



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FIFTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Volume L

FIRST SESSION

Number 58A

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Derek Bennett, MHA

Monday

May 30, 2022
(Night Sitting)

The House resumed at 6 p.m.

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to start off by asking leave to do first reading of Bill 64, the reduction in gas tax.

SPEAKER: Leave granted?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

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 Bill 64 be now read a first time.

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that Bill 64 be now read a first time.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board to introduce a bill, An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act No.6," carried. (Bill 64)

CLERK (Barnes): A bill, An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act No.6. (Bill 64)

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

When shall the bill be read a second time?

S. CROCKER: Tomorrow.

SPEAKER: Tomorrow.

On motion, Bill 64 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice and Public Safety, that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 60.

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 (Trimper): Order, please!

We are considering a resolution respecting the imposition of taxes on carbon, Bill 60.

Resolution

"That it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the imposition of taxes on carbon products."

CHAIR: I now recognize the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port.

T. WAKEHAM: Thank you, Chair.

It's a pleasure once again to stand in this House of Assembly on behalf of the residents of the Stephenville - Port au Port District.

Unfortunately, I'm standing again to talk about a tax increase. I wish I was not standing to talk about a tax increase, but rather talking about some other measure. But that is what it is. It's an increase in taxes and on the same day, as I said earlier, that we're going to be introducing a bill to reduce gasoline tax on the one hand, we're going to add carbon tax on the other.

And, of course, we've talked a lot about taxation and about what's coming. The carbon tax debate we're having now, tonight, but we also know that in September there is looming a sugar tax for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And while the government talks about the benefits to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador of increasing taxes so that they can eat healthier or drink healthier, I'm not sure that their logic is totally accurate. The fact that you're going to take more money out of people's pockets to try to force them or change their habits, in this particular case, I would argue that the impact you are hoping to achieve by implementing a sugar tax has already been achieved by the fact that inflation is now at over 6 per cent.

So when you go to that grocery store now or your local stores or you go to buy food, you're looking at those choices you have to make between what's essential and what one would consider optional. And for some people, optional may be that soft drink. The price of those soft drinks has already risen by more than the tax that you want to impose on them. So why would we add another burden of taxation when we already know that inflation has taken care of what you hope to achieve by putting on a tax.

If we were in a different time and a different place when it was first introduced, I'd understand the logic, but now nobody could tell me that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador need another tax, whether you call it a sugar tax or some other tax. And as I just said, the inflation alone has taken care of that. The high costs, the increased costs are through the roof on every single product. People understand that. The people opposite understand it, people on this side of the House understand it; you just have to go to the store.

In economics, inflation is described as a general increase in prices and a fall in the purchasing value of money. So that's exactly what has happened here. We've seen significant increases in prices in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and across the country and a significant fall in the purchasing value of money. All of those people on fixed incomes in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador have seen the value and a fall in the purchasing value of their money. And how does that impact them? It impacts them when they go to the grocery store. It impacts them when they go fill up for gas. It impacts them when they go and fill up their oil tank. It has impacted them almost in every way possible. In some cases, they do not have options. With a limited amount in their bank accounts, which they've now used up to pay for last winter's heating costs, they are looking for help. The last thing they need is another tax. The last thing they need in the fall is another tax.

So let us not simply turn around and implement a tax because we had planned to implement it. Let's really look at the economic situation of the people of the province. The fall in the purchasing value of their money. So a sugar tax, if you want to implement it, you've deferred it until September. Defer it more. Defer it until such time as inflation starts to come back down to where it was when you decided to implement a sugar tax. So maybe that's what you could do. It's already on the books. When it was originally proposed inflation was much lower than it is right now. So I'm suggesting, defer it until inflation comes down and protect the purchasing value of the money of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Those are the things that matter.

Who benefits from inflation? We know companies benefit from inflation. If you have a product that is in high demand and short supply, you will benefit from inflation, because the prices you charge for your product will go up. But let's add one more beneficiary of inflation: the provincial government. The revenue, the coffers of government increase because of inflation.

Let me give you a classic example that everybody in this House should be able to relate to, and that is the cost of a piece of two-by-four.

If you're going out to build a shed, build a patio, build a house, your original price, prior to this huge increase, a piece of two-by-four cost \$3.59 and you paid HST on that purchase. The government's share of that HST on that one purchase of one piece of two-by-four, when it was at \$3.59, the province collected 36 cents. On that one piece of two-by-four, the province collected 36 cents.

Now, that same piece of two-by-four costs \$8.99. So anybody that's thinking about building houses, building decks or doing any kind of renovations, or garages or sheds, faces significant increased costs. But who benefits from that? Provincial coffers, because now on an \$8.99 piece of two-by-four, the provincial revenue, their share of HST does to 90 cents.

So the provincial government on piece of two-by-four is seeing an increase in HST from 36 cents to 90 cents. The government is benefiting from inflation, in that perspective. Every single purchase, a simple thing like that, increases the coffers.

The Minister of Finance has acknowledged increases. The cost of the temporary tax reduction on gas tax from June to December is \$44 million. The Finance Minister, in her statements the other day, said this will not increase the deficit, as the revenue collected by the province is also increased. This two-by-four example is one example of how the revenue to government has increased. Now if oil keeps trading where it's at, above what we have budgeted at \$86, and production stays the same, we'll see another significant benefit to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador – another one.

So let's talk about not imposing any more taxes. We do not need it. The people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador simply cannot afford it. They simply cannot afford it. And the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador does not need it from a revenue-generation piece. They do not need it. Because we're going to see significant revenue increases, which the government has already received and will continue to receive. So let's turn around and say no to a sugar tax at this time. Let's defer it. Let's put it back until the inflation rate drops to where it was when it was introduced.

Let's say no to the federal government on carbon tax increases – because again, inflation has taken care of that particular problem. Because the price at the pump is now twice as much as it was when perhaps carbon tax was first introduced. And that's another benefit of course, to the province, because every time the price of gas goes up, the province has seen an increase in HST. All of those things surely would tempt you to say the last thing that we need to put back to our people, giving them a tax break on the left hand is to take it away in the right hand by increasing taxes.

Thank you so much for your time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Thank you very much.

I now recognize the hon. Member for the District of Exploits.

P. FORSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, Mr. Chair, it's always nice to get here at this House of Assembly and represent the people of my district. Any time they've got some issues to share, I certainly don't mind bringing them here. And this time certainly it's the taxes that they're facing on this one right now, the carbon tax, which is forcing those people to be forced into a higher cost of living, higher tax that they have to pay, and they are burdened to death with taxes already, burdened to death with the cost of living.

They can't afford any more taxing, any more increase in food, any more increase in cost of living, because every day it takes a piece out of their cheque, more and more. Right now they're only living cheque to cheque, and that is a strain on families, it's a strain on their incomes and people are trying to survive as comfortably as they can. Again, Chair, even volunteer groups in my district – I know my colleague from Cape St. Francis has brought up the same issue – and the volunteer groups pay a big portion of my district, they support my district a great deal.

But they are finding it tough now even to be able to do their volunteer work as in contributing to the things that they wanted to do, because the cost of getting around to fulfill their needs and

the things that they want, they just can't afford to do it, Mr. Chair. A carbon tax doesn't help this situation by no means right now. It's just adding more burden on our society.

Increases in population: You want to increase the population. They're deciding now whether to have a second child or not. Do we make those decisions on having another child? It's just too expensive to have another child. We know how much we need growth in this province with regard to children, people, and our own are making decisions of not having to have another child because it's too expensive to clothe them, too expensive to buy the needs that they have to have for them, buy the necessities that they want. That's a really tough decision, that is, and forcing those people to make those decisions is not where we need to be. We need to be getting those taxes down, getting that carbon tax off, and then putting it to a better use.

Farmers: We talk about increasing food self-sufficiency. The carbon tax, the taxes that we apply, only adds to – yes, I know they're probably not going to pay tax on the direct fuels that they're using, but they're going to be paying a higher cost on the parts that they need, higher cost on the wheat that they need, higher costs on the fertilizer that they need. All that's coming in through other means of transportation, causing the farmers to put those food increases on the tables of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Every time they get an increase in cost, they have to pass that cost down. They have no other choice only to put their cost up. A carbon tax right now is certainly going to increase on the tax of foods that we're paying on the tables of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

We need to address that. We need to go to Ottawa and get Ottawa to decline on that carbon tax now, so that we can get the farmers back to a more regulated season. This is the growing season. They're telling me that they can't expand on their land because of the fuels in their machines – it's too costly, to clear the land. So in order to increase food self-sufficiency, food security, we need their land cleared. We need for them to be able to grow their crops. They can't do that. It costs too much, even just to clear the land. Not only then, just to get the fertilizers and

to be able to grow their crop and get it on the tables of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Climate change doesn't have to mean a carbon tax; it really doesn't. There are other ways and means that we can support our climate change. We have done that through – I've heard it here again – Muskrat Falls, through the green energy projects that we have. We've paid enough. We are the generators for it. We should be able to have the carbon tax release.

Carbon taxes and all those taxes, this forces people to make choices. Not the kind of choices that the government makes; tough choices that the people have to make. The tough choice that they have to make right now is trying to get to work, trying to feed their families. How are we going to get there? We don't have an electric car. We have to use our vehicle, which gas costs more. I know that the government has put in a program for electric vehicles, which is great, but when they can't afford it upfront, it don't work.

Those are the type of choices that the individuals have to make. But I tell you the choice that government could have made, on a Premier's office in Central Newfoundland, \$750,000 probably in three years – what's an electric car? Fifty thousand dollars, basically, for an electric car. It makes that out to be 15 electric cars that you could have put in Central Newfoundland. There's your carbon tax.

If that office is not going to Ottawa to fight for our carbon tax, then give us 15 electric cars. He's not doing anything. Give us 15 electric cars and we can put them up on a draw; do whatever we like with them. I'm sure there are lots of residents that can't get to work Central Newfoundland because it's too expensive for them. I hear it every day.

Carbon – they can be driving away in their electric cars. There'd be 15 of them right now in Central Newfoundland that they could drive. But the Premier would rather have a voice in there that has no voice because he's not going to Ottawa. Seven MHAs and the Premier needs a voice.

That's the type of choices that they're doing. That's the kind of choices. Put 15 electric cars in there so that people could be able to afford to get

to work on their electric cars and be able to afford to do what they want to do.

Chair, that's the kind of choices, but unfortunately the choices that they have to make is food for their children. Seniors, again, they can't afford to buy fuel for their oil tank. They can't fill up their oil tanks, and we've heard this time and time over the winter. I've heard it. What are we going to do? I can't fill up my oil tank. And that's very sad.

The carbon tax, that's another tax that we don't need. We don't need seniors calling us saying, b'y, I can't afford to get my tank filled up. They cut the seniors' hours back in 2016 and increased their contributions, and now it costs more to live in their own homes when they can't even afford to live there in the first place. They can't even afford to live there. They can't afford to heat it, they can't afford the groceries there and government won't even help, give them extra hours to get there, only pay more costs on that.

So that's the kind of stuff that's happening, and we hear this. I know I brought up the Premier's office a dozen times, and I'll keep bringing it up, because that's what I hear in my district. When seniors and people are making those type of choices and they're looking at government and government is saying, boy, we're going to give this money to our Liberal friends now. We're going to create an office there, so that they can get to work, so that they can stay warm. We're going to feed their pockets, but we're going to take it out of the pockets of the rest of the people in Central Newfoundland. We're going to take it out of theirs and we're going to give it to you fellas, so that you can continue to go to work and do whatever you want to do, but the other fellas, you're going to have to pay for it.

That's the type of choices. So when people hear this in Central Newfoundland, that's why they get mad. That's why they don't like it, to see government money spent in those situations when they're trying to make a living. It don't add up. It really don't add up. Mr. Chair, when it comes to carbon tax and other tax, it forces people to make choices, not the choices that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are having to make right now, the tough ones, but they are making tough choices indeed.

So with that, Mr. Chair, I'll sit down and hopefully have my chance to talk on something else on regard to my area in the next coming days.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Thank you very much.

I next recognize the Member representing the District of Mount Pearl - Southlands.

P. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and glad to have the opportunity to speak again.

