



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FIFTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

---

Volume L

SECOND SESSION

Number 106A

---

HANSARD

*Speaker: Honourable Derek Bennett, MHA*

Tuesday

March 11, 2025  
(Night Sitting)

The House resumed at 6:30 p.m.

**SPEAKER (Bennett):** Order, please!

Admit visitors.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

**L. DEMPSTER:** Thank you, Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Order 11, second reading of Bill 90, An Act to Amend the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland and Labrador Act, and that's seconded by the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology.

**SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'll start off this evening by thanking the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology and the House Leader on the other side for postponing this bill to right now in order for me to attend to some personal business. It's much appreciated.

Bill 90 is the Atlantic Accord amendments. I would argue that the Atlantic Accord is one of the most crucial documents in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I listened to the minister last week and he did his best to quell any concerns we had and hopefully those concerns are gone, but I think the biggest concern that everyone has had through this process is the power that the federal government – and I'll say it like it is – may or may not still have over our offshore. You know, it's a little ambiguous. It's open to interpretation. I've talked to many proponents, senators, FFAW, all who – I wouldn't say all, but the FFAW are not necessarily on side, as the minister said. There were amendments that they wished they had seen that weren't there and it's a big concern.

Bill 90 is mirror legislation to Bill C-49 which has been given Royal Assent in the federal Parliament. Mirror legislation has also been passed in the Nova Scotia legislature.

Officials noted that the purpose of this bill is to establish joint management, a regulatory system for offshore and renewable energy such as wind, modernize provisions related to oil and gas and it's supposed to confirm that the province has sole jurisdiction over inshore energy development.

For those who have tried to muddle their way through the Atlantic Accord, section 4 clearly says that the Accord supersedes any federal legislation. One would hope that that is the solution to any questions that lie inside of this bill.

From my own thoughts, we understand that it has been changed to the LGIC and the Governor General in Council, federal and provincial, and that both have a level of power for veto and co-operation and all that good stuff, but I'll read some things in this evening. People who know me, when I stand up and speak here, they know that I generally don't do a lot of reading but there are things that I think it's important are read into the record this evening.

My biggest concern, I would argue, is twofold. First off, the message that this may send to proponents inside oil and gas, and I say that for this reason. If I am a developer or if I have an existing development offshore and it's not rock-solid that the federal government can't come in and shut something down or stop something from going forward for environmental reasons, I would be concerned. The concern isn't that we believe that that is what will happen; the concern is the level of investment that may not happen because that belief does lie with some of the proponents out there. That would be the first concern.

The second concern is, regardless of what we say as a province, and we know and we've seen it federally, if we decide that we accept this bill and the federal government

for some reason unbeknownst to anyone in this Legislature – because listen, so we're clear, I believe that this House supports our oil and gas industry –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**L. PARROTT:** I strongly believe we all see importance in it and when we look at the industries in this province, oil and gas has been extremely impactful because of the Atlantic Accord. So when we go to make a change to something as monumental as the Atlantic Accord, we have to make sure as a group of legislators that we're doing it, not only for the right reasons, but that we have all our bases covered.

I'll get back to the concern. It really bothers me and we've seen it. Others opposite may disagree, but I feel strongly that when we were trying to get Bay du Nord approved, the federal minister, Minister Guilbeault, had some very strong words – some very, very strong words. As a matter of fact, the approval for Bay du Nord was delayed specifically because of him. He specifically said, this will be the last one. Those are strong words: This will be the last one.

We know and we all agree, we've seen *Advance 2030*, and we know that while there has been a lack of exploration since 2020, that there's a possibility that more is going to happen over the next little while.

The other thing that this bill does that I think a lot of people don't understand is that when land leases previously were 99 years, it looks like they'll go back to 25, which is a good thing. It will give the ability for offshore entities to co-operate and utilize each other's resources.

To put it in perspective – and this is just an example, I'm not saying that this exists. But let's just say for example one of the proponents offshore has a find of 70 million to 90 million barrels. Well, the reality is, for people who aren't familiar with the oil and gas industry, that's not enough for anyone

to develop. Nobody is going to come and build an FPSO, a GBS or any of those types of things.

This bill will allow them, or the C-NLOPB, it gives them broader powers where the C-NLOPB can allow two entities to work together. So from one offshore field to another. For example, if this find was in proximity to Hebron, then there's a possibility that Hebron could develop that 70 million to 90 million barrels for the other proponent, if they could co-operate, C-NLOPB allows it. The beauty of that would be that most of the environmental regime, everything, the red tape would have already been approved. It's a win.

So when I talk about this tonight and I say some things that scare me, it's not because I don't think there are good components of this. Because from a technical aspect when we sit back and we look at it, we need to understand that this can be very good for our offshore oil and gas. It can allow for the development of offshore wind and it gives us one regulatory board that looks after both.

My concern is, why do we need to tangle wind into the Accord? That is really the first thing. I don't understand why they need to be hand in glove. I don't know why it's not separate legislation that allows us to do that. That would be the first concern.

Secondly to that is the whole idea that the FFAW is on board with this. Well, I would argue that the FFAW is on board as long as there's some kind of a guarantee that it doesn't affect their men and women that operate inside of our fishery. That there's no way that the federal government can shut down any portion of our fishery for environmental reasons, or that any wind turbine that's offshore, whether – I would assume that unlike Nova Scotia, we're not going looking at tidal turbines and stuff. It's more a wind turbine. If it's offshore, it has to be on a GBS; it's the only way it works. Very similar to the way the Hebron rig is out there

and Hibernia and certainly the new West White Rose that's going out.

So these platforms will be mounted on concrete and the fishermen have expressed concerns over lobster grounds and different – and this is closer to inshore conversations. So it's not way offshore. But there are concerns. And listen, we don't have to look too far to see the concerns that the fishermen voiced over oil operations in Jeanne d'Arc Basin. They've said that this has interfered with their traditional cod fishing grounds and stuff so, we have to have concerns, there's no question.

When I read this stuff over, over the last few weeks and the minister was good enough, there was two technical briefings that were offered. There's been some time for people to get up on this and I said, to someone last night, they said, you're not yourself and I said, I have to speak tomorrow on what I would feel and listen, I've spoke in this House very compassionately about a whole lot of different stuff, but I feel that this has implications for our province that I don't think the general public and everyone in this House really understands, if we get it wrong.

If we get it wrong and there's a way for something to be shutdown offshore, or it prohibits us from developing more things offshore and it just gives us a route to green renewable energy, I think it creates trouble. We all know the fiscal situation we're in. I've argued here very heartily that I believe we have to transition to green energy; I believe that with all of my heart, but I also believe that our transition, our silver bullet to find a way to utilize and develop green energy, comes through oil and gas. It comes from our ability to capture clean or the cleanest oils in the world and bring coffers into our province, so we have the financial ability and backbone to develop green energy.

The thought that any project can be stymied, stalled or completely abolished based on nonsensical environmental

reasons from someone up in Ottawa scares me. It concerns me greatly. It gives me – as a matter of fact I will say, unlike most things that have come to the House, I've lost sleep over this. That's a big deal, it really is.

So the bill is going to expand the scope of offshore regulator and also regulate offshore renewable energy development. The name will change from the C-NLOPB to C-NLOER, the Canadian Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Energy Regulator. The offshore regulator will regulate both renewables and non-renewables, so oil and gas and, as an example, wind. Unless there's different technology that we can bring forward.

It will establish a process for offshore wind development, governed by the offshore board under joint management. It will establish a land tenure system for offshore renewable energy, and this includes submerged land licences regime with a call-to-bid process, similar to our non-renewable bid process that we go through; expand environmental protection and occupational health and safety governance of the offshore regulator to renewable energy projects; allow regulations prohibiting an offshore renewable energy project for the issuance of interest in the offshore area as identified as an area for environmental or wildlife conservation protection, that's one part that scares me; establish protocol for oil and gas reserves that have an international border running through them or that run outside the jurisdiction; appoint a regulatory board as the point of consultation with Indigenous communities.

So, you know, if we look at the powers it will give the C-NLOPB, our ability to develop renewables, our ability for offshore operators to work together to find solutions for untapped resources. All of these things are really good, and I'm not going to stand here tonight and say they're not good because they are good and people inside my caucus and I'm sure on the other side, anyone who listened to the minister the

other night, they know that there is good stuff in this bill.

The problem, as identified in the Senate, there was an amendment put into the Senate that was approved by the senators that was voted down in the House of Commons, is the fear of – and again, we know that there has been amendments made to this bill that we're being led to believe will prohibit the blocking. You know, it will take away the powers from the federal government to be able to come and halt these projects. But I'm not all the way there. I'm really not all the way there when someone tells me the federal government doesn't have this authority.

So even if they lose the authority in Legislative ability – and so we're clear, they've always had the authority to do that, regardless of what we say about the Atlantic Accord or other things and what it has given us, if the federal government comes to a government in power today and they say you're shutting this down and we say no, and they say well you're shutting this down or we're not giving you this. They've always had the ability to hold a gun to our head and say: You're going to play ball or you're going to lose stuff. I think everyone inside this room would have the fear.

But when we've got federal ministers and senators talking and speaking out in really harsh language about the offshore and different things, you know, I don't know that we can trust anyone. I'm saying this is not, for me, about a Liberal government or a Conservative government. This, for me, is about the men and women who inhabit this province, who work in our offshore, who fish from our oceans and who will possibly develop wind energy off the Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. It's about the future of them, it's about the future of this province and everyone who lives in it.

It bothers me to no end to think that the federal government may have some authority over it regardless of what stripe –

regardless of what stripe. The Atlantic Accord was fought for long and hard. It was brought in, and we've all reaped the benefits of it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**L. PARROTT:** All you've got to do is look at our you look at our offshore resources right now and the developments that we have, you will quickly understand how important it is. I'm sure others will get up to speak tonight and my plan isn't to give a history lesson on the Atlantic Accord but when the Atlantic Accord came in in 1985 everything changed in this province with regards to the offshore, it changed. We've seen developments, you know from my standpoint, and I am sure from others in this House, we haven't seen as many developments as we'd like. I'm certain of that, actually, and you know we know that there are many more out there.

We're in a world now where tariffs and all of these things are happening, and we really need to think about what we're doing at home. I guess some of the examples I look at is, you know, we talk about LNG, and I get asked by people who I represent all the time. Why can't we get LNG into the houses?

So my honest belief, not as a politician, but as someone who has worked in the industry, do I think that we should be able to develop our LNG offshore? I absolutely do. Do I think that we can utilize LNG to ship to every house in Newfoundland and Labrador? No, I don't. I'm sorry. Our geography is going to make that extremely hard to do but I do believe that we can export our LNG. I do believe and I'll say this, I think part of any MOU that we sign with Quebec for the Churchill Falls deal ought to have included a power corridor, an energy corridor, through Quebec. It should have been part of the negotiations, and it would have given us an ability to ship our oil or LNG out of here.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**L. PARROTT:** So, you know, when we continue to talk about this bill and where we're going, the power to block or halt the project scares me. So when this legislation went through the federal Parliament, there was a significant discussion regarding specific clauses which talked about regulation-making authority which would prohibit oil and gas activity in an environmental or wildlife conservation area. That's fine with me. If it's already deemed a wildlife or conservation area everybody in this House is on board with that.

The concern isn't whether it's already deemed. The concern is what happens if there's an operator in the area and it gets deemed as a wildlife or conservation area after there's someone operating or after exploration has happened and somebody is keen to start a project up, it's pretty much gone. Whether the federal government says it's gone, or the provincial government says it's gone or not, if I am a proponent coming to Newfoundland and I am going to – we're not talking about \$2 million, which is a lot of money. If you go back and you look at what Hebron cost, I think the final cost was somewhere around \$13 billion. So if an investor is coming into this province and that company is going to spend \$13 billion to build any kind of a rig, whether it's an FPSO or a GBS, in this province to employ our people, they've got to have some assurances that it can't get shut down, that they can't be in the middle of a process or they can't be at the start of a process, or they can't be operating.

We just will not attract people to invest in our province if they think – and listen, I think everyone in this House and the minister has said it, I've said, we've had this discussion lots, the previous minister, one of our biggest problems with the development of our offshore, whether it's going to be wind in the future or previously oil and gas and hopefully oil and gas in the future, is the red tape around the environmental approvals

from Ottawa. It's the time it takes from day one to start construction. That has been our biggest problem for the development of our offshore for a very long time. I'm not convinced that this bill doesn't make that worse. It certainly will not excite people to come and invest their money off the shores of Newfoundland and Labrador.

For me, what does the Accord have to do with wind? The legislation is supposed to be about paving the way for the province to manage the nearshore wind energy projects. Again, I'll say, why does it have to go into the Accord – and I bet you the minister has an answer for this later on, but why couldn't it be separate legislation? I understand that this has to be mirror legislation with Ottawa, so I'm not putting this back on the minister. We had no choice but to bring this legislation forward, for the record.

But what I am saying is that why couldn't Ottawa have done it different and where does it leave us as a province? I really struggle with the fact that I believe, and I still do believe, that Ottawa is in the driver's seat with this. There have been amendments made. The minister alluded to it last week and I'm sure, again, sometime this evening he will allude to it. When I get to the point where we're asking questions in Committee, I've got a lot of questions and hopefully he will quell any fears we have, but I'm not convinced right now.

Why is the wind clause even in there? What we're being told is there are no worries, it's perfectly okay because federal and Liberal Cabinets need to agree. All these new powers are subject to clause 7, which gives the province a veto over any such decision made by the federal government. But guess what? The federal government also has a veto.

