can do at this point in time and looking at the revenues going forward to see what more we can do, as I've said publicly and in this House.

The best I can say at this point is for that member maybe carpooling, is one of the ways you can start to alleviate some of the stress that's being brought on because of the cost of fuel.

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The minister's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. WALL: Thank you, Speaker.

Let me share with you a story from a lady from my district. A local businessperson is helping to pay her oil bill. She is currently living off of canned food, and she had to cancel her physio appointments, because she cannot afford to put gasoline in her vehicle.

How will the minister help this lady who said to me, please make sure something more is done to help us?

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

S. COADY: I thank the Member opposite for the question and for pointing out a situation on behalf of an individual member. I'm happy to work with him and his constituency assistant to help that person. I know the Minister for Children, Seniors and Social Development would be more than happy to help as well.

We have programs available to assist people in this very circumstance. That's why we've increased by 10 per cent the Income Supplement; that's why we've increased the Seniors' Benefit. That's why we've cut fees and cut taxes, Speaker, to try and put money back in the people's pockets. We recognize that the price of food, the price of fuel is having a very challenging effect on the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. WALL: Thank you, Speaker.

I appreciate the response from the minister; I will reach out.

Speaker, I have another resident in my district who volunteers driving people to cancer appointments and delivering food hampers to those in need. Unfortunately, due to the skyrocketing cost of gasoline, he can no longer afford to do so. He's not able to volunteer.

I ask the minister: How can our province survive without the work of our dedicated volunteers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

S. COADY: First of all, Speaker, I commend and thank the individual whom the Member is referring to, because volunteering, giving back to the community, driving people to appointments, and delivering food hampers is very, very important and hopefully there are organizations that would be able to assist that volunteer in his delivery or her delivery of those services. I appreciate that.

One of the reasons why we were able to find the \$142 million is to help people like the person the Member opposite referred to, to be able to continue to assist, and we certainly thank them for their volunteer efforts and hope that an agency or some organization could be able to assist that person to continue in their deliveries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Speaker, it's very clear that the government hasn't done enough. In my district early childhood educators have to drive to work. One early childhood educator wrote me saying – quote – I live paycheque to paycheque, and I'm currently having to put my gas payments on my credit cards.

Does the minister realize that people are going into debt just to keep their jobs?

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

S. COADY: I thank the Member opposite for the question, and we certainly are listening. I can tell you that's why we've made certain investments in early childhood education. That's why we've lowered the cost of child care. That's why we've made the investments in helping make sure the electricity rates won't double. All of those are on behalf of the person to whom the Member opposite referred.

These are very, very challenging times. We had to put the \$142 million that we've returned to the people on the province's credit card, Speaker. That went on the province's credit card, on behalf of our children and grandchildren. We're going to continue to do what we can to help, and hopefully the situation will improve in the next few months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Speaker, I truly hope that the government is listening, and if they are listening, then hopefully they're going to provide relief now to the people.

I heard from a small business owner. She wrote – quote – I make at least two to three trips a week to St. John's for supplies. This gas money comes off my very small profit margins; add that to the unbelievable rate increases in almost every product that comes through the doors of my business, and it is nothing short of catastrophic.

Given the increasing costs of doing business, should this small business owner have to close her doors?

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

S. COADY: Thank you, Speaker.

Of course that's not what this government wants; indeed, this is being faced across the country and around the world, these very challenging times. We have acted, we have

provided \$142 million back in the form of money, back in people's pockets, and we're looking to see what more we can do to assist the people of the province.

But I have spoken, as I spoke this morning, to the Employers' Council on these very issues of very, very difficult times right now, and we recognize that and that's why we're trying to provide what we can from the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Speaker, access to timely health care is also a cost-of-living issue. I have a constituent who has been waiting for hip replacement surgery for three years now. Because he can't work, his spouse has to work two jobs to support their family. She says – quote – my husband can't work. I have called to get an update on the surgery list and I end up crying on the phone like I am doing now.

I ask the minister: What does he say to families like this?

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

J. HAGGIE: Thank you very much, Speaker.

Surgical wait times and backlogs have become an issue since COVID. It is a national issue. We have been in active discussions with the NLMA and the regional health authorities. We announced, last week, measures to address the cardiac surgery wait issue with a novel, collaborative arrangement with the University of Ottawa Heart Institute.

There is more work being done and we have set up a task force which will look at wait times across the province and mechanisms to improve surgical wait times and reduce the backlog. So there is work coming and we will have announcements on this as they roll out.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

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

J. DWYER: Speaker, I heard from a government employee who said – and I quote – I am not the one to usually bring my personal concerns forward, but I am a single parent to a beautiful four-year-old little boy who can't afford to save money to build a secure life for her and her son, due to all of the cost of living that are rising.

When will the Liberal government provide some relief for this single mother?

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

S. COADY: Thank you, Speaker.

I will say we have provided relief already in the form of increase in the Income Supplement, increase in the Seniors' Benefit. For income support, we provided a cheque of up the \$400 per family. We have also reduced fees, reduced the cost of home insurance by removing the tax.

Speaker, all of that has added up to \$142 million of which we are borrowing that money to provide back to the people's pockets and we will continue to look and see what more we can do because we recognize that the cost of living is very, very difficult and stressful on the people of the province.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Speaker.

The government closed the then Bonavista Advanced Education Skills and Labour office, which would be now called the Immigration, Population Growth and Skills office, in 2019 – the most frequented office in the province, sending the employees from Bonavista to commute over two hours a day to Clarendville. This, while available office space exists in Bonavista.

Why are these people expected to spend over \$400 a week in gas to travel when existing space is available in Bonavista?

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

G. BYRNE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

One of the efficiencies that have been created by a new awareness of the capacity to be able to work remotely, but as well to work to stylize new ways of delivering services is one of the rarities of the consequences of COVID-19. We'll examine all impacts of staffing and service delivery.

But one of the things that I will note is that one of the issues that has been identified is that many are receiving telephone services, and I would be more than pleased to work with the hon. Member and all Members of this House as to how we can create greater efficiencies within our public service, within the delivery of our public services because in so doing we may be able to use those efficiencies to provide additional services to our –

SPEAKER: The minister's time is expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

L. O'DRISCOLL: Thank you, Speaker.

A constituent in my district said recently: "... the gas prices have escalated to the point that about 40% of my take home pay is going to have to pay for fuel, just to get to work. My wife and I now find ourselves having to choose which bills get paid and which do not."

Minister: Which bills should this person prioritize, because I don't need to hear \$142 million?

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

S. COADY: I really respect Newfoundlanders' and Labradorians' resilience and I'm sure the

constituent to which the Member is referring will make informed decisions that best suits their particular needs.

I can say that we all recognize the price of fuel, the price of food, the price of things have escalated and we're working very hard. That's why we put money back into people's pockets, and that's why we're looking to see what further we can do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

Speaker, students walked out of class this week at Menihek High School due to confusion and poor communication over policies of the NLESD regarding trans students.

Now that the NLESD will be absorbed by the Department of Education, will the minister direct his staff to review and update these policies and make sure that they are applied and understood by all schools in this province?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education.

T. OSBORNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The situation that happened at the school was unfortunate. I do understand that the NLESD has sent out an advisory to all administrators reminding them of the policy. I understand as well that situation has been resolved.

It is important that all students, regardless of their culture, regardless of their gender or gender identity feel welcome and safe in our schools.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

Words are nice, but meaningful actions are much better.

Will the minister commit to meeting with all 2SLGBTQQA+ students and teachers from across this province to hear first-hand the barriers that they are facing within the current education system? These individuals deserve better and deserve to be heard and respected.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education.

T. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, I have met with a number of individuals and organizations representing the LGBTQ community. I certainly welcome other meetings with representatives of the community in various parts of the province.

It is important that all students, regardless of how they identify, feel safe and welcome in our schools and we aim to ensure that is the practice. The NLESD has ensured that administrators are reminded of the policies. We will certainly continue to endeavour to ensure that our students feel safe and welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

L. EVANS: Thank you, Speaker.

I was surprised and pleased at how ministers in this House took the added press coverage of the royal visit to talk about reconciliation. They confidently spoke to reconciliation, yet made no commitment to take an action on the pathways to truth and reconciliation.

So I ask the Minister of Finance: What action has this government taken to end economic marginalization so Indigenous peoples in this province can heat their homes and have access to nutritional food?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Indigenous Affairs and Reconciliation.

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

Yes, we, too, were pleased to see reconciliation at the forefront yesterday. We were pleased to host the Indigenous leaders from around the province and were also very pleased, Speaker, with the relationship, under this current Premier,

that we're building with Indigenous leaders and peoples around this province.

On the cost of living, there is no doubt that people are feeling it, no matter what part of the province that you live. That is why in this budget there were a number of measures put in place. Whether it's housing – we were just up in Labrador and announced a four-unit, one bedroom, in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. We have the highest number of poverty reduction initiatives ever in a budget, \$286 million. I believe the last time –

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The minister's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

E. JOYCE: Mr. Speaker, cataracts for seniors are very serious and denies them of their dignity and isolates them. Premier, you need to get involved. They are your constituents also.

The Canadian Institute for Health Information stated in their report: Newfoundland and Labrador are one of the three provinces that cataract surgery wait-list has increased. Tracy Johnson states: "... because even if you can ramp up to what you were prepandemic ... you still have that backlog"

Premier, please, when will you help the seniors and eliminate these wait-lists for these seniors out in Western Newfoundland, many who are your constituents?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, as the Minister of Health has already articulated, we started a task force with the NLMA addressing all surgical backlogs, including ophthalmology, Mr. Speaker. We're working hand in glove with the NLMA so that we can get a definitive plan moving forward to try to resolve all surgical wait-lists to our best of our abilities. And certainly ophthalmology and

cataracts on the West Coast and throughout the province will be fully considered and surgeons are welcome to participate in that.

In fact, the NLMA sent out an email to all members yesterday, or the day before, asking for surgeons to be involved so that they can voice their opinion about how to best direct this task force, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

E. JOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I say to the Premier: Why should they have to wait when they're blind as we speak, can't see, can't drive and can't read their medication? Why wait?

Mr. Speaker, in Halifax, the health authority, to help eliminate the cataract surgery wait-list, they sent 2,300 cases to a private clinic. In St. John's, a new ophthalmologist starting a new procedure, the allocation of approximately 1,250 citizens is now divided among the two surgeons, 625 each.

Due to the reduction, the Eastern Health authority gave each ophthalmologist an additional 300 cases off the wait-list – per person.

I ask the Premier: If this can be done in Eastern Health without going to the NLMA, why can't it be done in Western Newfoundland?

You just stated Premier it has to go to the NLMA. Eastern Health just gave out 600 new cases to a private clinic. Why can't it be done in Western Newfoundland? They're your constituents, Premier – they are your constituents.

SPEAKER: Move on to your question.

E. JOYCE: They can't wait, Premier.

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

J. HAGGIE: Thank you very much, Speaker.

The Premier is referencing the task force and surgical wait-lists in general. I think it's

important to inform the House that in the last year, we, in this province, have exceed our prepandemic numbers for cataract surgeries. Ninety per cent or more of cataract procedures in Western Health exceeded the national benchmark of 112 days.

There is no cap –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

J. HAGGIE: There is no cap on procedures in RHA facilities. The surgeons are welcome there. If they choose to take those lists, that is their decision.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The time for Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Tabling of Documents.

Tabling of Documents

SPEAKER: I do have one document to table.