Mr. Chair, you know, one of the things we've been talking about here in this House, of course, is –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order, please!

It's a little difficult to hear the Member.

Thank you very much.

P. LANE: – I guess the main focus has been cost-of-living issues; specifically we're talking about carbon tax. But I think it all comes down to the overlying theme is cost of living, and what does government have the ability to do to help people with cost-of-living issues that we're currently experiencing.

Now this is a bit of a strange request, or suggestion I would say, Mr. Chair, but it did come to me from a senior, actually. I understand that a lot of seniors, sort of the ongoing plan is you turn 65; you get your OAS. You don't need to work anymore; you get your OAS, CPP, and so on. But there are a lot of seniors who find themselves in the boat where – some of them want to work beyond 65. They have their health and so on, and just to get out of the house, whatever, they like to go to work. There are some seniors who, at that age, again they have their health. They may not necessarily want to work as much, but they want to enjoy a better lifestyle.

I know there are seniors, for example, who even though they might qualify for their OAS, CPP, they might work for a few months of the year to try to get some money together so that they can perhaps go away down South somewhere for two or three months, whatever, and that's how they earn their bit of money to do so.

I had a senior reach out and said, look, why not throw this out there – I'm not suggesting that we want to put all seniors to work now and crack the whip or nothing like that; that's not the suggestion. But for seniors who do want to work, beyond 65, one of the impediments that this person said they have is they're afraid if they work too much, they lose their drug card. They can work a little bit and keep their drug card, but the suggestion to the government is, even if it's a temporary thing, while the price of everything is through the roof, why not consider changing the threshold so if I'm a senior, at 65, and I want to –

AN HON. MEMBER: You are.

P. LANE: My colleague is saying you are.

If I am a senior, at 65, and I want to work and I'm able to work, that my drug card won't be impacted or any other benefits won't be impacted. So I'm able to earn a little more money to try to get myself through this turbulent time, to earn some extra money, and not have to worry that if I do so, my drug card or other benefits that I might otherwise be entitled to get cut by the government.

Arguably, that wouldn't cost the government a cent to do that, really. Because if I have drug card now that I'm entitled to, and you're already paying for it, all you're doing is you're continuing on. As a matter of fact, if I go to work and make more money, I'm actually paying more taxes into you. So I see that sort of as a win-win scenario. It's not going to work for everybody, Mr. Chair, but for seniors who are out there that are able and willing and want to work, allowing them to earn extra money, if they so desire, that helps them with the cost of living. It gets more people out in the workplace. We know there are a lot of employers finding it hard to get people to work – and then those seniors, if they want to do that, can do so with the assurances that any of the benefits that they are

currently entitled to, whether it be drug cards or anything else, is not going to be taken away from them when they do their income tax, that they are in fear of losing that benefit.

So I throw that out there to the Minister of Finance; I know she's listening attentively there. That is something that you could do to help some seniors and it wouldn't cost the government one dime – not a dime. So I put that out there.

I thank this senior for reaching out with that suggestion because it's not something I really thought of, because it's always kind of been frowned upon in a sense. A lot of people say, you know, I can remember when you go down south, down in Florida and so on, you see seniors all the time, you go into the grocery store, half the people, three quarters of the people working there bagging the groceries and so on are seniors.

Now, they're there out of necessity, I would suggest, because they don't have a good health care system and everything else, but still they do it. There are people here that do it. If you go up to Kent's or any of these places, you'll see a lot of people who are retired, probably a lot of them that are over 65 that are working. So if we can raise that threshold and allow them to still do that, earn extra money, pay more taxes, but at the same time not have to worry about losing their drug card or any other benefit, then I see that as a win win. It's a win for employers, it's a win for the government and it's a win for the senior and it doesn't cost the government one dime.

So that takes me down to about less than half of my time. So, again, trying to stay relevant in terms of cost of living and so on.

This has been raised before, I think, in some iteration, but I want to join with my colleagues in the Official Opposition, the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port, I have to say, has been very diligent – I have to give credit – on these cost of living issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

P. LANE: It relates to the fact that here we are – I'm not going to say we're arguing but we're

debating over a few cents on a litre of gas and so on and cost of living issues for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and where are we going to find the money and if we take money from this we don't have money for that and so on.

I can't help but feel and agree with my colleague that somewhere along the way Ottawa is getting off the hook. I really feel like Ottawa is getting off the hook, whether it be in the health transfer payments that are coming down, whether it be the equalization program, which I really don't think is fair to Newfoundland and Labrador. I don't think it's fair to do it on a simple per-capita basis for any of these programs.

You have to recognize our aging demographic; you have to recognize our geography, sparsely populated all over the place. When you look at health care delivery or education delivery or any of these programs, the economies of scale are not there, you simply cannot deliver those services the same way as you can in a large city where you have a large population on a small footprint and you can have those economies of scale and efficiency and so on. You cannot compare that to our situation in Newfoundland and Labrador, you really can't. I would say we're more comparable to perhaps a territory, in many ways, than we are to some of the other provinces.

So that recognition does not seem to be there and I think that more has to be done to bring that case forward so that we can get more money from Ottawa in terms of equalization and fairness as a partner in this Confederation.

And I'm not knocking, I know the government talks about the great relationship they have. I'm not knocking the feds money that has come to Newfoundland, but in a lot of cases when you look at the COVID money and everything else, everybody got that. It's not like they did Newfoundland and Labrador a favour and said we're going to give you all this extra COVID money. We only got our proportionate share of everything the same as every other province. When the infrastructure money comes down, when the green funds come down, whatever that formula is, we get our proportionate share under those programs.

So I know it gets couched by MPs and so on as this great announcement, like we're doing something wonderful, like you see the small craft harbours money going here and there. My God, we delivered with small craft harbours. But they're doing the same thing over in British Columbia and they're doing the same thing over in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. They're not just doing it here in Newfoundland.

So I think we can't lose sight of the fact of the bigger picture. We can't lose sight of the fact, as I said, of our unique geography, our population density or lack thereof and the challenges that we have with an aging population when it comes to health care delivery in particular. Like I said, I feel as if Ottawa is getting off the hook.

The same thing with our seniors by the way. We have seniors on basic OAS and CPP and we're having to prop them up – think about it. This program, \$2,000 a year that government just gave a 10 per cent increase to the seniors. Why are we even having to give seniors \$2,000 a year and then increase that? Why are we propping up the feds? That's the federal government's responsibility, I thought, OAS and CPP and so on. So we're making up for their shortfall and we're doing it out of provincial funds that we don't have, we're borrowing money to prop up the feds. It's just not right.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Thank you very much to the Member.

I now recognize the Member for the District of Topsail - Paradise.

P. DINN: Thank you, Chair.

Again, always a pleasure to speak on behalf of the wonderful residents of Topsail - Paradise.

The hon. Member for Virginia Waters - Pleasantville spoke or –

AN HON. MEMBER: What a Member.

P. DINN: What a Member, right? He's not even listening. Oh no, he's listening there, through his left ear, he got me there, he got me there. He's a

good fella. But he did speak to the sugar tax and you know –

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

P. DINN: Yeah, tell the truth – and the sugar tax –

AN HON. MEMBER: Tax matters.

P. DINN: Tax matters, but taxes are a burden and a strain on people, right?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

P. DINN: Oh, tax matters, too, in your case. No doubt about it.

But, anyway, with the sugar tax, we talk about trying to change health outcomes. Of course we have the highest rates of diabetes and other major illnesses and trying to curb that. But much like the carbon tax was imposed on us; the sugar tax is that as well. Because the Premier I know noted many times, many times we've been talking about the sugar tax, he called it behaviour modification. That was his words. He always spoke to it as behaviour modification.

Now, I think of behaviour modification as some guinea pig in a lab and you turn on the light and you try to get him to do one thing and not the other. So I think when you look at behaviour modification, when it comes to healthier outcomes, a better education process would help. And how do you come about that? Because I can tell you right now behaviour modification doesn't happen over night. People will still suffer. And the ones who will suffer are the ones who can't afford to buy, or are just barely able to buy soft drinks and that on the income they have. Because they can't afford to buy healthy choices.

I think healthy choices is something that we need to reduce the cost on. Maybe that's where some of our revenue from taxes should go, to reduce and provide healthier choices to our population.

We're over here and we're not always criticizing. I mean, our job is to hold government accountable, but we've provided solutions. Just take the recent gas tax

adjustments; those were suggestions made over here for the last month to two months. These were over here.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

P. DINN: Well, I never said to what degree, but they were certainly made as to what we suggested.

The other thing I look at, when we talk about better health outcomes for the public, for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, we've also suggested some options there. We know our health care – well, we know over here our health care is in crisis. I can say that with certainty. But when you look at it, what are other ways to do what you can with what you have?

I've gotten up in this House many times and spoke about continuous glucose monitoring devices. I've stressed and brought forward quotes from Diabetes Canada and many, many reports that documented the pros and cons of these devices, and let me tell you there are very few cons about it. We talk about 30 per cent of our strokes and 40 per cent of our heart attacks are due to diabetes, 50 per cent of kidney failure requiring dialysis, 70 per cent of all non-traumatic amputations and it's the leading cause of blindness.

So if you could take on these continuous glucose-monitoring devices, for a nominal – it's an investment. Just think, if you reduce a percentage of strokes, if you reduce a percentage of heart attacks, if you reduce a percentage of kidney failure requiring dialysis, if you eliminated non-traumatic amputations and if you could prevent blindness, you tell me that's not a good investment. You tell me you're not saving money and investing elsewhere in the health care system or in our whole budget.

You look at the other issues around diabetes. These devices reduce emergency calls; almost split them in half. Cutting emergency calls in half, which again leads to cutting emergency room visits in half. That's freeing up time to be invested elsewhere.

When individuals can participate in their everyday activities; you're not recovering or trying to recover from an amputation or

blindness, kidney failure or heart attack. These keep people in the workforce longer. Keep them contributing. Keeping them paying into the tax base. I mean, these are investments and these are solutions that we have offered.

You look at some of other issues around population growth. We've spoken and I've spoken here to IVF clinics. I know there are two doctors in the province here who have put in a proposal that does not require any additional funding from this government. Their proposal says that. Just continue what funding is put there now, and they'll put in their own, match that, and continue on – no additional funding. So we wouldn't be paying out \$5,000 per cycle to individuals to travel abroad to obtain these services. Five thousand dollars which is part of upwards to \$60,000 that patients pay for – \$60,000, it's amazing. You could put that there and you could have that done. You could support our population growth.

So we have offered solutions that can utilize the same budget, and in fact, save us some money, become more efficient in what we can do and offer elsewhere. To me, it's the responsible thing to do, to well analyze and explore all the options that are available there. To simply say, something like a continuous glucose monitor, we done a report and there's no recommendations. I find that hard to believe when there's so, so, so many reports out there that deal with this.

There are opportunities here when it comes talking about taxes. I understand taxes are a huge way of raising government revenue. That's where our revenue comes from, but you have to look at the big picture. An investment in the short term, in some of the things we've offered, will result in long-term payments. I go back – let's bring up this now, which comes up, Muskrat Falls that everyone talks about. They talk about the \$500 million every year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Just a little order, please.

Thank you.

P. DINN: But guess what?

The Upper Churchill Project is worth, in today's dollars, \$400 billion. That's the value of the Upper Churchill Project in today's dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who signed that agreement?

P. DINN: I don't know who signed that agreement. But here's my point, if you go back to the excuse all the time, well if we didn't have to pay Muskrat we could do this, if we didn't have to pay Muskrat we could do this, we could do this. But the bottom line is – and the Premier just put a committee task force together to look at the negotiation of the new Churchill Falls Project, the new agreement, when it expires in 2041 – that's 19 years. If we had a portion of that \$400-billion project, we would never be in the position we are today. We would never be there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

P. DINN: So don't toss out the history; we don't do it. But to make a point here –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order please!

P. DINN: The Member can tell me when I spoke of history last; this is the first time I spoke to it. This is dealing with an issue and offering solutions. And unless you take your blinders off, you'll never find them.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Thank you.

I next recognize the Member for the District of Placentia West - Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order, please!

Here we go.

