



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FORTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Volume XLVIII

THIRD SESSION

Number 47A

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Perry Trimper, MHA

Monday

December 3, 2018
(Night Sitting)

The House resumed at 6 p.m.

CHAIR (Parsons): Order, please!

Is the Government House Leader ready?

We are now resuming the debate on the resolution and the related bill, Bill 44.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: Yes, I thought you were going to say the beautiful District of Cape St. Francis, Madam Chair.

It gives me great privilege to get up and to be able to talk. Again, it's a bill that we can all talk about, and it gives us a wide range to speak about a lot of different things, as speakers have done here already today.

I suppose I'm new to the climate-change world – not that I'm new to it, but you learn more and more every day about it. We see all these different scenes on TV where you see the ice flows and huge chunks of ice falling in, and we look at what's happening around the world today when it comes to our climate.

I had an experience, actually, this weekend in my own district, where I was out on the wharf in Flatrock talking to a couple of fisherman. They were saying that these are the highest seas that they've ever seen in the town, and we were looking at where the waves are coming up to – and, actually, I sent some pictures off to Small Crafts Harbours this morning because there's some pavement coming up.

There were experienced fishermen that were telling me that they've never seen this before, so for anybody to say climate change is not a factor and rising sea levels are not a factor – we see it everyday. We've seen it in the last couple of weeks. We saw what happened out on the White Rose, and we saw what happened – I spoke to people, also, on different rigs out there. They've never seen anything like it.

We're living in world where it seems like the climate has a huge effect. We're seeing floods. We're seeing – when it comes to typhoons and waves and everything else, and the disaster that

it's doing. This is a real topic, and what we pump into our air and what we pump into the atmosphere has a huge effect on it. I believe that. I'm not President Trump, who doesn't believe in it, but I do believe in it.

My problem with this whole bill is that I want to know what the results are going to be. The extra tax that people are going to pay – and you can say whatever you want – but it is money that people are going to have pay on – their gas tax is going to be relieved. Now, this tax is another 4 cents a litre that they will have to pay no matter what. What are we going to get for that?

Now, if you had a plan over there and said this is what we're going to do with this extra \$62 million of revenue that is going to come in to our coffers, this is how we are combat climate change, this is how we're going to combat and make sure that the carbon and emissions don't go into the air and we're going to get things done, but that's not part of this bill. This bill tells us that you're going to take the money and put it into general revenue, and that's wrong, because we should be taking this money and doing different things with it.

I noticed that there are a lot of – education is a huge factor, and I know someone mentioned today about wood burning and different efficiencies. I know, in my own home, that I've done things to reduce my light bill. I put a heat pump in there, and it cut down on the amount of energy that I'm going to use, and it's saving me a few dollars, by the way. There are all kinds of different things we can do to make sure that we use less energy.

There are also things we can do in transportation. We can talk about how we travel. What incentives are we giving people to use public transit? Maybe that's a way to take cars off the road. We look at what we burn out in Holyrood – and I can remember the conversation one time about Holyrood, and it's equivalent of 300,000 cars a day, what's burning out in Holyrood, and what is that doing to our – those are things that we have to look – there are different ways that we can make sure that people are educated and people are aware of what we're doing to the climate.

I'd say today people are more in tune than what they were when I was a younger person and coming along. I'll give an example now, also. You talk about educating people. I remember first when my children were in school and they'd start coming home talking about recycling, and I never recycled before, but today I do recycle. I recycle everything I can get. Actually, last week I brought some cans, bottles and that out to the Green Depot out on Torbat Road, and I set up an account for my two grandchildren. They're only 16, 18 months old, and last week I went over \$200 in that account. That's really, really good. I've never done that before. If we educate everybody and teach them how to do things and how to make smart choices and what we can do to improve our climate – it's very, very important.

This tax that you're bringing in, there's no plan in place. There's no plan here to show the people in this province that the extra revenue you're going to bring in from this extra tax – and you can say what you want; it is an extra tax – what you're going to do with it. How are you going to combat it? What is this revenue going to do to make sure our emissions are lower? How are you spending the money to make sure that people in this province, and our children and our grandchildren, are going to live in a place where we don't need to worry about the ocean rising?

This is what this bill is about. This is what we're saying over here on this side. We're not against climate change. We're not against saying that yes, it is a factor. It's a huge factor that – our whole society is changing. Like I said earlier, I spoke to fishermen that have been on the water all their lives, and they've never seen the water so high as they saw this weekend.

There are a lot of things that are changing. All we have to do is watch the news. Every night there's a disaster somewhere in the world. I've been around for a good few years, but I've never seen anything like it. It's a factor when we talked about all the fires in California. It's a factor that you look at all the disasters all over the world with mudslides and everything else. What are we doing with this extra revenue? That's my problem. That's what I want to see. I want to know what we're doing with this money. How are we combatting what's happened around

us in the world? There's no doubt it's about the future of our families and the future of who we are as a province.

I know the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment got up and he said we didn't introduce 300 new taxes, but what you did –

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. K. PARSONS: You're right, you're correct and I'll correct the statement now, and I know you'll clap for this one too, Member for Bonavista. You increased them. You increased them all and you added 50 new ones. That's the actual fact.

There were 300 fees. When you went down through your 2016 budget, you went line for line for line and said let's increase that, let's increase this, let's increase this. Every bit of revenue that was coming in that people in this province were paying taxes, whether it was fees for your moose licence, whether it was the fee to register your car, whatever it was, you increased them. There were 300 fees there that you increased and then you added 50 more. Now, that's the fact, and I'm sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment will get up and say you're right.

I know the Member for Bonavista is shaking his head over there, saying you're right; I know you are. So, those were new taxes, and this is another tax. It's a burden. People don't mind paying taxes on different things if there's a result but there's absolutely no result with this. You're not showing people how you're going to take the extra money that they got to spend on another tax, a new tax, and what are the results – what are you going to do? What's your plan?

This is just to say, listen, give us another \$62 million, we'll throw it into general revenue and we'll spend it the way we see. That's not what people want. I think it would be more understanding for people if they said okay, this is \$62 million we're going to take from you and here's what we're going to do with it. Here's how we're going to make climate and our emissions – here's how we're going to make our future for our children and our grandchildren so that they don't need to worry about what's happening around the world.

We have to change; everybody in this world has to change. But what you're doing is just charging another tax. This is just another tax on the people of the province that really can't afford any more taxes.

Our economy today, it seems like its rising a little bit as the price of oil – you might disagree with this one, but the oil industry is a key factor in how our economy works in Newfoundland and Labrador. You all know that now that you're in government. You didn't know it three years ago, but you do know it today, that it plays a huge factor in what the price of oil is and how it affects what revenues government takes in and how they can do their expenditures.

When we look at the things that we're doing as a province when it comes to climate change – and I think that it'll start right off the bat; it's just to get people more aware, more aware of carpooling, more aware of what we're doing, how we're burning things and how it's going into the atmosphere. We've done a great job with waste management and stuff like that. I can remember years ago there were dumps everywhere. You drive all over and you'll see a dump in every community. That stuff is good; that's good for our environment. We did a great job on that. But we need to do something. If we're going to take \$62 million –

CHAIR: Order, please!

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

MR. K. PARSONS: – out of our economy, we want to show the people what we're going to do with it.

Thank you.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Bonavista.

MR. KING: Thank you, Madam Chair.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. KING: Yes, I'd certainly like to give leave to my friend from Cape St. Francis. It was an interesting speech, to say the least. I'm sure, given this is a money bill, we'll have more

opportunities to get up and have 10 minutes of say, and all that sort of stuff.

I find it interesting when they talk about raising taxes, raising fees. When you leave a province with a \$2.7 billion deficit, when you leave a province, a government, two weeks before Christmas, in a place where you can't pay your employees, that is the legacy of your government and make no wonder you had to increase taxes and fees, because of the fiscal mess that you left us after 12 years. It's absolutely shocking and disgusting, Madam Chair.

Imagine now, two weeks before Christmas, not going to meet payroll. The public service of this province would not be able to pay for children's presents under their tree, to have a nice family dinner. That's what they left us. It's absolutely disgraceful and they should be ashamed of themselves. That's what foolishness and nonsense they're getting on with.

You talk about climate change, it frustrates me to no end, because you see the group of people like Andrew Scheer and his cronies on the cover of *Maclean's Magazine* called *The resistance*, denying climate change is happening. I could tell you in the District of Bonavista the last two weeks we've had so much wind and bad weather, rising shorelines that the sea fences of Bonavista –

MR. K. PARSONS: Rising sea levels; the shorelines stay the same.

MR. KING: Oh, sorry. Thanks to my friend from Cape St. Francis – sorry, rising sea levels – that sea walls have been damaged very, very badly in Bonavista and around the surrounding areas. That is proof that climate change is happening.

I moved home four years ago. I tell this to people all the time. I can't remember it ever being this windy in this area. Now, it has always been windy on the Bonavista Peninsula, but the level of wind and storms that we get now are directly related to climate change.