On Wednesday, May 4, 2022, this House of Assembly passed the following resolution:

THAT this House concur with the report of the Commissioner for Legislative Standards entitled *Joyce Report, April 12, 2022*;

AND THAT the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands is directed to submit the required information to the Commissioner for Legislative Standards within seven clear sitting days of the adoption of this resolution;

AND THAT the Speaker is ordered to appoint a mediator to assist the parties to resolve this matter described in the report;

AND THAT the mediator appointed by the Speaker shall, within seven clear sitting days, report to this House;

AND THAT if the House is not then in session, that report may be tabled as if it were a report under section 19.1 of the *House of Assembly Act*;

AND THAT where the mediator finds that a resolution cannot be achieved due to unwillingness by the MHA for Humber - Bay of Islands to comply with a reasonable requirement for the Commissioner for Legislative Standards and, as a result, the Member's statutory obligations are still outstanding, the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands shall, as the date of the tabling of the mediator's report, be suspended from the House of Assembly in accordance with paragraph 45(1)(c) of the *House of Assembly Act*;

AND THAT the said suspension be without pay and shall continue until such time that the Commissioner for Legislative Standards advises the Speaker that the statutory obligations referred to in the report have been met.

I wish to advise the House that I appointed Ms. Gail Hamilton, FCPA, FCA, ICD, to assist in resolving the issues raised in the *Joyce Report, April 12, 2022*.

Ms. Hamilton was a commissioner member with the hon. J. Derek Green on the Review Commission on Constituency Allowances and Related Matters. The commission produced the Green report, 2007, as well as a draft of the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act*.

Ms. Hamilton also served two terms on the Audit Committee of the House of Assembly. I note that external members of the Audit Committee are appointed on recommendations of the chief justice of the province on the basis of demonstrated knowledge and experience in financial matters and suitability to represent the public interest.

Ms. Hamilton has today submitted her report in accordance with the timeline prescribed in the

House of Assembly. I wish to advise all Members of her findings as articulated in the Executive Summary, as follows:

"It was determined the information requested of MHA Joyce was reasonable in terms of the applicable legislation and authority granted by the Commissioner. MHA Joyce subsequently provided additional documentation to the Commissioner. After reviewing the documentation, the Commissioner determined that the information was in order and a Public Disclosure Statement for MHA Joyce was prepared, delivered to the Clerk on May 17, 2022 where MHA Joyce reviewed the report and signed it. As the Commissioner has confirmed the information is complete and the Public Disclosure Statement has been provided, the statutory obligations of MHA Joyce are met and the issues noted are resolved."

I would thank Ms. Hamilton for her willingness to complete this work in a very quick time frame and for her continued dedication to the House of Assembly on matters for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Are there any further tabling of documents?

Notices of Motion.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.

Petitions.

Petitions

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Speaker.

The background to this petition is as follows.

WHEREAS individual residents have expressed serious concerns about the economic crisis our province is facing. The pandemic has had significant adverse impacts on women in particular, who are getting hit the hardest; and

WHEREAS women in Newfoundland and Labrador make 76.8 cents for every dollar earned by a man, pay equity legislation is one way to help close the gender wage gap, and an important step towards pandemic recovery; and

WHEREAS in 2018 the House of Assembly unanimously approved a private Member's motion to implement pay equity legislation. Here, four years later, Newfoundland and Labrador is the only Atlantic province without such legislation;

THEREFORE we petition the hon. House of Assembly as follows: We, the undersigned, call upon the House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to develop, table and debate pay equity legislation during this spring session of the House of Assembly.

Speaker, we only have a few more sitting days left to this session of the House of Assembly and I ask the Minister Responsible for Women and Gender Equality, when is she with her counterparts over there going to bring in pay equity legislation, to the House of Assembly.

This matter, Mr. Speaker, has been going on for years. I've heard from women in our province who have been discriminated against in terms of not getting equal pay for the same amount of work that they do with men. We're hearing from other organizations just recently, earlier in May, the St. John's Status of Women, they said they were tired of waiting for legislative change; they're tired of the rhetoric. Pay equity is a human right. Avoiding pay equity legislation only perpetuates and legitimizes conditions for discrimination of women within the workplace.

Thank you, Speaker.

Orders of the Day

Private Members' Day

SPEAKER: Order, please!

This being Wednesday, I call upon the Member for St. John's Centre to introduce the private Member's resolution to be debated today.

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

I will be introducing the following resolution on just transition legislation for Newfoundland and Labrador, seconded by the Member for Torngat Mountains in this case; and

WHEREAS the science unmistakably tells us that we need a 45 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and a 90 per cent reduction by 2050 in order to avoid ruinous climate change; and

WHEREAS the Secretary-General of the United Nations recently noted that "addiction to fossil fuels is mutually assured destruction" and that "the world is sleepwalking to climate catastrophe;" and

WHEREAS the effects of climate change are already harming the people of this province according to the final report of the Health Accord, through more frequent and destructive weather events, disappearing sea ice in Labrador, or through toxic pollution; and

WHEREAS any new development of offshore oil and gas extraction is incompatible with keeping our international commitments, meeting our obligations to future generations and averting global disaster; and

WHEREAS the major economic transformations of the past were carried out without consideration for workers in phased-out industries; and

WHEREAS the former Bank of Canada Governor Mark Carney stated in the fall of 2021 that the green transition is "the greatest commercial opportunity of our age," and estimates from Stanford University predict the creation of one to three million new jobs in Canada as we transition towards safe and renewable energy; and

WHEREAS Newfoundland and Labrador stands to gain by entering early in the green technology sector, since we are blessed with some of the strongest renewable energy resources in North America, a rapidly growing technology sector, world-class education and research facilities and opportunities to gain federal funding for building this industry; and

WHEREAS our workers in the oil and gas sector already have the skills and know-how needed to build the new green industries and are therefore well placed to take advantage of this unique opportunity; and

WHEREAS a 2021 survey conducted by the *Atlantic Quarterly* found that more than four out of five Nova Scotians and Newfoundlanders and Labradorians not only wanted a transition to renewable and efficient energy, but also support for affected workers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this government prepare for the coming decline of the fossil fuel industry and make sure that affected workers themselves become leaders of the change by introducing just transition legislation in this House, ensuring high-quality union jobs, guaranteeing workers who want to enter the new industries receive the supports they need to do so and ensuring local communities are the primary beneficiaries of the green transition;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this government recognize the gravity of the climate emergency by introducing a climate and energy bill in this House that stipulates a planned phase-out of the oil and gas industry, sets clear targets so that by 2050, 85 per cent or more of the total energy consumption in this province is clean energy, guarantees that all renewable energy production, distribution and service remain in public hands, and commits to positioning our economy, research centres and businesses to benefit from provincial, national and international efforts to create new renewable energy resources in wind, hydro and solar;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House urge the government to establish a new statutory Office of Climate Accountability with a climate accountability officer, whose mandate would be to guide policy and targets, work with industry to help advance low-carbon industry and infrastructure, and review, audit and report to this House annually on government, business and economy-wide progress on legislated reductions of greenhouse gas pollution of 45 per cent by 2030 and 90 per cent by 2050.

Speaker, I start with a news report on *Global* that came out today at around 11 o'clock and it is: EU proposes \$315B plan – US – to ditch Russian energy – 300 billion euro, 350 US, that includes more efficient use of fuels and faster rollout of renewable power.”

Now, we have heard here that the opportunity here to replace Russian oil is an economic opportunity for here. Europe is already looking at a more efficient use of the fuels they have and transitioning more quickly to green energy. That is where they are going.

They want to deprive Russia of any of its billions that it makes from natural gas and coal in revenue and strengthen the EU climate policies. They are focussing on energy savings and renewables that will form the cornerstone of the package.

They are basically to abandon Russian fossil fuels completely by 2027. That is what they are aiming for: 2027. They figure this will cost 210 billion euros. And they are looking to streamline the approval process in EU countries for renewable projects, specifically as part of this plan on solar energy seeking to double photovoltaic capacity by 2025. In three years, that is where they are headed.

The EU’s “group’s research shows rapidly expanding solar, wind parks and use of heat pumps for low-temperature heat in industry and buildings could be done faster than constructing new liquefied natural gas terminals or gas infrastructure, said Matthias Buck, its director for Europe.”

So that is where they’re heading. They are not doubling down on fossil fuels. They are, actually, now moving up their game and moving ahead with the transition to green. That does not bode well for the oil industry in the long run, but there is an opportunity here to get in on the green transition.

It was Alexander Graham Bell who said that when one door closes another one opens, but we often look so long and so regretfully upon the closed door that we do not see the one which has

opened before us. I think in many cases that's what we're facing right now. We came into this oil industry late in the game and we're coming at a time when the world is already starting to shift somewhere else, and I can understand that.

The fact is that we've heard in this House basically consensus from a number of Members here, that no one is denying climate change, no one is denying the need to transition to a green economy. Regardless of whether it's stated or not, there's always a but. The but is always there – but – and it's a but we can't do it right away. Where are we going to get the money?

The fact is we've been through this. We've been through this already with the cod moratorium; 37,000 people were thrown out of work. The fact is there were plenty of warning signs and we failed to act on them. Heritage Newfoundland and Labrador states that: "Although conservation became an increasing concern after the 1960s, officials consistently overestimated the size of cod stocks and, as a result, also overestimated the amount of cod fishers could harvest at sustainable levels. This resulted in an overexploitation of northern cod," which resulted in the cod moratorium with catastrophic effect on our workers, on our economy and on our communities. There was no plan. Now, the warning signs were there decades before. We failed to act; we failed to have a transition plan in place.

So what we're looking at here in making this proposal, I don't need to go into the economic costs of climate change, the catastrophic effects on our ability to survive, but I think there is an opportunity here to capitalize. And what we're looking at this is not good intentions like you'd have in your New Year's resolutions, but let's formalize it, let's put it into legislation. Here are the targets we're setting out, here is the legislation that will protect jobs, that will make sure that jobs stay here in Newfoundland and Labrador, that will protect our workers and protect our communities. That it set out targets not only for the reduction of the oil industry, however long that takes, but Bay du Nord is approved.

Where are we going from here on in? Are we going to limp from one project to the next, or are we going to start capitalizing on the new industry for our workers in this province? Are

we going to start looking at what's the transition plan to increase green technology, green industries, to make sure that we capitalize on that work?

Europe is already doing it. They're not waiting for us. Part of that plan wasn't to look for Bay du Nord oil or Newfoundland oil. They are already moving away. It's time; what we want is clear legislation that lays this out, that has input of all people, all parties in this House, the workers whether unionized or not, communities, business, you name it. But let's come up with a plan that lays out clear targets that holds government, regardless of whether they're in power or not, whoever comes, that they're held accountable. They have a responsibility to act.

Speaker, policies are fine but they can be changed. Legislation is more enforceable.

Thank you.

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Speaker.

I'm pleased to be in this hon. House today to speak to the Private Members' motion brought forward by the hon. Member for St. John's Centre. I thank him for bringing forward another opportunity for us to talk about climate change in not just this jurisdiction, but around the world.

As we all know – and I don't think we need to highlight in too much degree – climate change is one of the most urgent and challenging issues facing our planet, as we know. It impacts almost every aspect of government, industry, companies, citizens: each and every one of us and future generations long after us. We recognize that urgent work is required to address climate change and we recognize that in order to succeed we all need to work together. So on that I do agree with the hon. Member.

Tackling climate change requires effective actions on two fronts simultaneously. We need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to mitigate its impacts and we also need to adapt to the changing climate. The impacts on climate change are evident globally. Every step we take to lower greenhouse gas emissions matters today

and for the generations to come. Our government continues to advance actions in the Newfoundland and Labrador Climate Change Action Plan and work toward net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, implementing programs that support transition to the low-carbon global economy.

As a government, we have committed to taking action to address climate change. From releasing our action plan, as we just highlighted, establishing the Net-Zero Advisory Council, maximizing our renewable energy, the province's renewable energy action plan that will advance electrification and innovation to further transition into a renewable energy source. I am sure my hon. colleague will speak to that a little later.