J. DWYER: Thank you, Chair.

In continuing on in our debate of the carbon tax, I'm going to continue on to take it from the perspective of the government department that I am the shadow Cabinet minister for, and that is Children, Seniors and Social Development, Status of Persons with Disabilities, the community sector, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and Income Support.

I've already spoken to the plight –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

J. DWYER: Chair?

CHAIR: Order, please!

J. DWYER: Thank you for your protection, Chair, I appreciate it.

CHAIR: I'll do my best.

J. DWYER: As I was saying before, we are here debating a carbon tax, and the reason why it's being implemented by our distant cousins is because we need to be stewards of our environment. That's the angle that I expressed in my last address to the carbon tax, and from that perspective I spoke on how it was affecting the children and the seniors. But this being AccessAbility Week, as my time was getting short in the first opportunity, I didn't want to just brush over it because it's something that's very important. It's something that's very near and dear to my heart. Like I said, those people are my constituents. They are my people and represent them I will.

This being AccessAbility Week, after us passing legislation in the fall, about accessibility, then I would anticipate that we would have a deeper look at not marginalizing further people with disabilities.

I'm glad the Minister of Environment is listening this time around because being stewards of our environment is not just about taxing people into a new lifestyle. It's about letting them enjoy peaceful enjoyment of where they choose to live and the choices they have made.

The main point that I made in my first address was that if we're going to be stewards of our

environment and we want people to go into a new green economy, then there is no way that we should be allowed to go into a green economy while over 200 municipalities are still on a boil order for more than 10 years. That's not acceptable.

If we're going to be stewards of our environment, then we have to make these environmental decisions first. Because right now we're at pioneer stage of electric cars and this green economy. So some of the things that we're trying to implement right now are going to be obsolete by the time it's on an uptake for everybody in the province. Our demographic doesn't allow for us to be able to do that.

We're implementing, right now, instead of taking people off a boil order in their municipality, we're putting a lot of money into these electric charging stations, over 200 charging stations across the province. From my understanding, it's only about 500 cars that can use these in the province. So where are they going to be in five years or 10 years down the road? They're going to be in the same place that the rest of it is: the landfill or trying to be recycled for some parts that will go into new components of electric charging stations. Because being in the pioneer stage, we know that this idea is not developed to fruition, same as the carbon tax. It's just not developed to understand the demographics and the geography of Newfoundland and Labrador.

While the idea might work in Alberta, BC, Ontario, wherever, it just is not going to work here, except for a very minute part of our province.

Ask the people on the North Coast what are they going to drive their electric car on. Ask them.

Like I said, this is AccessAbility Week. We try and do what we can for people with disabilities, but, like I said, if people with disabilities are on a boil order, I think there's more of a safety concern than anything, because if you have mobility issues and you're trying to move around to boil water, it's certainly a pretty delicate dance to get a glass of water.

So what we're doing is we're further marginalizing the most vulnerable in our society,

which is very unfair, very unequitable, and it's just not right. We've got to start doing the right things for the right reasons because we are representatives of others. We're not here on our own accord, we're all voted in by people that asked us to represent them. And that's what I'm so proud to do for the District of Placentia West - Bellevue.

When it comes to people with disabilities, they're already often impoverished. They're struggling in any economy, let alone one that's increasing taxes at this kind of a level. They have to have modifications for their vehicles and modifications for their workspace and all this kind of stuff. These are all things that a lot of times come out of pocket because that accessibility legislation has only been changed recently. I hope it all gets implemented very soon, because, like I said, the most vulnerable in our society right now are hurting.

The other side of the House is just not listening. They're doing stopgap measures that are not really taking into account everybody and everything. But, like I said, having over 200 municipalities on a boil order should obviously be our responsibility before we start offering a rebate on electric cars. That's just coming from a common person, speaking for the common man.

AN HON. MEMBER: Call VOCM.

J. DWYER: I don't need to call VOCM because I'm right here in the House of Assembly. Maybe you should listen and then we won't have to deal with it in a public manner.

Some people with disabilities have to use alternate modes of transportation, like the GoBus and stuff like that. We've done some stopgap measures here now for the first little five-point plan that they thought was going to get them over the finish line but that's just not good enough. Because like I said, that doesn't help that person with disabilities in Arnold's Cove or Swift Current or Red Harbour. They still have to get to their job, if they're lucky enough to get one, and they need to be looked at where we're not marginalizing them further and we give them that opportunity to succeed.

Carbon tax is just not doing anything to help in that sector and it's very disappointing that it hasn't been addressed.

A couple of my colleagues already have alluded to the community sector. It's very unfortunate that we find people calling our offices these days saying they'll have to give up their volunteer hours because they can't afford to get to their volunteer position. I was at a Charter Night for the Lions Club in Marystown on Saturday night, which I might add was quite a nice event, and I was happy that we could all meet in person again. But I had some people there that said that they're questioning being able to stay on with their local Lions Club because they just don't feel that they have it in their budget to be able to continue to get to the meetings or get to the opportunities to help.

They all rely on their vehicles and with the price of fuel now, it's obviously taking away from the disposable income that was probably a little bit over and above what they normally had for their budget. But now our community sector is struggling. These are all our volunteers. Even the fact of our municipal councils, they have to get back and forth to meetings. I'm not saying that they can't afford it or anything like that, but everybody is finding it tight right now.

We're not asking that the carbon tax be cancelled. We want to be stewards of our environment on this side of the House as well, but we don't want it drove down our throat. What we were looking for is for it to be postponed. If not postponed, then maybe it's time to look at the fact of who's doing the majority of the pollution and therefore we kind of address it that way.

Not to overburden anybody else or drive anybody out of business, but to give them an opportunity to understand why they're being charged another carbon tax. You're taking eight cents away on one side and you're adding 11 cents on the other side. Instead of saying that we hit a homerun, maybe we should let people know that you're only going to get increased this time around by three cents as opposed to saying that we're reducing anything or taking anything away.

I can see that my time is coming short, Mr. Chair. Like I said, I will address a couple of more headings from the Department of Children, Seniors and Social Development at a later time.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: I thank the Member very much.

I next recognize the hon. Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Chair.

Quite the honour to talk for the many viewers watching this evening, and there are many. My colleague from Exploits mentioned Doreen Carter from Botwood, and I had the privilege of meeting her this past weekend. She watches every sitting of the House of Assembly. Nancy Vaughan, in the minister's District of Virginia Waters - Pleasantville, watches every sitting of the House of Assembly. And in my district, the District of Bonavista, watching tonight is my friend Sandra Cooper in Bonavista. And I'm sure she's interested in the speech. So that's wonderful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

C. PARDY: I'd like to talk, Chair, about three things, now in my short time remaining. I'd like to talk about the Liberal carbon tax – and it is a Liberal carbon tax, because it is the federal Liberals and distributed by the provincial Liberals, and the cousin of the Liberal carbon tax is the Liberal sugar tax, which is totally on us locally, not nationally; and then if I have time, I'd like to look at the Liberal regional property tax that's coming maybe later this year.

So let me start with the carbon tax. I stated a little earlier, and I just want to for clarification, that we have 11 cents carbon taxes charged to our gas as a deterrent for people to drive and commute. I stated a little earlier that by 2030 the plan is that the carbon tax will be 37 cents a litre. So if you take between the year '22, this year, and 2030 being eight years, then we're looking at probably 3.5 cents per year for the foreseeable future until 2030, when we settle, maybe, at 2.2.

Anyway, the carbon tax, some would engage in a question and say is it inflationary in and of itself, that we're adding a tax and we're putting taxes on people in inflationary times. Would it be inflationary that we're adding to it? And I would say that some economists would say quite possibly we do. If we're adding taxation, we're adding to the inflationary pressures of residents of Newfoundland and Labrador – rural, urban. But conceivably a greater impact on rural than what it may be on urban, for factors that I had mentioned before.

Sugar tax: My hon. colleague from Stephenville - Port au Port asked a question about will the sugar tax be cancelled in a Question Period in the previous session. And at that point in time it was the Minister of Education who stood up and he stated: "Furthermore, we all know that this province has the highest rates of diabetes of our population across the country." It is important. "It's not only beneficial to our health care budget, but the health outcomes for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador."

And that's our goal, isn't it, with the sugar taxes, as a punitive measure to change the behaviour of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Well, it would be nice that when you embark upon the sugar tax to present the research that's out there to indicate that it's going to work. Anything that I've researched or requested to research, it doesn't work. So while we're going to issue a tax that which may be inflationary, add to the dread and the hurt in Newfoundland and Labrador, but quite conceivably it has no effect. And that's the research that I could find what it has.

My hon. Member for Grand Falls-Windsor - Buchans has stated earlier and he referenced \$5 million. Well, it's \$5 million this year, but remember, the Liberal sugar tax is in a condensed period of time this year, because it's not starting until the fall. But it should settle in at about \$8.7 million a year coming from the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador to the tax coffers of the provincial government. So not \$5 million, \$8.7 million.

Every tax dollar we take in we spend on something, but remember what you spend it on is up to the government to decide what you

spend it on. And I would say the office that my colleague representing Central Newfoundland, that's coming from taxpayer dollars. So the revenue generated is up to the current government to do so.

But let me share a little bit on the sugar tax before I go to the next one. I stated earlier that Quebec National Institute of Public Health stated that they looked at that proposal a few years ago and it doesn't work. Here's what they state: It is the tax's regressive nature that makes it effective, most notably, amongst the less well off. Or, in other words, poor people should be thankful that the government wants to tax them back to health.

Now I say that – and several countries have tried the sugar tax, and it didn't make any effect in reducing obesity and wellness in our population. The only thing I would suggest, the government must have done their due diligence with the sugar tax. We would hope that they would never initiate it and launch it on our population if they did not do their due diligence, true? We all agree with that. Why tax somebody with a desired outcome when research states that it doesn't work, regardless of where you're going to spend the money that you pull in.

So maybe it would be a good idea to produce the research in the House that we can remain silent on the research and say yeah, we can see that, that's a bona fide research, that it does work. The article here would state that it doesn't exist. The sugar tax doesn't work. So even though it's inflationary, even though it's regressive according to the editor, the bottom line is that it doesn't work.

The last one, I had the pleasure to be outside in my district a short time ago at a meeting, and they were talking about the budget. In Old Perlican a gentleman asked: When the regionalization property tax comes, what are we getting out of that? Now, keep in mind, it's still in progress. I don't know until it's launched or tabled or you tell us what it is, but I mentioned land-use planning. Remember, that was a significant one, that we'd say land-use planning, sharing resources. His question was: How much is that going to cost me? And that we couldn't tell. And that we didn't know.

So the only thing I would say is that no matter what good intent, or what good rationale that regionalization – and we know that the spirit of working together, regionalization, is always a good concept. Working together and collaborating your efforts and your resources is always good. But the bottom line he had asked: What is it going to cost me?

Significantly this year, carbon tax, and for the next eight years to come. You have the Liberal sugar tax which is coming; that's going to pull in this year \$5 million; following years, \$8.7 million or more. The third one would be the regionalization property tax, where if you're outside, in an LSD, or an unincorporated area, you know that you've got property tax coming, how much and what benefit you're going to accrue from it to be determined in the short course.

I'm sure Sandra Cooper watching now is going to want me to mention how much revenue is taken in. Projected in 2022, our gas tax revenue will be \$167 million. The carbon tax will be \$113 million?

S. COADY: \$141.6 million for provincial gas tax.

C. PARDY: Okay, I have to check that in the book. I just wrote it down before I – and the total of \$280 million, to be double-checked. I would say if it is \$280 million, then I would say that the GST on that, our portion, would be \$28 million.

CHAIR: To be continued.

I thank the Member. His time has expired.

I now recognize the Member for the beautiful District of Cape St. Francis.

J. WALL: Thank you, Chair.

I always appreciate that. It is good to be able to stand again this evening to speak in Committee to Bill 60.

Chair, while we were on the supper break, I had a phone call from a resident who was obviously watching, as was said earlier, and the question was asked: Do we care? That hit hard to me

because we care. My colleague from Mount Pearl - Southlands said earlier about the impact of taxation on the residents. I wanted to go back to the many, many news release that my colleague from Stephenville - Port au Port has put out with respect to the high cost of living, the level of taxation. There are about 18 or 19 of them here. I said to this resident on the phone, I said, yes, we do care.