For their buddy in Ottawa, Andrew Scheer, and his cronies, Doug Ford and the rests of them there – Jason Kenney on the cover of *Maclean's*

Magazine saying that they're the resistance. Resistance for what? Flooding our shorelines, causing more damage, ruining our environment for generations, for our children, our grandchildren. We have to take action on climate change. If we don't do it today, the future for our kids and grandchildren is not going to be too bright. They're subscribing to the Donald Trump-style of climate change. It doesn't exist. I mean, come on b'ys.

We have a made-in-Newfoundland plan to tackle climate change. This is not a federal government coming in and saying we're going give you this; here's what you got to do. We worked with industry, we worked with stakeholders, we developed a plan with our friends in Labrador – our Indigenous communities – developed this plan. They say: Oh, you didn't have a plan.

I have a document here, about 10 pages long of research, of how we approached this and what we did. It's absolutely ridiculous the nonsense that they get on with saying that we don't have a plan about anything. The proof in the pudding that they didn't have a plan – there's a \$2.7-billion deficit that they left us. So, when they talk about taxes, I find it's pretty rich.

Back in 2007, Danny Williams then premier, lowered taxes for his rich buddies when he shouldn't have done it. We have \$5 billion of lost tax revenue from Danny Williams. We have \$25 billion of squandered all revenue, thanks to the former PC government. That's not a legacy that I would want to have. Now their legacy is getting up against climate change – a Newfoundland-made plan. So, what do you do?

MR. EDMUNDS: Newfoundland and Labrador plan.

MR. KING: Sorry, Newfoundland and Labrador plan. Thanks, Randy.

So, what do we do? Do we have a federally-imposed carbon tax put on us? What we've done is our research, we worked with industry, we worked with all key stakeholders, we worked with Labrador to come up with this plan and this plan would work best for Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. OSBORNE: A few provinces are suing to try to get out of it.

MR. KING: Exactly. Well, that's part of the resistance that you saw in *Maclean's Magazine*. It's still mindboggling how five middle-aged, white guys can get up and get in front of a camera from *Maclean's* and say: We're the resistance for climate change. That's their buddies in Ottawa. That's their buddies in Alberta and Ontario – Andrew Scheer and the gang. We heard their leader talk about how they're following Andrew Scheer's lead. It certainly sounds like it tonight with the debate, that's for sure.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. KING: It is ridiculous.

MR. OSBORNE: Sheer ridiculous.

MR. KING: Sheer ridiculous, as the Minister of Finance has said.

“Before exemptions, approximately 91 per cent of provincial GHG emissions in 2016 on a National Inventory Report basis ...” – sorry.

“Before exemptions, approximately 91 per cent of provincial GHG emissions in 2016 ... Report (NIR) basis (9.8 MT of a total of 10.8 MT of GHG emissions). This share is the highest among provinces and reflects the fact that the province has a small share of GHG emissions from non-energy” sources “such as agriculture, industrial processes and waste.

“Including exemptions as outlined below, the effective coverage is approximately 76 percent.”

So we are working to get GHG levels down but taking into account our oil industry, our agriculture industry, our forestry sectors, all of those things that are important in the District of Bonavista. Agriculture is big in the district, forestry is big. We don't want to be putting burdens on our key industry stakeholders so that we put them out of business. We work with them.

Muskat Falls, the biggest folly we've ever seen in Newfoundland and Labrador, has actually helped us out a bit on this and we're able to

leverage that to reduce the cost. This is why you're only seeing a moderate increase in what carbon tax you'd have to pay. We're removing the gas tax and putting it back as the carbon pricing.

Madam Chair, when you talk about climate change, I often think about where Newfoundland is going to be in 40, 50, 60 years time.

MR. EDMUNDS: And Labrador.

MR. KING: Well, Newfoundland because we're an Island, I'd say to the Member for Torngat Mountains.

With rising sea levels our coastlines are going to slowly erode, and you're seeing that now. You're seeing it happen in our communities near the ocean.

Rural Newfoundland is built on the fishery and built on the ocean. You see a number of houses that are hugging shorelines and hugging cliffs. If we keep the sea levels rising, what's going to happen to that? We're going to have to make major investments to stabilize our shorelines, to stabilize those houses, to have additional cost.

Madam Chair, climate change is not a fad or it's not this made up thing that Andrew Scheer and his gang want you to believe it is. It's actually affecting the lives of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians right now.

If you look at this summer past, one of the hottest summers we've had on record, weeks without rain, and you see the wildfires in British Columbia or California, all down the Pacific coast, and I was surprised – I was pleasantly surprised that that didn't happen here in Newfoundland and Labrador; yet, my friend from Baie Verte - Green Bay talked about communities and water. He experienced this.

Prior to Milton getting water online from the project that was put in place in 2017, they would have dried up and had no connection. They'd have to connect to Clarenville. This is proof that climate change does exist. We're seeing weather patterns here in Newfoundland and Labrador that we've never seen in our lives.

The Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands, and he can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think he said weather events that you would see once in a 100 years you see now once in 10 years, once in every five years, maybe yearly occurrence. This is what we have to fight. We have to do our part on climate change, and, Madam Chair, I will certainly be supporting this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl North.

MR. LESTER: Well, as I do up my jacket here, I realize that I probably ate too much chicken for supper. But, in saying that, as I was sitting down eating my meal of chicken, I was looking at what the carbon tax is going to have on that meal of chicken, what effect that's going to have.

While I know the fuel for agricultural-produced goods is going to be exempt, my question is: Well, what about the cardboard and the fibre that that box of chicken was in? What about the airfare or the air travel that the eggs have to travel on? What about the cost of feed?

Right now, in Newfoundland and Labrador, we're producing very, very minimal amounts of cereal grains, and a chicken obviously has to eat lot of cereal grain in order to grow and produce. So all of that has to come in through either a truck or a boat, which will be subject to the carbon tax.

What I find, and what I've read, is the way to change people's behaviour is not through punitive measures but incentive. Basically, any form of tax is a punitive measure. This punitive measure is going to affect businesses bottom lines, and, basically, they're going to pass it on down to the consumer.

I know earlier we discussed the effect of the carbon tax on our offshore oil industry. We, as owners, appear not to be taxed but the operator of the site, of the facility, will be subject to the carbon tax. So that's an added expense to that operator. That will come off his bottom line and, therefore, it will affect us negatively when it comes to the royalties.

Madam Chair, currently the majority of oil refineries in North America are approaching the end of their productive life cycle. Most of these oil refineries are located in the Gulf of Mexico or along the Eastern Seaboard. As we all know, the United States is rapidly shifting from oil to shale gas as their hydrocarbon source and there'll be no more need for oil refineries to be built in the States.

This could be a prime opportunity for us as a province to really move into a position of being the oil refinery hub of Eastern North America. But, as my colleagues have said, the profit margin within the oil refinery industry is so, so minimal – less than 2 per cent is what I've read – a carbon tax is going to be prohibitive of oil refineries establishing here in our province.

Why do we have to accept everything that comes from Ottawa? Why can't we stand on our own, stand as independents, stand as five other provinces have stood up? Over half of the population in Canada is now on record as objecting to the carbon tax in the form of a legal action. Why can't we, as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, stand up and realize, look, on the end of the whole supply chain, on the end of the food chain, we're going to be subject to this increased cost of living. There's no way around it. We still import a large portion of our food. We import just about all our goods that we rely on to conduct our activities, furnish our homes and communicate. All this will have a buried portion of carbon tax within it.

People say: oh, well, it's only 25 cents on a tank of gas. Well, guess what? There are families and individuals in our province today that do not have 25 cents in their pocket to spare. This is going to go right across their whole lifestyle. It's right across their whole living. So 25 cents here, 25 cents there.

Right now we have people that aren't able to afford groceries. We have people – and not (inaudible). It's an increasing segment of our population all the time. So how are we going to expect to load on more of a financial burden on the people of our province?

We, as parliamentarians and as elected Members, have to stand up and say, look, our people are suffering; our economy is in a very

low state. Yes, it is largely due to commodity prices, but we have to stand up for our people and say, look, we cannot afford any more hands in our pocket pulling taxes out. Yes, it's a federal government program, but guess what? We also elect federal government representatives. Where are their positions on this?

In reference to climate change – and no disrespect to anybody else here – but I would say that my career and my occupation prior to and still while –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order, please!

Can we keep the noise levels down?

MR. LESTER: – I'm an MHA, being a farmer –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order, please!

MR. LESTER: – I've seen huge changes in climate change, and what has happened is bad weather has gotten worse. We're seeing more of an extreme wind. I know on our farm last year we clocked on our wind meter 168 kilometres an hour. Myself and my family and my wife, we basically watched all our greenhouses disappear into the wind. That has never happened before.

So we see those types of things increasing. Yes, we are able to produce a little bit more heat-loving crops like pumpkins and squash and corn, but because our patterns of weather have changed such and are no longer predictable, even though our climate has warmed up, we could still get that killer frost or that windstorm or rainstorm that will totally devastate our crops. As most of us know, we still produce so, so minimal amount.

I'd like to point out the situation that occurred there last week with the romaine lettuce recall. So there was no romaine lettuce available in basically all of North America, but what I also noticed was on our shelves in Newfoundland and Labrador there was also no lettuce available, and that's because we are the last people in the

whole of North America to get food. Everybody else gobbled up all the other lettuce prior to it reaching Newfoundland and Labrador.

As it goes to our fisheries –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR: Order, please!