Speaker, as the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, I'm mandated to work with my colleagues, to lead our government to advance climate change adaptation and mitigation, to continue to work through our Climate Change Action Plan and the path to achieve net zero by 2050. I'm also committed to working with my colleague, Minister Parsons, but all the colleagues in this House of Assembly to move forward on a green transition.

The demand for oil still exists and will continue for sometime, but we all know that will change. We will continue to work together to ensure development of green growth opportunities that are responsible and sustainable for Newfoundland and Labrador.

Our government is also committed to advancing the province's status as a clean energy centre of excellence. We continue to work closely with our federal counterparts in the Department of Environment and Climate Change Canada and Natural Resources Canada.

Speaker, we understand the urgent effort that is needed to meet these 2030 and 2050 targets for greenhouse gas emission reductions. In this past December, we announced membership for the Net-Zero Advisory Council. This council will focus on providing advice to the provincial government on how to achieve the 2030 and net-zero targets for 2050. This council is identifying and reviewing near term and foundational actions that our government and others can take

to set Newfoundland and Labrador on a strong path to achieve greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

We all understand how important that is and that is why we brought this council together, the brightest and best that are looking at options. Not always necessarily agreeing with every word that each member of the council says, but they bring a variety of viewpoints which is very, very important for this conversation.

This council will advise on global trends to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the importance of the use of carbon sinks. I thank the council in advance for their contributions. I know they're working very hard and diligently. I look forward to hearing their advice and recommendations.

We continue to advance our Climate Change Action Plan, implementing programs that support the transition to a low-carbon global economy. We recognize the urgent work that is required to address climate change and mitigate its impacts. We also recognize the need to make a transition to the green economy in a manner that assists a just transition for all people in our province; just transitions approach to climate change action that aims to create an equitable and prosperous future for workers and communities as the world builds a low-carbon economy.

Transitioning to the green economy is increasing rapidly as more companies and governments make the commitment to move to net zero. The conversation is frequent, with external stakeholders such as econext keen to weigh in and public discussions being encouraged by projects such as the provincially supported Forecast NL initiative by the Harris Centre to look to the future of our climate economy and society.

The province's 2019 Climate Change Action Plan sets out a course of immediate steps to green energy and the economy. This five-year plan sets to work toward net-zero emissions by 2050. We know additional plans will be required, for sure. We are making great progress in implementing this plan, with all 45 items in progress or completed. These actions are

working to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and stimulate clean innovation and growth.

We are supporting several initiatives under the program, such as the Low Carbon Economy Leadership Fund and the Climate Change Challenge Fund, as we move towards our commitment of net-zero emissions by 2050. By 2030, these and other programs are expected to deliver over 830,000 tons of cumulative greenhouse gas emission reductions and 650 direct person-years of employment. That is significant, but it definitely needs to be more, for sure.

The federal government also has a role to play in moving us forward in a green economy. We are continuing to pursue opportunities to partner with our federal colleagues on opportunities that will benefit Newfoundland and Labrador.

Global outlook for energy is changing and all sectors in our economy are actively looking at ways to decrease their greenhouse gas emissions. Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore projects are already amongst the lowest carbon-intensity-emitting production facilities in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

B. DAVIS: For example, the recently announced Bay du Nord Project will be the most carbon-efficient development of its scale in Canada. Emissions from Bay du Nord are estimated to be approximately eight kilograms of CO₂ per barrel, compared to an international average of 16.1 kilograms of CO₂ per barrel.

And I understand fully what some of my colleagues will say about that and I get it. I completely understand where they are coming from. But we also have to understand that we are transitioning and we need to make sure that those needs are still being met. If we have to meet those needs, my conscience will allow me to see developments in our own offshore because they are much better than the offshore developments in other provinces and other countries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

B. DAVIS: These types of projects are moving in the right direction. While our offshore presents a significant opportunity, we recognize that more must be done. But we also know that our operators are committed to the green transition as well.

While industry facilities have historically been the source of emissions, each facility is required to meet stringent, annual reduction targets. The first two years of implementation, the total reduction in emissions have exceeded the set targets. In 2019, emissions were reduced by some 389,000 tons below the reduction targets that were required. In 2020, the emissions were about 970,000 tons below the reduction targets that were required. Those are significant numbers.

Global companies focused on the environmental sustainability are increasingly interested in our low greenhouse gas production, in particular, in the oil and gas and mining sectors.

Speaker, as a government, we have had a firm commitment in addressing climate change. I can highlight a few of the initiatives that I had the opportunity to highlight in previous discussions: \$17.3 million in continuation of the Low Carbon Economy Leadership Fund; an additional \$2 million for homes to transition from oil to electric; \$1.9 billion in infrastructure for charging stations, which will equate to \$2,500 and \$1,500 rebates for electric vehicles and plug-in hybrids respectively; \$1.2 million to help mitigate actions of climate change by flood-risk mapping.

Speaker, transitioning to the green economy is not going to happen overnight but we must –

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The minister's time is expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Speaker.

It is a pleasure to have a few words within the 10-minute block that I'm provided to speak to the PMR that my colleague from St. John's Centre has put forth.

I just want to make a declaration, that our party was the first one in the province to develop the Energy Plan in 2007 to set the record and the path for the initiatives which we talk about today and we feel very good with that.

Are we in favour of driving the green technology? You bet. Are we in favour of reducing greenhouse gases? You bet we are and we're there.

The key words we would have that we look at would be that within the PMR and one that contained so many WHEREASes, it probably exceeded any PMR that we've had in the past, but some of those WHEREASes we may have some issues with and would take a different stand. I would think the speakers behind me, my colleagues, will speak to that very, very shortly.

We talk about a just transition. The Leader of the Third Party had mentioned that the European Union was ditching the Russian oil and that's a good initiative. We depended on Russian oil, I would think, for a significant amount of time. Us in Canada, which is one of the leaders in the climate change initiative and goals and pursuits, we import 300,000 barrels of oil a day. I didn't know that until recently. But our country is not self-sufficient in oil and we need to import 300,000 barrels per day. That's a lot of oil. And we know we have oil-producing provinces.

So what happens when we don't have enough oil? Or what happens when there's a shortage of oil and gas that would be in the world? One of the fundamentals in the foundation of economics would be when the supply gets so low people on the demand side have to pay more for that product. So when we talk about a just transition and making a just transition within our goal, we have to make sure that we don't create a whole lot of hurt and inconvenience along the way. I would say to you, we've spent weeks talking about the inordinate cost of living for the residents of which we all serve – 40 districts. We serve them, and the cost of living has gone through the roof. I would say to you it has to do

with supply and demand. A big part of it is based on our oil and gas industry.

So while we all desire to get to electric vehicles and reduce our greenhouse gases, that transition has to be a just one. We cannot create hurt and severe inconvenience with our population. And I find that's where we may be headed with some of the pursuits of which we desire.

I hear sometimes from some people that we should be able to cut our production right now and let's go green. But that can't happen. It can't happen. We can't transition that quick. But rest assured, we ought to make sure that we have ample supply of our oil and gas to make sure that we do that transition as painlessly as we possibly can for the people in this province and this country.

So if you think what we do now – and I would think all Members of the House would agree – the residents in the District of Bonavista, we charge them a carbon tax, right now, whoever, but they've got a carbon tax for every time they go to fill up.

Most can't buy an electric vehicle; they could put their name down to get one in the future, but a lot of them can't afford that electrical vehicle right now. It does not seem just to know that we are being punitive with them to the fact where they don't have any options, either to not travel or, I assume, to travel much less. And that initiative is not bad. But when we have people who can't go for medical appointments that need to travel three hours from Bonavista to get to the Health Sciences because they can't afford to go, we know that something is not right.

So we have 11 cents carbon tax now. By 2030, if we do a projection now, seven years time, you will have 37 cents of carbon tax on our fuel. Because all along this journey that we place we're going to make it tougher on the residents that we serve.

I would think if we had the technology and rolled out the electric vehicles, as I stated before, that were cheaper than the gas combustion engine, you wouldn't need to sell that to the residents of the District of Bonavista. They would be buying them up. It would be

happening without any punitive measures that we can lay on the residents of which we serve. They would be buying them up. But we are not there. Those were some of the issues.

The minister just spoke about the incentives he put out. Just let me, in my closing time, speak to that. So they put out a program with \$5,000 for people to change from oil to gas. Good initiative, but we have no idea who is accessing the \$5,000 or what their household income would be. One hundred people availed of it last year – 2½ people per district. Now, anytime someone comes off it, it's a good thing.

This year it is 140 and 140 is 3½ people per district. Just say I have 3½ people in the District of Bonavista but they do not know what the household income was of those people that received the money. Meanwhile, I would have people in the District of Bonavista that want to get rid of their oil, they can't do it because it's going to cost upwards of close to \$10,000 beyond the \$5,000 that the government is going to provide.

So we are not making it easy for those people. What I suggested the other day was the fact that we should have a program for those people that would offer to pay for the conversion to electric, receive their \$5,000 towards it and the rest of it could be paid out in, say, very low installments of \$50 a month. Chances are they will accrue savings beyond the \$50 a month, savings within their home, plus we have taken more off oil.

So to throw out a program of \$5,000 to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who earn less than \$60,000 – I think I'm being conservative with that figure, it's probably higher – but those with \$60,000 who can't afford it, is incorrect. That is not a just transition. If we look at that program alone, that is not a just transition.

So I would say the Bay du Nord Project that reduces its emissions and produces quality product to the world is a good initiative because that is a good initiative for us transitioning. If, in two or three or three or four years, one comes out to beat the transmission out limits or what

they put out for Bay du Nord, that project ought to be entertained so we can make sure that our transition is as beneficial for the environment as what we could.

But, surely, in this PMR it would state that there is no room for oil and gas, even though it does state transition, but for future developments. But if we had a future development that would certainly reduce the transmissions of those oil-producing countries that are out there, then that is certainly something that we ought to consider.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

S. STOODLEY: Thank you, Speaker.

I am very pleased to talk to this PMR. I'm going to focus mine on some of the opportunities that we have for wind. Originally, I was hoping to split my time between wind and hydrogen; I admittedly knew and know very little about both industries so that is certainly something that I'm going to try to educate myself on. I have done some reading about wind and I'm very excited, so that is what I'm going to focus on today.

I guess part of the challenge with our transition – and we're very pleased about the Bay du Nord announcement – is we have a lot of people with very high-paying jobs in that industry. So, originally, and up until I was doing a lot of research on wind last night, I was a bit worried. How do we transition people from high-paying jobs into retraining for the new economy? But the more I learn now, the more confident I am that there is not that much retraining that we need to do. We already have all of these skill sets needed.

I haven't even gotten into hydrogen. A while ago, I bought a hydrogen book but I haven't had a chance to read it yet, so that's what I'm going to do next week and learn a bit more about hydrogen. I have heard and I do understand that it is a significant opportunity for Newfoundland and Labrador, which is incredible. I know that

wind is an incredible opportunity for Newfoundland and Labrador.

I think part of the challenge I have had, maybe, is understanding the lingo. Unfortunately, I can't speak the lingo. I've heard the Premier talk about carbon tons per barrel and that kind of stuff. So that's something that I need to educate myself on better so that I can talk about that. I do think the general public are not as knowledgeable as we should be, I think, in terms of the different ways – the newer ways of talking about carbon and electricity. So that is certainly a big opportunity that we have here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

I hadn't really thought about wind, Speaker. I spent some time in the Netherlands and there are a lot of windmills and turbines there. In the UK, we drive from where I used to live to the airport and you would pass by four or five big farms, fields, full of turbines. So I guess I kind of just took that for granted.