I'll go back to this one, this was dated in March from my colleague from Stephenville - Port au Port, and it says: There was a great risk of prices of fuels, gasoline and home heat fuel, and the price of goods will increase again. I know many people in this province are already struggling to balance their household budgets and have changed their spending habits. I am concerned about what the impact of more cost increases will be on the residents. That was back in March.

So, yes, we are quite fully aware of what's going on with respect to the level of tax increases and the cost of living. We do care. I'm sure there's not one Member in this hon. House that doesn't. We're all here because we do care; however, someone said earlier about listening. We do need to listen to our residents and we do indeed take that very seriously.

Before I get into my critic role for Municipal Affairs again, I want to share with you an exchange of conversation that was passed on to me by a constituent. My constituent was at the gas pump on Torbay Road. On the other side of the gas pump was a gentleman in his 50s who was putting gas in his car. He started pumping gas and he put \$10 worth of gas in his car. Now, we all know here what \$10 worth of gas is going to get us in our vehicle.

So my constituent said jokingly to the gentleman across the pump: Skipper, you forgot your wallet. And he said: No, this is what I have until Wednesday. That is reality. That is what we're dealing with when we say we are listening; we do understand what's going on, to the plight of the residents in our province. They are struggling. And this extra level of taxation is going to be another burden.

It was said to me by another constituent they don't disagree with climate change, they don't

disagree with the carbon tax, but not right now. Hold off on it; it's punitive as it is. However, another level of taxation that's going to come on us right now at this point in time is just not needed. We're just not able to handle it.

Mr. Chair, it makes a difference when the residents are reaching out, they're asking if we care. Yes, we care; yes, we're listening; yes, we're doing our part. That's why we're here representing our constituents and the people of the province with respect to what they're going through. And we do realize that it's extraordinary times, as was said earlier by my colleague.

Mr. Chair, I had the privilege in my municipal career to be the chair of Jack Byrne Regional Sport & Entertainment Centre, a fine, fine facility on the Northeast Avalon. It's a gem. I had the privilege of chairing that –

AN HON. MEMBER: Named after a (inaudible).

J. WALL: Yes, exactly. Named after a very nice gentleman. Former Member of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

J. WALL: I had the privilege of working with municipal officials, people from the community who served on that board. I had the opportunity to chair that for a number of years and I was very proud of that. The problem right now that we're finding at Jack Byrne is the extra cost of paying for goods and services. And that extra cost is then passed on to the user.

So we have families who have two or three children involved in different levels of hockey at Jack Byrne, that requires transportation to and from, and we do have many, many children outside of the district who come to Jack Byrne for recreation activities. However, the rising cost of getting to and from is again becoming unbearable and it's leaving them, of course, with very little disposable income for other activities.

I did speak with a couple in Outer Cove who took their son out of hockey because of the rising costs, because of the level of taxation, because the less and less disposable income that they have. And that's one less child taking part

in their recreational activities. We can't have that. Going forward, we need to make sure that this doesn't happen again and that every child has the opportunity for healthy living and healthy activity.

Mr. Chair, I know my colleague from Topsail - Paradise has spoken many times with respect to the Health Accord. We, in the Official Opposition, have met numerous times with Sister Elizabeth Davis and Dr. Pat Parfrey with respect to listening to the Health Accord. And that clearly spells out the urgency of the financial pressures that people are facing and how that's affecting their daily lives. Higher taxation drives poverty and poverty means poorer health. That's something that we, as a province, cannot stand to have any more of with poor health.

We all pay for that at the end of the day. Increased cost of people living in poor health will drive up our costs related to health care. So tax relief no doubt could be a preventative measure against poverty, and keeping that in mind when making decisions, we should, of course, keep the Health Accord in mind as well as to what that clearly states.

It was said earlier, Mr. Chair, with respect to travelling to and from appointments. My wife and I have had the displeasure of going to an appointment and having it cancelled many times. But, of course, we're a very short distance outside St. John's. The people driving from the West Coast – a friend of mine from Stephenville - Port au Port, her and her husband travelled here to the capital city for their treatment at the cancer centre. And, of course, they had to stay an extra day in order to get their treatment because that particular appointment was cancelled. So that, again, gives that couple extra costs of staying here. You put the extra costs of taxation on top of that again and it does take its toll with respect to travelling for appointments outside the city. We all know how important it is to have timely appointments, especially when it comes to cancer care.

One question that I never heard asked, and I don't think it was brought up here, with respect to the road and air ambulance and carbon tax. How's that going to affect our road and air ambulance with respect to carbon tax? That is

something that we all need to be aware of. We're going to have, of course, the need for using ambulance systems, but when you're looking at the added cost for that throughout the province, no doubt it's going to be astronomical when it comes to the road and the ambulance system.

E. LOVELESS: (Inaudible.)

J. WALL: Perhaps I'll have a chat with the minister after and he can fill me in on that. So I appreciate that, Minister; that came to me earlier with respect to – and it's a very good question. We don't think about it. You know, you call and the ambulance is there, or the air ambulance is there with the flight team. So I look forward to that, Minister, with respect to that conversation.

Then with our health centres and our long-term care facilities, those that have to stay warm and functioning with respect to the use of oil – again, that would be an added cost on to the department, on to the provincial coffers when it comes to the level that's being used. Of course, the taxpayers, we will bear that extra burden when it comes to carbon tax, even at our health care facilities and our long-term care facilities. We have the rising cost of fuel and it does have an impact with respect to the health and safety of our patients and, at the end of the day, there will be less money for the overall health treatment and for health care professionals.

We all realize the level of importance that we need to have when it comes to our health care. We have an aging demographic. Some of us are healthier than others, and of course that all makes a huge difference when it comes down to paying the bottom dollar.

Mr. Chair, I do appreciate the opportunity to speak to this bill again. I'm sure we'll have another opportunity, and I look forward to hearing the continued debate and I thank the Members opposite for their attention this evening.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Thank you.

I next recognize the Member representing the District of Ferryland.

L. O'DRISCOLL: Thank you, Chair.

Again, it's a pleasure to be able to get up and represent the District of Ferryland, and again thank all the constituents of Ferryland for voting me in, so it's certainly a pleasure to get here and speak.

I'll certainly start here. We're talking about carbon tax, of course, and I spoke with the minister after I finished speaking the last time – Minister of Environment and Climate Change – and he sort of updated me on the batteries, and how they're charging, and 6.2 megabytes or 6.2 whatever he called it –

AN HON. MEMBER: Megahertz.

L. O'DRISCOLL: Yes, megahertz, whatever he called it. I'll give him kudos; he is doing his job in that part and checking out the information and making sure it's accurate when it comes to the carbon footprint.

I did work in a dealership and we did sell the electric vehicles, and I tell you it's a lot to keep up with when you're looking at that. You go down and do training, and they're talking about having hybrid cars that go and then they burn so much gas. When the electricity is gone, they start burning the fuel and how they charge themselves and stuff like that. So I will give him credit. He just informed me right away and let me know where it's all to, so I give him kudos on that for sure.

I'm looking at some of these costs that we – every time we come in here we're talking about budget, what we should do, what we shouldn't do. I sit here and the last time I got up, I mentioned the Jumpstart program and how are we going to fund it. Well, we could fund it by not paying \$5 million to Rothschild in the States, in evaluating our assets. We have somebody here that can do that. Somebody in this government building can do that.

Then to come in and not release it to the public. I can see a part of that, but I tell you one thing if you owned a house and you want to get the best dollar, you tell everybody what it's worth. You

have a vehicle and you want to get the best price, guess what you do? You shop around and see who's going to give you the best dollar for it. So why wouldn't you do that? You have \$5 million spent in the US to Rothschild, and I'm sure that can be done by a company in Canada or in Newfoundland and Labrador for sure, totally.

You talk about Jumpstart; \$5 million would be some contribution to start; \$5 million towards a Jumpstart program to get kids in hockey, kids in softball, kids in whatever. Some of the parents – and I'll use an example. There's a parent up our way that has three kids in three different divisions, going three different directions, and unless they can get somebody to take their kids somewhere else – how are you going to tell one of your kids that you can't join hockey, can't join softball, can't join dance or whatever sport you're going to be in, whatever that may be? I'm sure I'm going to miss one, but the point is that they're going in three different directions. Can you imagine how much that cost them this winter, in the last couple of months?

Now the hockey is over and there's going to be softball and there's going to be soccer. Most times, the kids are three different ages, in three different groups, so it's going to cost them. We have to think about the people in this environment. These are the middle class, where we're to. Someone over \$100,000 is not worried about eight cents in the price of gas, or \$150,000 in the gap that we have there. They're not really worried about the price of gas. Yes, they talk about it, but that's not really their concern. The people in the middle is where it's to, and in the lower income. Those are the ones we have to concern ourselves with.

We talk about \$750,000 in Central Newfoundland for an office for the Premier. Jumpstart program – it could certainly help. Why wouldn't that help the Jumpstart program? I mean, it comes up. We sit here and we ignore it; it's not going to go away. So you talk about wasting money, that's wasting money. In my opinion, that is wasting money from the government to take care and put an office there for three years, \$750,000 for the three years. It's deplorable that we do that. We have so many other things that we can do with \$750,000 in this province – so many other things, but we want to

sit there and keep throwing money. You listen to suggestions; these are two that I just threw out there.

I had a call the other day – I was driving. The lady called the office and she wanted to speak to me, so I called her. She owns a business in the Ferryland District. She has two workers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order, please!

L. O'DRISCOLL: She's injured. She's off. She's there. She has two workers that couldn't show up to work because they couldn't afford to buy gas. Now that's as simple as it gets. It doesn't get any more simple than that. That's where it hits home. She called me and I said, wow, that's unbelievable. They cannot come to work.

That's where we have to get our heads to. I know that I'm not the only MHA getting it. I know you're getting that; you have to be. There's no one in either one of these districts that are not getting those calls; you have to be.

How do we get to it? It's just hard to understand how we can't help these people, or try to help them. We can't give away the world, I know that. You have a budget and you have to adhere to it. But when you say you have a budget that you have to adhere to, you forget about the \$5 million, the \$750,000. We said before, take care of the pennies, the dollars take care of themselves. Well, we're not taking care of the pennies, if we're wasting it, in my mind. We're wasting it. Spending it on that – wasting it.

Open up the door, there's \$80 million. Door number one, close that door –

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

L. O'DRISCOLL: No, I'm not going getting into the couches. I'm trying to stay relevant to this because this is where it's to. It's talking about saving money. The Province of Newfoundland and Labrador saving money and spending on things. All of a sudden there's another big announcement next week, a million dollars. Where did that come from?

It must be an account in your budget called slush fund or something; you just find it when you need it. Two hundred and twenty-two million is the new number now. That's the one we have to talk about. We just started tick marks this afternoon. That was only mentioned twice today, but if we're here long enough, we'll get \$222 million. It will get mentioned often enough and we'll get a tick mark going for that.

I think we need another pen for Muskrat Falls. The ink is gone out of that one. I just wanted to pass it on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too many strokes.

L. O'DRISCOLL: Too many strokes, yeah, it's gone.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

L. O'DRISCOLL: Well, it will get out there sometimes I guess.

CHAIR: Order, please!

L. O'DRISCOLL: Again, I'd like to talk about the fishery a little bit in regard to –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order, please!

L. O'DRISCOLL: – fishermen being able to go out. So right now they're on a catch limit; they can't go out. It costs double the fuel for these boats to go out to their fishing grounds and come back. They can only get 6,000 at a time. Along with the price of fuel doubling since last year, they have to make four extra trips right now, if they're in a quota of 25,000 or 30,000. That's the inshore group.

Something that the minister could get at and help this group out. The inshore people should be the ones that get their quota first, and let them get that done. It's 25,000 to 30,000 to get it all done. The mid-shore fellows and the offshore fellows have bigger boats they can get out in and not wait on the weather. They're things that should be discussed and get to. Lots of things to discuss.

Again, we have people with minimum amounts of fuel, when you order fuel, all right? People buying oil. The Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands, mentioned last week, I had a call from a different lady, same issue. The minimum they could get was \$600 worth of fuel. This time last year, it was \$300. Now it's \$600. They can't afford it.