From my limited time in the Legislature since 2019, I would argue that the federal government would have authority over any veto. If we veto it, they still have the

authority. The federal government would override. You know, I guess for a lack of a word, supersede. Again, I just really don't understand how that works for people in this province.

There are two problems with it. First of all, if you keep reading the rest of section 61, this clause is written from the perspective of the federal government having authority over the act. All of this involves a federal decision, a federal opinion, a federal decision again and a federal regulation. We need to question whether this violates the spirit of the Atlantic Accord by taking away the joint management and making it unilateral management.

The language appears as an initiative of controlling government, exercising its new authority to impose control over the offshore. Secondly, what about our provincial veto? Well, we all know how federal governments work when they want to be bullies, and we've seen it. We know, how they say, play ball or you're going to lose something. As I highlighted a little earlier, that is a major fear of mine. If you don't concede, we're going to block what you're getting. You'll never get what you really want – scary language.

Again, I'm really not trying to play politics with this, but I need to highlight some of the past decisions that were made by the federal Liberals. I would argue it is not preposterous for us to think that the federal government, the federal Liberals, would make a decision that's bad for Newfoundland and Labrador.

It's not preposterous to think that the federal Liberals and Environment Minister Steven Guilbeault might really be anti-oil, and we know that he is. We've seen it. Remember this is the same minister, Steven Guilbeault, who joined Chris Holden in 2001, scaled the CN Tower in the name of Greenpeace and hung a banner on it that read Canada and Bush are climate killers, to protest against oil projects and their impact on climate

change. The same individual is now the Environment minister and it's scary.

You have to remember that this is the same government whose Fisheries minister, Joyce Murray, just two years ago – think about this, it's just two years ago – she shocked, not just our fishing community, but the whole country by calling for commercial fishing to be scaled back so the ocean could become a more effective carbon sink to combat climate change.

Again, I strongly believe that we have to be responsible. I strongly believe in climate change. I strongly believe that we are the stewards of our own environment, but I also know what we have offshore Newfoundland and Labrador can help the world achieve all of those goals. It can help the world achieve those goals better than using oil from dictators and war barons. It can help us help the world by offering a cleaner, greener product while we do transition and for us to risk, possibly, losing that, I struggle – I struggle.

We also know the federal government has been strongly against ocean development and they want, and they've said it, oil to stay right where it is in the ground. Now, in recent times, obviously, the conversation has changed a little. The water on the beans has changed with the election of Donald Trump down south and the whole idea that, perhaps, the country finally sees the fact that we need to become self-sufficient and we ought to. I strongly believe that. I've said that forever. I've said that in this House from 2019 right up until right now.

Listen, I don't think anybody in here understands any better than I do the expenses associated with it, but I believe that the refinery ought to be operating, that we should be processing our own oil and gas and bringing it to market.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**L. PARROTT:** I also know that that's not government's responsibility. I understand that, too, but we're in a situation where none of knows what tomorrow brings now. So I think we need to be worried.

The people that are promoting the legislation – are we going to be so foolish as to tell ourselves that this is only about a few new wind turbines? It's simply not.

So here's the thing. The federal strongarm tactics have worked. Despite the fact that the prime minister and the Premier are both on their way out the door and the vast majority of Canadians no longer support the federal government, we're being told by the Liberals if we don't pass Bill 90, then the nearshore wind projects will not be able to proceed in Newfoundland and Labrador.

I'll tell you what startles me, and I'm going to pick up my phone. If the minister wants a copy of this picture, I can send it to him after. I don't mind that at all. But today, as I was doing a little bit of research, I went online and oddly enough I went on to the federal government's Natural Resources website.

Now, everyone in this room, regardless of what side of the House you're on, should listen to this. On March 11, today, before this legislation is passed, the federal government announced the Offshore Wind Predevelopment Program in Canada. The Offshore Wind Predevelopment Program legislation: Regional assessments of offshore wind development to capitalize on Canada's offshore potential off the coast of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.

This is an announcement that they're making prior to our legislation being passed. If that doesn't give someone a little bit of alarm, then they're not paying attention to what the feds are doing, and the feds certainly aren't paying attention to what we're doing if they don't know this legislation isn't passed. Because it's my

understanding that this has to be passed in order for that to move forward.

The timing of it stinks. I don't know why they'd announce that today. I can give them the benefit of the doubt and say maybe it's in error. But I suspect that they think this is going through regardless. But to say that it doesn't concern me would be wrong. Why would the federal government be as presumptuous to think that little old Newfoundland is going to just toe the rope because? I think it should concern everyone in the House, to be quite frank.

We're also being told that Nova Scotia will jump ahead on offshore wind and get all the action. So for people in the House that don't know, Nova Scotia is already ahead of us when it comes to wind energy. They're not going to jump ahead of anything. They've got major wind developments over there, they've got subsea tidal, wave generation and they have offshore wind.

So we need to act fast. I'm not suggesting for a second that we don't act fast. What I am saying is that it's far more important for us to be prudent and right than it is for us to be fast. We've been fast before and we've failed at it. Listen, sometimes the first person across the finish line is the first loser and we need to make sure that we're doing this the right way.

Nova Scotia signed off on this legislation, so it's one of the things that's been said to me so many times, well, why would Nova Scotia sign off on this legislation if there are any bogeymen hiding away? The answer is quite simple. Sable Island is pretty much defunct; it's gone away. They don't have offshore oil and gas the way we do. It won't affect them in the same manner. Now, I'm not saying that Nova Scotia doesn't have some offshore resource, but nowhere in the magnitude of what Newfoundland and Labrador does. You look at our projects, we have Hebron, Hibernia, Terra Nova, West White Rose, the Bay du Nord project hopefully coming online.

The other thing I would say is people might be interested to know that Nova Scotia, who was very quick to say okay to this legislation, has pulled back from fast-tracking its nearshore wind sector, despite the new legislation. They've slowed everything down. And I think we can learn a lesson from that. As I said, it's important that we are right.

So I'm sure that I'll get a rise from the other side when I read this in, but it warrants some conversation, I guess. When Ottawa's mirror legislation Bill 90 was passed in the House of Commons and the Senate, our province's Liberal MPs voted in favour. I'm not surprised by that. I don't remember seeing a time when they put people before their party, but I will say this, Premier Peckford, who was instrumental in the implementation of the Atlantic Accord wrote a letter and in his letter, just an excerpt, it says: "Let me go on the record and say I am disgusted to learn of your support for a bill which violates the key tenants of the Atlantic Accord." "I wish to record my utter disgust concerning your recorded vote in the House of Commons for Bill C-49 on May 2, 2024. In doing so, you have betrayed your Province."

Premier Peckford was upset about the new clause that gives the federal Cabinet the sole power to block offshore development. Again, the minister – and listen, he has really tried to quell that fear, but I still don't know that the wording or the legislation is strong enough. I can go back to section 4 of the Atlantic Accord which says that Atlantic Accord overrules any legislation, but it doesn't overrule how an industry feels about operating in our province. It doesn't overrule how investors feel about investing in a province and it doesn't overrule how long we as a province could be held up in court because the federal government challenges it.

Any challenge to any offshore development or any existing activity offshore that's now would be detrimental not only to the

province and the people and the employees, it would be detrimental to how we deliver health care, how we upgrade our roads, our schools, all our infrastructure, our provincial coffers and it would certainly drive any future proponents and perhaps not just oil and gas, perhaps people in the mining industry, if they come in and they see that Newfoundland can't manage its own resources, perhaps they won't want to come here and work here.

These people come in – and listen, I've heard the minister say it, I've heard the Finance Minister say it, I've heard lots of people say it and it's a conversation we're having about Gull Island development. We don't need to worry about it; it's not our money. I get that. We talk here about what it cost to develop Muskrat Falls; it's not our money. But I can tell you right now ExxonMobil, Equinor, Shell Oil, any of these companies – Cenovus – they are not coming in with their money and it's not our money.

So what does that mean? It means, now, we lose our offshore because they need to feel so confident when they come here that their investment is sound, that it is developable, that they're not going to get pushback from the federal government, that their provincial partners, because I would suggest that's what we will be, got their backs. I'm not so certain that this piece of legislation allows us to do that. I really am not.

We can say we think and we've said that. I've talked to people who say, no, I think we're good now because of the changes in the bill. Now we talk about the LGIC and that covers us, but nobody can say that for sure. Again, I will go back and say and nobody can guarantee that that does not mean the federal government will not take us to court and fight over a piece of legislation that they interpret differently. If they have the authority or the perceived authority – the perceived authority is very important because, again, I will go back.

These companies make investments that are in the billions of dollars.

If you really want to think about what this means, if you go look at what any of these proponents have done, they have all found a way to get greener. They've all found away to get cleaner. As a matter of fact, I would argue that the bulk of them will probably be the same companies that are knocking on our doors to develop wind energy offshore. That's where they're going. We know that but why are they going to come and do wind energy offshore if they're concerned about this bill, if they're concerned about their investment?

I know, as an everyday person, when I invest money in anything, I want to know first and foremost that it's safe. I want to know that nobody else has the ability to hurt or squander or ruin my investment. I think any company or any prudent businessman in the world would want the same. This bill leaves that level of question where it may leave us without proponents that come to our province to invest in our offshore and our province.

I need you to listen very closely to this. When this was debated in the Senate, there was an amendment that was passed and that was voted down in the House of Commons. Let's listen to the words of Senator Iris Petten about the legislation. Senators, I guess, we're not going to say that they have affiliation but Senator Petten was appointed by the Liberals, so I'll make an assumption that she's a Liberal senator: "Clause 28 and its reference in clause 7 are essential to Canada's achievement of an internationally negotiated commitment to protect 30% of Canada's oceans by 2030."

This is something that we need to really be clear on, and I'm just going to throw a number out there and I can tell you it's not accurate because we have more than 30 per cent on our side. We can say 50 per cent is in British Columbia and 50 per cent is in Newfoundland, which isn't accurate

because we got the Northwest Passage, which, again, we're not going to see any oil development up there. If we take into consideration British Columbia and Newfoundland, that's it, that's our offshore, 30 per cent of our waters are to be protected.

Now, you imagine what that means to our offshore oil and gas or any wind segment. That's right from the words of Senator Petten. Listen carefully to her state of priority: She has expressed no desire whatsoever about advancing our offshore oil and gas economy. She wants to subordinate the offshore oil and gas industry to marine protection and she believes clause 28 is the way to do that. She is willing to put marine protection ahead of our oil and gas industry.

We have a long history of Ottawa dictating what marine protection is in Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore. Ottawa mismanaged our fisheries resource to the brink of extinction without Newfoundland and Labrador having any say whatsoever. We have all long lobbied and I will go again and I'll say I believe Members of the other side would love nothing more than to see joint management of our offshore globally, not just fisheries, everything we do. They continue to oppose letting this province, with its century's old fishing communities, to have a direct say through joint management.

Let's go to Liberal senator, Stan Kutcher. He echoed Senator Petten's words when he said the following: "The overall intent of clause 28 is to support the Government of Canada in achieving its marine conservation targets: conserving 25% of Canada's oceans by 2025 and 30% by 2030."

Again, I'll say to everyone in the House of Assembly, close your eyes and imagine our country, imagine where our oceans lie in our country and now imagine that 30 per cent of that has to be marine conservation areas. If you can't picture how that is going to affect

Newfoundland and Labrador, our industry, how we operate offshore whether it's oil and gas, inshore wind or our fishery, then perhaps you should just keep your eyes closed maybe because it is going to be catastrophic.

So it appears the Liberals are more interested in shutting down our ocean industries than ensuring they're managed for the benefit of adjacent communities here in Newfoundland and Labrador. They're willing to sacrifice these industries in the name of a radical viewpoint that is anti-development, anti-oil and gas and anti-fisheries.

I'm going to go away from the notes now and I won't talk too much longer. I've listened to the previous minister of Industry, Energy and Technology when she was there before she became Finance Minister, speak very eloquently about our offshore and how much she believes in it. We had a document called *Advance 2030*, and I've made comments that it's shelved, and I do believe that everyone in this House wants nothing more than the success of this province. I believe that we want Newfoundland and Labrador succeeding.

Sometimes we allow our politics and our internal leanings to get in our way. This bill demonstrates dangers to our province that we have not seen before. It could give the federal government an avenue to shut down. To quote a Member earlier who discussed fear mongering, which I will use right now, it's not what I'm doing. I'm not trying to fear monger. I'm speaking as genuinely and from my heart as I possibly can here tonight.

I believe there is substantive change in this bill which is extremely good for this province. I believe it gives us the ability to manage our offshore in a way that can help, that can expand, and that can benefit everyone in this province. But I also believe it leaves the door open just a little tiny bit for people in Ottawa to come down here and

take control of a resource that we not only own, but a resource that we need and a resource that is ours and ought to be ours going forward, a resource that we should fight tooth and nail for and that we should stand together in this House and make sure we are doing the right thing.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**L. PARROTT:** We can find a way. I don't know – I mean, I would say this is probably a bill that we ought to have had joint consultation on. This is the type of legislation that we really should discuss before it comes to the House. This is the type of legislation that we should come together because of what it means to every single one of us, and not every one of us lives on the ocean, not every one of our districts is on the coast. But I can tell you, every single person in this House has someone who either works in the fishery or works in the offshore or is going to work in wind and I would say, a whole lot more than one. I would say every single community in this province has individuals that are associated with every single one of those industries.