I do think a lot of the skill sets that we have here, at the moment, will be great for new industries such as wind and hydrogen. So, again, I was going to talk about wind and hydrogen, but I think I'll be able to do 10 minutes just on wind. I'll save hydrogen for my next opportunity; I need to learn a bit more about that.

Looking at the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, they anticipate in 2030, 20 per cent of all the electricity consumed in the United States is going to be from wind. So that's a huge and significant opportunity. Then I started to think about what are the careers in wind energy and thinking about the types of careers we have in Newfoundland and Labrador and the skill sets we have. I guess, if you rationally sit down and think about it, none of this would come as a surprise, but sitting down and just making a list and thinking about what skill sets we have now versus what skill sets we need for a wind economy, let's say, not even going to hydrogen.

Obviously, the wind turbines, they need to be designed. We have a lot of really smart designers and engineers. They need to be built. I can't even fathom how huge an opportunity it is for – where do they even make and build wind turbines? These are significant opportunities for

us. Those parts all have to be transported here, to wherever they're going. They have to be erected. I can't imagine – there can't be that many people in the world who know how to erect wind turbines, Mr. Speaker.

I'm so excited about all the opportunities that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians could potentially have in becoming experts in these new fields. Manufacturing of wind turbines, the construction, the operation and the maintenance of wind turbines, it's just incredible. Then let alone getting them up and running, what if they need to be upgraded? We're going to have to upgrade our wind turbines. I'm sure there are lots more mature wind turbine fields and we could have teams here who are experts in upgrading wind turbine fields. We could be exporting our expertise around the world to do that.

Research and development: obviously, we have Memorial University, they have a lot of amazing skill sets and teams and they are able to commercialize a lot of the research that they do. I honestly don't know how much, if they're doing any. Hopefully, they are doing some research around this area, but that's a huge opportunity for Newfoundland and Labrador.

The sales and marketing around all this stuff is incredible. We have a lot of that kind of expertise here. The logistics, distribution, all the materials and supply – I know we do have a huge material and supply sector here for the oil and gas industry and I can only imagine that they're only too eager to supply any kind of wind turbine, these big mechanical industries. They're only going to be too excited to kind of pivot slightly and adapt to wind and hydrogen.

Project managers: I imagine the skill set is a little different, but managing these huge, significant projects is the same kind of ballpark skill set. The more I think about this, the more excited I get. No wonder Noia changed their name to Energy NL. I think that they're kind of ahead of the curve. I'm pleased that our government – we've gotten rid of the moratorium on wind turbines, if I understand that correctly, because I'm not an expert on that. But I do think this is a significant opportunity for us. I've probably said that 20 times, so I'll try and use different words next time.

So when we think about the turbines, where are they going to go? We have to clean the sites. We have to prepare either land or in the ocean. That is a significant undertaking. We're going to need experts in doing that. I just think about Crown lands, how are we going to sell or make the land available? Maybe, as a government, we already have that figured out; I'm not sure. But how are we going to make sure that the right companies are using the land that we have in the right way so that we get money for the province, and also make it commercially available for companies interested?

The regulatory environment: as minister responsible for lots of regulations I also think about this. I'm responsible for occupational health and safety in the oil and gas industry offshore. So I think about, we haven't even started, honestly. This is something I'm going to think about now and have my teams think about. What kind of regulations do we need for the wind and hydrogen? It's going to be significant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Planning.

S. STOODLEY: Yeah.

So health and safety, also I'm responsible for occupational health and safety. The occupational health and safety in the oil and gas industry is going to be very different than in the wind, but still you need that kind of expertise and background. I know we have a lot of that here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Then I was thinking about what kind of skill sets do you need within all those types of industries? People are going to need to design these wind turbines and test them. And those are aerospace engineers. I know a few people I went to university with who became aerospace engineers. I assumed they went to NASA or something. But people who design wind turbines are aerospace engineers, so they're going to, hopefully, come back to Newfoundland and Labrador and design some wind turbines for us. We're going to need roads going to the wind turbine farms. We're going to need lots of construction people. We're going to need lots of civil engineers and electrical engineers. All those people currently, we're going to need them to come to our new industries. We're going to need environmental engineers. I didn't even

know there was such a thing. But the environmental impact and the wind turbines and the noise and all that stuff. We're going to need industrial engineers and material engineers; all these things I didn't even know existed. Inspectors, assemblers, welders, production managers, all these people that we have here in Newfoundland and Labrador working in the oil and gas industry.

I'm really optimistic and excited that there will be – not tomorrow, obviously, we don't have wind companies running here at the moment, but I am really hopeful that we will, and as I learn more about this, the more excited I get.

I didn't even get to hydrogen, but it's kind of parallel to me for the tech sector. I think we haven't taken as much opportunity as we could have with the tech sector. There are hundreds and hundreds of jobs here that go unfilled and that are filled remotely in Toronto and places just because there aren't enough people for us to hire.

So the next time I speak with the president of Memorial University, or any member of the board, I am going to be talking to them about: we need to have programs about wind and hydrogen. It's too late once the companies are here buying turbines from Asia or Europe. We need to get that expertise now. I think this is a huge opportunity.

I don't know the life cycle of one of these projects, I imagine it's 10 to 20 years, but we need to start getting the expertise here now. I'm super excited about the opportunity for Newfoundland and Labrador and I haven't even talked about hydrogen. So that will be next time.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER (Warr): The hon. the Member for Lake Melville.

P. TRIMPER: Thank you to the Deputy Speaker.

It is indeed an honour to speak to this PMR. I would like to start right off the bat by acknowledging and thanking the Third Party for bringing it forward. It is very similar to one that I tabled on October 26 in this House, last year. I thank them because I think I would be waiting a few more months before we got a chance to debate so many of the elements. But I see a lot of the intention here and I thank them for it. So good on you guys.

I went through the PMR, and as folks have identified, there are several WHEREAS clauses and several THEREFOREs. Yeah, it is a little longer than what we normally deal with on a Wednesday, but do you know what? This topic is incredibly complicated. It affects all walks of our life and of all of the crises facing this province right now, whether it be fiscal, whether it be geographic, whether it be demographic, there can be nothing more vital than the future environment in which we are all going to live in.

I can tell you, as a gentleman representing one of the four districts of Labrador and the changes and the effects that we are already feeling, so many issues that are already irreversible because of what has been going on, I feel the urgency. So, again, I thank the Third Party for bringing this forward.

As you know – and just to put this in perspective – if you go on to the website for Climate Change and you look at the predictions for what is going to happen by 2050, that is 28 years from now, the community where I live, Happy Valley-Goose Bay, is predicted to be six degrees warmer than pre-industrial levels by 2050. That's 28 years from now. Nain – my colleague right in front of me for Torngat Mountains represents that district – will be 7.3 degrees warmer. Five degrees colder and we had an ice age.

For many of us, one or two degrees of difference doesn't seem like a lot, but I can tell you when you put it on the scale of averages and over time and you look at the change, it's huge. We feel this, and I understand my colleague is going to speak more to this as we go on in this debate.

I did want to mention, though, one more detail that just struck me for the sheer in your face, look what's happening, and that's last winter. Not the one we've just gone through, but the winter before. There was insufficient ice cover on the North Coast of Labrador such that for the first time in I think, well certainly my time in Labrador, several decades, but for anyone else that I spoke to, you could not travel safely between communities – insufficient ice cover. We are already feeling it.

I look to the fishery. Every day in this House I see issues related to climate change, whether it be the fishery and allocations of shrimp or snow crab, and where they are suddenly shifting north as they're trying to find the colder environments. Because the ocean, by the way, is the number one sequester of carbon dioxide that we have and it's taking a beating right now as it tries to absorb more and more CO2. It's becoming actually more acidic, warmer and sea life that's looking for that cold water temperature is having to chase it further north away from our shores. This is some of the reality.

I have to go to a bunch of points. I'm going to run out of time, but I have to go to a point here. It was just last year we looked here, we all met and we all unanimously agreed to support going ahead with the Terra Nova Project. We allocated some \$505 million of federal and provincial dollars. On the provincial part in terms of royalty relief, and from the federal government, thank you very much, \$205 million. It's half a billion dollars we've provided Suncor to proceed with the Terra Nova Project.

As we sit here and argue over carbon tax and the 2.2 cents that we're going to be adding and so on I keep saying to everyone, take a look at Suncor's declared profits from just last week: \$2.9 billion record profit they just declared for the first quarter – \$2.9 billion. We're arguing over 2.2 cents and these major oil and gas companies, yes they are a big part of our economy, yes they are employing a lot of people, yes they're contributing to our GDP, but I can tell you folks we should be going after that profit.

I just listened to the Official Opposition here this afternoon talk about so many eloquent, hard, tough stories to hear about what people are

facing, and I'm watching these oil and gas companies with these amazing profits. Folks, the legislation is there; the Americans are bringing it in right now. I am tracking it in Congress: windfall profit tax legislation. It's not on production; it's on the profit. The money is there; they are taking it and they are applying it to low- and middle-income residents of the United States. We should be looking to do the same. I have investigated. We cannot do it as a sub-national, but the prime minister was here yesterday and he and his government, they can bring this in. And we should be talking about it.

I want to talk a little bit about just transition, and how important this is. And I like the three suggestions here that the NDP have. Some of them I hadn't thought of, but in terms of bringing in just transition legislation, yes, we should be at it. It was about two years ago, I remember I led a PMR which brought unanimous support from this House to move Newfoundland and Labrador to net zero by 2050. This is a very important target, but I can tell you, folks, by 2050 if we're at zero in terms of what we're emitting and what we're sequestering, it's going to be too late at the rate we're going. We really need to move on this.

So just transition does not mean turning off the tap right now. It means gradually turning off the tap. It means preparing the workforce, society, legislation, our economy; everyone needs to move with a plan, with one vision and going in the same direction. I'm going to take Newfoundland and Labrador in the context of Canada. Oil and gas industry has represented, in our recent memory, as much as one-third of our total revenues. It's now approximately 10 per cent.

Poland, similarly within the European Union, has a heavy dependence on coal. So what's gone on recently is that the European Union have set up a huge multi-billion dollar euro fund to allow member nations to move forward with their just transition. Guess what? The majority of the money is going towards Poland. Here's an entity, much like Newfoundland and Labrador in the Canadian federation, Poland to the EU is being heavily supported to get on with that just transition. And you know what? They're making great progress. Poland's increased their GDP sevenfold and decreased energy intensity by

some 56 per cent since 1990. They're doing it. They're already moving ahead.

In addition to supporting so many Ukrainian refugees, they are shifting their economy in the direction that we're talking about today in this PMR. And you only have to look to them for an example to see how it's being done.

I need to talk about so much of the debate that we've been talking about in this House in the last few weeks, months, carbon tax and so on – somebody else should be doing this. We really should be looking around. And when I talk about per capita situations in comparing Newfoundland and Labrador within the context of Canada, we are the third-dirtiest entity in Canada.

What that means in terms of dirty, our emissions per person living in this province are the third highest in Canada. Canada, in the context of the world, is the seventh worst. So in terms of our population, on a per person basis – and people say: Oh, that's per capita, in terms of total and so on. Well, guess what? When I talk about per capita, what I'm really trying to do is get everybody to understand every single person can make a difference. We can all change our habits. We can all do something to get forward with this.

So when I look to the PMR and talking about coming forward with key asks of this House, the idea to bring forward climate and an energy bill and to set up – I really like this idea of office of climate accountability. Why not have a third party, much as we have a Consumer Advocate, evaluate our ability to pass legislation, to set policy, such that we're really making progress.

I will say to everyone in this House today and I have heard already a couple of comments – I'm just waiting for it; I've made a bit of a prediction. I'm not sure if there is an amendment coming because I suspect there are probably some clauses in here that are causing some angst for people. But I'll tell you, every one of those clauses, I've looked at them, is accurate; they're factually accurate.