I mean, you get a lot of people calling – one of the guys that works in the oil industry, taking calls and delivering oil, numerous people calling and cancelling their automatic fill-ups. One time they would let a furnace go down to half a tank or a quarter tank and then get it refilled. They're taking it as far as they can right now, hoping that the price of fuel is going to go down – hoping. You know, it's a tough choice; no question about it, it's a tough choice. But they're hoping that the price of fuel is going to go down.

That's what they're living day to day. They're trying to manage their budget and, again, they're not going to go get – \$600 worth of fuel is only getting you the same amount of fuel it got you last year, you're not getting any more fuel for it, it costs you \$300 more. You're not getting any more fuel for it.

So this carbon tax is something that the federal government is passing down to us and telling us that we've got to have it. And if that is the case, you listen to the Budget Speech and they couldn't change anything; after three weeks, they found \$80 million in some office, somewhere, or some closet, they found another \$80 million to be able to give out. And they're going to make a big announcement today how they helped the people of the province.

They must have forgot what drove them to get there, which is this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

L. O'DRISCOLL: You might open a door next time – door number three might get you \$222 more million, we hope, to take care of the people.

AN HON. MEMBER: I hope it do.

L. O'DRISCOLL: Yes, I hope it do, too.

And \$600,000 for NASCAR, did we need that right now? I agree, but it's the timing is the issue. It's not the problem with NASCAR or trying to help and build it, that's not the problem, it's the timing.

Door number four: \$600,000 for NASCAR. That's not bad. Not bad. We'll soon have Monty Hall on the other side of the building sitting down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

L. O'DRISCOLL: It's unbelievable.

Anyway, Chair, I'm running out of time so I'll leave that there until the next time I get up.

Thank you so much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: I next recognize the Member for the District of Grand Falls-Windsor - Buchans.

C. TIBBS: Monty Hall, that was good.

So the carbon tax, obviously, it's definitely the flavour of the day the past couple of weeks here. The reason why we took this on and the reason why, you know, not that we dragged it out, but we definitely wanted to do our due diligence on this side of the House and ensure we sat and debated it for as long as we possibly could, to bring up as many points as we possibly could on a personal note.

So when it comes to gas tax or carbon tax, in general, all it's doing is hurting more people across the province. We get the point of it, but, in my opinion, it's – again, everybody said it – something that we don't need right now.

It's hurting existing business, that's one thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order, please!

C. TIBBS: It's also deterring new businesses from getting started.

So we look at Marathon Gold, for instance. Marathon Gold is a huge company that started

here in the province and we're so happy to have them. But talk to Marathon Gold the past couple of weeks, this carbon tax, other gas taxes, the price of fuel in general, is going to raise their overhead so much from three years ago when they first started; first when I got involved, literally, almost twice as much.

So can they absorb the cost? Well, I'm sure they can because they're a big company, they'll find the money to do it. But you have to ask yourself where could that money have possibly gone? Higher-paying positions for people throughout the province; more positions for people throughout the province; charities throughout the province or, also, many companies come into smaller towns like Buchans or Millertown and they help with community assets and community programs.

I know when I was drilling for oil up in Bonnyville, Alberta, Canadian Natural Resources Limited were a big presence up there. They were the biggest company up there. Everywhere you go everything is CNRL, CNRL, the complex, the fields, the sporting units. They have given so much to that town it's not even funny.

So if Marathon Gold had a little bit more money in their pocket maybe they would've passed it on to their employees, hired more employees or done more community work.

So with the bigger companies and existing business, it's hurting them. It's going to deter new business. I sat down with many people who looked at books and they said do you know what? I cannot afford to open a business right now. Might be a small business, but we need every little bit of business we can get in Newfoundland and Labrador. But I know new businesses that are waiting to open that cannot open. They are too afraid to get started.

That is what's happening now when you get this much inflation, gas tax, tax on top of tax on top of tax. Businesses are just deterred. They don't want to open; they don't want to take on that risk. So when you see businesses not wanting to open, businesses closing, eventually it gets too difficult, it's going to hurt the province at the end of the day.

The mom and pop shops, of course, they're going to be hurt most. The bigger businesses, they can absorb it, but unfortunately the mom and pop shops they cannot. We're seeing them close down every other day throughout the province. It's becoming a real issue. And it's a spiral that if it gets too far, it's going to be very difficult to come back from.

Restaurants: they rely on product, food, food prices, of course, which are soaring. It's going to be hurting the restaurants across the province and in general. You come out with a new gas tax, people are just more reluctant to drive, they park their vehicles; they don't want to go anywhere.

How is this going to impact the businesses throughout our communities? They cannot get out and have themselves a meal. Do you know what? A lot of these smaller communities, they have to drive 40 and 50 kilometres to get to a small restaurant or a food truck. They will not do it. They will stay home now. They're pinching every single penny they have, and it's going to hurt business across the board, which obviously trickles down and it will hurt individuals trying to work for that business.

Tourism and travel: it comes back to when I talked about every province is not the same. It costs \$500 just to get off the Island and do you know what? If you're in Toronto, for instance, you could go anywhere in Canada within reason, but in order just to get to another province, we have to pay, if we're driving, \$500 just to get off the Island. That's going to deter people from coming to the Island as well, obviously.

My colleague from Topsail - Paradise talked about behaviour modification. That's exactly what this is. I mean, the purpose of this carbon tax coming down from the feds is to make it difficult to drive so that people opt for another option. The fact of the matter is a lot of people don't have another option. Like I say, this could work in Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver; you have subway units, you have buses, you have Ubers. We don't have this in Newfoundland and Labrador, in rural parts. We don't have any of this.

If you're trying to give us another option or you're trying to push us into another option,

well, that's not going to work, because there are no other options in a lot of rural Newfoundland and Labrador. That's what people don't get. Putting a blanket carbon tax over this country, it's absolutely useless and it makes absolutely no sense. I would like to know what was said at the time to try to fight this to our counterparts.

The trickledown effect is unreal – less money. Money is meant to move around throughout our society in our communities. It's not meant to be kept in our pockets and a lot of people are doing that, because they have to hold on to every dime right now, but money is meant to be moved around throughout society. It's not meant to be kept in Cabinet coffers and for the province. It's going to inhibit a lot of people from doing that.

Groceries: groceries didn't go up by pennies over the past year. It didn't go up by dimes and nickels or quarters even, it went by dollars, literal dollars. It's absolutely insane and another carbon tax is just going to add to the cost of these groceries once again. It's impossible to buy food now for a lot of families, let alone healthy food. So on one hand we're talking about the sugar tax, trying to help families get healthier. On the other hand, the carbon tax is only going to drive the price of our fresh produce a lot higher and families are not going to be able to eat healthy foods, they really aren't.

We all can. It goes back to my point of knowing something and being aware of it. I can go out and buy a bag of apples, most of us here can, but a lot of people can't, guys. A lot of people can't so they have to revert to buying that unhealthy food and it hurts them in the long run.

No more Sunday drives: when I was a kid we used to always go on Sunday drives. I'm sure a lot of other people did here, too. It's not happening anymore. It's truly not happening anymore.

So when we talk about mental health, which is my next point here, we talk about those family drives, the family unit, the family dynamic. With that's been happening over the past couple of years here – and we get it; it's been a rough couple of years sort of thing. But for the government to acknowledge it's been a rough couple of years throughout COVID, the war in Ukraine, whatever else sort of thing, this is the

time to fight for those breaks right now. This is not a time for a new tax. We've recognized that the era that we're in right now is so difficult. Now is the time to try and fight Ottawa to get rid of this carbon tax, to not impose it on Newfoundland and Labrador.

The bigger cities, absolutely. If I'm driving around in a big SUV in Toronto, Montreal or something like that, the option is there to take a bus or to take a subway. But unfortunately, here in Newfoundland and Labrador, we don't have that option. So again, take that blanket off of Canada and look at it by district, by provinces, and say what's best for this province right now. I can tell you right now that a carbon tax for Newfoundland and Labrador is not what's best. People are trying to hold on to the little bit of money they have; stop trying to continuously take it from them.

Housing and new construction: We have a housing crisis here in Newfoundland and Labrador that it's not brought up enough. There's a housing crisis here, guys, like you wouldn't believe. Go to Grand Falls-Windsor, here in the metro area – I'm looking at people trying to rent a house, putting it out for \$1,800 and some people looking at saying well, I'll give you \$2,200 a month for it instead because they can afford to do it. But low-income families, they have no place to live. They have no place to live right now.

New housing is not going up like it should be, because of the construction costs. So when all that trickles down to the suppliers, it's going to be trickled down to the customers and it's just going to stall our economy. It's going to stall our jobs, and it's only going to put more hurt and suffering upon the people.

I'm going to go back to the mental illness for a second. You talk about the sugar being bad for people. Guess what, guys? Stress is probably worse for you than sugar. It truly is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

C. TIBBS: The stresses that the families have, throughout this province right now, is absolutely unmeasurable. The divorce rates are up. I talked to mom-and-dad couples all the time; they're fighting like cats and dogs over finances, and

they shouldn't have to. That should not be the focal point of getting up in the morning to when they go to bed at night, but it's happening in families, and it's ripping families apart.

I'm just going to take the last 45 seconds here, and just a little message to all the families out there, all the mom and dads out there that are suffering right now. Societal expectations do not have to be met. Stop paying attention to societal expectations. My son wanted to get in four dances this year; I told him he could only get in two. I'm sorry, but the other kids can get in four. There's nothing wrong with looking at your children and saying I'm sorry, at this time right now, we can only afford this much. Don't think that you've got to walk on water, because you don't have to. You're a mom and dad. You're a human being. You're trying the best that you can. It's okay to say it's not okay.

I want you know that societal expectations out there, to all the mom and dads, you do not need to keep up with it. Do what's best for you and your family. Take the tongue from the roof of your mouth, relax your jaw, take a deep breath and know that you're going to be okay.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Thank you very much.

I next recognize the Member representing the District of Conception Bay South.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's a pleasure to get up again and speak on this ongoing debate on carbon as we talk and I listen to my colleagues and listen to a bit of banter back and forth. I was there with one of my colleagues with the Third Party and I know they are supporters of the climate change carbon tax. He'd rather cap and trade, he said, but I'll tell him what was told to me by a senior official within government a few years back. Newfoundland is a particle of dust to the rest of the world. I've said this in the House before and I'll repeat it again and again, because that's an actual fact. We are such a small player as a country, not a province, as a country. And then

you put Newfoundland on the map where we're to as a country.

I go to my good friend and colleague from Bonavista and we had a bit of banter back and forth a couple of weeks ago about the Minister of Environment and Climate Change was accusing him of being a climate denier. And he clearly stated with his family watching that he's not a climate denier.

C. PARDY: And it still hurts.

B. PETTEN: And it still hurts him.

We don't live in a dream world; we know there's climate change out there. Is it to the degree that we're being told? Maybe not, but we're not saying it's not an actual fact. We're realistic. But do we think that the issue now, what we're facing now with this carbon tax and all these measures you see introduced across the country and there are electric vehicles and it's get rid of this and throw your furnace out by the door and get the little bit a rebate and spend another \$20,000 and go energy efficient. I might be facetious, but I'm being honest. You go and you get a rebate on a mini-split, but you have to still pay thousands of dollars. But you can't afford to go look for one because you can't afford to put gas in your car to go to the showroom to see one. All realistic problems.

But the point I get back to is: How big an issue is carbon? How big an issue is climate change in the province? People get up in the morning and they turn on the news and they put on the kettle or whatever and they get their coffee. I ask you to guess, how many people sit down and scratch their head and say what are we going to do about climate change? How are we going to deal with carbon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

B. PETTEN: Someone here in the House just put a zero up and they're right. That's an actual fact.

Again I know I'm being facetious, but I think that's a very valid point. People who watch this – and we don't know the numbers; we haven't got the viewer ratings – but a lot of people watch the House of Assembly and they appreciate the

realness. A lot of Members get in the House and they always say I like some commentary, because you're actually speaking my language. In an actual fact, that to me is one of the more straight up – I think everyone in this House can attest to what I'm saying. Is that your number one issue every day? No, absolutely not.