Can I kindly ask all Members to keep the noise levels down, as the Chair is having trouble hearing the speaker?

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl North.

MR. LESTER: In reference to my colleague from Cape St. Francis talking of sea levels and high seas, that's something I'm hearing, too. I have a lot of associates and people who I do business with that are involved in the offshore, and they were basically communicating with their family members last week in those high seas on almost a minute basis because what they were experiencing out there were seas of magnitude, even far greater than those that sunk the Ocean Ranger so many years ago.

Another story I also heard, and still kind of get a little bit upset over it, is a couple of years ago there was a polar bear that was swimming around the base of Hibernia. Now, what in the heck is a polar bear doing out in the middle of the ocean? He's out there looking for a piece of ice. And guess what? There's no more ice. The ice comes down quickly and melts quickly; yet, we're seeing more icebergs. We're seeing ice go up through Placentia Bay. We're seeing icebergs coming around the tip, going up through Placentia Bay; hardly ever heard before. So that's something we haven't looked with the Grieg project, but I guess we'll have to deal with that, too.

As I said, tax is punitive. Tax is always a disincentive for consumers to spend money.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's regressive.

MR. LESTER: It's regressive. We're trying to promote people spending money. We're trying to promote and expand the economy. God knows, we need it.

What do we have, 17,000 people leave our province in the past 18 months. Those are people that all of our taxpayers' dollars paid to educate. They're people that should be contributing to our tax base, but because of tax, they've had to leave, because the cost of living here is more expensive than other jurisdictions. Now, our carbon tax is just going to increase that.

The reality is, yes, we do need to address climate change, but we cannot address climate change by further putting a burden on the people of our province. Collecting money is not going to change corporate direction unless it is profitable for them. As long as they can pass that tax cost on to the consumer, they're going to carry on business as usual.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Order, please!

The Chair recognises the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I wouldn't normally get up a second time, but I have to get up and address some of the issues that my hon. friend from the beautiful District of Cape St. Francis had in his few comments, and that was around we have no plan for the revenue that's going to be taken in under this carbon pricing, which is absolutely, categorically not true.

Because I tell you, yes, the money is going into general revenue, but what we failed to mention, of course, is that as part of this agreement, we've negotiated with the federal government an \$89.4 million, which is a joint federal-provincial investment over four years, for greenhouse gas reduction projects through the Low Carbon Economy Leadership Fund, and 50 per cent of that – \$44.7 million – is provincial. Now, I don't know where that's coming from, other than general revenue.

We've committed, Madam Chair, to significant funds to address greenhouse gas emission

projects. So to get up and say we're taking in \$62 million – by the way, it's only a net, I think, of \$17 million this year – to get up and say we have no plan to spend that money is not true. We have a plan, and we've negotiated that plan with the federal government through the Low Carbon Economy Leadership Fund; \$44.7 million that comes out of our general revenue. We don't have a money tree out there for the Low Carbon Leadership Fund; it doesn't come out of that. It comes out of general revenue.

Not only that, we've also, through the Investing in Canada infrastructure plan, we have over \$300 million in federal funding for green infrastructure under the Investing in Canada fund, \$136 million of which will be invested in climate change mitigation projects over the next 10 years. Now, that's \$136 million from the federal government. We're not getting that for nothing. We have to ante up our share, as well. Any projects that we do with municipalities under this fund or other entities, there's a federal portion, there's a provincial portion and there's a municipal portion.

So, Madam Chair, we have to come up with – we don't know how much money that will be at this point, but we have to pay our share, to pay our way. So to get up and say we have no plan for the revenue that's going to come through carbon pricing is not true. It's absolutely not true, because we have to pay our way. We are prepared to pay our way, and it's because we were able to negotiate these agreements with the federal government, we are going to pay our way. But we're going to pay it at the least impact on the taxpayers of this province – least impact. I'll say it again, I'll say it again, if we didn't go with the Newfoundland and Labrador carbon pricing plan we would be paying, the people of this province would be paying four times, four times more than they're paying under this plan.

So, to say that we haven't made a good plan here, I think it's fabulous that we are moving forward with a plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and we're doing it in a very responsible way and a very, I guess, economic way for our people. Not only the people of this province but certainly the industries that are producing the greenhouse gases.

When you talk about big industry, Madam Chair, I cannot sit down because I may not get another chance during this session of the House, but last Tuesday in Labrador West we saw an announcement that's going to be good for the people of Wabush, good for the people of Labrador City, good for the people of Labrador and good for the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LETTO: Madam Chair, our Premier was there, along with the Minister of Natural Resources and myself and a few others, and we were very happy to partner with the Tacora on that day to announce the reopening of Scully Mine.

Now, we know, Madam Chair, that's going to have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions as well, but they're very happy to move forward. They're very pleased with the plan that we have in place so that they can – they're working already towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Madam Chair, it was a great day. It was a fantastic day. The people of Wabush were quite pleased and the employees from around the region. They held a job fair, if you want to call it or an information session, that night at the Arts and Culture Centre that seats almost 400 people. They had to turn people away. They had to turn people away, Madam Chair, so there's lots of interest in that facility.

We are a region that we know mining. We have people in that region that are well-trained, well-equipped to move into the mining industry in Wabush, so we're very pleased with that. We've worked, and the department, I must say, during my time there as parliamentary secretary, the people in the department worked very hard to bring us to that event on Tuesday, to get it across the finish line.

They raised over \$335 million; that's \$335 million that's going to be invested into the economy. They're buying new equipment, new trucks, new shovels, drills and they will be in production, Madam Chair, in June 2019. So if that's not good news for this province, I don't know what is. It certainly gives me great pleasure to stand in my place here today and to

be able to announce that and to say that we've been part of the process.

I remember the first meeting that I had in January 2016 with some of the people of this company, but there were other companies involved. It's been a lot of ups and downs since then. There were times when we certainly were doubtful whether we would get this across the finish line, but working together and being persistent – and I want to thank the people of Tacora. I want to thank the people involved with Tacora for their persistence in moving forward and raising the money, raising \$335 million to get Scully Mine back in operation so we can have good paying jobs for the people of Wabush, for the people of Labrador and for the people of this province.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MS. ROGERS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I am happy to stand and speak to Bill 44, and this bill would amend – it's an Act to Amend the Management of Greenhouse Gas Act and the Revenue Administration Act. What we're talking about is a tool, this basically is a tool to deal with the issue of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

Newfoundland and Labrador is part of the global community. We're also part of Canada, and as good citizens of Canada and good citizens of the global community, that we, too, must do our part. It's a whole new area for many people, and I think we have to look at how we talk about this. The word tax may not really be an accurate description of what needs to be done, what we all need to do to play our part.

My colleague from St. John's East - Quidi Vidi, we've been talking about that, and in other provinces they talk about carbon pricing; that it's not all about tax. We all have to do our role and we all have to play our part, but, basically, really what we should be doing is looking at polluter pays. This bill is looking at a carbon tax

in terms of the use of gas and diesel, and then also we're looking at greenhouse gas emitters in terms of on an industrial level.

I have a few issues. I believe, really, that again what we must see this as is as a tool that should be a tool and part of an overall climate change policy. And that this isn't the only tool that we have, but it's part of that toolbox. I believe what we have before us today really shows a weakness; it shows a weakness in terms of really, really reducing emissions in Newfoundland and Labrador. The goal is 6 per cent, then 2 per cent, then 2 per cent that will get us to 12 per cent, while really Canada had made a commitment of up to 30 per cent in the Paris agreement. We're not getting anywhere near that, and already we know we are behind that plan and we are behind those commitments.

The federal government talks about climate change, and they have, and they did before the Liberal government, the Trudeau government, were talking about climate change is a very issue. Is an issue that we have to be on top of, that we have to take extraordinary measures, because the issue of climate change has extraordinary ramifications for everybody, for people in Newfoundland and Labrador – and for people in Newfoundland and Labrador it's hard for us to really worry a whole lot about pollution, because we seem to have lots of clean air. We have lots of wind. We have a huge coastline with water. We have lots of freshwater. We have a lot of water in our ocean that surrounds the Island, and then as well as Labrador, when we talk about Labrador, the Big Land, and the pristine land of Labrador. So it's hard for us, as a people, as a province, as a community of people, to think about what is our role in climate change.

A lot of people feel, well, we're not polluters. We don't have heavy industry. We don't have traffic jams. It's not like traffic jams on the 401. We don't have crowding. We don't have real dense population where you can see the difference. But what we do see is we see the effects of climate change. We see more frequent storms. We see bigger storms, windier, more damage, more flooding. So we are affected by climate change, and we also have a role to play, because we have some pretty big emitters in our

province, and part of that has been part of industrial progress, so to speak.

When we look at Muskrat Falls, when we look at Holyrood – unfortunately, Muskrat Falls is a real problem. It wasn't the project that was going to do the province well as it had been presented by the previous administration.

We do have a role to play and we have a commitment to make, but what we have to make sure is that it's appropriate who pays and how they pay. When we look at something like Alberta – do you know, Alberta, for instance, in the plan that government has produced to us, are changing the gas tax to a carbon tax and they're not including home heating oil as a taxable item or a carbon pricing item. That, I believe, is probably not a really smart move.