The problem that, I think, you might have when you look at it – and I have to say, I think we've made some progress in this Legislature, just in

recent days, when I'm hearing some of the tone. You can't go down two paths; we can only go down one path. You have to think seven generations out. We have to think about future generations and what we're leaving them.

We can't leave them a climate that is going to be 7.3 degrees warmer in Nain. We can't leave them with, I've calculated, some \$24.8 billion worth of carbon dioxide penalties just associated with the Bay du Nord Project alone. That's the kind of legacy we're passing on to future generations. We need to take some serious action. So if there are clauses that are causing you some concern and so on, that is going to be the challenge of us all pulling hard and really showing leadership.

Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker.

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

A. PARSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'll just speak briefly to this PMR and I'll probably save some of the suspense and say that there is no amendment coming from me. I don't know if there is an amendment coming from this side.

I'll just speak very briefly to some of the commentary and the resolution itself, which certainly there is a lot of different parts to it. I guess what I can say is this: I don't think that believing in climate change and also trying to advance an industry for the benefit of the province have to be mutually exclusive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A. PARSONS: Half the challenge sometimes is when you talk about it, depending on which medium you're talking to they try to peg you as one or the other. That's not how it has to be. Nor at the same time, there was – especially a couple of years ago when the oil industry was going through an extremely tough time. When I talk about the oil industry, I talk about the workers. I couldn't care less about the bottom line of any of these companies. But when you're hearing from workers and hearing from people that have been affected by this, it was real pain that they were feeling.

So what I would say is that we were concerned about that, and you're also concerned when you talked about, again people try to peg it as if you were talking about transition, how we're leaving you out in the cold, we don't care for you and we're moving towards the green transition. I also say that's not true either. We are lucky here in this province. The biggest thing that gives me optimism every single day is the fact that I foresee a prosperous future for this province because of the resources that we have.

The challenge that every government has – previous, now and in the future – the biggest challenge is finding a way to make sure that we properly manage that and leave something there. That we don't fumble the ball when it comes to how we set this up, and I mean that especially when it comes to our renewable resources, which is something that we're at right now when we talk about setting up policies, setting up these opportunities. There is; there's huge opportunity, but again I don't think that planning for a renewable future means that right now we remove ourselves from the game as it relates to the oil industry. As we can tell, there is obviously demand. People much smarter than me will get on the business news every night and talk about the fact that it's hard to plan exactly where we're going to be.

The reality is no one can predict how this future is going to go. But when I look at the top ten-producing oil nations, of which Canada is one, I look at Newfoundland and Labrador as a part of one of those and say why would we remove a Bay du Nord from that equation. Why would we not do that, remove ourselves from that and let other countries with lesser ethical and regulatory standards place themselves there? We have a product that is in demand. Right now, I think part of it is using the money, the royalties we get as a province, to help develop some of that new technology.

So I agree with some of the parts that are in here, when we talk about the skill sets of our oil and gas workers. Again, a lot of these skill sets can be transitioned, and some people will make that transition; they'll do it on their own. But I certainly don't want to have a forced transition, where we're forcing people to make that decision. When it comes to all these different things, I'm lucky to have a department that talks

about tech, that talks about industry, that talks about resources. One of the biggest challenges we have is finding the people to fill all the jobs that will hopefully be created. Especially on the tech side, which again relates to resources. I mean these companies are finding ways to incorporate in there, to become more efficient, to become safer, and we need to support that. We'll continue to support that. Again, the investments we make hopefully are going to have returns for this province and for the people in the province.

My colleague said one thing about workers in these industries. I tell you when we made the announcement to remove the wind moratorium, per se, I had an email from a person – a Newfoundlander and Labradorian – works in the States, been working as a wind technician for the last X number of years in the States and was so thankful that this industry is hopefully going – you know it is a nascent industry here where we are going to move into that. We have the best resources in North America, as far as I am concerned, when it comes to that and we are going to continue to do that.

I guess my final point is saying I believe we can do that. I believe we can still contribute to a world that has demand for oil right now. I would put our product up against any in Canada, against any in North America, against any in the world and I don't feel the need, right now, to remove ourselves from that, but I also don't think that that makes you a climate change denier.

So I will leave it at that and say I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

L. PARROTT: Thank you, Speaker.

I am a son of Newfoundland and I am a son of Labrador and I support oil and gas, make no mistake about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

L. PARROTT: And so I am clear and nobody thinks I am sitting on the fence, I do not support this PMR. And I will explain why – quite simple.

Oil and gas right now is our silver bullet to our future. It bewilders me to listen to the Member for Lake Melville talk about Poland and how they have been transitioning since 1990 and not think about Churchill Falls, Muskrat Falls, Fermeuse and St. Lawrence. This province is transitioning. We are actually leaders in this industry. We have been doing things.

As a matter of fact, I will go to the five-point plan, which I have not supported because I don't think it goes near far enough, but we are trying to get people to buy electric cars. We are trying to transition people from oil. We are doing the things we need to do, but here is the other thing we need to do. We need to make sure we can pay for our future or we will not have one. We will not have a future.

I understand that we have to transition with climate, make no mistake about it. I have two small children and they are the world to me. And I only got involved in this job so I could have a better future for them. That's the one factor when I decided to run for politics – my two children – Gavin and Olivia who I love very much. I ran so they would have a future, and I think a lot of people in this House feel the same way.

So when people stand up and say our grandchildren's future and our son's and daughter's future, we have got to think about the present and how we get there. We are in a fiscal crisis and part of that is because of Muskrat Falls. Part of that is because of the cost of gas and oil. But let's think about this.

We heard the Member for Bonavista earlier talk about the amount of oil that gets shipped in here on a daily basis. How does anyone in their right mind think that is part of a transition plan? You put the oil on a tanker from Saudi Arabia or from Russia – they aren't electric tankers; they

burn oil and gas and bunker C and everything to get here. So they burn all that fuel to ship all the way around the world and land it here in Canada. But that is a cleaner option than Bay du Nord? That is not even a cleaner option than what we have out West in the oil sands. As long as oil is off our shores and there is a dependency in this world, we ought to be taking oil out of our waters, period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

L. PARROTT: That is not me saying that the climate is not important. That is me saying that a transition includes a smart way to proceed. Any transition means that you understand that there is a balancing act; that you have to get there on a path. And yes, there are two roads to transition, make no mistake about it, and those two roads are supposed to meet at the end, but they don't meet until you get to that transition point. Our transition means we should be utilizing our resources in order to pay for our green future.

It is a pretty simple concept; if we can produce cleaner, more ethical oil, than other places in the world and we depend on it, we ought to be doing it and that is actually a smart idea. Why would we take dirty, unethical oil? Our oil builds roads; our oil builds schools; our oil pays for our health care; it builds hospitals. I would suggest that what's being suggested here today is that we continue to depend on oil coming from areas where there are dictators. Areas where there are people blowing people up for no reason other than they want their land. That's not acceptable.

The world is trying to transition to green energy, but we have to be smart about it. We have to understand what is happening in the world. If we sit in this House and we talk about geopolitical tensions that are happening in the world and we're looking at it globally, then the reality of it is we can contribute on a global level. If we just eliminate oil and gas from Newfoundland and Labrador, we're enabling these dictators; we're enabling dirty oil. We're actually going against what we say we want to do.

We just don't build wind – listen, they just approved wind in Voisey's Bay; it is a fairly substantial project. Guess how much power they are going to produce? Speaker, 12.3 per cent of

the required power – 12.3 per cent. So I listen to our colleagues from the NDP and it shocks me that we have a Member that has Voisey's Bay in their district, a Member with IOC – Wabush Mines, or Tacora now – all heavily dependent on oil. Airplanes, boats, all heavily dependent on oil. We just don't shut it off and these things keep going.

If we stop producing oil tomorrow, I can tell you our mining resources will be of no matter. If we shut down oil tomorrow, we won't have an ability to put wind. Wind turbines aren't going to grease themselves. There is no question; they're not going to build themselves. You don't produce aluminum or steel without the power of oil. So we need to transition and the one thing that behooves me is that I don't ever hear anyone in this House talk about petrochemicals. Go up around Montreal or Quebec anywhere and see what's happening up there: The largest polluters in the country. When we talk about here by per capita, look at the land we got. Holyrood is our issue. When Muskrat Falls comes online, if Holyrood disappears, we instantly become a leader. We can't in one hand deny what we have for hydroelectricity and in the other hand say that we're the worst.

Between the oil refinery, Muskrat Falls, Churchill Falls, Fermeuse, St. Lawrence, you eliminate Holyrood and tell me that that doesn't change everything we do here in a big swoop. It absolutely does. No question. And do you know what? You start looking at nobody's talking about what the effects of going to hydrogen are. It takes about 400 litres of hydrogen to produce one megawatt. We're going to evaporate all that water. They want fresh clean water, no chlorine, no salt water, they don't want to go through a desalinization process; they want fresh water. What happens? We've got people in this province who don't have fresh water. Now, all of a sudden, we're going to say we're going to use our fresh water to make hydrogen; it's that simple. It's not that simple.

That's the problem with this government. It's that everything we do, we don't look forward. We don't consider the ramifications or the repercussions. We need to transition to a green economy, but we need to make sure that we're doing it in a transitional way. And part of that is to keep the men and women that are in our

offshore employed. Another part is LNG Newfoundland and Labrador; we ought to be pushing that as fast and hard as we can. And the reason is quite simple: The world is going to need natural gas to transition.

There's no question that some of the European countries are going to transition faster. There's no question that there are Canadian provinces that are going to transition faster. We don't have that horsepower; I'm sorry. We've got the knowledge, we've got the skill, we've got all the things required, but we've got to get it to market, we've got to get the people to work in the industry and we've got to have the wherewithal to do it. Part of that is it's going to take time.

We have an opportunity here, as a province, to transition from oil and gas into a green economy, but we've got a window of opportunity here, too. Bay du Nord surely shows that. West White Rose shows that. LNG NL shows that. Why not take advantage of those opportunities?

You think about the refinery and these biodiesel plants. What's going to happen when all these biodiesel refineries start buying up the canola and all the vegetable oils? What's going to happen to Mary Brown's? The hon. Speaker gave a Member's statement today about Mary Brown's. What's going to happen to the cost of going to buy a piece of chicken or a piece of fish when they're paying – I can tell you, I talked to a franchisee with Mary Brown's last night and in the last two months, their cost of oil went from \$50 a jug to \$80 in two months. He said they expect it to double again in the next two months to \$160. You know who's going to pay for that? Everyone here and everyone on this Island.

So we need to start thinking about what we're doing. It all sounds great, and I totally understand the importance of the environment, but we have to have an ability to move forward and do things. For some reason, people lose sight of that.

Workers: sure we have great workers. But not everybody can transition. I'll say the Member for Labrador West should know this, but he's probably a little bit too young. When Wabush mines shut down in 1986, I believe, and they offered this CTEC program to everyone, there

were a lot of people left out in the wind. Do you know why? Because not everybody is young enough to transition. Not everybody has the background and the education to get into the schools to transition to new trades. Not everybody can get accepted and schools don't have the capability of bringing people in to do this training.

So what about those workers? What about those people? They're left out. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, transition is a really good word and I believe we need to have a just transition. But we also need to believe that this isn't just about transition. It has to be about the present and where we are and what we're doing.

If Newfoundland and Labrador's silver bullet is our oil and gas, we ought to embrace it. We ought to tell the world we're open for business. We ought to say we can supply North America. We ought to stop shipping oil in from overseas. We ought to show the world that we can become independent when we need oil and gas. We ought to be looking for a way to flex our muscles on a global scale and show people that we're here and that we're going to utilize our own resources in order to transition into a green economy. Because we can do that and we can sell our green economy to the rest of the world.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Further speakers to the resolution?