Is the price of gas your number one issue? Sure it is. Over 11 cents a litre, carbon pricing tax. That's what they talk about. Are they concerned that they're going to throw the dryer in on the dump and start hanging their clothes out every day? No, that's not their issue. They can't afford to take the furnace out. They can't afford to do that. They are trying to get a woodstove. Trying to find a way they can afford to live.

So here we are in 2022, pushing June of 2022, and the number one issue facing the province and the country today is carbon and climate change. I mean, I don't know what stations they're watching; it's not the same news channel I watch. That's why I say sometimes I may be facetious but I'm trying to be real. Because we all live in the same province the last time I checked.

This is not Beijing, Mr. Chair. We're not living in Beijing; we don't need to go out with a mask on to see across the parking lot. I've been in Beijing. I know what Beijing is like; it's not very nice. And I think you've been there too, Mr. Chair. We're not Beijing. But if you listen to some of the commentary here, oh yeah, we got to get ready; she's coming to an end. It is all over.

You've got the Third Party, they're advocating and they're all about carbon, and the leader drives a big gas pickup truck. Big gas truck in the parking lot. I don't see any Smart car. Unless someone else has got a Smart car and they get dropped off in a pickup truck to get the Smart car; I heard that story.

Forgive me for being, again, facetious, but I know you get the point. I sit in the House as House Leader and I sit in the House and I listen to debate all day long. And ultimately I sit back and I say, we've been here now for how many hours, debating this? Answer me the question. How many people get up every day and the first issue they've got on their mind is carbon tax?

They don't live in CBS. And if they do, I'm sure they might reach out to me in the coming days. And if they do, I'll talk to them, obviously, and explain my view.

But they don't live in CBS. I don't think they live in Carbonear. I don't think they do. I don't think they live in Conception Bay East - Bell Island. He might have a couple. He actually got a couple in Portugal Cove-St. Philip's. My colleague from Topsail - Paradise, he may have a few down on Topsail Hill, but I'm familiar with that area.

That's what we're dealing with. The world is coming to an end if we don't get carbon. Oh, we have to get carbon, get up every day and oh, yeah, I'm worried about how I'm going to get from point A to point B.

I said earlier when I spoke this evening, I have a nice truck home, but my wife turned it into a flowerpot. I can't afford to drive it. So is my worry a carbon tax? No. Am I worried about the climate change? No. I wish we had better weather. I mean, today we're in here all day today and tomorrow it's supposed to rain. We might get out early tomorrow, who knows right, in a rainy afternoon. That's how we have everything figured out here; we have it backwards. We probably should have done this tomorrow, but we're here.

Mr. Chair, I can write notes. I have books here, I can write notes, but that's the question that everybody has to ask themselves. Whoever is watching home, whoever is watching this, whoever watches the recording of this, they need to ask themselves that question: Is this the number one issue facing you today? No. I can't see it. Yet, we'll debate it and we'll debate it and the Premier will fly all over the world with the entourage and the cameras and the photographers and everyone else because we care about the climate. We're climate change activists.

It sounds great, Mr. Chair. It sounds wonderful, but it's not. I go back to the colleague who showed the thing of how many people – the zero that feel that way, that's true. If I polled this House now, I think I'd get a vast majority of people who would agree with what I'm saying,

but they can't say that because it's not cool to say that.

Chair, I was the climate change critic for the Opposition for several years. If I'm not mistaken, the Chair used to be minister of that portfolio. We had many questions here in the House of Assembly, because I was trying to figure it out. I was more interested in roadwork and pavement and potholes. He was into climate change, I wasn't.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

B. PETTEN: The Member for Corner Brook finally woke up and commented on something. He didn't wake up? Oh, I thought he was – now he's arguing, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR: Order, please!

I ask you to keep the noise down, somebody is trying to sleep. So please keep –

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South, please continue.

B. PETTEN: People try to interrupt you in this House. It's happened over the years and I've been here long enough to find it and it's similar people every now and then. Every now and then they try to do it, but he can have the 10 minutes after I'm done, Mr. Chair. I don't think he agrees with carbon much more than I do. I'm looking forward to his commentary on the carbon pricing because I wonder how many people in Corner Brook are concerned about this.

I would say that everyone out in Corner Brook got the same thing tomorrow morning. Lights will be on before daylight comes because they are worried, they can't sleep, worrying about carbon and worried about the climate change. They don't care. They're fine. They don't care about paying \$2.30 a litre for gas or \$2 a litre for price for furnace oil. They're fine. Or \$7 or \$8 for three cans of beans. They're good with that. They're worried about carbon. They're worried about climate change. All the people in Corner Brook are. Again, not most of our districts, I

have doubts if Ferryland is worried, too. I know my crowd aren't. I don't hear it. And that is the point I am trying to make. I do not hear one single word about carbon pricing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: After this speech you will.

B. PETTEN: You never know. They will probably all agree. But they don't talk about that. How do I afford to live? That is the question. How are we going to ever survive this? How are we getting through this? When do you think this will all end? I can't answer those questions. Not one of them.

But what I can tell them is, we sit in this House of Assembly daily and we have been doing a lot lately, and we speak about issues that are important to them. We speak about their concerns. My colleague, the Member for Bonavista, does a great job and he singles out people and he talks about people in his district. They got sense, same as all of us. My colleague from Stephenville - Port au Port, he has been very vocal and done a great job advocating for improvements. Does his district have a lot of carbon, climate change activists? Maybe. Is that the biggest concern? No.

Yet, we'll sit here and we'll debate and we'll debate and we'll debate and we're looking for change. We are getting some improvements. We would like more. But, ultimately, I plead – this is my final comment on it – there are much bigger issues in this province and this country. This is not where we should be to. This is not our most important issue. That particle of dust, that's all we are. Let's get on with the real business of the House, Mr. Chair.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

L. PARROTT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would say leading up to this January, I have had constituents reach out to me asking

questions about climate change and different things, certainly the environment, but since January, I haven't heard a peep about it. I will say not one peep, but I have received hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of emails from people concerned about how they're going to afford to buy groceries, how they're going to buy milk, how they're going to put kids in school – all of the things that are very important to people in their daily lives.

There is no question that the future of the world depends on how we treat it, but the future of the province, right now, and the people in it depends on how we treat them also. And people are hurting and there is zero question about it. The one thing that affects everyone and it affects the cost of living and everything we do is the price of gasoline and the price of gasoline has an effect on every good that we buy and sell.

So when we talk about carbon, I'd say to the Premier sitting over there, I'd say we'd love to hear what you said to the prime minister when you visited and talked to him about carbon tax. I'd love to hear exactly what you said to him. We haven't heard a peep about it.

The reality of it is there's an 11.05-cent tax that's here and there should be a pause put on it. I don't think anybody in this House, not once during this whole debate the last couple of weeks, has said that it should be eliminated. The words that have been said is that there should be a pause put on it.

A pause is a plausible thing that can give people relief. So between 11.05 cents – and certainly, again, another thing that I haven't heard anyone say, other than it's out of our hands, it's up to the PUB, is the five-cent gas tax for the refinery. And the reality of it is we were importing fuel in here for a very long time, long before the refinery shut down and those proponents never asked for that five cents. We're doing it now and we've been doing it for a long time.

As a matter of fact, we're going to discuss a bill tomorrow that has a sunset clause and we ought to have tried to find a way to put a sunset clause on that five cents. Although, I know it's not legislation and the PUB control it, we should be

looking for a way to do that. Because the reality of it is people are paying way too much at the pumps and the cost at the pumps is what's affecting everyone else.

When we buy our groceries and we look at how things are taxed – I always say this, and I'll use processed food, because we pay tax on processed food – when we –

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

L. PARROTT: Do you want to say something? Stand up and have at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

L. PARROTT: No, but we can't, all I can hear is chirping, so stand up, have at it. Or you can stand up after and have your say.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

L. PARROTT: No, but it gets to her.

When we buy processed foods at a grocery store, we pay way more. Nobody considers that. We'll use a TV dinner as an example. If we pay \$4 for a Swanson TV dinner, we pay 60 cents tax on it. If you go to Nova Scotia and you buy that exact same TV dinner, they pay \$2 for it and they pay 30 cents tax on it. And that's all got to do with what – it's processed food, there is taxes. Yes, absolutely. So when we buy processed foods, there are taxes on all of it. You pay a lot of taxes.

But we don't think about those things, right? Logistically, how we ship things into the province every day hurts us. We've got to find ways to improve it. But, right now, the immediate relief that we can find is at the pumps.

Now, listen, make no mistake about it. There was legislation – mysterious surprise legislation that's going to be proposed tomorrow that was announced on Thursday where we found some money in order to give some relief. Does it go far enough? I don't think it does. I have zero reason not to support it because any relief is welcome. But, at the end of the day, we need to find a way to get more relief.

It's fair to say that premiers across the country are against this carbon tax and are all looking for a pause. Well, maybe it's time for that bold move where we're saying it louder than the rest of them. Where we're trying to reunite the premiers across the country and trying to come together and let the prime minister and the federal Liberals know how dire this is. Because it's dire.

I'll tell you, there was a comment made here earlier by my colleague from Grand Falls-Windsor, and if you think about this it's such a reality. Rural Newfoundland or rural anywhere versus metro areas are entirely different. So when you look a regressive tax like this and you think about how it affects people, the first point is it affects everyone. It affects them in their pocketbooks, it affects them when they go to grocery stores and it affects them when they try to do something.

But if you live outside of the city where you can't take advantage of things such as Metrobus or if you're unfortunate and you're sick and you have to travel to a major centre in order to get health care, or if you have to travel to get groceries or if you have to travel to get your mail, you immediately pay way more than anyone else. And nobody's considering the difference between rural and metro Newfoundland. We can compare ourselves to other provinces, but we're not other provinces.

I've said for a long time when we talk about anything we do here, from health care to regionalization to taxes, the one thing we always overlook is our two major disadvantages: population and geography. But the people that are outside of the Avalon Peninsula with regard to gas tax and the cost of living are at a major disadvantage right now, and there's no mistake about it.

We talk about the five-point plan, and I find it amusing how we – listen, the five-point plan is going to help some people very little, but when we talk about people not paying taxes on home insurance, you go out around the bay and a lot of people don't have the fortune to own their home. And those that do probably don't have a fire hall close enough to it where they can get insurance. So it doesn't help them. Now, they still have drive all the distance in order to buy food.

When we talk about electric cars, if you go out around the bay, a lot of people out around the bay have 100-amp services. They could buy an electric car and go home and not be able to charge it. They certainly can't afford to upgrade to a 200-amp service. And most likely can't afford to buy an electric car.

As a matter of fact I think that the minister said that the cost of the electric car rebate was \$1.9 million, and my colleague from –

E. JOYCE: Humber - Bay of Islands.

L. PARROTT: – Humber - Bay of Islands was looking for somewhere around \$1.6 million for cataract surgery. Now, imagine if that money had to have been invested in that and those seniors could get their sight back. Just think about that. We have a choice between giving people the ability to do something that they most likely won't, either because it's not available in the market, they have fear of how it's going to react, or if they buy it they can't charge it. Or we can give 800 citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador their vision back. Seems like a no-brainer to me. Seems to me like a very plausible plan.

When we're here in government, it's easy, certainly in Opposition – and I say this, it's easy enough to speak back and throw barbs, but when you're in government the one thing you've got to understand is when you throw that stone in the water, all of those ripples have an effect. And we don't look at it that way.

When you think about seniors, and certainly seniors with regard to the cataract surgeries and things, and alternatives that we have, to me it's the one group that we should be rewarding and trying to look out to. Government had a choice, and they chose not to do that. They simply chose it. They had every opportunity to do it.

This carbon tax is baffling again, like I said, because never once have I heard – the Premier hasn't stood on his feet and said one word about it. He hasn't said he's for it or against it. He hasn't told anyone in the House about the conversations that he's had with the prime minister – he said he's had the conversations – but why not say what they were? Why not tell people where you stand on them? There's no

reason not to. At the end of the day it's the people of this province that are being hurt and the reality of it is we're here to represent them.