I understand why government doesn't want to burden our people with extra taxes. We have a lot of seniors who are just at their limit, some seniors who can't even afford to heat their homes. We have more and more seniors going to food banks. What Alberta has done, for instance, around this issue is they make sure that people who are low-income earners, people who live in rural communities – and we have a lot of people living in our rural communities who depend on vehicles, on personal transportation, because we also don't have good infrastructure for public transportation. People are absolutely reliant on their cars. Oftentimes, we see people commuting back and forth to work and there's one person in their car. They can't rely on a public transit system if you live outside of St. John's or Mount Pearl. We are very, very dependent on our vehicles.

In Alberta, they give a rebate; people in Alberta get a cheque back. They get about 60 per cent – this is a high percentage. About 60 per cent of households in Alberta are eligible for a full or partial rebate of the province's carbon levy.

A household in Alberta with two adults and two children would be eligible to receive a rebate of up to \$540 a year in 2018. That's what they were getting back; more than the estimated cost of a levy for this size of a household. They're getting a cheque back. If they are going to pay a carbon tax on home heating, they're going to get some of that money back. If they're paying it on gas,

they're going to get some of that money back. Those who can afford to pay more are often those who use more as well. They can pay, they can do their part and, again, we all have to do our part.

We look at the federal government talking about this as a really important issue, yet when we look at what government has presented to us, it doesn't show it in that light. I'm concerned a little bit about, really, what does it mean for our larger emitters? What's that going to look like in terms of the greenhouse gas reduction fund?

For those who are not meeting the targets of reduction by 6 per cent, they'll have to pay a penalty and that penalty will go into a greenhouse gas reduction fund. We don't really see any real direction about what will be the priorities for that fund. We know that there's going to be an advisory committee that will be struck to administer that fund. We don't know who's going to be on that advisory committee –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CHAIR (Warr): Order, please!

MS. ROGERS: – and how they will establish their priorities, how that money will be spent and allocated. I'm hoping there will be community members who are part of that advisory committee, not just industry members or government Members. We need to have some details on those types of issues.

The exemption of home heating oil from the carbon tax is very unusual. What you want to happen is you want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and there's really nothing in this bill that encourages individuals to reduce their use, that encourages industry to reduce its use. That's the goal. If there is not enough incentive to do that, and also to use any money by those who are not achieving their goals – because people can achieve their goals and, if they don't, they will pay a penalty. If there's not enough incentive, then, to turn that penalty around to make a difference and get in individuals' lives and in industry, then this is not a strong bill.

CHAIR: Thank you.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi.

MS. MICHAEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'm happy to follow up on my colleague in speaking to Bill 44. It's an interesting bill; it is An Act to Amend the Management of Greenhouse Gas Act and the Revenue Administration Act. I think it's because of that last piece that we are having this debate in the format that we are under a resolution, and holding the debate in the Committee of the Whole.

I say it's an interesting act because with those two names, *Management of Greenhouse Gas Act* and the *Revenue Administration Act*, it makes one believe that everything in it has to do with greenhouse gas. So that if you open it and you read and you see a section that talks about the carbon tax, then you think that's really geared to reducing greenhouse gas because it's in this bill.

In a sense, this bill – I'll be polite and call it a bit of a smokescreen. I've thought of other terms for it but I thought I just might be on the edge of what I might be able to say in the House. I'll call it a smokescreen because, in actual fact, it is hiding the reality of what government is doing in this bill.

I am going to concentrate on the section under carbon tax. It truly is – I guess, the phrase I would use for what we need to be doing in the province, what we need to be doing in the country with regard to trying to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is look at carbon pricing. What is the price we need to put on carbon in all the different ways that we use carbon? What is the price we need to put on it in order to make sure that we are reducing emissions?

This bill is not sophisticated like that. That is not what this bill is about. When I look at the section that's called carbon tax, what we are talking about is basically an ordinary revenue tax for this government to get from consumers, to go into the general revenue fund to spend on

programs. That's what it is. It's not a carbon tax in the sense that most governments are meaning when they say carbon tax.

The government has been very straightforward about that – I heard the Member for Labrador West – very straightforward about what this is about. It's about getting money from people. The interesting thing is what they are doing. In 2016, this government put a very punitive tax on gas. It was a gas tax; it was 16.5 cents a litre for gas every time you filled your vehicle up. People were really upset over that tax; it was a temporary gas tax.

Government started the process of bringing it down over the last couple of years and now what they're doing is they're replacing that gas tax, that was a temporary gas tax, and doing it again and now calling it a carbon tax. As I said, the revenue is going to go straight into the general revenue fund, our Consolidated Revenue Fund to be used for government expenses.

It's not going to be used as one would expect, to go into the remission of greenhouse gas. It's not going to go into programs that will help with the remission of greenhouse gases. So it is not a carbon tax in the meaning of carbon tax, it really isn't. So that's why I call the bill what it is, the bill is a smokescreen.

So because of that, because it isn't what they call in Alberta, for example, a carbon levy, because it really isn't something that's being put in place in order to deal with greenhouse gases, government is not going to see this tax the way it is viewed, for example, in Alberta. My colleague from St. John's Centre just made reference to that.

In Alberta, they're being very honest. They're saying it is a carbon levy and they're saying the levy is there in order to help them reduce greenhouse gases, but they also recognize that an awful lot of people can't afford that levy. So there actually is going to be a partial rebate of the levy, not more than – 60 per cent of the families in Alberta are going to be eligible for that partial rebate. There, they are being quite upfront with people about what that carbon levy is about, why it's being put in place and doing education of people around that in order to try to have people lessen their use of gas in an effort to

deal with greenhouse gases. This government is doing none of that.

In this bill, we have no plans at all; except a plan in the carbon tax to get revenue for government, because it is not being creative about revenue, the revenue issues in this province. They are not dealing with the issues around revenue and the fact that our revenue is so dependent on the price of oil, for example. It has been saying for three years it's going to diversify the economy.

Well, first of all, putting a gas tax on in 2016, bringing it down for two years and putting it back on with a new name is not much diversification of the economy, I have to tell you. The people whose money is coming out of their pocket is not seeing it as diversification of the economy. If that's the brightest they can come up with when it comes to revenue to run this province, we're really in trouble, and we are in trouble.

When I look at this bill, even with the part of the bill that deals with the management of greenhouse gases, and which deals with the companies, with the offshore and with the industry we have there, that is our largest greenhouse gas promoter – not promoter but producer. When we look at that, and we look at what they have in place, still there are no plans.

We're being told by the government we're going to have a reduction by 6 per cent of the emissions in the first year. In the next year we're going to have a reduction by 8 per cent. In the third year 10 per cent, and by 2021, I think it is, 12 per cent. But there's nothing at all to show how they've worked with the companies to come up with those numbers to make them realistic for the companies. There's nothing to show what companies' plans are going to be to get there.

They tell us what they're going to do if companies don't make it and there'll be a penalty, or they can buy back their usage, or the fact they have created more emission than they should have, but none of that is really going to get us to a point where we're going to have a reduction in greenhouse gases. They haven't shown us how they're going to do it.

I'm amazed they think they can put this out here and expect us to vote for it. I'm amazed they think that people don't see through it. I'm shocked; I'm shocked that we do not have a plan from this government as other provinces have – not all, I know that – but some have really good plans in place and this government doesn't have a plan. Once again, we have things being given to us without a solid plan.

So here we have government saying the emissions will be reduced by its participation in the federal programs, but we have no idea what their involvement in the federal-provincial low carbon fund is going to be. We have no idea what their – we have some idea; I shouldn't say none – of what their involvement in the federal infrastructure program is going to be, but this government – we're not meeting our targets now. We haven't been meeting our targets.

Instead of them looking at, how can we increase our reduction on emissions? They're going for the bare minimum. They're saying, okay, we're taking part in the federal-provincial plan and that's going to cause some remissions, but we're doing this carbon tax and it has nothing to do with it because we don't have to have that tax have anything to do with lowering emissions because we're taking part in the federal-provincial plans, which are minimal.

So this is shocking. It's shocking that they're putting this out and expecting us to accept it as a plan; that they're putting it out and expecting us to say yes to it. In saying no, we're not saying no to the desire to have a change in the emissions, in our greenhouse gases. We're saying no to a document that is not going to do what they're saying it's going to do.

So that's why, Mr. Chair, I don't think either one of us is going to be able to support this.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the Opposition House Leader.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm glad to rise to speak to Bill 44. I listened to my colleague speaking to the actual content of

Bill 44 and some of the issues she identified with the actual bill.

We had a briefing the other day and recognize the staff that took us through the various aspects of Bill 44, and Bill 41 as well. I think the finance component of it as well, we went through it.

I think my colleague just mentioned in regard to the environment and protecting the environment and programs we put in place to deal with it; climate change plans and those initiatives that many provinces have and we have in this province. A carbon tax is one component of that climate plan or climate management plan. We've seen it in other jurisdictions as well.

Today in Question Period, the minister indicated – I asked did they update the provincial climate change plan. I think his answer was, no, but after bringing in the carbon tax we're going to update the plan then. That would seem not to be consistent with managing the climate and climate change because, overall, a climate change plan has many aspects to it. One could be carbon reduction, another could be polluter pays.