And we've heard it, our fishery, well over a billion-dollar industry. Oil and gas, in the billions of dollars of revenue. It's just so crucial right now.

Speaker, on that note, I will say, when we go to Committee, I'm going to have a substantial amount of questions. I hope that what I said here this evening has touched a chord with some people, because I think that it's important that we understand what we're doing here.

The most important thing I will say is that we can't just accept people's word for it. If we're not certain that this legislation is bulletproof, if we're not certain that this allows us to have the full authority over all of this, then I think we ought to put it on hold and maybe do some joint consultation and find a way to make it so it does.

I get the fact that it has to be mirror legislation, but I'll go back and I'll say, again, it bewilders me why Ottawa would bundle this into the Accord. Now, I'm not claiming to be any kind of a political scholar, but I do know that this wind management portion could be outside the Accord. I do know that we've all experienced in this House, anyone who's had anything to do with oil and gas or sat in this House since 2019, we know how long it takes to get things approved for any type of construction offshore. We know that all the red tape comes through Ottawa. We know that this province has worked extremely hard through OilCo, through the Members that sit in this House and who have led the way. All the way back from 1985 until now, this has been the province's battle cry. It really has. Oil and gas are a big deal here.

Now we're at a point, in 2025, where we could open the door just that little, tiny bit to change our future in a very significantly bad way. I, for one, really want to make sure we're doing the right thing.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you, Speaker.

I stand here now and discuss the new bill on the mirrored legislation between us and the federal government on what was the C-NLOPB and the Atlantic Accord. I guess we're opening the door to something different. We're moving into having them help jointly manage renewable offshore wind, which is a very new industry even in Canada. It's very much more developed over in Asia and Europe compared to here. We're looking at a joint management scheme.

It's hard to wrap my head the point – I'll mention the Member for Terra Nova – with

this being added to the Accord and, I agree, I had a hard time wrapping my head around how that's a part of this.

Also, I guess my own thing is I don't like the idea of Ottawa having so much say into the governance of resources here in this province either; I agree with that as well. I'm a strong believer that if it's next to us, we're responsible and we should be the primary thing.

Having this jointly managed, I have a hard time wrapping my head around that as well, but, so be it, now that this is here, it's before us and it is important that we do have offshore regulation, it's an important part of that. But, like I said, it's still hard to wrap my head around the fact that Ottawa is a part of this. It's interesting but seeing that, we do have to make sure that there is some regulation here, be it the province or the feds.

Going through this, there's a lot of the stuff that the Member for Terra Nova mentioned and a big part of it that I see was missing and a missed opportunity was the industry itself, but also that it does leave a lot open for these large European companies that do the offshore wind. It leaves a lot of the doors open for them to come in and build the industry without a lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians being the primary beneficiary of those jobs.

There is a lot of work around it, but offshore wind is a little bit different on the amount of employment and amount of operation, gives the more hands on and more day-to-day operation compared to offshore oil and gas. What I found disappointing when we were reading through is the lack of the amount of requirement and benefit for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to enter that industry.

I know usually that comes down through the environmental assessment and that can have a process there, but they did leave a lot out when it came to an opportunity there

to make sure that we actually build the industry locally and, instead, the worry of seeing the possibility of leaving the door open to these large European companies that are – actually a majority of the industry right now for the construction of these offshore wind projects is large European construction companies. So we're leaving the door open so that they come in, build it and leaving a lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians not benefiting the maximum amount from jobs.

That was very disappointing to see that there was nothing there, that the feds never really picked up on that or left it out altogether, which was kind of worrisome that we're leaving the opportunity for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to move into this new industry, on the hopes that we do something locally to make sure that goes and then, instead, having some basic guidelines allowing those people to maximize those jobs. We see that this is a missed opportunity as we move forward.

Another thing we also see is for a lot of the offshore safety and regulations, there's a lot of stuff that came up over the years. We all know, very intimately, of some of the stuff from reports and stuff that were not seen and adhered to. We look at how the regulator is also in charge of the safety and that. It is little bit worrisome there that we never fleshed that out more to make sure that we maximize the offshore safety side of things, given it's a very different environment to work, it's a very dangerous environment to work in. We were hoping that when they did make some of these changes coming forward, that some of the stuff that was recommended over the years for offshore safety will be implemented, given that we're also bringing in a whole new other industry in on top of the existing oil and gas industry.

So we were hoping, you know, that we would see some of these recommendations and stuff that were made over the years in all of the reports and stuff that were done for

offshore safety that would be considered and implemented in this new legislation. I guess I will flesh it out more in questions to the minister at the time.

We know, like I said, this is now joint management with the federal government. We know that these are the things that we have to do some mirrored legislation to make sure, but we're next to the resource. This is ours and we want to make sure that we have the ultimate say at the end of the day on how it goes. I'm not saying one way or the other, any industry or anything like that, but we have to make sure that we have the maximum benefit when it comes to jobs, when it comes to royalties, when it comes to the revenues and any other opportunity that comes through.

I agree with the Member for Terra Nova, I don't see how this is not ours, 100 per cent. This is something that should have been through the province. I know it's the ocean and there's all this grey area of (inaudible) but I really can't understand why we're going down the route of joint management with this.

A province talking about capturing the wind. We have land based and we're working on that and now we're doing this. I honestly think that this is something that should have been ours right from the beginning and I'm really apprehensive of the idea of the federal government touching our resources, is the best way to put it. It belongs to us, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. I even argue, including the wind, it belongs to us.

So I support the idea of what they have here, and I guess the need of legislation to make sure we move forward, but I do really have a hard time wrapping my head around that this is how we decided to do it. I know it's important that we do need green energy and we need it through that. I have a lot of concerns about offshore safety, but also the lack of any guidelines or anything in here about how the jobs are going to operate or how to make sure that we maximize the job

opportunities and construction opportunities for this province. But, like I said, it's really hard to imagine that we have to share this with the feds. I have pages and pages of questions there.

Other than that, I'm going to take my seat, but I still think that we should be the primary beneficiaries of this one at the end of the day.

Thank you.

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

**P. LANE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, glad to stand and speak to Bill 90, which is quite substantive, as we all know. I'm not going to get into all the details of it. I know there are going to be a lot of questions that are going to come up in Committee of the Whole.

There are a lot of important pieces of legislation that's gone through this House of Assembly over the years. I think of – as was mentioned – former Premier Peckford. I know a lot of times people will – whether it be from a partisan point of view, making jokes, whatever the case might be, he'll always be tagged with the Sprung greenhouse and the cucumbers.

At the end of the day, perhaps that facility was a few years ahead of its time. Perhaps he should've chose tomatoes or something else, as opposed to cucumbers, but I'd love to have that facility here in Newfoundland right now, to be honest with you, this many years later. The idea wasn't a bad one. It's too bad he gets remembered in that way.

The way he really should be remembered though, in my opinion, in terms of the premiers we've had here in Newfoundland and Labrador, to my mind in terms of legacy, in terms of somebody who really made a difference here in this province, beyond Joey Smallwood, who obviously he

gets all the credit for Confederation, for those of us who would be happy with that decision. Beyond him, perhaps the biggest, most important piece of legislation and the most important thing that got done in this province that had a lasting impact and will have a lasting impact on this province is the Atlantic Accord.

Premier Peckford, perhaps, does not always get the credit he deserves in terms of bringing that piece of legislation in. But it's something that certainly I'm thankful for Brian Peckford for doing what he did and bringing this forward. I think we all should be. Because if you look at the revenue stream coming into this province year over year to pay for all the services, how much of that significant portion of those revenues are coming from oil and gas?

It all started with the Atlantic Accord. The principle of the Atlantic Accord, of course, is that Newfoundland and Labrador has the opportunity to control its own destiny and to reap the values, to be the primary beneficiary of its resources. That was really what the Atlantic Accord was and still should be all about.

I don't have a problem with adding wind energy to the mix. As the Member for Terra Nova has said, it could've been done perhaps separately. I can kind of see why they threw it all under the one umbrella, I suppose. I can see it. I'm not necessarily opposed to it, to be honest with you. As long as that same principle of Newfoundland and Labrador having control of its offshore resources and being the primary beneficiary of its offshore resources, as long as that remains the same, whether it be oil, whether it be LNG or whether it be wind, whether it be tidal, whatever the case might be, whatever it is, the same principle can apply. As long as that principle applies, I'm okay with it in regard of what piece of legislation it happens to fall under.

The concern I have, as has been expressed, certainly by the Member for

Terra Nova – he did it in a way which was more eloquent than I can. He has more knowledge of it, very well versed and well read when it comes to our resources. I will give him credit. Every time he stands up to speak about our resources – I’m not just saying that now because he’s here, to give him a big head, but I will always put in my earpiece in and listen. I learn a lot from him. I really do.

Just like I like listening to the Member for Bonavista because of a lot of stories and stuff like that. But I have to say, the Member for Terra Nova – I listen to the Member for CBS because I love the entertainment value. But I always do. I always listen intently because he is very well read and well versed on the Atlantic Accord, on natural resources and so on, and I value his opinion, and I do share the concern that he has.

When we start relinquishing control, or even in the smallest bits – like they say if you open up that door, even a little bit and somebody can get in there and then they stick a wedge in there, that is problematic, especially when you have a government who may be ideologically driven.

This is not Conservative-Liberal thing. Believe me, it’s really not, especially our provincial Liberals. Because I know that all Members in this House of Assembly, I really believe that, for the most part, we all support our offshore and so on, but up in Ottawa is a little different. Individuals like Minister Guilbeault, as was mentioned earlier, it worries me, because he has an ideological belief as does, I think, Senator Petten or whoever it was that was named there and so on.

There’s a group of them up there. There are a number of them up in Ottawa that are just anti oil and gas. It’s as simple as that. They’re pro-climate change and so on. I think we need to do within reason what we can to deal with climate change.

I’m not a climate change denier. I don’t think any of us are. Look no further than here in this province and we’ve seen some of the weather events that have happened here. Like the Member for Ferryland and the breakwater and so on, it’s after being destroyed a couple of times and the Member from Port aux Basques and we know what happened there with the hurricane and so on. It is real.

I think we all know that and I think we have to be reasonable with it. But the bottom line is that you can’t kind of throw out the baby with the bathwater. People still need to be employed. We still need revenues as a province to pay for health care and so on. People need jobs. The economy has to operate.

As we have said, as a province, the reality of it is that the world still requires all these energy sources, including fossil fuels. We may reach a point and time in our history where we won’t need it anymore. Maybe we’ll be getting energy from the moon. Maybe we’ll all be driving around like the Jetsons at some point in time, who knows? I can remember as a kid watching *Star Trek* and so on and Captain Kirk had a communicator. It was basically a flip phone is what it was. But at the time, it was like oh my God, how is he doing that?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** *Dick Tracy*.

**P. LANE:** And the watch phone, *Dick Tracy* and so on. So technology, we’re seeing things happening over time, things that we watched years ago that was science fiction and it’s happening in real time.

But we understand, I think, that in the world at this point in time, oil and gas is still a factor, as well as these other energy forms such as wind, which we’re going to be adding here, and tidal and solar and everything else, hydrogen and so on and the world is not coming off that. So we can utilize our resources as we’ve said, which has been our argument, or you can buy it

from some tinpot dictator – I was going to say in the United States, God forbid. It's true actually.

It's sad but true, but you can buy it off Putin or you can buy it in Venezuela or whatever the case might be, or you can buy it here in a democratic society where we actually have environmental protections in place. We have safety and we have rules and we have everything else. We have all those things. The world is going to use it anyway, it may as well be ours.

But we have a government in Ottawa right now that doesn't feel that way. They don't feel that way. I don't want to make this into a political speech about the federal government or nothing now, but I don't know where Mr. Carney stands. To be honest with you now, just as a little side note, I think the minister or the Premier or the new premier, whoever, needs to write Mr. Carney – write all the leaders actually – and ask him, what is your stand when it comes to oil and gas development in Newfoundland and Labrador?

That's an important question. That's the biggest question for me, to be honest with you. That is the biggest question. I've said that I was kind of leaning a certain way because of where the current government is on this oil and gas.

It doesn't mean that I believe in all this stuff that – I was going to say Pee-wee, sorry – Mr. Poilievre is saying when it comes to the LGBTQ community and women's rights. I don't agree with him. I absolutely do not agree with him, but at least they are pro oil and gas from what I can gather. This particular government right now isn't. I don't know where Mr. Carney stands. We need to find out, though. We do need to find out where they stand.

Anyway, regardless of who's there now and who might be there after the next federal election, this here is going to go on in perpetuity for many, many years, and

governments can change as we know. We need to make sure that we are protecting our resources and we are protecting the ability to develop our resources for our primary benefit. That's what we need to do.

As my colleague from Terra Nova has pointed out, some of the language that's here is a little concerning. Some of the language would suggest that, perhaps, there's an opportunity for an ideologically-driven federal administration, regardless of which one that is, that they could step in there and start making our decisions for us. Tell us what's in our best interests. Tell us what we're allowed to develop and what we're not allowed to develop. That was not the intention of the Atlantic Accord.

I'll go back to Brian Peckford again, when Brian Peckford and his colleagues brought forward the Atlantic Accord and this agreement was made, it was never the intent to open the door for someone else to come in and to start dictating to us what we were going to do with our natural resources, how we were going to develop them and when we were going to develop them. That was never the case. This here, as has been said, is opening that door. Like I say, you only need a little bit, then you get the wedge in, then you can start opening it a bit more. When it starts, where does it stop?