Eleven and a half cents goes a long way. Now if you were to add that 11½ cents on to the seven-cent announcement, which equals 8.2, I think – is that right? Somewhere around there? Now we're at 19.7 cents – substantial. Now if we could do something with the five cents, we're at over 24 cents. Much more substantial. And if you ask someone in the public how they feel about all of that, I can tell you right now I haven't had one person come to me and say that they felt what was offered was adequate. Now, I've had a lot of people come to me and say that they're happy there was something, in all defence. But in the next comment they say, it's going down eight cents but then it's going up four cents tomorrow, and it's this ...

Do you know what? They have a reason to feel this way, because that's the history with what's been happening with our gas prices here in Newfoundland and Labrador. This carbon tax is an opportunity for us to stand up as a province and say to the federal government that we do not want it, we do not like it and we're just looking for a pause. Nobody wants to give up the future – nobody wants that – but we need to understand the present we live in. And the present we live in is a province that's struggling financially, on a personal and corporate level, and the individuals that need this money the most could use a break at the pumps, and that break at the pumps will go into everything that we buy and purchase. Everybody knows that. The cost of living has gone through the roof. Gas is the best way to put it down.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR (Warr): The Chair recognizes the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands.

E. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm going to just have a few words. I'm going to talk about the carbon tax and some of the issues in the district concerning the carbon tax.

One of the big things I hear, especially with the carbon tax that's going to be put on the gas – and I'm sure it's all around the province; it's not just Humber - Bay of Islands – are the roads. And you hear it on a regular basis, people saying, well, we're going to pay more taxes on our gas, but there are a lot of issues with our roads. And this is not a knock on government, because it's the climate we live in and the hard winter we had and we had seven thaws this winter, but usually we get one – seven. So that causes a lot more issues with the roads itself.

You get people asking those questions and you can't answer it. You honestly can't answer that question. Like, okay, we'll put more tax on the gas, but our roads aren't being maintained to the level that the residents expect. I spoke to the minister and I know he's looking into it out there in Copper Mine Brook, but I just wanted to put it on the record that I have brought it to the minister's attention on many occasions and he is looking into it. It has to be fixed. If not, they're going to have to shut the road down. It is getting that dangerous. If someone goes there in a motorcycle or a small car and don't know the road, there's a very serious chance for a serious accident. And the minister's aware of it and I know he's working on it.

So those are the kinds of things that politicians, when you go out in your district, have to try and explain to people. You always talk about the carbon tax to the people. Well, why are they putting it on gas? Why don't we put it on something that we can save more? Why don't we put it on some recyclables, some other way? But when you put it on the gas, you see the connection between paying for gas and the roads. I think a lot of municipalities – I hear the Member for Cape St. Francis talking about the municipalities. They are finding it very tough. They are finding it very, very tough right now with the increase in cost.

A lot of those municipalities also do have trucks and they do have tractors. Their cost has gone up a lot. As I said earlier today, on many occasions, we've been hearing now two or three weeks saying, oh, we can't do anything with the tax on gas because the federal government would just step in, scrap the deal that we have with the federal government. So we know now that's not true. Once that's off the table, Mr. Chair, then

we can say what else can we do. What else can we do to help the people of Newfoundland and Labrador who are struggling? Trust me, they are struggling.

I know the Members opposite – some do, I'm sure some don't, but most do get the same calls. And then you look at a lot of seniors. There are a lot of seniors and people on low income who are finding it very, very tough these days. They are finding it tough. As I said earlier today, there are a lot of children and grandchildren who are helping their parents or grandparents out, buying oil, buying gas, buying their medication, helping to buy their food. It is a reality. It is an actual reality.

I was speaking to one person Sunday when I was driving in, the family had to get together and put the oil in their mother's tank. An older lady, they had to actually put oil in her tank. She was getting \$1,400 a month. To fill up her tank for that month: \$1,200. The maximum income she has is \$1,400, and it was \$1,200. There has to be something where we can target seniors on low income and people on lower income. There has to be something better we can do. What it is, I don't know. I have some ideas, but, of course, you had to fight for three weeks just to get them convinced that you can do something with the gas tax.

So we just don't have enough time now to convince them that there are other things you can do. But there are other things you can do. There are definitely other things you can do. And that government, which I was a part of, did before. So I know there are things that can be done. I know there are subsidies to low income. I know that can be done. I know there can be a reduction in the income tax. I know that can be done.

So when people stand up and say, oh, we gave them enough, just think about that when you say we put back – so here you are telling somebody who's struggling on the street, seniors who are cold, seniors who can't eat, seniors who can't take medication, you're saying we gave you enough. But it's not. We have to find some other way. We just have to find some other way to do it.

We will not be here long enough to keep on with the government to try to keep bringing it to them. Almost bring it to the point where everybody is starting, everybody out in the province is saying, lord, jeepers, b'ys, we're suffering, we're hurting, we need something. And we won't have time to do that. The Opposition, and I know at least two of the independents, have been raising those issues ever since this House opened. We got some headway but it's still not enough.

There has to be a targeted group that we can help out so that people can start enjoying their summer. Instead of sitting in their house, they can go for a little Sunday drive or they can get their medication or they can get their food.

I say to the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board, I know it's not easy. I know in your position it is not easy. I don't know any time in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador when you're in that position that you're not one of the number one targets in government. I know that. This is nothing personal to you – nothing personal. Because no matter who's in that seat the same questions are going to be raised. Because the process is that once everybody in the department brings things forward, the minister brings it to the Cabinet, this is a Cabinet decision. But it happens that we have to go through you, Minister, to bring it to the Cabinet to try to get some changes, which have been done.

But there has to be some other way to help out seniors or lower income. I implore upon the government – and in some cases, you take the Humber - Bay of Islands, the fishery is very big; Corner Brook Pulp and Paper is doing well. So there are positive things that are happening in the area. But even a lot of the smaller companies are struggling these days. After the pandemic and this with the war in Ukraine, of course, everybody though employment was going to pick up. Then because the costs have risen so much, a lot of employment hasn't taken place as we thought it would.

So there are issues there also because people aren't rehiring as much as they thought they would be in the employment sector in the Bay of Islands, in the Corner Brook area especially.

But there are some positive things that are happening, it's not all doom and gloom. There are some businesses that are moving and there are some businesses that are expanding. But it's the common person who we are sworn to help that elected us in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador who don't have a voice. I thank you, Mr. Chair, for agreeing with me. Who don't have a voice to stand up here. We are the voice. We are the voice of those common people.

That's why if anybody says, oh, we're just standing up here and we're just talking, killing time, you haven't been in someone's kitchen who can't get their medication. You haven't been in the kitchen with someone who's saying they don't know what they can afford to eat. You haven't been in the kitchen with someone – and I use the cataracts again in Corner Brook area, mainly a lot in the Corner Brook area, a lot of the Humber - Bay of Islands, a lot in the St. George's region, a lot in the Premier's district. When you sit down with them and the only way to do it, they have to go somewhere in St. John's and pay \$3,400 an eye, they can't afford it, when we can walk in tomorrow and get it done – start. And the Premier himself will not stand up for that.

So when you sit down and talk to those people, the people that elected us and you hear those concerns, that's why we're standing in this House. That's why we're trying to explain to the government, listen, you're making bad decisions here. Here are some options. You're going to make the decisions; you have the majority, you're going to make the decisions.

I'll say this in closing, Mr. Chair. I offered the Premier, the Member for Corner Brook, he can go also, and I offered the Minister of Health, go meet with Western Health, or come out with me and meet with some of the seniors. Sit them down face to face and tell them to their face, you have to wait another year for cataract surgery, when we can get it done.

Let's see your courage. Let's see how much courage you have. I'll arrange the meeting. Sit down with those seniors, as many as you want, sit them with them, look across the room and say, listen, we're not going to get this done now because we have a personality conflict. We're not going to allow your surgeries to be done.

Let's see who got the courage to go out and do that. I bet you they will not take me up on the offer.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Lake Melville.

P. TRIMPER: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you very much for the opportunity.

I wasn't going to speak, but anyway we've had, as it is, a debate. You have different thoughts. You have different perspectives on the floor. Sometimes when you're sitting as a Chair, your duty is certainly to protect the speaker, but I just wanted to grab the mic and go – now I have that opportunity I say to my friend and colleagues across the floor.

I want to start off, my first couple of minutes, just in response to some of the comments I just heard. First of all, folks talked about is the most burning issue on the minds of our constituents of this province right now the future situation and projections for climate change? I'd say probably not. Is it the need to put a price on carbon and pollution? Probably not.

However, we all know, and I believe the province knows, that if we really start thinking seven generations out, we need to start being very worried about a variety of issues. I'll just go through a few of them.

First of all, we have a demographic crisis. In these last few weeks of this session, we've looked at things like regionalization. We've heard the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure talk about how he's putting out, now, feelers and strategies for how we can deal with the reduction of ferry services, all this big problem.

We have a concentration, 50 per cent of our pollution lives in this little area around where this Assembly is right now. This vast landscape with scattered communities and over 9,000 kilometres of road, very challenging for us to

service. This is also a crisis. That's why we are taking these steps now; we're thinking ahead.

We also have a health crisis. Let's face it. I can tell you we've had some – I'm sure every single person has had some tough stories these last seven days when we went back home. I had a very difficult afternoon that I'll speak about later this week, but people are literally losing their lives while we try to get a plan for the future in place for our health care system. It is another crisis – it is another one that is burning, consuming so much time. We need to get it right, again, for the future.

Fiscally, wow, we talk about Muskrat Falls and we talk about all these other issues that are going on. We've had bills in this House where we've talked about improved ways of borrowing money and some real good advantages and we can see those fiscal advantages. That's why we're doing it, because we're thinking about, again seven generations out, making sure that there is not a debt left for those generations that are going to come after us.

And then finally is climate change. One that I and many others – and I believe there has been progress on the debate of this bill because I think I have heard everyone say that they recognize that climate change is indeed a serious issue for themselves; for their families; for generations to come; for this province; for the world.

I think most of the commentary I hear is saying, well, we have to park it now. Well, you know what, folks? We have been parking it; we have been parking it a long time. In terms of the reference that somebody made just a little while about us just being a dust speck on the butt of the world. Well, as I've said, on a per capita basis the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador, frankly, have the greatest carbon footprint. We are contributing at a rate that sets us in the third place in terms of Canada. As a country, as a Canadian, we are seventh in the world in terms of our carbon footprint. We might talk the talk and we may be concerned but, folks, we still are not doing enough.

We need to get started and, yeah, I'd like to park this too. I can feel the fiscal pressures. I can tell you right now, I've been sitting in my chair watching because in Happy Valley-Goose Bay,

where I live, we're bracing for the ship to come in. We have enjoyed somewhat of an isolation from these wild gas prices.

Last week when I left – I drove back home – I said to the owners in Port Hope Simpson after driving across the Island – yes, in my gas truck that my wife has. We landed in Port Hope Simpson and I said to those folks, who I know very well, for the first time in the 20 years that I have gone to gas up and coming from the Island up, the price was lower than what I had been paying, and that is in Port Hope Simpson. It was quite remarkable and we're bracing because we can feel this.

So people are actually asking me tonight: When do I think that this legislation will be passed? When will the PUB be alerted? I said: It could be the next few days. But people are watching that ship coming in. Lake Melville, the North Coast of Labrador, we're going to feel it and we know it.

However, what I wanted to reassure everyone in this House, and despite all these pressures right now, there are some 111 countries. I can remember when my colleague for Conception Bay South was my critic, when I was defending the moves and efforts of the climate change office back many years ago. We used to have a great debate back and forth, and I used to remind him, I'd say, go look and see what they're doing across the United Nations.

I don't know if he's ever gone to look, but I can give him a little update. There are 111 countries that are proceeding with a form of taxation on the price of pollution, on the price of carbon. We are not unusual; this is not just a Liberal – this is not just a Justin Trudeau move; this is happening around the world. And it's tough, but we need to step up and join in, because frankly we haven't been doing that. And by the way, there are some 12 more on the way.

But I have to bring this debate again, and I've got to thank Anna Hutchings who works with me and Bonnie Learning for the last few days. I said: I sense we're not done yet with carbon tax. We're going to need to speak to this one more time. I said: Let's just get a little update on what we call windfall profit tax legislation. So we just did a little scan, not just across the country but

around the world. And I wanted to bring this back to the floor, because I want everybody to pay attention.