The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

I'll take my time. First, I'll start with the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL she talked about workers and the transition. Interprovincial certification in a trade is good anywhere that they're certified to work in. Sometimes when we talk about transitioning and stuff like that, we talk about language and stuff like that. A lot of these workers, they're ready to go. They've been trained in multi-aspects, multi-parts of the trade. I'm a tradesperson. I went to trades school. I understand. My wife is a tradesperson. She went to trades school. I know

how the interprovincial works and your Red Seal certification. That's one thing about that.

The Member for Terra Nova mentioned about IOC. IOC is the second largest polluter in this province. If all furnaces are running, it can almost be the top polluter in this province. They were given five years by their parent company to stop that, because if they don't stop using bunker in their furnaces, they won't be able to trade their goods internationally. That's how serious other jurisdictions are putting pressure on us, as a country; that they were given five years to figure out a plan. A part of their big plan is they have to decarbonize the entire site. That is the future. That's the markets. The market is applying the pressure now.

So they have to come up with a five-year plan to stop burning bunker C, diesel and anything on their site. They had a great write-up about in the *Canadian Institute of Mining* magazine on some of their ideas and their plan.

Right now, they are actually looking for clean, renewable energy on top of what they did. Right now, they use over 200 megawatts of electricity right now and they will almost double or, potentially, triple the amount of that and it has to come from a source that is deemed green, so wind or hydrogen, nuclear or hydro.

The Minister of Digital Government did mention about wind and its big potential. It is a big potential and a lot of mine sites across Canada right now are using wind, intermediately, to reduce their use of diesel plants. But another thing she mentioned was hydrogen. I know she never got to her chat about hydrogen, but right now some of the blast furnaces in Europe have been basically told to switch from fuel to hydrogen in the steel-making process. So that switch has already happened.

One of the largest steel manufacturers in Europe, actually, is using plasma electrolysis as a means of making iron and getting steel.

So we are not reinventing the wheel here. We are not doing that. Industry is already on their own right now. It is making transitions and

making plans to decarbonize their sites to actually make their product marketable because a lot of these large markets are actually going to be putting restrictions on trading for places that do not meet or exceed the standards that they wish.

Like I said, my own district is seeing that pressure right now and we have been given a very short timeline to meet it. The actual transition plan that they do talk about in there talks about how they would actually have to increase staff. They would have to hire more people full time to run these operations. So we are going to talk about larger employment opportunities.

Post-World War II in Europe and Asia and, well, the world, one of the fundamental things that actually changed – almost a second industrial revolution – was the Marshall Plan to rebuild an entire continent. When that deal was struck and they actually started implementing it in Europe, it actually caused a massive jump in employment, especially in trades, in natural resources and industry. That's how Labrador West became Labrador West, because of the amount of need for iron to build, to change the world.

This change of our economy, we're going to go through another industrial revolution right now. We're probably in the midst of it now, as we change our economy, change our behaviours and how industry actually operates. We are about to hit – the amount of money that's going to be available to basically rebuild infrastructure, to change how natural resources are extracted, how to change our society, we're about to enter another kind of rebuilding. So we're about to hit Marshall Plan two, basically, because we're about to have to rebuild our entire economy. The amount of infrastructure, the amount of work that has to be done, yes, it's costly, but it's also going to drive a massive economy; another boost as we actually put a lot of people to work to do a lot of work.

The federal government, along with this provincial government actually, just released the Atlantic clean power planning report and roadmap that actually calls for more energy to be put onto our grid and to interconnect our grid

as Atlantic Canada. It even talks about basically you have to upgrade the Maritime Link already, just to meet the demand and the need. We have polluters in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia that have targets they have to meet to reduce their emissions when it comes to burning coal and to be burning oil and that. We ourselves have to do the same.

To do that work, it's years of work, it's a massive undertaking to basically rebuild the grids of this province, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and even Quebec. So the amount of work, the amount needed, the amount of bodies, we don't have enough in this province even to do the work that needs to be done. So the opportunity is not just for us, but it's an opportunity actually to even grow our population, because there is so much work that has to be completed in a very short period of time. There's a lot of opportunity there. There's a lot of money floating around there for that opportunity.

Now, I know the Members of the Opposition mentioned end oil. Nowhere in the PMR says end oil today, end oil tomorrow. It's about a plan. It's about how do we do it and how do we also create opportunity along the way. I know there's going to be a lot of opportunity in my district, with or without a plan, because outside forces are going to dictate to us on how we move forward. We have no choice; mining companies have no choice. They want to compete in a global market, they got to do it and they're going to do it. They're going to have to spend a large amount of money to do it.

At the end of the day, we have to take responsibility and actually have a plan, because we're responsible for the electrical grid, we're responsible for a lot of things, but it is going to take a lot of workers. It is a lot of workers – a lot of expertise we already have here. We just built a hydro dam so we do have people trained up to do other stuff when it comes to the electrical grid, when it comes to actually building that. We have expertise in a lot of other things that we can utilize here.

It was great to hear the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology talk about a worker who worked in the wind farm industry as a tech. That's going to be a lot of jobs and potential

here. There is opportunity for training and stuff. So we do have the ability, we do have the opportunity, but it is a great opportunity. It is a fantastic opportunity to do it, to make the plan, to start work on it, because it is where the world is going, it's the way the world is turning right now. By not grabbing it and holding on to it, we're going to let a lot of dollars slip through the cracks.

We always have the old saying, *carpe diem* – seize the day. Well, we have to seize the day; we have to seize this opportunity and look at an amazing amount of opportunities that we're just in an amazing position to do it – absolutely amazing position to do it.

At the end of the day, do we want to be a part of the next industrial revolution? The next Marshall Plan? The next opportunity to move forward and show the world that we can do it? Because I know we can do it. There are a lot of world leaders that want us to do it and there is a lot of opportunity here in this province to do it.

We have the skill set, we have the mindset and we have the resources. So why don't we take the opportunity, make a plan and go forward and show that we mean business and we're going to seize the day.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

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

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this PMR today. My colleague from Terra Nova spoke a couple of minutes ago about how oil and gas, what it pays for in the province here: schools, hospitals and roads. He's certainly right.

There's one thing he forgot – and it's because he has the humility not to say because I know he's been involved with so many of these projects – that's our charities here in the province. The charities within our province have been given millions upon millions of dollars through a lot of

these projects. Where would those millions come from if they weren't around?

So when we go to bash the oil companies, you know what, how many millions of dollars in mortgages have they paid over the past 40 years? Car payments, kids' school, hockey – it goes beyond measure exactly what these jobs bring into the province and the revenue it brings into the province.

As to do with the PMR itself, the Leader of the Third Party, I have a huge amount of respect and admiration for him. I've said it before; he was my high school teacher back in the day, a very smart man. I admire their initiatives in regard to a much cleaner environment. I have a 14-year-old son and a 17-year-old son, and I truly do want the best for them in the future, as the Member for Terra Nova said as well. But that has to be bridged.

Unfortunately, the bridge isn't built yet. What happens if the bridge isn't built yet and we go too far, too fast across that bridge? Well, everybody's going to end up falling over the edge. So we need a better plan to build that bridge. As the initiatives are there, it's great, but we need to ensure that they are conceivable, that they are practical in their timelines. So that's something we need to look at moving forward.

In one of these clauses here, Mr. Speaker, it says, "any new development of offshore oil and gas extraction is incompatible with ... international commitments" I get that but my commitments are to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

C. TIBBS: That's my commitment. The international commitment, it's a huge task to take on. I hope that everybody in the world is on the same page eventually, but right now my commitment is the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, where we're moving in the future. Our economy is not great. To pluck something like oil and gas now off our radar, off our own initiatives, it's not the right move and it's definitely not the right move right now. It's something that we rely on and we need to continue to rely on it.

We need a more realistic target, moving forward, for our children. Again, the Member for Terra Nova said it perfectly. We will not have a future unless we keep our oil and gas here and those initiatives, and put all that money back into technology for a greener tomorrow. It's been said a dozen times and they're right, it needs to be done that way. This country should be self-sufficient on our own oil. America did it a couple of years ago. There is no reason why Canada can't do it. We have talked about it. It is going to be around for a long time. We need to ensure that we take full advantage of it. A lot of these oil companies, like I say, we want them to come in. We don't want to send the wrong message. I believe the oil and gas is going to be around for quite a long time.

Many people compare ourselves, in Canada, to Norway and a couple of stats on Norway, and the numbers should be about right here. Norway has 5½ million people. Canada has 38 million people. Norway has a land mass of 385,000 kilometres squared. Canada has 10 million kilometres squared. Norway put out seven metric tons of CO2 in 2018. Canada put out 15 metric tons. Canada has seven times the population. It is 25 times bigger in land mass and we put out twice as much carbon in 2018. I think our numbers are pretty good. Can they get better? Yeah, of course they can as time goes on.

Mr. Speaker, the petroleum products will be needed for a long time. We have discussed that over and over again, but I think that when it comes to a greener tomorrow, we need to look at putting more initiatives into recycling and our waste. That's a huge problem I see moving forward in this country, in the world. The amount of land mass waste that we have, recyclable products that are just being buried, dumped and burned or in our oceans, I think that's a real issue and I think that that's something that we should be putting more focus on right now than trying to kill our offshore oil and gas. That should not be an option for us right now.

I support the initiatives behind it. I don't think it is realistic at this time. I don't think it would benefit Newfoundland and Labrador. I don't think it would benefit my kids right now. So that

is the reason why I, personally, won't be supporting this PMR as it is.

We talked about the workers in offshore oil and gas, or in oil and gas all across Canada and whatnot. I get sick and tired of people telling me that the oil and gas workers can't wait to transition to another job. Again, the Member for Terra Nova talked about a lot of these people might not have the age to have that cushion to transition or learn something new and, unfortunately, that is the case with a lot of people. But the other case is they don't want to – they don't want to.

The oil and gas guys and girls across this country and in this province love their job. The majority of them absolutely love their job, and so they should. It is something to be very, very proud of. Sometimes it is very demanding, but at the end of the day when they come home with all 10 fingers and 10 toes and they've got a decent paycheque, it goes a long way for their family. It goes a long, long way and that's why –

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

C. TIBBS: It goes a long way to the province, too, that's right. And that's why we support it.

Again, the Member for Terra Nova touched on it; I think he read what I had here first: the LNG project. Right now we're learning that one of the cruise lines for one of the cruise ships from Disney is coming out fully reliant on liquid natural gas. That is the future. That is part of that bridge of our transition. So we have a proposal put forward here in our province to start LNG, I'm thinking 2028 maybe, or somewhere down the line.

I think that we should get started on something like that right away. That could be the future of tomorrow. There's a market out there; it's a much cleaner fuel, so I truly believe that we should be putting a lot more concentration, a lot more resources, into our LNG here in the province. You know, we've got trillions of cubic feet of LNG off our shores, it's a much cleaner fuel source and I truly believe that's where the future is for us here in Newfoundland and Labrador, and I will be a supporter of that

project whenever it gets started. Hopefully it's sooner than later.

When we talk about the alternatives, we do not have realistic alternatives here. We really don't. I can't wait. You know, I look forward to the day that every car on the road is an electric car, but it's just not there yet. This bridge is not half built yet, and I said it before, we're going to fall over the side if we're not careful here in what we do. I kind of compare it to if I was home and my kids were eating junk food and I was trying to get them off the junk food and they were eating 3,000 calories a day of garbage food, and I wanted to get them off junk food, I wouldn't place an apple in front of one of my kids and say, okay, that's yours for the day, that's it.