Again, as my colleague from Terra Nova has said, if you are a large oil and gas company, and we're talking billions of dollars, they want some assurances before they come to a jurisdiction. They want some assurances that they're going to get that return on that investment. They're doing risk assessments all the time. Before they take the risk of investing millions and billions of dollars, they want to make sure that there's an upside to this and that they're not going to just have all this red tape and so on thrown at them.

We've seen it now with our oil industry in terms of the number of licences that have been released over the last number of years

to drill. It is non-existent, at this point in time, since that Bay du Nord discovery plus all we had, plus all the seismic data – I was up with the minister of Natural Resources when it was the Minister of Finance.

She was the minister at the time and did a briefing there on Elizabeth Avenue up in her office, I can remember that a few years ago, and showed me all the seismic data. I'm sure we all probably saw it. I mean, we've got oil galore out there. We haven't even come close; not a fraction have we even tapped into of what's out there. We could be sitting pretty forever. I don't know if forever but for an awful long time. A lot of generations can benefit from that offshore if we can gain access to it and we can develop it.

Right now, even though everybody knows that that data has been shared, how many companies are coming to drill? Zero, goose egg – the last couple of years has been a goose egg. With the developments we've got, Bay du Nord in the wings, there should be companies coming there now. We should have no trouble selling off those land sales now. There should be exploration going on out there on an ongoing basis. It should be happening. It's not happening.

Why is it not happening? Because we have a federal government that is anti-oil and gas.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**P. LANE:** That's the truth. That's not politics; that is the truth. They are anti-oil and gas, and that's having an impact on us. So if anyone thinks for a second that if we put in a piece of legislation that gives additional access to some of that crowd up in Ottawa to be able to interfere in our industry, if you think they're not going to do it, you're dreaming. You're dreaming. They absolutely are. We need to do whatever we can to shut that door. I don't know how we do it here tonight. I don't know how we can just simply shut this door tonight.

We can't really, unless we were to perhaps withdraw this bill temporarily and do like my colleague from Terra Nova said and actually have I don't know if you want to call it an All-Party Committee – I know that word gets a little stale after a while – but to have additional eyes, people on all sides, to really go through this, get more briefings and a greater understanding. To make suggestions and see if there is anything here that opens that door, to see if we can shut that door.

It's not a done deal – until we pass it, it's not a done deal. We can take the attitude, well, it's here now. It's all you can do. You're for it or against it. We don't have to be. We don't have to be. There is an opportunity to make some change.

Anyway, with that said, I'll take my seat, Mr. Speaker. I'm all for developing our resources. I absolutely am. It's critical to our province. This will be a great addition to some of the stuff that we're already doing. God knows we need the revenue. God knows we need the jobs. God knows we need to boost our economy. We have a lot of needs; it all costs money. We can't continue to borrow, borrow, borrow and go deeper and deeper in debt. We need more revenue.

So I am for this in concept but, as I've said, if there are legitimate concerns here that the feds can now step in and shut down our opportunities to develop wind the same way they've shut down our opportunities to develop oil, if they can do the same thing again, then I have major problems with it. I think we all should for generations to come.

What Brian Peckford did in 1985, whatever it was, was so important. This, likewise, believe it or not, is very, very important. We cannot undo what was done.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

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

**T. WAKEHAM:** Thank you, Speaker.

They've put an hour on the clock but, rest assured, I probably won't need a full hour. Far from it. I do have a few points, though, I wanted to make about that and how it can go and continue to go.

The first thing I want you to do is think back to 1985. Where were you? Where was everybody that's currently sitting here in this Chamber today? Where were you in 1985? Some of you were still in school, kindergarten – there you go – but for most people, your parents would certainly remember 1985. Those of you who were in other careers or working somewhere else would certainly remember 1985 and would remember the celebration that took place when this Atlantic Accord was actually signed.

This Atlantic Accord has been one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation ever for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I think we all agree with that. I don't think anybody can argue that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**T. WAKEHAM:** For 40 years, this Atlantic Accord has served the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, whether they have been Liberal governments or PC governments, this Atlantic Accord has stood the test of time and allowed us to develop our offshore oil and gas when those opportunities probably would not have existed.

When we think back to when we joined Confederation in 1949, because of some arbitrary decision that ocean territory has to be treated differently from dry land – that was something that was arbitrarily decided – Newfoundland and Labrador's right to manage our ocean resources were stolen away from us and put under the control of

the Government of Canada. Rights that we once enjoyed as a self-governing Dominion were relinquished. This, in my opinion, is one of the greatest tragedies of the Terms of Union.

Our ocean-reliant province lost control, also, of our fisheries management – something we are still, of course, grappling with today. As we later discovered, Ottawa also gained control of the offshore oil and gas resources that were in Canada, only because – quote – we were in Canada. In the 1980s, as been said here, Premier Brian Peckford waged a hard fight against the Liberals of Pierre Trudeau to assert ownership of our offshore oil and gas resources.

Section 37 of the Terms of Union stated, "All lands, mines, minerals, and royalties belonging to Newfoundland at the date of Union, and all sums then due or payable for such lands, mines, minerals, or royalties, shall belong to the Province of Newfoundland, subject to any trusts existing in respect thereof, and to any interest other than that of the Province in the same." Peckford argued that oil and gas resources off Newfoundland and Labrador had never been explicitly transferred to Ottawa's control at Confederation and were therefore ours.

Now, the Trudeau Liberals opposed him in the Supreme Court of Canada and, in 1984, the Supreme Court ruled against Newfoundland and Labrador. So Premier Peckford, at the time, turned up the heat and kept on fighting and he turned his attention towards achieving joint management and making Newfoundland and Labrador the principal beneficiary of all offshore developments.

He didn't find any friends with the Trudeau Liberal government, but he did find friends with the Progressive Conservative Opposition. In 1984, PC Leader Brian Mulroney promised that Newfoundland and Labrador would achieve joint management as an equal partner over offshore oil and

gas and become the principal beneficiary of its development, and we all know what came next. The Mulroney Conservatives defeated the Liberals in 1984 and followed through on their commitment the following year.

In 1985, Brian Peckford and William Marshall along with Brian Mulroney, John Crosbie and Pat Carney, signed the historic Atlantic Accord; one of the most important documents, as I said, in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, hard won and not to be toyed with.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**T. WAKEHAM:** We think about how the benefits because of that agreement, because of the tenacity of the premier of the day not to give up, not to take it, not to simply say, okay, we've got to do this because the federal government says we have to. This premier stood at the time and said, no. It doesn't have to be that way, and he had a federal government that said, you're absolutely right. We agree with you and let's get on with it.

Offshore projects like Hibernia, Terra Nova, White Rose, White Rose Expansion, Hebron and Hibernia South, all of those projects because of that Atlantic Accord – all of that because of our Atlantic Accord. The south expansion and this, completely transformed the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador and continues to transform the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador. It has the ability, as my colleague just mentioned, to continue to transform the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador if we have partners in Ottawa that are willing to join with us and make it happen.

Unfortunately, right now, as we know, this federal Liberal government, which were led by another Trudeau, would have been totally opposed to offshore oil and gas. As a matter of fact, comments were made that the latest development will be our last.

How can you turn around and have any faith in a government that has already stated that they have no interest in future development of oil and gas off the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador? That's why there's a challenge with all of this. That's why we need to seriously talk about it and seriously do something about it.

Again, this is not the first time that our Atlantic Accord was challenged, of course. Back in 2005, Premier Williams fought to hold the Atlantic Accord. We remember that fight, we remember how that went down but again, we managed to achieve an agreement that secured our Accord, and in that time, I think, following up on Brian Peckford's words that he issued back in 1985, "Some day the sun will shine, and have not will be no more."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**T. WAKEHAM:** And in 2005, we came off equalization for the first time in the history of our province and I think we were all proud of that at that moment. We were very proud of that.

Unfortunately, things have changed over the coming years but, again, it was the Atlantic Accord and the principles of the Atlantic Accord that allowed us to do this, and 40 years later, we're here because of it. I think we're a better province because of that Atlantic Accord and because of the people that have been able to gain full employment working in our offshore oil, the men and woman that go out everyday.

We've had our incidents. We've had people who have been lost because of our offshore oil but it's still there. There's lots of it there, as my colleague said, and we need to make sure that if the world demands oil or has a demand for oil, that we ought to be the ones providing it. What we need are partners that will allow us to do that.

Part of that comes with the whole – look, we all are worried about the environment, and

we certainly should be. We should never take the environment for granted and we ought to make sure that we have those environmental impacts in place, and we work hard to ensure that. But the processes that we put in place to do that are often cumbersome and long and take so long to do that it often deters investors from investing in our province. Not because they're afraid of doing environmental assessments, but just the fact of the matter it takes such a long period of time to get approvals and get things done.

We know the development, from the time you explore, the time you discover a well to the time it starts producing here in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and our offshore is a considerable amount of time; far longer than it ought to be, in my opinion. I think we ought to find a way to see if we can't help move that right along.

Again, what I want to do today, and I simply wanted to do, because we'll go to Committee and we'll have lots of questions on this legislation but as, again, my colleagues have said, that the Atlantic Accord does not apply to offshore renewable energy resources. It does not apply to offshore renewable energy resources, yet we are amending the act to include renewables. As I have heard from a couple of my colleagues here: why wasn't this looked at in separate legislation?

Unfortunately, now, we're told that we have to have mirror legislation and so we're not at that stage. But, again, I go back, and I'll simply end with this, there's an old saying that we ought to be considering when we discuss this and we discuss the Atlantic Accord; it simply says: if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Thank you, Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**B. PETTEN:** Thank you, Speaker.

I don't plan on going on too long. I've got some notes I'm going to speak from, obviously. I don't always do that, but I will tonight. I think whenever the phrase, Atlantic Accord, comes up in Newfoundland and Labrador more than anywhere else in the country, Atlantic Accord is iconic. In my opinion, I've been around for a few years, without dating myself, but I remember when the accord was signed. It was one of the first times that we can actually stand in our place and feel good about who we were as a people. We finally found our footing. We finally got our feet under us. We finally felt like we belonged. We were part of this country. We stood proud as a province because we finally all felt – and history will show you in the pictures and the videos have shown many times before when the signing of that agreement – it was an iconic moment, but it was more than just the Atlantic Accord. It was about us as a people. We finally felt we found our place in this country. We felt we belonged.

The benefits of Atlantic Accord has been billions and billions and billions of dollars in revenue come to our province and continues to come to our province as a result of the Atlantic Accord. Any time there's any change or any alterations or anything that's to any document of that status, it should cause everyone some concern. It should cause everyone to pause and reflect and it should cause us to have a deep look at it. We've done so. We have some concerns. There are lots of aspects of it that are fine, but, again, I'll always repeat, our role in the Opposition is to do what we do; to do exactly what we're doing here now. It is to highlight those concerns, address them on the floor of the Legislature, be on record.

Ultimately, at the end of the day, government will vote with the majority, as they see fit. It's incumbent upon us, though, to lay out our concerns and lay them on the floor of the Legislature for all to see and

then everyone can make their own decision from that moment on.

But I do believe, as every Newfoundlander and Labradorian will agree, the Atlantic Accord is a sacred document in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**B. PETTEN:** And it should be treated as so.

Speaker, in questioning the bill, we refer to a legislative Committee where it can undergo proper review and scrutiny. When mirror legislation went through the federal Parliament, there was a significant review through legislative Committee process. This included having expert witnesses join the Committee to testify what they anticipate the impacts of the legislation to be on the oil and gas industry.

Why are we asking for this? First of all, the Atlantic Accord was a hard-fought battle which gave us all our benefits from the offshore oil and gas industry. Any time this agreement is opened or modified, it is our duty as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to do due diligence. There has to be concerns raised publicly about this legislation and the possible watering down of the Atlantic Accord. These concerns must be investigated, as I've already said.

The federal Liberal record on oil and gas is dismal. Their anti-oil policies have resulted in a decreased investment in our offshore. Simply put, we don't trust the federal Liberals with our oil and gas. An open and transparent legislative process will allow us to ask detailed questions to the experts: legal experts, oil and gas experts, wind energy experts, the offshore board and more. That way, we can rise above the political rhetoric and truly understand what the impact of the legislation will be.

Trusting the Liberal government opposite, they tried to sell the people of the province on a Churchill Falls MOU, but the people of

the province saw through the heavy political spin. Now the Liberal minister is saying this is good legislation and there's nothing to see here. Frankly, we don't trust him.

They tried to fast-track the MOU through the House. They may try to do the same with this legislation. They refused to allow the independent experts to testify in the House to the MOU. Will they make the same mistake this time and refuse a legislative Committee who can call in the experts?

Oil and gas assets: The Liberals have mused publicly about selling offshore oil and gas assets. They have even undertaken an evaluation of the assets. But they have not been fully transparent on the matter. Are they going to sell away our stake in the offshore oil and gas? To whom, for how much, and before we consent to any changes in legislation we demand a full story.

We are being told the legislation is to allow the offshore board to jointly manage the offshore wind energy industry. The Liberals have put the interests of their friends before when it comes to on-land wind. So we must make sure they do not do the same in the offshore. We cannot support this 129-page bill which deals with one of our most important industries without turning over every stone, investigating every clause and doing our due diligence that this is in the people's best interest, in the industry's best interest, in the workers' best interest. We are concerned that there could be something hidden in 129 pages that is not in our best interest.