I believe you are, and I say as we fight over, whether it be some 11 cents right now for carbon pricing, or the seven, eight cents that we're going to see for the bill that's coming later this week – wow, are we missing the boat; are we truly missing the boat. First of all, when we talk about windfall profit taxes, here's a little definition. It's a piece of unexpected good fortune, typically one that involves receiving a large amount of money.

Okay, so let's take a look at it. So the United States, as I've alerted this House – I think it was about a month ago, during Question Period and watching – they're introducing profit tax legislation. They're going to be targeting the large oil and gas companies and their massive profits, and that money that they'll be receiving, it's in the billions – billions of dollars – is being rerouted back to low- and middle-income folks. The folks most vulnerable to this rising cost that, let's face it folks, is primarily related to the price of petrocarbons: gas, diesel, propane and so on.

Spain, by the way, it was actually one of the first national governments that I was able to find; they actually started an idea of a windfall profit tax. It's 10 per cent on their oil and gas companies, and what they do is they revert it right back to the taxes that the Spanish government has forgiven its residents for paying for home heating fuel. So they've given a break to the residents, they've taken the profit from the companies that operate in Spain and there's a nice moving around of dollars to those who most need it. Folks, I can tell you these are not crumbs; these are serious dollars.

I mentioned, when I first talked about this some weeks ago, that the United Kingdom was considering it. And if you're watching Boris Johnson and the debate for many weeks, several months, he was resisting pushing back. Suddenly, just a few days ago, a complete reversal because so many of the other national governments are doing this. So the UK is implementing it. It is going to be 25 per cent of that calculated profit, and in the interest of time I will not go into it. That is going to generate some 400 pounds of rebate per household

throughout the entire United Kingdom. That's a substantial bit of support that you can put back and, by the way, this is not profit. This is not a production cost. It doesn't drive anything up. It is just profit that these shareholders are making.

I want to go back again to Suncor. I am not necessarily wanting to beat up on Suncor, because I see them doing several progressive things in the oil sands projects in Alberta and so on. However last year, folks, during the first quarter, Suncor declared a profit of some \$821 million. This year: \$2.95 billion profit. And that money, it went to shareholders. It didn't go to help the low and the middle income. It didn't go to helping environmental cleanups and reductions of emissions. It went to shareholders, executives, owners, and that is what is going on. We are playing this type of debating game here on the floor and meanwhile I can tell you, folks, people are making a lot of money.

I want to leave you just with a couple of quotes. The profits did not arise because of changes to risk taking, innovation or efficiency and, for that reason I am sympathetic to the argument to tax these profits fairly. That is from a gentleman who is the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

“The industry is effectively transforming a humanitarian disaster and pain at the pump into Wall Street returns. Exploiting the war in Ukraine is a desperate play on the part of these companies to salvage their reputation with investors.” And that is from Lukas Ross – Friends of the Earth. But it is absolutely the truth. If you look to see where these dividends are going, it is going to shareholder return and we are fighting over seven cents, eight cents, nine cents.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair is recognizing the hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

P. LANE: Thank you. Mr. Chair.

This will be my last opportunity, I guess, to speak to this particular matter. First of all, I want to say it is a very interesting concept that my colleague just brought forward. I definitely think it is something worth looking into. My only concern would be is that if we were to do this and our country were to do it and then the US, what does that mean in terms of – would those companies then say, okay, now we are just going to double down on oil in the Middle East and in Venezuela and in these places. There is always that risk that if you do that, they just pack up their bags and leave and invest in other countries who don't really care about the climate.

So that would be my only concern, but, in concept, it sounds like a good idea, definitely something worth looking at. I think it's definitely something worth looking at, and I appreciate him bringing that forward.

On a similar vein, when we talk about corporations and money and so on, I had a person come to me, a business person recently, and this is something that – when you talk about the cost of living, it's not just about – we're focusing on government taxation, when we're talking about the cost of living here and cutting tax and so on, but part of the cost of living, as well, is driven by what you have to pay for goods, whether it be at the pumps or what you have to pay for groceries and the inflated costs and so on.

One of the things that this person pointed out to me, which I wasn't really aware of how it worked, but you have this thing called a fuel surcharge. Now, pretty much most of the goods that are coming to this province are coming here by ship, they're coming in container. In the past – he showed me bills – you had a container, and he showed me one, I think it was like \$1,600 for the container. Included in that cost would be all the costs, would be the fuel costs, the labour costs, the overhead and, obviously, built in a profit and so on, and here was the total cost that they paid for this.

Then a couple of years ago they came up with this fuel surcharge. Now, I could understand it. I would make sense to me, that if someone said well, the fuel component of this \$1,600 is \$300 and because the price of fuel has doubled, now

it's going to be \$600, but that's not what's on the bill. The bill actually said – one bill he showed me – 115 per cent fuel surcharge, not on the fuel, on the entire bill. So the \$1,600 was \$3,500, even though the actual fuel – the extra cost on the fuel might have been like \$300 or \$400 more, but they were charging like \$1,500, \$2,000 more. So the rest of it is all just pure profit.

Now, I did check it out with Consumer Affairs and in talking to them it's really the federal government, because there's a piece of legislation that we sort of have here that governs fairness and so on, but that's fairness between consumer, being a person, and a business. But because this is a business-to-business transaction, in other words, the business is bringing in the container, not on the individual, and they're doing business with the company that's bringing it in, because it's a business to business, it falls under federal legislation and it doesn't fall under our provincial legislation. That's what I was told by the department, the director there.

So it's something, I would say to the government, you should look into. I really ask you to look into it, talk to your federal counterparts, because we have a monopoly, pretty much, here on this Island. I mean, we have one company and we have Marine Atlantic, pretty much. And that's how all the goods are coming. So just think about it. If the companies are bringing in goods to the Island and they're having to pay twice as much money for it, then that's going to be passed on to the consumer. So when people are saying I'm going to the store, whatever, oh my God, the price of everything has gone up, and we're arguing over a bit of tax. At the same time, you have this large company that is making an absolute killing – making an absolute killing.

Of course, obviously, the company who is bringing it in they have no choice but to pass it on. If their costs doubled, well they have to pass it on to someone or they'd go out of business. So they end up passing it on. But the fact that they're allowed to do this. So I ask you to check it out: a fuel surcharge. I didn't even know about it.

The other thing that was on the bill, which was interesting, was another additional \$300 charge and it was called a marine mammal protection fee or something like that. So apparently that has to do with the right whales. So because of trying to protect the right whales from being struck by ships, there are certain lanes that they have to go when they're passing through a certain area, they have to slow down a little bit, apparently. And they're saying that creates – it's not as much fuel efficiency when they slow down. So on top of that for one container was an additional \$300 per container for the marine mammal protection fee, on top of this hundred-and-some-odd per cent surcharge on the entire contents of the container.

So when we're talking about consumers and that, because it's the same people we're talking about here, when we're here talking about well, they can't afford the tax on things, but the goods themselves, we're not really talking about the goods themselves and what's being charged here. Potentially, it sounds like a gouge to me. Then maybe that's something we should be looking at.

So, again, I would encourage the Minister of Finance or whoever, or Service NL, whoever it would apply to, it may not be under provincial legislation, but it's definitely something that you should talk to with your federal colleagues just to explore how this fuel surcharge and these other charges are working and applying, and if indeed it has any level of fairness to the consumers. Because, ultimately, we're the ones paying for it in the end, regardless of how it arrived at that number.

Another one that was brought to my attention was, apparently there are a number of – and this would be provincial, as I understand it – shop fees. I don't know if anyone has heard of shop fees. So every time now you go to – and I'm not saying it's every garage, but some garages and places, now they're charging shop fees. So I go to a garage and I say I want to get my brakes done, so they charge me for my brakes and that. They charge me for the labour and now they're saying 10 per cent, I think it is, or whatever the amount is, 10 per cent or 15 per cent, like another tax, shop fee is what they're calling it. Because when they were doing my brakes, maybe when they were taking off my tires, there

was a lug nut or something that wouldn't come off very easy, they put some grease, or they had to put a bit of Spray Nine on it or something. Again, if you had to use some Spray Nine and it costs \$5, charge \$5, not \$50. Not like 10 per cent, 15 per cent on the entire bill. That's what's happening, I'm being told.

I had someone who even told me – this is even better now, again, it's hearsay I suppose, you have to check it out, but this person told me they went to a particular retail outlet and got four tires. Never got the tires put on there, just got the tires. Took them off the rack, I'm going to put them on myself or my brother-in-law is going to put them. He has his own garage in this backyard, so don't charge me. Just give me the tires. He told me there was a shop fee on that. He said what is the shop fee for? Because we had to pay for the pair of gloves that the young fellow was wearing when he took the tire off the rack or something.

If I went in the store and I bought anything else there, I'd take it off, I'd put it in the cart, no problem. You get something down in the automotive, a set of tires: shop fees. That would fall technically under our legislation.

I know we're focusing on the tax. I get the fact we're focusing on the tax, but as we focus on and we go back and forth over how much tax is not too much tax and we understand the province's situation financially, we need as much revenue as we can get, and we're fighting amongst ourselves, and then you have these things happening that perhaps should be addressed. You wouldn't be worrying about the tax, if people weren't being gouged in other ways by some of these companies. It's something that definitely needs to be looked at.

I mean, you look at the price of groceries and then if you look in the news or whatever, you'll see some of these grocery chains and so on are making record profits. So if they were just jacking up the price of groceries to compensate for the high price of fuel, they'd still make the same profit, but they're making record profits because they're obviously taking more than simply the additional cost of fuel and expenses. They're using it as an opportunity to gouge even more.

So we're here fighting over tax on people, saying people can't afford their groceries, and we're not even thinking about the fact of, well where are they getting the groceries from, and how much are they charging – is that even reasonable costs?

So these are things I just put out there, that it's not just about taxes, and big corporations also need to be held accountable.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Seeing no further speakers, shall the resolution carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

AN HON. MEMBER: Division.

CHAIR: Division has been called.

I summon in all Members.

Division

CHAIR: Are the House Leaders ready?

Order, please!

All those in favour of the resolution, please stand.

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

CHAIR: All those not in favour or against the resolution, please stand.

CLERK: David Brazil, Barry Petten, Paul Dinn, Craig Pardy, Tony Wakeham, Chris Tibbs, Loyola O'Driscoll, Lloyd Parrott, Joedy Wall, Pleaman Forsey, Jeff Dwyer, Eddie Joyce, Paul Lane.

Chair, the ayes: 20; the nays: 13.

CHAIR: Order, please!

I declare the resolution carried.

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act." (Bill 60)

CLERK (Barnes): Clause 1.

CHAIR: Shall clause 1 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

CLERK: Clause 2.

CHAIR: Shall clause 2 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, clause 2 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.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

CLERK: An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act.

CHAIR: Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, title carried.

CHAIR: Shall I report the resolution and Bill 60 carried without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

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

CHAIR: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Mr. Chair, I move, seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader, that the Committee rise and report the resolution and Bill 60.

CHAIR: The motion is that the Committee rise and report the resolution and Bill 60.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

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

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

When shall the report be received?

S. CROCKER: Now.

SPEAKER: Now.

On motion, report received and adopted.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that the resolution be now read a first time.

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the resolution be now read a first time.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

The motion is carried.

CLERK: That it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the imposition of taxes on carbon products.

On motion, resolution read a first time.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that this resolution be now read a second time.

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the resolution be now read a second time.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

The motion is carried.

CLERK: That it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the imposition of taxes on carbon products.

On motion, resolution read a second time.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, for leave to introduce a bill entitled, An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act, Bill 60, and I further move that the bill be now read a first time.

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the Government House Leader shall have leave to introduce a bill, Bill 60, and that the said bill now be read a first time.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

Motion, that the hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act," carried. (Bill 60)

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act. (Bill 60)

On motion, Bill 60 read a first time.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader, that Bill 60 be now read a second time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act. (Bill 60)

On motion, Bill 60 read a second time.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Bill 60 be now read a third time.

SPEAKER: It is moved that Bill 60 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 Revenue Administration Act. (Bill 60)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Revenue Administration Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 60)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

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