Obviously, that's not the bridge you want. You want to introduce better food to them, just like you want to introduce better alternatives to oil and gas. But that takes time, and we are not there yet. You look at the electric cars on the road and electric vehicles, there is not an abundance. You know, we're getting better with our power stations across the province, but the fact of the matter is there are not a lot of them across the province. The will isn't there. The money isn't there right now for people to buy electric vehicles or put in electric power stations into their house.

It's not realistic and I think at the end of the day, if we come at this with an approach that's not realistic, we will fail. We will be doomed and we will fail at this. So we do have a path in front of us and we do have a road, but we want to ensure that those timelines are realistic. It's feasible economically to do them for the people of the province. If those things are not in place, like I say, we will fail. We are on an island as well, so we need to ensure that we look at the wind power. I've heard it here before. But the LNG –

AN HON. MEMBER: And Labrador.

C. TIBBS: Sorry, and Labrador, that's right. But for us here on the Island, we do have our different set of circumstances and we need to ensure that we do what's best for the province here. Again, I just encourage government to look at that bridge, ensure it's built right before we

fall off the edge. If not, we will fail and we will be doomed.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: I'm recognizing the Member for Tornjat Mountains.

L. EVANS: Thank you, Speaker.

I had full intentions of sticking to my 10 minutes and not getting cut off – stick to the script. But I have to say not only am I very, very proud that Vale is in my district, the mining operation – Voisey's Bay, we refer to it – not only am I proud of that, I'm really, really proud to have worked there for many years in the environmental health and safety. A big part of that was sustainability.

I'm going to run out of time again now because I wasn't planning on talking about this. I have been very, very proud to work with a company that has such a good sustainability program and had done a lot of work, in actual fact, that wasn't forced upon them. They took the initiative over and over again. They worked on their efficiencies and reduced energy consumption over and over again. And so I'm really proud of that. The fact that they're reliant on diesel is only because in my district there is no road access to the Trans-Labrador Highway. It's too costly right now to put in a power line without that road, without the road support.

In actual fact, Voisey's is going to develop wind power. That's just a first start for them. They're actually planning more things. So I must say I have no problems with that. And in terms of the airlines having to fly in the big Dash 8s, yeah, they're consuming fuel. But at the end of the day, Voisey's would rather have a road. They would rather have a power supply from Muskrat Falls, the hydroelectricity, or from Churchill. Another thing too is over and over and over again they've won the John T. Ryan award. A big part of the awards that they get, the CIM award, the John T. Ryan award, has to do with sustainability and efficiency.

And there I've just used up a good two minutes of my time talking about Vale. But the thing

about it is sometimes people have to consume fuel, fossil fuel, but in actual fact there's always an eye to the future about transitioning. And that's what this PMR is about. I'm very, very proud to be a part of this PMR. I am proud of every part of this PMR but I'll just talk about a couple of the sections here for people who haven't heard the Member for St. John's Centre read it out.

But it talks about the science unmistakably tells us that we need a 45 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 – 45 per cent reduction. So how are we going to do that unless we transition off our need for fossil fuel consumption? And a 90 per cent reduction by 2050 in order to avoid a ruinous climate change. Ninety per cent by 2050. 2050 is also another important date because, as we know, by 2050 Nain is going to have four times as many thaw days in April as present day. In April, thaw days, four times as many. We rely on April to cut and haul a lot of our wood.

Another part of this PMR: "... the effects of climate change are already harming the people of this province according to the final report of the Health Accord, through more frequent and destructive weather events, disappearing sea ice in Labrador, or through toxic pollution" People in Labrador are already being harmed. We know that. My people already know that. The people in Labrador West know that. The people in Lake Melville region know that. The people in Cartwright - L'Anse au Clair District know that.

It also talks about "international commitments, meeting our obligations to future generations, and averting global disaster" So we have to transition off. It also talks about, "introducing Just Transition legislation in this House, ensuring high-quality union jobs, guaranteeing workers who want to enter the new industries receive the supports they need to do so, and ensuring local communities are the primary beneficiaries of the green transformation"

Now, the reason why I read parts of this is because in my district if you talk about a green transition, you talk about transitioning for newer jobs of the new technology. A lot of people in my district and in Labrador may not pay a whole lot of attention, especially in my district, because

in my district people are focused on the cost of food. Right now, we are dealing with the loss of the caribou, a major staple for people in my district. We're also dealing with the loss of the cod, a major staple of food consumption for people in my district that was basically at their back door.

People in my district are also struggling with the cost of heating their homes. In actual fact, the price of gasoline impacts their ability to go in their speedboat in the summer and hunt and fish. It impacts their ability to drive a Ski-Doo. Now, that is relevant to people in my district. They'll talk about the cost of housing, the cost of freight – the cost, the cost. Also, don't talk about the cost of the hydrocarbons, such as gasoline and stove oil.

So a lot of times people in my district – there are six Indigenous communities in Northern Labrador – on the surface it looks like they are not concerned, but they live climate change every day. They live being harmed by climate change every day. That is really important for us because up in Labrador, especially in my district, we rely on snow and ice formation; we rely on it to form in the fall and to last the winter because we use it for transportation. We don't just use it for recreation. What's happening now is the changes to the weather are really impacting our ability to use this form of transportation.

Climate change is real and it's having a really serious impact for people, especially people in Labrador. But not only in Labrador, in our entire province – actually, across Canada. But for my district it impacts our ability to feed our families, it impacts our ability to heat our houses and it impacts our ability for quality of life. So that is really what the carbon emissions of the past are doing now. There is always a lag in what you're doing, in terms of your consumption, in terms of your emissions and in actual fact in terms of the weather.

I can remember back in 2010, 2011 – sometime around there, I can't actually remember. I remember I was actually in Nain in January. It was around January 10. It was just going into the

second week of January. Normally, in Nain in January if you go outside you have to be dressed up really, really warm, because if not, your flesh will freeze.

There it was. We were walking down the road, January 10. Not only were we lightly dressed, didn't even have a cap on, no gloves on, walking down the road, it was fairly warm, but you looked out to the water and normally that would be all frozen, the ground would be covered with snow and you could drive on the ice in January. In actual fact, there was no ice and the water was washing on the beach. That was our first sign of real global warming impacts. By then, people should have been out hunting and fishing.

Now, back in the day, we thought this was a one-off. We thought we would be talking about this for years, but, in fact, we have lived with mild winters. Each year, we live with mild winters. We pray for a cold winter, a regular winter in the fall, where the ice will form and the snow will fall so we'll be able to actually travel around.

Why is that important? I'll just read a couple of stats here. I'd like to talk about Robert Way, one of our researchers from Labrador – this is a part of his study – and climate model projections. It shows a clear decrease in snow cover duration by 30 days – a 30-day reduction in snow cover for the periods of 2040 to 2064. For the period of 2076 to 2100, we'll have a reduction in 60 days.

So what's our quality of life going to be like in Northern Labrador? When we look at Nain, four times as many thaw days. To me, I am worried. I'm worried about quality of life because we are already facing huge barriers trying to be able to feed our families, to heat our homes, to be able to travel.

In actual fact, for my region, if we don't get a handle on greenhouse gas emissions, carbon loading of the atmosphere, not only are we going to be impacted in terms of the weather; our quality of life is going to be seriously impacted.

I wish I had another probably two hours; I could probably break the surface of the impacts.

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

The Member's time has expired.

L. EVANS: Thank you.

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

T. WAKEHAM: Thank you, Speaker.

I don't think anybody in our caucus will underestimate the impacts that climate change is having, not only on the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador but on the country and the world. I know in my District of Stephenville - Port au Port, significant impacts of coastal erosion are causing people to look at having their houses fall into the ocean and roads being completely wiped out. So it is real. Nobody over here on this side of the House denies that.

I'd like to pick up on the comments of my colleague from Bonavista, Grand Falls-Windsor and Terra Nova and what they had to say, that this is not simply about one over the other. It's about balance. They spoke about just transition. That's what we're talking about: just transition. How do we just transition?

I will stand here today and talk about first transition. I'll stand here and say to you: We should transition off oil, but we should start with transitioning off importing oil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

T. WAKEHAM: That's how we do it. Let's increase our production up to the 300,000 barrels if that's what it takes to get us off importing oil. Let us do the world a favour by producing oil that has been proven to have less carbon impact than some of the other countries that we're currently importing oil from. Let's start there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

T. WAKEHAM: Once we get that done and we reap the benefits of that, then we can turn those economic benefits that my colleagues talked about into opportunities to move to a greener economy, to develop the Atlantic Loop and

those other projects. Maybe to build that road up to Nain and to Voisey's Bay and other opportunities that exist. But let us not fall into a trap of suggesting that somehow or another we have to stop producing oil to help with greenhouse gas. Let's start with not importing oil and that's what we'll do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

T. WAKEHAM: So that is as much as I am going to say right now because there is a –

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you can keep going.

T. WAKEHAM: Oh, I have a few more minutes? Okay.

In that case, I recently had an economist from MUN reach out to me and these are his words, not mine. He talked about the impact of our offshore oil on greenhouse gases. He said, "Fact: 17% of NL GHGs can be traced to offshore oil production activities.

"Perspective: 37.1% of NL's GHGs result from transportation (passenger 19.7% and freight 17.4%.

"Fact: NL accounts for 1.498% of Canada's GHGs which implies that NL offshore oil production contributes 0.0255% of Canada's GHGs.

"Fact: Canada is responsible for 1.6% of global GHGs or 0.0038% of global GHGs can be explained by NL offshore oil production activities."

He goes on to say, "Materiality: if all NL offshore oil activities were to be completely eliminated today, global GHGs would be reduced from 45.640 Gt to 45.638 Gt.

"Perspective: if you receive a 0.0038% increase in your salary of \$30 per hour, you would get a raise of one-tenth of one cent."

T. OSBORNE: Tony, if we stop producing our oil and the consumers use the dirtier oil, it will probably go up.

T. WAKEHAM: Hear, hear!

“While it may help you save for retirement, it will not help much!”

Those are the words of the economist at Memorial University, not mine.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

P. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Glad to have the opportunity to speak to this motion. Mr. Speaker, as other Members have said in this House of Assembly and I will echo those remarks, I guess, from my perspective. I’m certainly not a climate change denier. All you have got to do is look around you, watch the news and see what is happening in terms of natural disasters that are occurring throughout the world, climate change throughout the world, temperature increases throughout the world.

Even here in Newfoundland and Labrador, we felt the impact of climate change. What would normally be one in 100 storms are becoming more frequent and when we have the storms they are much more severe. We have seen situations throughout the province where our infrastructure could no longer handle the amount of water and so on associated to the storms that we have. Hence, you are seeing municipalities, now, as we replace systems, they are making them much larger to accommodate a lot more water and so on. I don’t think there is anybody, really, if they are honest about it, can suggest that there is not something going on out there in terms of the climate.

Now, I do have to say on the global warming side of things, while there is no doubt there are places that are having much higher temperatures; we’re not seeing a whole lot of that around here – not seeing a whole lot of that side of it. A lot of people would like to see the temperature go up a little bit perhaps around this area but, unfortunately, that doesn’t seem to happen. We don’t get the nice summers,

necessarily, that some of us would like to have, but it is a real thing, no doubt.

So what is being called for here in this PMR really is – what we are talking about is a transition or, I believe, the terminology these days is a just transition to cleaner alternatives. I certainly support that as well. I will say for the record, once again, as I have said in this House before, I’m not a supporter of the carbon tax. I think there are better ways to clean and green our economy without taxing our citizens into oblivion. I really don’t think that’s the way to go. I would like to see us to do more to go after the large polluters.

If we’re going to be talking about electric vehicles as an example, which I do support the concept of hybrids and electric vehicles, but I think there should be more of a focus on – and I believe the Minister of Environment brought it to my attention, because I wasn’t really aware that the feds do actually have a plan, I think, that says by a certain date that only electric vehicles will be allowed to be sold in the country. I support that notion. Perhaps that timeline could be even a little more aggressive in making that happen.