Our process: Let me begin with a few words about the process. Decades ago in the House the government would publish draft legislation before it came to the House, then require a legislative review Committee to hold hearings and give interested parties the chance to be openly and transparently consulted so they could recommend changes to draft legislation before it came to the House for debate and decision.

There was nothing in our Standing Orders then and there's nothing in our Standing Orders now to prevent such disclosure hearings and consultations. The difference now is that we no longer have a government willing to be open and transparent and consultative when it comes to the legislation.

Democratic reform has never been a priority of the Liberals opposite through their decade in office. We have seen the consequences of this last spring. Government brought badly written limitation legislation to the House that would have been impossible to fix through ordinary rules of debate. The legislation wouldn't even have applied to the gentleman whose terrible predicament as an abused child had exposed the need for legislation. It was only through the immense public pressure that the government was embarrassed into writing its own bill and bringing it to the floor.

The same thing happened in the fall of 2022 when the government brought a terribly flawed Public Health Authority Act to the House and then had to delete the entire part of the bill on (inaudible) –

**SPEAKER:** Order!

I ask the Member to stay relevant to the bill.

**B. PETTEN:** – quality council because it was so poorly constructed.

**SPEAKER:** Stay relevant to this bill.

**B. PETTEN:** I'm giving examples of my reasoning for my debate, Speaker, respectfully. It's based on my –

**SPEAKER:** Stay relevant.

**B. PETTEN:** It's backing up what our position is, Speaker, because people tell you it's relevant or not relevant. What I'm saying should be relevant, not what you're being told.

**SPEAKER:** Stay relevant to the bill.

**B. PETTEN:** It's the past record in this House; that's continuously happening in this House, being interrupted on a serious matter, Speaker.

**SPEAKER:** It is a serious matter.

**B. PETTEN:** It is a serious matter and I expect the same respect that every Member gets in this House.

**SPEAKER:** You have been getting respect.

**B. PETTEN:** People are not given an opportunity to see bills before debate is already started. The Opposition is prevented from fulfilling its role of consulting under the penalty or punishment by government majority. It's not what you would expect to see in a healthy democracy, given the serious impacts legislation can have on our people and on our province.

We seen the MOU being rushed. This House tried to avoid public scrutiny by not allowing outside independent experts to try to consult public conversation by not sending it to a truly independent review panel. Now we're seeing it again with this bill, proving government has learned absolutely nothing about the importance of openness, transparency, due process and public consultation. We are not prepared to stand for it.

Speaker, nothing is more important in our province than management authority of our ocean resources, whether it's fisheries, wind, oil and gas. We cannot agree to water down provisions of our Atlantic Accord and throw enormous uncertainty into the mix to chase away prospective investments from offshore oil and gas, expecting us to pass legislation that binds us to agreeing that the Atlantic Accord does not apply to offshore renewable energy resources.

Is the government opposite eager to water down joint management rights we already have when it claims it wants more joint management, not less? Is government opposite so eager to kowtow to Trudeau's Liberals whom they claim to have lost respect? Why is there a rush to ram this through when grave concerns have been raised by people who have fought so hard for the rights that the province has already gained?

There may be some Members of the House who are ready to rubberstamp this agenda. We are not. Perhaps some Members opposite will have the courage to agree there needs to be a more judicious approach. There's no harm in opening things up before final votes are cast. Therefore, I'm making the following motion to ask that this bill be given the proper legislative Committee so that true due diligence can be completed.

I move, seconded by the Member for Terra Nova, that the motion currently before the House is all the words after the word "that" be deleted and replaced with the following: Bill 90, An Act to Amend the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland and Labrador Act be not now read a second time. That the order of the second reading be discharged, the bill withdrawn from the Order Paper and subject matter referred to a Resource Standing Committee of the House for public hearings.

Thank you.

**SPEAKER:** We're going to pause to take a short recess to discuss the proposed motion.

### Recess

**SPEAKER (Bennett):** Are the House Leaders ready?

Order, please!

Upon review of the proposed amendment, I rule that the amendment is in order.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**S. COADY:** Oh, are we here until midnight?

**SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**B. PETTEN:** I say to the Minister of Finance: I don't know if we're going to be here until midnight or not, but I think I'll wrap up my commentary on the debate in the second reading from our side.

Basically, I started out and I think each of our speakers have said, the Atlantic Accord is iconic to this province and the people of this province. We've outlined the concerns. We think they're valid concerns. We don't see any reason why you wouldn't want them to review it further in a legislative Committee. It's something that we long stood for. We all speak about it. We all think that's the right way of going about doing it.

We don't have to, probably, do every piece of legislation that way but some of these pieces of legislation, you're better served by going to these reviews. We're here in the House. We know that government have other things on their mind. They'd like to move on out of this Chamber into other bigger and better things, so we're going to get the Atlantic Accord legislation through. We have the federal government making a release today that they assume that we've already passed this legislation.

On that note – I know my colleague from Terra Nova brought it up – I got to be honest, as a parliamentarian, as Member of this Legislature that represents the District of Conception Bay South, I find that so disrespectful. To be so dismissive of our Legislature that the federal government would put out a release in advance of this legislation even receiving second reading in this House, I think it's shameful.

I think we all should, and government opposite should as well, because it's their legislation to be taken for granted – the federal government to take us for granted. We've been taken for granted for a long time and the basis of the Atlantic Accord, as I said when I started, gave us that wind in our wings, wind at our back; we actually felt we belonged in this country because of the Atlantic Accord.

Now we're bringing in revisions to the Atlantic Accord, and they're dismissing us again. That's the irony. When I heard that today I said, my God, of all things to be doing this with it's on revisions to our Atlantic Accord. Just think about that, put that in context, what a poor example to show your disrespect and the dismissiveness of our province to be taking the Atlantic Accord, opening it up basically: We're adding things to the Atlantic Accord.

Before it was ever debated in this Legislature, for them to come out with a news release to say today that – we never had it passed. When I heard that, I thought that was ridiculous. I think we all should be shocked and the government opposite should definitely be shocked. There's no reason why we can't do a legislative review. Why should we rush it? Because Ottawa wants to rush it? Why are we rushing anything like that?

Again, why would you rush a piece of legislation, a document so important as the Atlantic Accord? That should be first and foremost on our minds to get it right, and I don't mind saying this, Speaker. I've said it in this Legislature before and I think I'm surrounded by my colleagues, all our caucus, we don't mind standing on principle. We'll do it again and again and again. We'll always do what we think is right and do it right by the people of our districts and the province.

On this one, I truly believe we're doing right. It should go to a legislative Committee and get a proper review and witnesses come in,

then we've got a good piece of legislation. We can come back in this Legislature and vote on it in the House like we should do.

Thank you very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

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

**A. PARSONS:** Thank you, Speaker.

If it's okay, I have a bunch of notes here and stuff if could refer to it, if I have leave of the colleagues across the way, if I could sit in my seat and speak. I'm sure it's still heard on the microphone if that's okay.

**SPEAKER:** Members good?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Yes.

**A. PARSONS:** Thank you.

First of all, I want to thank my colleagues for the contributions to this very important debate and I guess I would preface what I'm going to say by saying that the legislation is no less iconic on this side of the House either. We all recognize its origins. We recognize when it came, who was the architect, what it has done and how important it has been. Certainly, it's an achievement that we all understand as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as one that we don't look at with any less significance or sense of importance that anybody else. I think we all share that.

What I'm going to do is, I'm just going to go through a little bit of the notes that I made over the commentary because some of the Members made very pertinent and good points. So I'll try to answer now but we also have Committee to answer. I do thank everybody for the contributions. One of the things, my colleague across the way, the Deputy Opposition House Leader and critic for IET, brought up – and I think he made a lot of very good points. In fact, a lot of what

he was saying, I was nodding throughout what he had to say because we're very much aligned during some of this. I'll go through it.

The fear is the ambiguity; it feels that it is not certain. You know, if the proponents in oil and gas are worried – I think the quote he used was, not rock solid – maybe, there's a possibility of loss of investment. A few things I would say sort of in response to that is that we do have in this case joint jurisdiction. Without this Accord, offshore renewables would be under the jurisdiction, solely, of the federal government.

That's the reason that we're expanding it, to bring in offshore renewables into the fold so that it is jointly managed, which is, I think, what the Members want to see, but the second part of this is that we lose absolutely nothing in this legislation. In fact, we gain. I think we have strengthened it. I know that's the concern the Members feel and that's the one we want to support.

Proponents in oil and gas worried: I would suggest that proponents in the oil and gas have been worried over the last number of years, certainly with the comments made by the federal Minister of Environment. Of course, I share that. We've had, believe me, plenty of conversations on that. This bill is not what deters them, it's the overall – sometimes – ideology of the federal government.

I get that. We've had these rackets. I don't think anybody can doubt – I think one of the comments was that the federal Liberals have sort of failed dismally. There are times I believe that, but I can tell you the provincial Liberals have certainly strengthened this and fought for oil and gas every single step of the way.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**A. PARSONS:** I would suggest that a recap of the achievements we have done in the oil and gas over the last four years would be

very, very worthy of respect and certainly, in many ways, support from all around.

I point out, too, Energy NL, supportive of this; the CAPP, the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, they are supportive of this. We have met with them.

Members preach of going from 99 years to 25; again, industry driven. We agree it's a good chance to do this; talking about allowing two entities to work together – I think the thing that scares the Member, and I get it because we've went through this over the last year, is what can happen. What's not there? What might happen that we're not prepared for?

We think about, not just today while we're all sitting here, the next generation, the next House, who comes along in Ottawa. One of the questions was: why do we need to take wind into this Accord, and so one of the things I have here is: Why was the Accord used to implement renewables rather than its own legislation? The reality is that we do not have the authority right now to develop our own legislation for offshore renewable energy, as I stated earlier.

The offshore is under federal jurisdiction. The Atlantic Accord pertains only to joint management of oil and gas reserves. There's no requirement or obligation of the federal government to agree to administer offshore renewables in our offshore under joint management. They've been implementing an offshore renewables regulatory regime for federal waters under the Canada Energy Regulator and could've pursued that option if they wanted it in Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia as well, but they've amended the Accord which we are supporting through – quote – mirror legislation. That will come up later.

We're mirroring this to include offshore renewable so that it ensures, like oil and gas, that the province and Canada will jointly manage the renewable energy in our

offshore. Amending this also establishes the C-NLOPB as the joint regulator, which I think was actually supported by Members opposite. It gives the province exclusive jurisdiction over renewable energy development in our inshore and joint management in our offshore.

That is the simple reason why we are choosing to go through this route. Quite frankly, it's because we have to and it's the best step forward.

The Member talks about: believes in green transition but it comes from oil and gas. I actually agree. I feel, and I've said this, we had a lot of pressure early on because ideologies change and the world has changed. I mean, things have changed from 2017 to 2020 to, now, 2025. When you see a group like BP take their green energy aspirations, sort of put them to the side and go back to fossil fuels, that tells you where the money's going.

That's why we never, on this side, gave up on oil and gas, although there were many people wanting us to do that. Why would you give up on something that has provided for us for decades; but at the same time, why would you not take the opportunity to develop another resource? Why not have the best of both worlds? Why would you give up one for the other? It doesn't make any sense.

So I agree, the money from our offshore that goes into future funds and goes into renewable energy and green transition funds, absolutely, but I still believe there is a long path ahead yet for our offshore. It ranks favourably anywhere in the world and, certainly, in the rest of Canada. Again, not to take away from the Member's points, though, about concern. Fair points. Absolutely, fair points. I need to say that.

Sometimes we talk about scary language and one of the things I want to come to – and I get it because when you read it the problem we have here is we're dealing with

legislation. We have the provincial Accord in front of us, federal Accord in Ottawa, they mirror each other. In fact, the language complements each other and strengthens each other.

One of the things that the Member opposite mentioned and we got into is the marine conservation. I took the time over the break to put this together. One of the concerns is section 61 of the provincial bill. It seems to be the one that's causing concern because it provides the feds with an authority that didn't exist under the Atlantic Accord. That's the concern, and I think that's what generated a lot of the debate in Ottawa as well. The primary federal legislation governing marine conservation in Canada is the *Oceans Act* and the *Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act*.

Prior to these amendments, the federal government could unilaterally designate marine conservation areas – they could. These amendments bring the regulation of such areas under the joint management regime of the Atlantic Accord rather than the sole regulatory regime of the federal government. Section 56(1) of the federal Accord, available online, is now enshrined, introduces these marine conservation areas into the Accord.

However, and this is the key, this is the one that hopefully provides that surety, that confidence that we want. Section 7(1) of the federal Accord recognizes that any regulations under section 56(1) must be approved by the provincial minister. There it is. It's black and white. It is in legislation. It has been passed in Ottawa and it stands and it is the law. What we have here is a mirror legislation that says the same thing, but it actually says the federal government.

So the fact is, we have to consult, but they can't do it, according to the law, without whoever sits in this chair. Whoever sits in government, they have to sign off on that. The mirror provincial legislation introduces

the marine conservation areas under section 55(1) of the Accord Act.

Similarly, section 7(1) says that the provincial minister must consult with the federal minister. So yes, we have to consult, but at the end of the day, go to the Federal Accord Act, the protection is there. That's the one that concerned us. That's the one that caused the concern felt by many people. So now we just need to get the agreement done. We need to move this forward.

I'm going to come to a few other points. I think, the Member opposite, this is one of the big things we've talked about, section 55(1). I think I've explained then, the fact is, this is complex because we have our Accord, we have their Accord, we have other federal legislation and it's not just like we're dealing with a new bill.