It could be looking at various things in our society like water, refits of public buildings, infrastructure building, and a whole wide range of components that could factor into an overall climate management plan. As I said, carbon tax, if we agreed to go with one, could be one component to that. The logic behind a tax or a carbon tax or any tax, I guess, in this case is to try and inhibit what changed your particular behaviour.

This plan we are told is a hybrid plan, meaning two components to it. One is related to a direct tax on usage. An example being gas. So it's applied to combusted fossil fuels across the economy, and there are some exemptions in regard to various industries. I think there's agriculture, aquaculture and a few others, recognizing the challenges that may be with the extra cost with such a plan, with carbon tax. So that's one side of the hybrid carbon-pricing system that we're talking about here.

The other is tied to performance standards system, and that's for onshore and offshore large industrial facilities and also large-scale

electricity generation, which would look at bringing out the Holyrood plant here, which we know has significant, serious emissions. I think it's maybe 1.4 millions tons of greenhouse gas emissions, which is really significant when you think about it. I remember in speaking in our discussion in the briefing we had, we talked about offshore installations, and I think most of them were over 500,000 tons of emissions, in regard to what they were emitting. So it's significant.

The second component of the hybrid is that performance standards system, and what this is proposing is that it would look at those emitters that were greater than 25,000 tons, annually. You would be automatically in for land based and offshore, based on that amount of emissions.

We know when the Greenhouse Gas Act was originally brought in, there were five industrial sites on land that were identified, and that time, there was no indication that the federal government was going to mandate – I don't think at that particular time – that a carbon tax had to be in by January 1, 2019. And I remember, at the time, asking the minister about that. What happens if the federal government comes along and says: You need to modify or change what you're doing. And the answer was: Well, we'll deal with that.

But at that particular time, there were five on-land industrial sites that were brought in under that and plan was to monitor them for two years in regards to their emissions and see where they would be. But at that time, it was only on land. It didn't recognize, at that time, the offshore. What this does is amend it's – or proposed to amend it, and bring those installation sites offshore in the oil and gas sector into this actual hybrid model that's been proposed, which looks at over 25,000 tons, annually, and you're automatically in.

Now, for those that are out there, too, that are between 15,000 and 25,000 and are being monitored, and they determine that they would like to be part of this proposed hybrid system, they can, I guess, request to be brought in under that. They would assess, I guess, whether paying a tax just on carbon, straight tax on carbon for all the operations they do, it would be more beneficial to be part of the emissions from 15,000 to 25,000, and be part of the hybrid

system related to performance standard. So that's the two systems we're talking about.

Now, we have some discussions about the amount of money, not on the performance standards piece, but on the general tax on gas. We've heard that, I think, we're taking 4 cents off and we're putting 4.2 cents on, so really it's still a tax. And there is some information too, I know in the information we had it was told to us that, I think, it was around \$61.8 million that was going to be collected.

Now, there are other figures that was in Question Period today, the minister alluded to the fact that it was \$1 million, and then there was a figure of \$4 million and there was a figure of \$14 million or \$16 million on an annual basis that was going into the general revenues. And we had discussions on, well, how does money collected on gas from all of us who purchase gasoline and that goes into a general revenue fund, how is that going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? What's the direct link between that collection of \$61 million or whatever it is, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions? How is the targets set? How do we monitor it? How do we ensure that if we're charging a tax, that it's having the effect of supposedly changing behaviour and reducing your greenhouse gas emissions?

You would assume that would be done through the transportation sector, which is I think probably, if not the first, the second biggest emitter of greenhouse gas emissions in Newfoundland and Labrador, with the offshore maybe moving ahead in regards to those emissions. So it's a behaviour modification that you're hoping it attacks; 4.2 cents taxes going to adjust.

There's no evidence of that, and that's some of the issues we have with the proposal. We're taking money out of people's pockets from an economic point of view and from an income disposal point of view, and there's no direct link to how we're reaching the 30 per cent reduction by 2030, which I understand is still not reaching the Paris accord levels that were the last time – Kyoto was before that, the Paris accord was the most recent one, and my understanding is this still does not reach that target. I understand the province hasn't been reaching its target.

So, that's a concern, and specifically in regard to what we're doing, the actions we're taking, how annually, year after year starting in 2019 to 2030, we're seeing specific reduction in greenhouse gases, whether from a human consumption point of view in terms of gasoline, whether we're seeing – there's no threshold or annual review to show us we're meeting those targets. That's an issue.

The other side of it in regards to polluter pays does have a recognition of those that contribute, and if we can monitor and in some way incentivize the reduction in greenhouse gases there. There's some legitimacy to that as well, I would say. From that as well when you look at not reaching their performance targets that they pay into a fund, which somehow would assist in regard to those facilities taking technology or doing things to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.

I do note that there was a mention on that side of the two-tier system, that over a period of time there would be percentage reductions over a number of years. But those percentage reductions, only 10 per cent of that reduction of that percentage in a particular year needs to be done on that particular site. Over and above that 10 per cent, actually they could buy credits to offset increase or non-modification of the greenhouse gas emissions.

That would mean if you had the funds to do it, you could pay the bill after you did your 10 per cent reduction of whether it's 2 per cent, 4 per cent, 6 per cent or 8 or 12 per cent as you proceed through the years. So you could pay off that actual cost if you just did your 10 per cent on site.

I asked questions today in Question Period in regard to the targets, the performance limits. There's a whole range of regulatory framework that's required for this that we're neither close to or have reviewed or have seen here in the House on what it is and what it reflects. So that's of an utmost concern.

I do look forward to further questions, certainly posing questions to the minister as we go through and having further discussion in the hours ahead on this important piece of legislation.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I just wanted to stand to just identify a few more issues with this particular bill and, again, my concern around our participation in the whole area of climate change and our action around climate change and then the issue of greenhouse gas emissions.

We're a little bit concerned about, really, when we do see the greenhouse gas fund that will be established in a number of provinces, that money is going specifically – like when we look at Alberta and what Alberta is doing, that money is going specifically to help individuals, to help public sector and public sector buildings, to help industry to make their buildings more energy efficient, to ensure that everyone is doing as much as they possibly can to reduce their emissions. That's really what you want to be happening. Otherwise, there's really no reason for any of this.

We really don't know what government's plan is there. We see that a good chunk of money is going to go right into general revenue. Then, with the greenhouse gas fund I believe none of that money will be spent. It will accumulate for five years before the money is spent. I may be wrong. That's my understanding of it.

We really don't have any clear indication and identification of government's role in helping the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, helping working families, helping seniors make their homes more energy efficient, making their transportation more climate friendly, making our public buildings, our schools, our hospitals, our public offices – making those more climate friendly and more energy efficient.

When you think of all the money that has been spent on Muskrat Falls and then the fact that we couldn't decommission Holyrood because of the delay in Muskrat Falls coming online, then some insecurities, really, about how reliable that source of energy might be – Holyrood is still up and running and may be for quite a while. There

is nothing to really encourage people to get off oil as a means of heating their homes because nobody is going to be charged. There's going to be no levy, there's going to be no pricing and there's going to be tax on home heating oil.

We know that there are methods to ensure those who are more economically vulnerable can have a rebate if they're using oil to heat, or programs to help get them off oil – which is what we really want to see – and to use that Muskrat Falls power. We need everybody to be using that power as much as possible. That's power that we are generating ourselves through Muskrat Falls. We have to find ways of using that power as much as we possibly can because we're going to be paying for it anyway.

I'm concerned about that, Mr. Chair, in terms of terms of, really, what is the plan to make sure that our households are as modern and energy efficient as they possibly can be? What is the plan to ensure that our public buildings are as modern, energy efficient and climate friendly as they possibly can be? What is the plan to ensure that our industries and those large emitters are as energy efficient and climate friendly as they possible can be, that they are as modern as they possible can be?

The Minister of Natural Resources told us that Hibernia is one of the most climate-friendly oil operations in a number of places in the world. Their emissions are lower than in a number of places in the world. That's kind of interesting. Our concern, too, is who will be regulating? If it's the C-NLOPB regulating offshore industry, it's clear once again how important it is that we have an independent safety and environmental authority to deal with that issue.

We know that self-regulation doesn't work. We need that. When we see what happened with the Husky oil spill, how important it is for us to have a strong safety and environmental authority to be dealing with the offshore industry in the area of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. I think that becomes clearer and clearer, particularly as we see that industry expand. I think that's a no-brainer, Mr. Chair.

Basically, that's all I wanted to add to this. Government should be really saying that they are proud to be doing a really good,

comprehensive plan with tools that are effective to help us become modern, to help us become more climate friendly. This seems like it's just tweaking around at the edges, that it's a very modest approach.

I think that's unfortunate because, as we know, when we see what's happening with climate change, it takes bold steps. Also, we need to make sure that we are taking care of people who are living in rural communities, who don't have access to public transportation and to seniors and to people who are really on low incomes.

We have to make sure they are covered, but we also have to make sure that everyone, particularly higher income earners and industry, play a significant role in addressing this issue. I believe, Mr. Chair, this is really a weak approach. It's not robust, it's not bold and daring and it's not modern. It's not as good as it possibly could be.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have to get up and address some of the issues that were just raised by the Member for St. John's Centre.