When we talk about, for example, using electric vehicles here in Newfoundland and Labrador and the carbon tax, which is meant to encourage people to use it, the issue is that we need to have the infrastructure in place which currently does not exist. We need the infrastructure; we need the availability of the electric vehicles, which right now the availability is simply not there.

If you want an electric vehicle you’re going to have to wait a substantive period of time, from what I can understand, to get one; you have to order one and wait. It’s not like I can just go over to Hickman Motors or Avalon Ford tomorrow, I don’t think, and just start going through a selection of electric vehicles and start picking out colours and so on. I don’t think that can happen.

The availability is one piece, then there’s the cost. While I do acknowledge the program the government did put in place, albeit it wasn’t necessarily well received by the public as part of the measures to help the cost of living, but I do

appreciate in the meantime the fact of providing some assistance, I think the federal government and provincial government, in order to purchase an EV to get the cost down. But I would suggest that the cost is still not down to a point where the average person can afford it.

So that kind of leads me into the whole concept of the transition. While we all agree there has to be a transition, I think if there's going to be a transition there needs to be options. The options have to be available to people. If you want people to go green – and, again, I'll use the example of electric vehicles. If you want me to buy an electric vehicle, then I need to be able to readily obtain an electric vehicle at a comparable cost to what I can get a regular car for now.

The infrastructure needs to be in place throughout the province so that I can go wherever I want, as I do today, with my EV and convenient. Not to say it's possible. It's fine to say it's possible to travel from A to B; it has to be convenient to travel from A to B, and that means having enough infrastructure in place. Fine to say you can plug in and wait for an hour, but what if I don't want to wait for an hour. If I'm driving to Clarendville, Grand Falls or Corner Brook, whatever, and I want to go and I want to drive there and I don't want to waste any time, then I shouldn't have to stop two or three times, plugging in, waiting and so on. And until that technology is there that I can kind of come and go as I please, then you're taking away the convenience factor and people are not going to want to do it.

So there's work to be done. I guess the point is there's work to be done in terms of some of these things. Once the options are available and they're comparable options available at a price point that makes sense, infrastructure is in place, then by all means tack on your carbon tax. Then say, listen, if you're not going to play the game now, tack on the carbon tax. But until such time that that's in place, really, you're just being punitive penalizing people for something for which they don't even have a legitimate option.

Same thing when it comes to other aspects of greening the economy. Look, we have lots of resources here, Mr. Speaker, in our province. Opportunities for wind, opportunities for hydro, opportunities for hydrogen, tidal. There are all

kinds of opportunities here in this province to generate energy other than oil and gas. But as my colleagues have said, until, (a), we have to have the money to do it. It would be great if we could just snap our fingers and all of a sudden the oil money goes away and magically overnight it's replaced by green technology money. The oil jobs go away, snap our fingers, everybody's working in the green technology making good wages, comparable wages. If we could do that, if we could snap our fingers and that would just happen, I'm on board, 100 per cent; let's do it now. We can all collectively snap our fingers tomorrow, the oil is gone, everything is green, we're all driving around in electrical vehicles, everybody has good jobs and everybody is making good money – perfect.

That's fantasyland, though. That's not going to happen. It's going to take time. So until we get there, there has to be a balance of continuing where we are while planning for the future. There has to be a reasonable balance.

I give credit; I think that's what this government has been saying. I think that's what the Official Opposition has been saying. Certainly, that's what I am saying and that's what I agree with as well, that we need to have that transition, that balance to be able to go from oil and gas over here to the green economy. That's going to happen. That's going to take time and we have to be patient.

That doesn't mean that we sit back and do nothing and whatever. We can be working on it constantly. That's where that carbon tax money comes in. That's why, again, we see the carbon tax money coming in. Not necessarily all that money is going on green initiatives. That's where I think 100 per cent of that money should be going on green initiatives, going towards that transition.

But until the time comes that we're all driving around in electrical vehicles, all government buildings are electrified, there are windmills and there's hydrogen, there are wind projects and everybody is working and there are all kinds of jobs and prosperity – until that time comes, then we have to go with what we have. What we have is oil and gas that the world wants.

Yeah, maybe the oil and gas – I understand the concerns of my colleagues in the Third Party and my colleague here, the other independent, has. I get that, but at the end of the day we can buy it from Russia or we can buy it from Newfoundland and Labrador. I say buy it from Newfoundland.

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Member's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: It being 4:50, the hon. the Member for St. John's Centre to close debate.

J. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

If we could snap our fingers and make it all go away, we wouldn't be asking for a transition plan. That's the whole point here. It's about how do we get to that point.

I'll start with, first of all, thank you for the debate. It's been, if nothing else, enlightening and very civil. That's a good thing.

The Minister of Environment and Climate Change, thank you. He identified the fact that it is urgent, that there's a recognition here that we are facing an urgent crisis when it comes to climate change and the effects it will have on people's lives, on their income, on their ability to look after themselves and so on and so forth. We applaud the measures that government has taken.

What we're asking now is that government take the next step and work together with, whether it's employees, communities, unions, you name it, to have that dialogue with how do we develop a plan that will see us into the future. Because that's what this is about.

The MHA for Bonavista raised some very good points, especially the one of cost, about making sure we don't create a whole lot of hurt along the way. The Member for Stephenville - Port au Port raised the issue in recognition that in his district they're already seeing the effects where houses are facing the threat of washing into the ocean. Well, that is a cost to people. That's the very thing we're talking about. That is the real-

life current situation that we're facing and will only get worse, especially if sea levels do rise. It's going to have an even worse effect on our economy.

Just transition is not about hurting people, it's about making sure people don't hurt. It's about making sure that we take advantage of opportunities. It's about predictabilities, about stabilities. It's about making sure that there's no sudden transition or catastrophic failure like we saw with the cod fishery, so that we can at least make sure that workers are protected, that communities are protected and that incomes are protected. That's the reason for this legislation. It's about protection.

Here's the thing. If we transition it's going to create jobs. A lot more jobs than what is in the oil industry, because it's a lot more labour-intensive and a lot less dependent – more or less on skilled labour. So there is an opportunity here. Even an opportunity to build regional transportation infrastructure, because not everyone drives a car now.

The Minister of Digital Government and Service NL, I certainly thank her for the contribution. One thing that she did highlight was the great opportunities in the green economy for jobs. The thing about the green economy is that they never run out. As far as I know, there always will be wind and sunshine, but oil will run out one way or the other. So at this point there is an opportunity here to build on that and the opportunities.

The Member for Lake Melville raised a good point because a just transition does not mean turning off the tap now. That's not what's called for, but there's a recognition here that the oil and gas industry is coming to an end. Let's get ready for that. More importantly, let's talk about a planned shift in our economy to make sure we can take advantage of it. Whether this motion is passed, whether there is green just transition legislation brought in, it's not going to happen this year, but it's a phased-in approach.

The Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology raised a good point and I agree with him on this: that supporting the oil industry here is about supporting workers. From our point of view with just transition legislation, setting up

these measures is indeed about supporting and making sure that workers are looked after.

That we protect workers here, whether it is with local service agreements, community benefits – you name it. What I have heard the Opposition call for: to make sure that workers have good-paying jobs and that families can stay here and grow their community. It is not about a forced transition, but it is about dialogue, consultation and starting the process.

The Member for Terra Nova talked about Bay du Nord is our silver bullet and we'll need it to pay for our future. I need to remind people here that Hibernia got off the ground because of, at the time, \$2.7 billion in federal support. Not Newfoundland support, it didn't come from anywhere else but it came from federal support. That's \$5.2 billion in today's dollars.

The fact is I should point out, too, that currently where are we going to get the money? The federal government will be spending up to \$21 billion, Mr. Speaker, by the time the purchase of the Trans Mountain Pipeline is in place – \$21 billion. They're spending another \$1.7 billion in dealing with orphan wells.

The fact is, as the Member for Lake Melville has said, there is a value to the oil that we have there. If we're going to meet these global targets, then it is incumbent upon the federal government – Newfoundland is not doing this on it's own – to make sure that the support is there that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians benefit.

We may not be able to eliminate oil, I doubt if that will happen, but I will tell you that as demand dries up – and we're seeing it already as the transition ramps up – demand will drop. Clean oil or not, human beings being human beings, will go for the cheapest.

The MHA for Labrador West points out very clearly that there are events that are going to force us to change; IOC is a clear example of that. Whether they're environmentally conscious or not, the fact is they know if they want to sell their product in Europe they've got to transition to green and do it quickly.

The MHA for Grand Falls-Windsor - Buchans, I thank him for the fact that – it's a tricky one when you are dealing with people who did get along, but I appreciate that. He could have revealed a few more embarrassing stories but he didn't.

C. TIBBS: I'll save them for later.

J. DINN: That's right.

He talked about a transition has to be bridged, and that's what we are talking about. Like, right now, you cannot shut off this tap in September. It is not happening, but we are talking about building the bridge right now and that bridge has got to include people like yourself, like the workers. But how do we go forward and plan for this? Because it is going to come a time when we are going to need to and he makes a very good point.

It's a commitment to the people of Newfoundland and not the international commitment. I agree with that, but I also put it this way: If we don't make these commitments to the international community, it's about commitments to local. It's going to have a direct effect on local people.

I agree, putting more money into recycling and waste, for sure, but I'll tell you this, we are not promoting that oil and gas workers can't wait to transition. It's not about forcing them. But there will come – as my father who worked on the railway – a time when some workers will want to transition and they will want the support to do it. They will want to retire early and they will want to have that support. Some will want to move on. Some will want to stay. Whatever it is, but the just transition plan is about making sure that at all stages these workers have a choice. That's what it's about, not to have the agenda set by the oil companies or anyone else, but the workers have that choice.

The Member for Torngat points out the fact that we are arguing with science and there is a direct effect, at this point in time. The Member for Stephenville - Port au Port acknowledges the impact of coastal erosion, and I said there is a

cost. That is a cost that people will have to bear. So the first transition, again, if we are a global economy, if the demand dries up, what would happen to our product?

Finally, the Member for Mount Peart - Southlands, I agree, if we could snap our fingers we wouldn't be having this debate right now because we would already be there. But that is what this is about. This is about the hard work of transitioning.

By the way, there are some gas-powered cars right now that are well out of the range of most people, even in here.

So let's talk about affordability, but if you know anything about technology, Speaker, it gets cheaper and more prevalent. So it will happen. But here is the plan to get there and that is what we are promoting here. Put it in legislation, enshrine it and make government accountable.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Division.

SPEAKER: Division has been called.

Call in the Members.

Division

SPEAKER: Are the Whips ready?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, Sir.

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

CLERK (Barnes): James Dinn, Jordan Brown, Lela Evans, Perry Trimper.

SPEAKER: All those against the motion, please rise.

CLERK: Steve Crocker, Lisa Dempster, John Haggie, Gerry Byrne, Tom Osbourne, Siobhan Coady, Pam Parsons, Sarah Stoodley, Andrew Parsons, Bernard Davis, Derrick Bragg, John Abbott, Brian Warr, Elvis Loveless, Krista Lynn Howell, Paul Pike, Scott Reid, Sherry Gambin-Walsh, Lucy Stoyles, Barry Petten, Craig Parady, Tony Wakeham, Chris Tibbs, Loyola O'Driscoll, Helen Conway Ottenheimer, Lloyd Parrott, Joedy Wall, Pleaman Forsey, Jeff Dwyer, Eddie Joyce, Paul Lane.

Mr. Speaker, the ayes: 4; the nays: 31.

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I declare the motion defeated.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader, that this House do now adjourn.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

This House do stand adjourned until 1:30 o'clock tomorrow.