For anybody that's never debated legislation, looking at a new, clean bill is quite easy compared to looking at an amendment to a bill where you're seeing section 56 replaces section 72 and all these different changes. It can be daunting but, in this case, I am very clear and I'm very safe with where we are. I feel confident about it. How do you think I'm going to feel, or anybody else, if you inadvertently signed away our Accord rights? Believe me, I think we've done our research, Mr. Speaker.

I think that my colleagues also spoke from the NDP and from the independent. I move forward, and I appreciate what they had to say was not as comprehensive, but I think it brought the same concerns forward. The Leader of the Official Opposition had a lot of comments, much of it echoing what the Member had to say and much of the same thing, wanting to ensure protection. The one line, though, that stuck with me: If it isn't broke, don't fix it. If we don't fix this, we say no to offshore renewable energy full stop or us having any jurisdiction over that.

To anybody that's worried that there's a boat out there with a turbine ready to go tomorrow, it's not. We have not had significant conversations on this recently because it has been an unsure conversation, but it allows us to know that we can be a part of the conversation rather than the federal government take it upon themselves to do that. I don't want that. I don't want the federal government – any stripe – making those decisions on their own. I feel the same was as Members on the other side. I think we all do.

Now, I'm going to move into some comments, and one of the comments was sacred document and treat it as such. Absolutely, couldn't agree more. Now, I'm going to move into the House Leader for the Opposition who made some comments here that certainly I think I would take exception to and I don't think they had a lot to do with the actual bill.

We talked about doing a legislative Committee here in the House. I'd have to refer to the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands, because I don't know if he recalls the last time there was a legislative Committee in the House of Assembly. I don't think there has been one since the '90s. Maybe the Minister Responsible for Indigenous Affairs, who's actually done some scholarly work on this, could talk.

We haven't seen a legislative Committee here in decades – in decades. But I will point out – and I appreciate the Member opposite, because the Opposition House Leader talked about trust. Talked about ramming this through. So a couple of things I'll point out. This has been on the Order Paper for some time. There was a briefing last week. Now I can tell you when I was in Opposition, we were lucky sometimes to get a briefing, and you might get it the day before you did the bill. I didn't like; I certainly wouldn't want to treat the other side like that.

The Member for Terra Nova came to me and said it wasn't the greatest briefing. There are a couple of things we wanted to do. So what do we do – and tell me if I'm wrong. We organized another briefing a few days later, after the weekend. The Members did not want – as was our legislative right – to debate that day because they wanted a second briefing. Fair ball. What did we say?

I said: Let me do my 20; we'll do another briefing for you on Monday. Did another briefing. Sounds an awful lot like a crowd trying to ram it through. Sounds an awful lot like that. We weren't trying to force nothing through. The federal bill has been debated for over a year. And I point out this is where the word comes back "mirror legislation."

The Member brings up the Churchill MOU. Now, what in the heck does that have to do with this, I don't know. But if we want to relitigate that, we can. Because what I would say to the House Leader of the Official Opposition, I hope you vote this time – I hope you vote this time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**A. PARSONS:** And the part that got me the most here today, the Member, he goes into this diatribe. Oh, this crowd over there, transparency and openness, nothing there. He talks about no democratic reform over there.

I seem to recall actually forming government in 2015 and forming a Standing Orders Committee in the House. Dave Brazil was on it. Lorraine Michael was on it. We had other people on it. We made a bunch of changes because actually one thing, when we were in Opposition, we weren't guaranteed petitions every day because it depended on the mood that the House Leader was in. We ticked him off, boom, no petitions. Oh, we don't like what you're saying. You're staying all night.

Now, we changed that. We put guarantees in. We don't see any of that foolishness

anymore. Now, again, I haven't heard – tell me if I'm wrong. The Member chose tonight to bring up democratic reform but I have not, that I recall – I stand to be corrected – in almost 10 years I've been over here, I don't know if the Member has mentioned democratic reform to me.

**B. PETTEN:** Many times.

**A. PARSONS:** Many times. Oh, many times. We have the real House reformer on the other side tonight, Mr. Speaker. I don't think he has ever – because do you know what? He hasn't. He has never. In fact, he said, we're talking about all the stuff. I don't trust them. Now, I don't think he was talking about the federal Liberals that he doesn't trust because he actually said that after he mentioned the Churchill MOU and I don't think that the federal Liberals talked about the Churchill MOU.

So what I would say to the Member opposite, you don't have to trust me but, thankfully, there are other Members on that side that we've established a good working relationship with and we can try to get things done for the betterment of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, not just foolishness to pander to people – just absolute foolishness because there was no relevance or value to 90 per cent of what the Member said tonight – no relevance.

He started to get into health bills. Now, it's funny. I sat there and listened to every word, but again, he can't help it. He has to speak. I didn't say a word while you were talking, Sir.

**B. PETTEN:** (Inaudible.)

**A. PARSONS:** There he is. Oh, there he is.

**SPEAKER:** Order, please!

**A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**SPEAKER:** Order, please!

**A. PARSONS:** Again, the record shows the Member can't stop.

Look, go ahead and prove us wrong. Go ahead. See, the Member doesn't have the common decency to know when he's wrong. Do you see me saying this to any other Member on that side, Speaker? I'm not because we actually have valid points made by Members of the independents, the NDPs and other Members of the Official Opposition, but that Member had to get up and get on with that foolishness.

Now, one thing he mentioned. He talked about, you know, this was rushed through. There weren't enough people looking at it. Where was all the consultation? Well, this is all available federally online. The Atlantica Centre For Energy, February 21, 2024; the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, February '24. Oh, this one here is an independent submission by a citizen, Kris Costello. East Coast Environmental Law, the Ecology Action Centre, Energy NL – these are all submissions, by the way, to the committees in the House of Commons. I have to say it, again, mirror legislation.

The FFAW, the International Union of Operating Engineers, Marine Renewables Canada – oh, here, this is a very important group to Newfoundland and Labrador, Miawpukek First Nation brief on Bill C-49. Net Zero Atlantic submission for the study of Bill C-49. This one here is Northland Power. This one here is Nova Scotia Fisheries Alliance For Energy Engagement, Oceans North, an informed opinion on C-49 by Mr. Max Ruelokke, another Newfoundlander and Labradorian, SeaBlue Canada.

This one here is from Ecology Action Centre, also February. Over a year ago, I'd say – over a year ago. Really ramming this

down the throats of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Ms. Shannon Arnold – oh, an important one, February 12, 2024, as an individual, Mr. Ches Crosbie.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**A. PARSONS:** So Ches Crosbie knew this was going on. Ches Crosbie actually took the time to go to Ottawa and make a submission. So I say to the House Leader for the Opposition: Why didn't you go to Ottawa? Ches Crosbie did. Why didn't you go to Ottawa?

Katie Power, FFAW; Normand Mousseau from the Polytechnique Montreal. Oh, now this is witnesses. This is all public, too. April 11, April 8 – I don't really want to go through all these names, but it's a full page of names. The Senate Committee – oh, Senate testimony, Patrick Butler. Then there are Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq chiefs. Then we have Ian McIsaac, Bill Montevocchi, known around Newfoundland and Labrador.

Then we have Elisa Obermann, Paul Barnes, Colin Sproul.

**L. O'DRISCOLL:** (Inaudible.)

**A. PARSONS:** Oh, now the Member for Ferryland is upset because he never gave his testimony. Now you had the chance.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** You've made your point.

**A. PARSONS:** No, no, I haven't made my point, Sir. I haven't made my point.

**SPEAKER:** Address the Chair.

**B. PETTEN:** Speaker, a point of order.

**SPEAKER:** What's the point of order?

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**B. PETTEN:** You're sitting in your Chair – and you call me out for what you want here.

You're sitting in the Chair and you're allowing stuff to happen across the floor. The man's taking over the House. He's having confrontation with my colleagues behind me and you haven't called relevance once. Call me out if you want.

**G. BYRNE:** You look a little red.

**B. PETTEN:** Do you know what Gerry Byrne –

**SPEAKER:** The Member is speaking because the Member had the floor. The comments came across the floor.

**B. PETTEN:** What?

**SPEAKER:** The Member had the floor. That's why he had the right to speak.

**B. PETTEN:** You've got no control of this House.

**SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology. You have 10 more seconds.

**A. PARSONS:** I would say it's a good point, but I can't give the Member that tonight. He's getting really upset here but I'm going to continue on because it's a counterpoint –

**SPEAKER:** Order, please!

The minister's time has expired.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**SPEAKER:** Seeing no other speakers – are you speaking to the bill?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**SPEAKER:** Order, please!

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**SPEAKER:** Order, please!

I ask the minister and the Opposition House Leader, please.

The hon. the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands. We're speaking to the proposed amendment.

**E. JOYCE:** Thank you.

I'm just going to stand for a few minutes; I don't need to go through the Atlantic Accord. I just ask the minister –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**SPEAKER:** Order, please!

**E. JOYCE:** I'm just going to make a few small –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**SPEAKER:** Order, please!

I ask Members on both sides, please.

The hon. the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands you have the floor.

**E. JOYCE:** I just thank the Members for the applause of me standing up here. That was awful nice of you.

I'm not going to get into the Atlantic Accord because we all know the significance it added to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The big concern that we all have and I have going through the full legislation is – and this is pertinent to the minister: Will Ottawa have control to make decisions? That's the biggest concern here.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** (Inaudible.)

**E. JOYCE:** Pardon me?

We're not debating, but I'm debating about putting this on about if you're going to have a hoist –

**AN HON. MEMBER:** (Inaudible.)

**E. JOYCE:** It is the debate. Yeah, so this is my point –

**P. LANE:** This is the amendment right?

**E. JOYCE:** This is the amendment that we're discussing.

**SPEAKER:** It's the proposed amendment that we're debating.

**E. JOYCE:** That's good. That's all right.

That's the biggest point that I've got here is that the Atlantic Accord – we fought so hard to ensure that the oil and gas be brought into Newfoundland and we have control, the question is, with this mirror legislation that we have from the federal government, will we still have control? If we say no, can it go ahead?

That's what I'm asking the minister and he could have a chat on that; because if the answer is that, if the decision is made and Ottawa says: no, we're not going to go ahead with it; we're not allowing you, but the province has the veto to say yes or no on this here, I'm fine with it.

If Newfoundland and Labrador don't have that veto to say yes, we can allow this, or no, especially on some of the marine areas that've been discussed, if that's not a part of it, then we're taking a backwards step. If it is a part of it, then we still have our control that Mr. Peckford, John Crosbie and others fought for for so many years, which we can't give up. If we're not going to give up that control but still be able to go with offshore wind for energy and jobs, I'm fine.

That's my question here. I don't need to debate the whole – it is an extensive legislation. I did read up on it before even coming here because this had been on the go for a while and I remember when Mr. Crosbie did go to Ottawa and make the presentation. So that's my only concern with this here: Are we giving up control that we had prior. That's my question and that's my

concern that I ask. I know that people who are in the industry, when I spoke to a few of them on this, that was their biggest concern.

I'm going to take my seat and then if we can't find some way to work through that, then I agree that we should do hearings on it until we get that answer and get it clarified or make some amendments in the legislation where we're going to protect it or not even approve it. If we're giving up our control of the offshore, then it's pretty hard to vote for this. I just ask the minister for that, and if he can verify that then I'm fine.

Thank you.

**SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Thank you, Speaker.

I think it's important that I speak to the amendment that was put forward.

The motion currently before the House is that all words after the word "that" to be deleted and replaced with the following: Bill 90, An Act to Amend the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland and Labrador Act, be not now read a second time, that the order for second reading be discharged, the bill be withdrawn from the Order Paper and the subject matter referred to a Resource Standing Committee of the House for public hearings.

We listened to the minister stand up and talk, sit down and talk, and what he brought up is the fact that we haven't had Committees in this House for 20 years or longer. So I will say this, and I've said it before and I think it's been said by Members opposite, there are two things. One is, we ought to have Committees and we ought to have Committees on a regular basis. Forget about not having one over a 20- or 25-year period, forget about just creating one for a one-off, but we should be doing way more Committee work.

We should be bringing bills into this House that have been reviewed, discussed and debated by Committees that come in and we know the legislation is strong and it's for the people of this province, Newfoundland and Labrador – everyone.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**L. PARROTT:** I don't buy the fact that because we haven't had a Committee, we shouldn't get another Committee. It just don't wash here. At the end of the day, the reality is that the Atlantic Accord is one of the most substantial pieces of legislation that this province has ever had. It has put us in a place where we need to be now and where we need to move forward, and this is far too important.

I get the changes that are in the mirroring legislation. I understand the difference between the LGIC and GGIC and I get all of that, but it still does not eliminate the fact that the federal government could tie this up in a court, it doesn't give security to anyone who wants to come in here and invest money, and it puts us in a situation where we, regardless of what we think, are in a position of weakness.

I don't think it's absurd to ask for this and given the parliamentary schedule and the fact that we are scheduled to sit here this Thursday, all next week, go on a break and return to the House, there is no reason why we couldn't do that – zero reason whatsoever. Instead, my guess is that tomorrow the House is going to be dismissed and we're going to go home and we're probably not going to come back here until May 12.

We are going to try and get the Atlantic Accord legislation through, close the House in order to accommodate a leadership race in the Liberal government. Mr. Speaker, the reality is that this is far too important. We need a Committee to review this; it's pretty simple. Do you know what? I read the legislation and I'm not going to talk and say

that the minister isn't right in what he says. This legislation can be interpreted in many different ways, but there are questions.