First of all, she talks about: We have no plan and there's nothing in this plan to address seniors and low-income earners and so on. I've only been in this role for two or three weeks, so I was not much involved in negotiating this plan, but I will say there were members of our department that did a fine job of negotiating this plan.

I don't know how the Member for St. John's Centre feels, but I can get up here today and I can say that that I am very proud of the plan that's been negotiated for carbon pricing by the people in the department and ministers before me in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment. I'm very proud and so are they.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LETTO: Mr. Chair, we talk about low income and seniors. Well, that's why we fought

to have the home heating fuel exempt, because the majority of the people that use home heating fuel are our seniors, our low-income earners and so on. That's why the previous ministers involved in this insisted that would be exempt from carbon pricing. To get up in this House and say that we have done nothing to protect our seniors is just ludicrous.

She also mentioned about the greenhouse gas reduction fund and how the money is going to go into that and that there's no plan on how we're going to spend that, Mr. Chair. That's why we're going to put in place an advisory committee of five to seven people that will provide recommendations to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment and to the department on how that money should be spent.

We've also made it quite clear that those five to seven people are going to be well qualified. For instance, there's going to be at least two members who will have climate change expertise, that's two members that really know what they're talking about when it comes to climate change; there's going to be two members with industrial expertise, so that avenue is covered; and there will be at least one from a government executive. Mr. Chair, that's five to seven people, so we will have an advisory committee in place that will advise the department and the minister, whoever he or she may be at the time, on how that money should be spent and what projects we should be looking at to make sure that we do meet our targets.

Our targets, between now and 2030, is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 650,000 tons – 650,000 tons between now and 2030. We know it's ambitious, but I can guarantee you this government is committed to reaching those targets, and we will. We will because we will put in place a plan that people can buy in to and people can support. It's not a willy-nilly plan as being suggested on the other side, that we have no plan how to spend this money.

As I said before, we have the low economy fund that's going to invest \$89.4 million into this province over the next four years; \$44.7 million of which is our money. I don't know where they expect us to get that money if it doesn't come out of general revenue. So when you say we're putting money from the carbon pricing into

general revenue and it's being lost in the shuffle, well it's not being lost, Mr. Chair, because we've committed to spending \$44.7 million over the next four years on greenhouse gas emission projects.

As well, we've also signed an agreement with the federal government that will see \$136 million through the Investing Canada Infrastructure Fund over the next 10 years in projects that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Now, \$136 million, as I said, from the feds which means we have to pay our fair share as well.

Mr. Chair, we're making progress already. The Minister of Transportation and Works just reminded me of the fact that any new buildings we're building today are much more efficient than something we would have built 20, 30 years ago. We strive to lead criteria. We strive to put in place energy efficient buildings that will. If they're not using the energy, that reduces greenhouse gases.

So to get up in this House and say we have no plan and we have no idea how we're going to meet our targets, well, Mr. Chair, I beg to differ, because we do have a plan and we do have commitment. Unless you have a plan and you don't have commitment, then the plan is not worth the paper it's written on, but we have both. We have a plan, we have commitment, and we will live up to that commitment.

As has been said in this House already today, greenhouse gas emissions have to be curbed. We have to cut them down. That's why we said to industry, we don't want to put you out of business. That wouldn't solve anything. We don't want to put you out of business. You have to remain competitive.

In the meantime, you need to do your share for climate change and cut down on greenhouse gas emissions. That's why we've set targets for them, and these targets will be closely monitored. These targets will mean by 2022 that they have, any large industry – and I have a list of them here – who've bought into this – and, by the way, they fully support it.

It's companies like IOC, Rio Tinto, Vale, Voisey's Bay, the plant in Long Harbour, Tata

Steel, Tacora Resources – the new on the block, but they will be subjected to it as well, and they bought in – Hibernia, Terra Nova, White Rose, Hebron, North Atlantic refinery, Kruger pulp and paper, the Holyrood terminal, Holyrood diesel and Hardwoods Gas. So all these big industries, Mr. Chair, have bought in and they are very supportive of what we're doing. They're very supportive.

I'll now read: From an industry perspective, while no company wants to be regulated, the large industrial facilities based in this province have indicated they understand that greenhouse gas emissions need to be reduced and they understand they need to contribute to this effort. I reiterate again, all the large industrial facilities in our province have indicated a clear desire for the province to regulate greenhouse gas emissions through the *Management of Greenhouse Gas Act* rather than by the federal government.

The companies also appreciate that the province is working towards establishing a mechanism, such as the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, to assist in seizing new opportunities. It's phasing in the system to 2022, which will allow them to plan to minimize any capital cost they may incur.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should table it.

MR. LETTO: Mr. Chair, I can table it, not a problem, because that's what they're saying. That's what they're telling us. I'm not making this up. This is what they're telling us. Now, I don't know if you've talked to them; I don't know if you have.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. LETTO: So what are they telling you? What's your plan? Do they agree with your plan? I ask again, do they agree with your plan? Do they agree with the Opposition plan?

Well, they've agreed to our plan, Mr. Chair, and they've bought into it because they think it's the right thing to do. It's the right thing to do, to address climate change. It's the right thing to do to clean up our greenhouse gas emissions, and it's the right thing to do to be responsible for that and they're willing to do their fair share.

They're willing to do it. It's not something that's being imposed on them. It's something they came to the table with and they're very pleased with. They congratulate us for reaching a plan that meets their needs –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LETTO: – that allows them to stay competitive, and to allow the people of our province to not be, as they say, taxed. I say, not taxed, Mr. Chair.

I'd say the people of this province are willing to do their share to clean up this environment that for so long has been ignored, not only by us but everybody in this world.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm glad to take an opportunity now to speak to Bill 44.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIR: Order, please!

MR. LANE: As this is a money bill, I do have some things I want to say about Bill 44. I'll say that the next time I stand, but as this is a money bill, I want to talk about something else which is likewise important; very important to me at least.

I want to reference the Minister of Finance. When he was up speaking earlier today he was talking about the Muskrat Falls Project. I just want to say to the Minister of Finance, I share in everything of what you said. I think any Member who voted for the project that's in this House, if they were to be honest with themselves, I don't know why everybody isn't outraged, but I'm outraged. I think anyone who voted for this project should be outraged of the way that this project has gone and all the revelations that are coming out of the Muskrat Falls inquiry.

You listen to it day after day, and all you're doing is you're shaking your head and you're saying, how could this possibly be? Which is why, when I just heard the Minister of Municipal Affairs talking about climate change and he was talking about his panel of experts and so on, I say that I don't know if I'll ever look at – if anyone ever says to me again about, I have a panel of experts or we have experts looking into the things or whatever, I don't know if I'll ever really trust the word expert again.

No disrespect to the minister in what you're saying, but in terms of all the experts that were talking about Muskrat Falls and Manitoba Hydro and Nalcor and all these so-called experts, and to see where we are today is absolutely shocking. It really is shocking. So if you want to use the word deceived, lied to, hoodwinked, another good one, I'd say all of the above. That's how I feel at least. That's how I feel, and nothing would make me happier – and we'll see how the inquiry comes out. Nothing would make me happier on a personal level than to see someone doing the perp walk on NTV to be honest with you. That's how I feel. That's how angry I am about everything that's gone on.

Now, whether it will lead to anything like that, who knows, because at this point in time there doesn't seem to be necessarily any proof of anything criminal that went on, but there was definitely incompetence of the greatest order from what I can see. I have to say that.

And that's why I say to the Minister of Natural Resources, and I've been presenting petitions and talking about Nalcor and holding Nalcor accountable, that's why even before the Inquiry started, I had written the Minister of Justice and the Premier and raised it in this House, about putting appropriate resources in place to be watching this Inquiry that's going on, because the Inquiry can only make recommendations, talk about what happened, what the conclusions were, make recommendations so that it doesn't happen again. The Commissioner can't say: I think you should lay charges against this person, this person and this person.

The Inquiry can't say: I think you should sue this company, this company and this company. The Inquiry can't say: I think this person should

be fired, this person should be fired and this person should be fired. It doesn't have the ability to do that, which is why I believe then, and I still believe today, that there should be somebody assigned, if you will, from the RCMP commercial crime, to be viewing all this as it's going through and if they see anything that warrants a criminal investigation, to get it started ASAP. To have somebody from a legal perspective looking at what's going on and saying if they see anything untoward happening here that we should be suing people or suing companies or cancelling contracts or whatever the case might be, that we do it. Having someone from a HR perspective that's going to recommend the handing out of pink slips because, definitely, at the very least, there needs to be a few pink slips handed out, from what I have been watching and listening and gathering from all that's gone on. I can't believe they're not being held to account.

It also comes into effect, when we talk about Nalcor and the imbedded contractors issue and changes to the *Energy Corporation Act*, which I've raised in this House many times, and we did get a change in the spring. I said at that time that change wasn't going to cut it. The Privacy Commissioner said that change isn't going to cut it

I was told in the last sitting of the House, when we come back here in the fall, hopefully, there'll be another change to the *Energy Corporation Act* once they've had a chance to look at it. Now, I don't see anything here, maybe there's something coming. I don't think it's going to come now, but I say to the minister we need changes to the *Energy Corporation Act* to hold those people accountable and to make sure we can get the information that the public deserves to receive. That it goes through the Privacy Commissioner and let him determine whether or not the information should be released. Not somebody at Nalcor because they've been running roughshod and doing whatever the heck they want. They have been given the total autonomy to do whatever they want and look at where it has gotten us.