He read out how many people were consulted; all of those people aren't on board. Every senator isn't on board. The Liberal government shot down an amendment that was approved by the Senate. The FFAW have said they're not entirely on board. They've outlined what they want. They've said that the legislation isn't strong enough wording for them, but they look forward to future conversations.

If you don't believe me, I'm willing to table it. I've got the letter and all the documentation that he was talking about right here. I'm more than willing to table it. The letter to Dwan Street, the letter to the minister and the presentation that they did in the Senate. With the House's permission, I'll table it.

**SPEAKER:** Does the Member have leave to table the document?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Leave.

**SPEAKER:** Leave is granted.

**L. PARROTT:** We can make a mistake here, but we can do the right thing too. I'm not suggesting for a second that this isn't good legislation. But I don't feel like we're bulletproof here. It's far too important for it not to be. Why not have the conversations? Why not sit down and make sure we're getting this right?

This is not about getting a piece of legislation. This is about getting the right piece of legislation for the people of this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

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

**P. LANE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker, I just want to briefly speak to the amendment. As I said when I spoke to second reading and others have said, this is perhaps the most important piece of legislation that's going to go through this House of Assembly, that has gone through this House of Assembly in all the time I've been here. I've been here since 2011. By far, the most important bill.

I would say it for the record that I have the utmost confidence in the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology. I do. I'm not just saying it. I believe that. I believe he has the best intentions and, as he said, why would he ever want to have his name associated to something negative like that, to say that he destroyed the Atlantic Accord.

I get that. I believe that 100 per cent, but I will also say that forever and a day, no matter how many times I bring it up, my name will be associated to Muskrat Falls. I thought I was doing the right thing, too. I'm not saying that there are people working in the background here in his department intentionally feeding him the wrong information, that are hiding risk reports and all that kind of stuff like happened and we saw come out in the Muskrat Falls inquiry. I'm not saying that's happening.

The bottom line is it's the same principle. The same principle is that something that was so important to this province, something that will have an impact for years to come, that being Muskrat Falls – I had no intention of doing the wrong thing. I did what I thought was the right thing based on what I was told and so on, the information I had. I will be forever associated to that vote.

As much as I'd love for it to go away, I'd like to wave a magic wand. The only thing – I've had a somewhat colourful political career. Controversy has followed me around a bit, no doubt about it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** You chased it.

**P. LANE:** The hon. Member says you chased it. Maybe I do. But I don't regret one thing I've done in this House, except that. That's the only thing I regret. Everything else I don't regret. I had my reasons and I stick by them. But that was the only thing I do regret, but I had the best intentions in mind.

This bill, as I've said, is so important to our province and to our people, and it is so critical that we get it right. As I've said, I believe the minister is doing what he thinks is right, right now, and I hope it is. I hope it is bulletproof, crystal clear that this is going to work out the way we want it to work out, that this is the way it's intended to work out. I really believe that, and every Member, I'm sure, wants that to be the case.

But given the fact that the minister said himself that this has been on the go for over a year, the feds have had hearings, they've received information, had submissions, the Senate has been involved. It's been a fairly fulsome process, I would say, that has occurred.

So what is the harm, I would say? What is the harm to simply delay this for a few weeks, whatever the case might be, put the Committee in place, like the Members are asking for, and do that bit of work so that we can come back then with this bill? There's lots of time. I'm not sure that there's any urgency. Maybe there's urgency that we're not aware of, I would say. I'm not aware of any urgency. We've got to come back here – like, if the House shuts down next week or if it shuts down tomorrow, whatever, we're going to be back in a few weeks' time anyway to debate the budget and everything else.

So there's no reason why for that time in between, we couldn't do as is being suggested and do that additional due diligence so that we can bring it to the House then and hopefully everybody on both sides can confidently all vote in favour of it. Because I believe that everybody in

this House wants to vote in favour of this. I really believe everybody wants to vote – I want to vote in favour of it, I really do. But I just don't understand, why not allow that a little bit of extra due diligence? What harm would it do? I'll just say, what harm would it do? I don't see a downside. I see an upside. I see zero downside to doing it.

With that in mind, and with all due respect to the minister, again, who I do trust – I will say that, who I do trust – I'm going to support the amendment as has been suggested to just pause this now and take that bit of time to do what's being suggested and then we can come back here when the House reopens in three or four weeks' time, whatever it is, and then, hopefully, everyone is confident, everybody's happy, it's approved unanimously and I don't see any downside to doing that.

So I will support the amendment.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**SPEAKER:** Seeing no other speakers, we are now going to vote on the proposed amendment.

All those in favour of the amendment, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**SPEAKER:** All those against the amendment, 'nay.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Nay.

Amendment defeated.

On motion, amendment defeated.

**SPEAKER:** We now go back to the original bill, the second reading of Bill 90.

Any other speakers?

Seeing no other speakers, if the minister speaks now, we'll close debate.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Thank you, Speaker.

I'm happy to speak, again, to close second reading of this debate. A few points I want to make and I never got a chance to make earlier when we were dealing with the amendment. One point that the Member –

**AN HON. MEMBER:** (Inaudible.)

**A. PARSONS:** I got called (inaudible). Isn't that funny?

One point that the Member made that was interesting was the website about the pathway to predevelopment. What I would say to the Member is that is launched for Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia. It's open until 2027. The reason they have opened that and included both sides is that Nova Scotia is ready to move forward on this and Newfoundland and Labrador are not. Newfoundland and Labrador applicants cannot apply for that now. They wouldn't get approved because they don't have the ability to go but if they did not include Newfoundland and Labrador in it, then we would be kicking up a different kind of fuss because we weren't included in this federal funding program.

So right now, they do not know. They know that we still haven't passed ours yet, but they've recognized that we are intending to pass it in this Legislature. We've given a signal, which I thought it was fine to go with that. Now, that doesn't change the fact that there are times, yes, when the federal government does things that certainly tick me off.

I can tell you now, it's one thing when you're in Opposition and I've had that happen with federal governments and governments, and I can tell you, in government as well, there

are times when the federal government does stuff. This is not one that causes me concern, given the fact that we worked with them extensively over the last two years on development of this bill, along with Nova Scotia at the same time.

So we worked with them which is why they wouldn't have minded putting this out to allow people that might apply from Nova Scotia offshore to avail of these funding opportunities to basically engage on offshore wind development.

The reason that I'm not supportive of a delay in this is the fact that this has been discussed extensively. I know it hasn't been discussed extensively in this House, but the fact is that it has been reviewed by multiple committees at the federal level, the provincial governments have been engaging and, in fact, the general public, more so than any bill I've seen in some time, has been engaged.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling this binder, of which I never got to everybody that has spoken, and everybody can have access to that. I can tell you now, the fact that the Ches Crosbies, the Max Ruelokkes, the Kris Costellos – all citizens, not with any organization, all had a chance to go and present to the Senate and to the House of Commons shows that everybody had a chance for some time. This is not rushed.

Nova Scotia passed theirs three months ago. In fact, we've had this for some time but I held it off. One of the reasons I held it off is that I did want to have further consultations with the FFAW, especially in light of the fact that they were getting new leadership. So we waited and we talked to Ms. Street. We talked to some of her staff who were involved in this. We held off on this. That's why it's in this session of the House because we wanted to ensure we consulted with the FFAW.

I think the Member for Terra Nova mentioned, well, the FFAW is supportive

now but if things go sideways. I always assume that things are good until they aren't good. I get what the Member is saying. If this comes to a point where this has a harmful effect then, believe me, we're going to hear it, but I can tell you now that I think that the actual legislation is changed federally and provincially to take into account fishing grounds. It was specifically done to ensure there is a mechanism and, as I pointed out last week, we were actually forming a mechanism for them to engage with the C-NLOPB.

The other thing I want to point out, and maybe this is where we get the Committee, I've heard the term watering down the Accord rights. I heard the term we're worried. So here's what I specifically want to ask: What sections of the bill give us the worry? And I'm not saying that in any other way but with sincerity. What are the sections of the bill that hold us from debating this bill continuing on? That's what I need to know and that's why we have a Committee to go through that and that's a chance for a full, wide-ranging debate.

To answer the Member from Bay of Islands and his point during the last part of this debate, he stood up and said if you can say to me no, that it doesn't give away our rights, then that's one thing; if not, I want to see a Committee. Well, I can say to you, Sir, unequivocally, no. It does not give away anything. We are only gaining by this, as reflected in black and white in the writing of the legislation.

We have held off on this for some time. I have appeared in more parliamentary Committees on this legislation than anything else I've done in 10 years. We've talked about the legalization of marijuana in this House. That was a big thing. I had more hearings on this than that. I've appeared in front of the Senate, televised nationally, House of Commons committee, nationally, all televised for anybody to access. Our department – and I point out, this is far from a partisan debate. Because I can guarantee

you if I was on that side and if you were on this, I'd be asking the same questions and I do believe you'd be giving the same answers. I don't believe this is partisan for one minute.

But I will say also to that point is that the women and men in the departments, multiple departments, that have been working on this are good public servants. But more than that, good Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. They don't want to do something – you think that it's just politicians that feel this? It ain't. They are going to feel this too. And I can tell you I have trust in these people, people that have been around for two years, people that have been around for 30 years. We've had a wide range of people looking at this, all that want the same thing, all that shared the same concerns that you share and that I share.

What I'm saying to you, and then I'll sit down, I don't share those concerns now because I think they have been addressed through the amount of time we have put in this. But we have that Committee, we can go through that, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**SPEAKER:** Is the House ready for the question?

The motion is that Bill 90 be now read a second time.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

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

Motion carried.

**CLERK (Hawley George):** A bill, An Act to Amend the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland and Labrador Act. (Bill 90)

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

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** Now.

**SPEAKER:** Now.

On motion, a bill, "An Act to Amend the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland and Labrador Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill 90)

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** Thank you, Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Order 11.

I move that this House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 90.

**SPEAKER:** And a seconder for that motion?

**L. DEMPSTER:** Seconded by the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 90.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

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

Motion carried.

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

### **Committee of the Whole**

**CHAIR (Trimper):** Order, please!

We are now considering Bill 90, An Act to Amend the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland and Labrador Act.

A bill, "An Act to Amend the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland and Labrador Act." (Bill 90)

**CLERK:** Clause 1.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 1 carry?

The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm not going to spend any time talking on this. I do have a multitude of questions, so I'll get right to it.

The minister indicated that he was willing to put forth his binder. I'll highlight the fact that last week on Thursday when he introduced the legislation, he used some prepared notes to speak on specific parts of the bill. I'll ask if he'd be willing to make them publicly available also?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Absolutely.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Obviously, one of the larger issues with offshore is the impact the timeline and the regulatory processes had on our ability to develop new projects. Is there any feeling as to how this could impact timelines associated with offshore oil and gas from, I guess cradle to grave, really?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I don't think that the changes to this bill are going to have any significant effect pro or con. I think the impacts that we have to have to expedite oil and gas development come down to federal changes as it relates to environmental impact statements, assessments, things like that.

The bigger thing that's had a chilling effect on all this, and we've said this, is that the federal government comments at times – the ones you referenced tonight and other Members referenced tonight, that's what has a chilling effect on investment.

But the other thing that has a chilling affect on investment, and this is why I want to move this forward – I'm looking at a press release here – is "Government of Canada and Nova Scotia Moving Forward to Seize the Enormous Economic Opportunities of Offshore Wind." Right now, there's a bit of a chill in the air when it comes to offshore renewables here in the province because they wanted to have the regulatory certainty before they invest that money. They will go to Nova Scotia first, before they come here, even though I think we have a better opportunity here.

So I don't think this is going to impact it. In fact, when this gets done, I think people will look at it and still say that there are no changes to the protections and everything else that was driven in the Accord. As for the bigger picture, sort of non-tangible, well, that comes with new administrations, and we have a new prime minister now. We'll see what happens in the federal election,

and that changes where the people want to invest, plus the whole down south situation.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** So obviously during this process, the debate was around the Atlantic Accord, and one of our bigger issues certainly with our offshore and it will be a part of our wind issues too is the environmental assessment and approval. Was there any thought to trying to capture greater responsibility provincially in that process rather than depending on the federal government to do it?

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

**A. PARSONS:** It's not a conversation that I had because I dealt mainly with the minister of Natural Resources but I would imagine it was a non-starter. No more than we want to have more, they probably don't want to give it up.

So it's not a conversation I had on that aspect. Our biggest concern was ensuring that the language stayed similar when it came to the offshore oil and not changing anything on that front.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** This one will be a little winded.

In the federal Parliament in public discourse, there were concerns raised about specific section of the legislation and the ability that Ottawa could use it to shut down the offshore oil industry.

Federal legislation reads as follows: "56.1 Subject to section 7, the Governor in Council may, for the purpose of the protection of the environment, make regulations prohibiting, in respect of any portion of the offshore area that is specified

in those regulations and that is located in an area that is or, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, may be identified under an Act of Parliament or of the Legislature of the Province as an area for environmental or wildlife conservation or protection, (a) the commencement or continuation of (i) any work or activity relating to the exploration or drilling for or the production, conservation, processing or transportation of petroleum, or (ii) an offshore renewable energy project; or (b) the issuance of interests."