Imagine, hiding information and reports and risk reports and lowballing costs, and, supposedly, allegedly, not letting the deputy minister know, not letting the minister know, not letting the

premier of the day know, not letting anybody know, just deciding on their own to do it. That's what's been said. I'm only going on what's coming out in the Inquiry. I can't believe it. I absolutely can't believe it. It comes down to accountability and we have to hold people accountable.

We can go back even before the Inquiry, I've referenced this before, nothing ever became of it. DarkNL, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's one and only mandate really is to keep the lights on. That's their job, to keep the lights on, and we had DarkNL and the Liberty report comes out and they said they didn't do basic maintenance. They didn't do maintenance at Holyrood and we were all left in the dark.

There was little to no explanation from the CEO of Nalcor at the time and nothing happened. Nobody was fired that I'm aware of. They should've been; somebody should have been. I'm sure the power engineers up in Holyrood didn't decide: Let's not do the maintenance, let's let her go. I don't believe that for a second, Mr. Chair. There's no way that happened. Somebody had to knowingly direct people not to do maintenance or say we're not giving you money to do maintenance. We can't afford to do maintenance. We're going to roll the dice and hope that we can get Muskrat Falls before the lights go out. That was never investigated.

I wrote the Auditor General, the former Auditor General, met with the Auditor General, you think I could get him to look into that. No way, couldn't seem to make any progress there. Even though we couldn't keep the lights on, all the executive all got their corporate bonuses. They all got the corporate bonuses, every one of them. Do you know why, Mr. Chair? We had a good safety record. Imagine, we had a good safety record.

Now, there's nothing wrong with having a good safety record. I'm a safety practitioner, that's what I did before getting in here. I applaud them on their safety efforts, but their mandate is to provide power and they couldn't do it because they couldn't do maintenance and everyone gets full bonuses because we had a good safety record. Answers never came out to why that could be.

Before the former board of Nalcor quite en masse, they got upset about some comments made in the 2016 budget by the then minister of Finance, and they all quit. And a story came out in CBC shortly after that, where the former chair of the board was quoted on CBC, or an email that they ATIPPed or something, say: Load up the guns, get the information, former chair was in a conflict of interest. I know she was in a conflict of interest. Dig out the files.

How come nobody investigated that? I wrote the Auditor General. Still, no, nothing happened there. But he was saying that persons in a conflict of interest on the board, and he knew about it. So he must've knew about it a year before and the year before that and said nothing. Why is that? Because they were all buddies, everyone was happy go lucky then so I'm going to forget about the conflict. Now, that I'm mad at you, I'm going to tell the whole world to dig out the information to get the dirt on you, you're in a conflict. So how many other people could possibly have been in a conflict that he wasn't mad at? I don't know. These are questions; can't get answers.

Two years ago I wrote the Auditor General, this one apparently had been investigated, and I've talked to the new Auditor General and, hopefully, something's coming out very soon, I'm hoping, about our current CEO's contracts, and how it's okay to retain 5 per cent share in Fortis while being the CEO of Nalcor. How is that okay? I can't understand how that could not be a conflict. Well, we're waiting on that one. Hopefully, we get an answer on that one. But there are so many things that have happened without answers and we need accountability at Nalcor.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island.

MR. BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's indeed an honour again to stand, as we always do in this House, to debate legislation in an open process here, and there's always some open discussion and maybe even some disagreeing on the interpretation and the intent and possibly even the outcomes.

I would hope the intent here is that the outcomes are for the betterment of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, presently and into the future here, and that's what I'm confident we all strive to. We all may have different approaches towards it, we all may have different concepts of policy and we may have different interpretations of the best way to do that, but we set out to do that.

I'm confident nobody here would argue that we are all cognizant and supportive of protecting our environment, and that we have a responsibility to do that. How we do that in the best interests of our society, and particularly the future, is, again, up for debate.

Part of what we're debating here is around Bill 44, which is the *Management of Greenhouse Gas Act* and the *Revenue Administration Act* combined. There are two components here that are very important; one leads into the other because it's a revenue-generating process. The bigger picture here is not necessarily the amounts of money being generated, it's how we're going to use that money to better our society from an environmental point of view, and how that impact is going to have a positive reinforcer and a positive influence on ensuring that individuals and, particularly, industries, are cognizant and are good corporate citizens around protecting our environment, and how do we do that.

I've got some reservations here. I've heard my colleagues on both sides here talk about the impacts it may have. I know we've sometimes gone different angles and used an opportunity to bring other things directly or indirectly connected to it, but I want to concentrate more on the particulars of we're generating monies, and I know any time you generate money that comes out of the pockets of taxpayers, it's going to have an adverse effect on them. Sometimes it's a necessary evil because the outcomes of how you're going to invest that money are much more beneficial to the masses in our society and has a long-term positive effect.

Right now, I'm not confident of that. I'm not confident of that mainly because of the old cliché: The devil is in the detail. How that money is going to be used in the best interests of ensuring that we've got a process, a plan, a go-

forward mechanism that ensures our environment is protected, either if it's through an educational process we're going to use, if it's through hiring of staff that may be necessary to police, a certain process. It may be investing in industry that ensures the toxins that are released in our society or the way that we're being a danger to our environment is addressed, and that we look at a long-term solution to being able to deal with those types of situations.

When we look at the act itself, it's a fairly intensive act. It covers off a multitude of sectors and responsibilities in Newfoundland and Labrador and all those who are involved, and the responsibilities and, in some cases, the privileges that they have as part of the legislative process here. We have an opportunity to do something here that's significant.

I know it's become somewhat of a contentious issue here about provinces getting to a point where it was going to be enforced or regulated on them a particular process that may or may not have been in the best interests of that particular province. That's based on the types of emissions, the carbon footprint that is seen as a negative in that particular province. In some cases, I think – in defence of our province – the positive things that have been done, from an industry point of view and from a government point of view, to look at being an environmentally friendly province, particularly, around heating access to getting away from our carbons, using our natural energy levels here, particularly around safe energies and clean energies.

We've come a long way to be able to do that over the last number of decades to get to a point where we now are industry leaders in how we're going to do it in safe, clean energy. The issue here is it doesn't seem to look like we're getting our due justice here from looking at how we address the costing of moving forward on some of the other things.

I know we talked about the made-at-home plan and I support that process. I support the fact that Newfoundland and Labrador should have been and, no doubt, was allowed to put together a made-at-home carbon tax process here. The problem I have is that it is a carbon tax which

means the first thing it's a tax, it's going to be a burden on people.

Again, I'll go back to what I started with – and I still say it – sometimes you must pay revenues, you must pay out of your pocket to ensure you get a better lifestyle, that things are protected and this type of thing. The question I have here, and the question that we've been asking on this side, is: How is this going to roll out? What financial impact is it going to have on people directly? We already know now we're just switching in and out from a tax part of it, from a gas tax and we can go from there. That's not my contentious issue.

The gas tax was there and we've had a multitude of sessions in this House debating the impact that's had on our society and the impact it's had financially on people and that it was to be an eliminated tax. Really, where we are now is that's just going to swap out for the carbon tax. That's fine if that's the move of the government who understand they have to generate revenue and that's their home-based, home-developed, home-configured plan here.

The issue again becomes what exactly are we going to get and how are the people going to benefit from the monies that are generated from that tax? If you said to somebody tomorrow: You pay an extra half a per cent tax that will go directly into health care and it's put in a separate approach to increasing access to health care, I think most people would be supportive of that. As would people be supportive of protecting our environment to ensure industries can be sustainable, to ensure that our natural resource industries, fishing industry, the forest industry: all relevant things like that would be sustainable and the potential for expansion.

We need to know. I think the general public would like to know and I would like to know. This is being sincere. I'd like to know. If we're going to generate \$50 million or \$60 million, how is that going to be used, so at the end of the day I can feel confident that my kids and my grandkids, and the province that we're all very committed to, is going to be better off from an environmental point of view. They're the issues that we have here.

When we talk about some of the big emitters of toxins here, particularly around greenhouse gases, we only have less than a dozen of what would be considered comparable large ones. We know Holyrood; we've had this conversation, we've had this debate. One of the big issues around everything that's moved forward in the last decade has been around how do you address the emissions out of Holyrood? One of the issues is: Get rid of Holyrood, but you need to have an alternative process for that. Right now, that's what's being worked on under green energy as part of that.

When you look at the largest ones we have here: Holyrood, Come By Chance, the mines in Labrador City, Voisey's Bay, Corner Brook Pulp and Paper – Schefferville in Quebec is one-tenth or less than one-tenth that we have in –

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. BRAZIL: No, you're right. Sorry, I apologize. You're right. It's just in quotes here in Quebec, but that's ours, too. I apologize. Even the Hardwoods gas turbine in Mount Pearl – they all have impacts.

I can see why industry would want to be able to minimize the greenhouse gases that are being emitted. There's no doubt they would want to work with the government to find either partnership solutions or investments. I have no qualms, if somebody can apply for incentives from government to increase the way that they prevent greenhouse gases from being emitted in our society, I think – I mean we have a responsibility to do that and taxing people to do that is not necessarily the wrong thing. The wrong thing is people not understanding and being comfortable that the money that's going to be collected is going to go somewhere that are going to benefit them.

If this plan outlined that, I'd have no qualms in saying, you know what, as somebody who was very supportive of the environment, I would support that. As somebody who is very supportive of industry, but realizing industry has a responsibility, and we have a responsibility as government sometimes to give incentives or partner with them to ensure that they have the ability to do their part without jeopardizing their industry itself. I think we have that ability here.

The issue becomes, from our side of the House here, outlining exactly how we're going to do that, what the incentives are going to be, how we're going to benefit that. It just can't be a cash cow for industry; it can't be that we're going to take this money and spend it over here, yet it was identified for this to solve a long-term solution.

What we're asking here is an outline of exactly how this investment – this tax that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are going to invest back into the government, and entrust the government to spend with industry, to improve our environment, how that's going to be done.

Mr. Chair, I just wanted to note that we need a plan here so people can feel comfortable that their money is going to be spent in the right manner.

CHAIR: Thank you.

MR. BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's a pleasure to stand and speak again, and this time I will speak to the actual bill.

The last time I just took advantage of it being a money bill to vent a little on Nalcor and so on, but anyway. And by the way, despite what some people think, I really believe that – even when I was talking of Nalcor – I really believe that everybody knows a lot of what I was saying, we might not totally agree on everything, but I'm sure we all have concerns about Nalcor and stuff that's gone on in the inquiry. I know we do a hundred per cent, all of us, so I will say that.

Mr. Chair, in terms of Bill 44, my original thought on it was – I was torn, but my original thought was I had the inclination in one sense not to support it based on the tax at the pumps. That's really my biggest issue with it, because I really do believe, as I said earlier, that there are big polluters out there. We all have to do our part to deal with that. Governments have to do

their part, not just in Newfoundland, not just in Canada, but around the world. Unfortunately, some of the biggest polluters in the world are taking little to no action, which is a shame.

Some people would argue, what's the point of us doing anything here when the real big polluters on the other side of the hemisphere are doing nothing and they're the ones that are really causing most of the problems? Well, I guess it's got to start somewhere, and we have to hold to our beliefs in the environment and do our part. I believe most people, I can't say everybody, but I think the majority of people in our province understand and support us doing the right thing for the environment, obviously within reason and realizing costs and so on.

I have no issue with establishing targets for industries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. That all makes sense, and there has to be either incentives and/or penalties to make that happen. I think that's really the intent, and that's good. I would support that, because we all realize climate change is very real and, as I said earlier today, we've seen it here in Newfoundland and Labrador first-hand. Nobody in this province can say there's no such thing as climate change.

Now, we did have a former mayor of a certain city, apparently he didn't believe in climate change at one point. Maybe he's changed his mind, but, for the most part, we all believe that climate change is real. We've seen it first-hand with the flooding and different things we've had happen across the province when we've had significant storm events, and they seem to be getting more frequent all the time. As a matter of fact, it was only last week, I believe, that out in the Port aux Basques area, I saw some pictures there of a roof blown right off a building and significant damage from high winds and so on. So it is a real issue, no doubt.

Again, my concern is not about setting targets for polluters. I think polluters are the people we should be going after, the big polluters. I also don't have an issue with, in general, I suppose, in creating incentives and encouraging the general public to do their little part to help the environment and so on where they can, but charging a gas tax at the pump, that's where I have an issue. That's really the only part that I

have an issue, because I don't believe it's going to make a difference.

If I thought by charging that four cents at the pump, that that was going to significantly lower our greenhouse gas levels and so on, or it was going to somehow help bring an end to fossil fuels and everyone would be driving around in electric cars and all that great stuff, it would be wonderful. But the reality of it is, is that fossil fuels are not going away. They're not going away any time in the near future, or I'd say even in the mid-term they're not going away. Eventually they will, but I don't suspect – for a long time to come, we'll still be dependent on fossil fuels.

So people are going to drive cars, and as someone said earlier, yeah, when you throw a few cents' tax on gas, yeah, you'll feel it a little bit. It depends on how much and so on, but you do feel it; but, at the end of the day, people have lives. They got to go to work. Kids got to go to school. They got to go to dance class. They're going to have their holidays if they can afford it. They're going to drive around, that's reality, and they're going to burn gas.

I don't think by charging 4.5 cents at the pumps is going to do one thing to change people's habits and people to pause and say, hold on a second now, I'm going to stop using fossil fuels, or I'm going to reduce my use of fossil fuels. It's not going to happen. All that's going to happen is you're going to pay more at the pump and more money will go into government coffers as a tax, which is what it is, and there'll be no difference by doing it. So that's my problem with it. That's the issue I have.

Now, with that said, it sounds like I'm going to vote against it, but, here's the thing – yes, there's a however. The however is this; the however is this is being forced on us by the federal government. It's being forced on us by the federal government. So we really don't have a choice, that's the issue. If we don't vote for this, it's going to be shoved down our throats anyway and probably something worse.

We're told that what we have here is sort of a made in Newfoundland and Labrador solution, if you will. While I might not like the idea of the four cents, if we don't do it the feds are going to

shove something probably worse down our throats anyway. So we really don't have a choice in that regard.

Now, we can talk about the fact that – and I did earlier today – about how other provinces are fighting the federal government in court and all that kind of stuff. I will still maintain, as others have said, I wish we had to have been part of that fight, so to speak. I wish we had to have been more vocal and part of that fight and said, listen, we're signing on to this, too. The federal government needs to find another way as opposed to just taxing the general public for pulling up to the gas pump; but, it doesn't matter. It is what it is. They're going to do it anyway.

The good part, which I didn't realize at the time until the Member for Bay of Islands indicated it, and I guess I'll ask the minister if she speaks or he speaks. There's a #MeToo clause, or whatever you call it, that if the other provinces are successful in their fight against Ottawa on this, then we're not going to be stuck with this while they get off with it. We can opt out of this.

AN HON. MEMBER: True, true.

MR. LANE: That's my understanding. I'm hearing true. So if that's the case, which I didn't realize at the time, to be honest, then I think that offers a protection as well, that we won't be stuck with something that other provinces won't be stuck with.

So, with all that being said, although I don't – again, I don't like the idea of 4.5 cents at the pump. I don't think it's going to make a difference in terms of behaviour or do anything with greenhouse gas emissions. I think the other parts of the plan do make sense.

I do share in what the Member for Bell Island said about it would be nice to know specifically what the money is going to go to, but I suppose in one sense that's no different than any other tax or fee, or even legislation when it's left to the government to draft regulations. We don't really know. You have to trust to the government of the day, whoever it is, to make the appropriate choices with that money as it comes in, and hopefully put it towards good projects that make sense. If not, the Opposition

is there, obviously, to hold them to account in Question Period and other ways.

I guess with all that said, Mr. Chair, considering the points I just made, I will be supporting the bill.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CHAIR: Shall the resolution carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Act And The Revenue Administration Act." (Bill 44)

CLERK: Clause 1.

CHAIR: Shall clause 1 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

CLERK: Clauses 2 through 33 inclusive.

CHAIR: Clauses 2 through 33 inclusive, shall they carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clauses 2 through 33 carried.

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

CHAIR: Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

CLERK: An Act To Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Tax And The Revenue Administration Act.

CHAIR: Shall the long title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, title carried.

CHAIR: Shall I report Bill 44 carried without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

CHAIR: The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee rise and report the resolution and Bill 44.

CHAIR: The motion is that the Committee rise and report the resolution and Bill 44.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise and report Bill 44 carried without amendment, the Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Trimper): The hon. the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay and Chair of the Committee of Ways and Means.

MR. 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.

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

When shall the report be received?

MR. A. PARSONS: Now.

MR. SPEAKER: Now.

On motion, report received and adopted.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that the resolution be now read a first time.

MR. 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?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

The motion is carried.

CLERK: Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows: "That it is expedient to bring in a measure regarding the imposition of a taxes on carbon products."

On motion, resolution read a first time.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that the resolution be now read a second time.

MR. 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?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: I do believe the motion was carried.

The Clerk, please.

CLERK: Second reading of the resolution.

On motion, resolution read a second time.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, for leave to introduce a bill entitled, An Act To Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Act And The Revenue Administration Act, Bill 44, and I further move that the said bill be now read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the hon. the Government House Leader shall have leave to introduce a bill entitled, An Act To Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Act And The Revenue Administration Act, Bill 44, and that the said bill be now read a first time.

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

All those in favour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is still carried.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Act And The Revenue Administration Act," carried. (Bill 44)

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Act And The Revenue Administration Act. (Bill 44)

On motion, Bill 14 read a first time.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that Bill 44 be now read a second time.

MR. 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?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act to Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Act And The Revenue Administration Act. (Bill 44)

On motion, Bill 44 read a second time.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources that Bill 44 be now read a third time.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that Bill 44 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.

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

The motion is carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Act And The Revenue Administration Act. (Bill 44)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Management Of Greenhouse Gas Act And The Revenue Administration Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 44)

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Transportation and Works, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

I heard no nays.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 1:30 o'clock.

Thank you.

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