The legislation before us today replaces Governor General in Council with Lieutenant Governor in Council but the rest remains the same. Can the minister provide some comment on this and the public commentary that was made when the debate occurred in Ottawa? Given the concerns raised in the federal debate, how comfortable is the minister with this section?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Absolutely, I think this is the section that drove all of the commentary really. Besides the fact that I think not as it related to a specific section – I'm not taking away from the offshore fishery's concerns. That's one thing. I think any time you deal with any kind of development offshore, harvesters worry about, does that impact fishing grounds? So that's one thing.

On this one, though, it came into this new marine conservation – the whole concept of environmental protection. So I think you're mentioning section 56.1?

**L. PARROTT:** That is it.

**A. PARSONS:** Yes. So 56.1 is new. It's an addition to 56, which introduces the environmental or wildlife conservation or protection into the Accord and that, read by itself, causes concern. But then you go back to section 7.1, which is also introduced, which says that before a regulation is made

under section 56, the federal minister shall consult the provincial minister with respect to the proposed regulation, and the regulation shall not be made without the provincial minister's approval. That's why I feel okay about this.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** So for argument's sake, during the consultation process, there's a stalemate. It's your assertion that the provincial minister has full authority over the decision?

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

**A. PARSONS:** So that's the thing, because I look at the law the same as you do; I look at the interpretation. I mean, I spent days – and the two Members opposite will probably remember this. We spent days in here talking about may versus shall, and the reg here says with respect to the proposed regulation and the regulation shall not be made without the provincial minister's approval, which is what gives me that.

So if it said "may," it might have a different word. But "shall" is the important word in that sentence, the impacting word. That's where I take the comfort.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** So, for clarity, who will have the authority to designate an offshore area as protected for environmental conservation purposes?

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

**A. PARSONS:** So my understanding on that one is that one will be still under federal purview when it comes to, I guess, section 56 and section 7. So they can appoint what they want as a marine conservation area,

but when it comes to does it impact the offshore oil, section 7.1 allows us not to allow that to happen.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Can you provide a specific legal opinion to that effect?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I don't have the opinion here. I do believe that in the briefings that we had, various members from JPS that were consulted and were part of the briefing. What I could do is this, because I had no intentions – obviously we've talked about, like, why we're moving this ahead. But the third reading will not be done tonight.

I would have no issue ensuring that a legal opinion was provided, because there's probably one sitting there in JPS. I would have no problem ensuring that a legal opinion was entered during third reading, and if it's not what we think is the right thing, if it's not saying what I'm saying, then that's a whole different ball game.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** So, again, I guess it's kind of the same question, but for argument's sake, if the federal government were to come in and designate an environmental or conservation area in an area where there's existing exploration or an existing operation, that would not shut down the process going forward?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology, for the record.

**A. PARSONS:** I don't have section 55(1) here in front of me.

No, they cannot come in and override, by virtue of the Accord that we have here, and make a marine conservation zone in an area that is undergoing exploration, drilling, you name it. They do not have that ability to provide that override. They need our permission to do that – whoever sits in this chair or the Premier's chair, whatever.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** And just for my own clarity, I guess that would come under section 4 that says the Accord supersedes any federal legislation regardless of what it is? Is that fair?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Yeah, that's the big win about this legislation, before it wasn't always in the Accord. This is putting it into the accord so they cannot use other federal legislation to get in the back door. We have the Accord here which will still protect us.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Okay, so for future projects, whether they're renewable or non-renewable, who will have the authority to approve any exploration project? From an environmental perspective, will it be the feds or us?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I don't think I have the section here in front of me, but at the end of the day, when it comes to offshore oil, there's a supply certainty section. I don't have it here but, at the end of the day, the provincial minister holds the hammer when it comes to that. If there's ever a security of supply question, the provincial minister holds the hammer and makes that final decision.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** When I go back to Bay du Nord, as an example – and the next question leads into that – who has the authority to approve new producing projects from an environmental perspective? We've seen the situation where the federal minister, in essence, shut us down or delayed it or whatever and basically held a gun to our head for a period of time, so who has that authority?

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

**A. PARSONS:** The difference there is, that's not an Accord issue. That's a federal environmental legislation issue under that minister. That wasn't Jonathan Wilkinson – we'll use ministers of today– that would've been a federal Department of Environment decision.

They have the right to make that decision, but we, as a province, also have the right to challenge that decision in court if there's a disagreement on that to see that they concurred with the law and followed everything that's appropriate; something that many other provinces have done multiple times. We've been lucky we haven't had to go down that route many times.

That wouldn't be an NR decision. Again, I don't disagree with anything in your preamble, though. The fact is that it went longer than it should've.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** If we back up to our previous question where we indicated that the minister would have final approval, I guess? Basically, the federal government would consult with our provincial minister and the provincial minister would have to agree.

In an instance where the provincial minister didn't agree, would the federal government have the ability to take us to court? It's what I highlighted earlier in our speech. A very large piece of uncertainty for me is whether or not the federal government says we're taking you to court.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I'll just give you my take on this and you can probably find a couple of better lawyers in this room to give you their opinion, one on your side and then one on our side.

So, yes, I always say anybody can take anybody to court at any time. It comes down to the merits of the case and having the judicial system to hear the evidence. What I would suggest is that when it comes to applying the legislation, the interpretation would be quite clear to any judge of a superior court in this country that under the Accord, under that section 7, we have that protection.

Unless they have some kind of good reason that we could surmise and speculate, I think that gets beyond the realm of actual possibility, I feel very comfortable that if the federal government ever took that step, they would lose that case.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** The wheels are spinning now.

So would the minister agree that the whole premise that the ability for either the province or the federal government to take one another to court in some kind of a stalemate adds a level of uncertainty to industry that may make them worry about new – again, I'll go back and say we're not talking about a small investment. We're not talking about an investment that is backed

by government. We're talking about billions of dollars and uncertainty is certainly there.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Look, what you're suggesting is not wrong but, I mean, uncertainty exists everywhere. I'll just use Alberta for example. They're probably more at loggerheads with the federal government than we are, even on regular day-to-day things, but it doesn't cease that investment there.

I think the biggest thing we can do as a provincial government, that any provincial government could do, is to show that we, as a province, are supportive of and want that investment there. No different than any federal government of any stripe could come in and think things differently. We'll fight them with the law we have. We have good law here.

It will never stop them. That's one of the things, like, we always had the case, well, Norway does this and Norway does that. Well, it's too bad because Norway is a sovereign jurisdiction. We're just one part of the federation, so yeah, we're always going to have that.

But, generally speaking, I think that I feel comfortable where we are on that. More would be a worry if, as a province, we weren't demonstrating that we wanted that here, but Alberta seems to do fine and Saskatchewan seems to do fine. We look at the issues that we've had elsewhere in terms of the federal government and pipelines and things like that. I mean, that stuff exists. We might not be able to ever get away from it but we try to control what we can control.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** In the minister's opinion, once this bill receives Royal Assent, does it

change anything for us as a province from an environmental perspective? Again, back to the same two questions I asked him a few minutes ago: Does it help us be involved in the environmental approval from an exploration or operation standpoint?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I don't think this changes any of that. We still have the approval for the development plans. The rest of it still falls under the different environmental pieces in the same way that any offshore plan, oil or renewables, will go through an environmental assessment.

What I do think this does is now, once we have this certainty here, hopefully we will start to see those conversations about the possibility of offshore in electrification and, you know, along those lines. Right now, until it's done, I think people don't fully want to go down that road.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** From my perspective, we're lucky as a province that we've had OilCo, as an example, and we've got an abundance of seismic data and we know what's what and where it is. I would argue and hope and think that that is our proprietary data and in the event that we decide to sell off OilCo, we still keep that data.

I'm thinking out loud here, but knowing that and knowing who would have access to that data, was there any consideration to allow the offshore board to be the adjudicator of which areas should be environmental protection areas?

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

**A. PARSONS:** My understanding is that might go beyond the scope of this. I think the biggest thing about this legislation was

twofold. One, it was geared at the offshore renewables, allowing for that to happen and making it a joint jurisdiction, as opposed to what it is right now which is just federal. On the oil and gas side, I think it was very much just a housekeeping exercise. They did not want to poke at it too much and change that. I don't think there was any federal appetite for that and maybe that's a fight for a different day.

I mean, that wasn't really the consideration here. This was about getting the renewables under the regulator. As for changing the regulator or letting them do that, that's a whole different – maybe like I said, that's a fight for another day.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**S. COADY:** It was Harper in 2012 who made that change.

**A. PARSONS:** Was it? You should say that.

**L. PARROTT:** Yeah, it don't matter who made it (inaudible).

So the minister said a few minutes ago, and I'm not going to quote or paraphrase but, basically, when I asked about what changes for us from an environmental standpoint and all that good stuff in this bill once it gets Royal Assent, you didn't think anything would change. If that's the case, then why is section 61 even in the bill?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Okay, just let me go to section 61. When you say section 61 you're saying: The act is amended by adding immediately after section 55 the following?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Yeah.

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

**A. PARSONS:** So reading this, I guess this is part of the mirrored legislation that they wanted: “Subject to section 7, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council” – the federal legislation would say the GG – “may, for the purpose of the protection of the environment, make regulations prohibiting, in respect of a portion of the offshore area that is specified....”

The reason they have this is because it does allow for that mirroring effect. This is not something, obviously, that we would want to put in there. They would want to put in there but, again, the factor that gives me comfort is the section 7, when it comes to that reg.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** The section in our bill is 61, adding section 55.1 to our legislation is supposed to be about renewable energy, is my understanding, then why is the section added and, most notably, why is (i) being added? That specifically talks about petroleum. If it’s about offshore wind development, why are we mixing the two things together?

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

**A. PARSONS:** So just going to read the section here to make sure I’m on the same page.

“Subject to section 7, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, for the purpose of the protection of the environment, make regulations prohibiting, in respect of a portion of the offshore area that is specified in those regulations and that is located in an area that is or, in the opinion of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may be identified under an Act of Parliament of Canada or an Act of the Legislature as an

area for environmental or wildlife conservation or protection, (a) the commencement or continuation of (i) a work or activity related to the exploration or drilling for or for the production, conservation, processing or transportation of petroleum, or (ii) an offshore renewable energy project.”

I think my take on that is just that you have to have both in there under the marine conservation and wildlife protection. Actually, I think subsection (i) had been in there. I think subsection (ii) is the new part that was added to that.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Okay.

Section 8 of the bill adds section 7.1 to the act and it says, “For greater certainty, the Atlantic Accord does not apply to offshore renewable energy resources.” If the Atlantic Accord does not apply to offshore renewable energy then why is the legislation of the Accord being amended to include renewables?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Okay, the Member will have to give me a second here. Is it section 8?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Yes.

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

**A. PARSONS:** So adding immediately after section 7 the following: “For greater certainty, the Atlantic Accord does not apply to offshore renewable energy resources.”

It says here that it gives clarity and ensures that we can’t unilaterally cancel interest for

O & G and renewables. The Accord does not necessarily – I'm just reading here now – apply to renewable energy. There are some differences between the Accord and this. One of them is just under the benefits.

Some of the protections we have for oil and gas do not necessarily exist for this because the first right that we have on oil and gas for local citizens is actually not allowed these days under trade protections. So this one's a bit different.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** I guess what I'll say here is, you mentioned earlier some of the people that you consulted and letters that you've got, so I'm not going to go through five or six different questions, but I'll give you a broad spectrum of it.

Is there recent written support from the FFAW, CAPP, Energy NL, Trades NL, Unifor and the others? Not their submissions to Senate but have we received any recent support letters?

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

**A. PARSONS:** There has been nothing sent to us since the federal implementation of the legislation in Nova Scotia. Under the FFAW, I haven't had anything from them in writing. I had a meeting with the president and a couple of their staff. In fact, I actually made a phone call to the president last week to have a conversation. I did not get a follow-up call. Again, not saying anything nefarious reason, I made the call.

CAPP we have met with in the Premier's Office. I think CAPP did not want to be put into the politics of this going on at the federal level. CAPP was absolutely agreeable to where we are going. CAPP knows where the provincial government stands on this so I haven't had anything from them. With Energy NL, I haven't had

anything new, but Energy NL from my knowledge and from their submission is supportive of this and is okay. They will be the first ones to give us a hard time if we were doing anything to infringe on oil and gas and they didn't go down that road.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Yeah, I got to go back to the previous question when you highlighted the fact that portions of the Accord will not apply to offshore wind.

Is it the minister's contention that, for example the Accord has very strong wording with hiring practices and Newfoundlanders and Labradorians first and all that kind of stuff, we could be doing offshore projects that don't have firm rules for our hiring practices and Newfoundlanders and Labradorians won't be the ones doing this?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Not at all. That would be an important concern.

We do have a benefits agreement that's a part of that that says Newfoundlanders and Labradorians get fair consideration or the same ones I think that we have under the hydro. You can't say first because it's not trade compliant. I have it here somewhere but the overall answer to you generically is no, it's not my concern.

It's just, the legislation, the wording that we have for oil and gas is better than what we can get now because of the new trade agreements that we are a part of. I would like to get that wording in there; we can't get that wording in there, but I'm satisfied with where we are now. I don't have concerns no more than we have any time. I think it's on governments and regulators to ensure companies live up to their end of the bargain when it comes to hiring processes

and the points that you've brought up before.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** I guess my concern listening to that is two-fold.

From my standpoint and, obviously, we don't need to go through my history but I strongly believe it should be Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that are carrying out the work; and secondary to that component is that I believe that any construction, certainly the civil portion of any GBS that's associated with putting a wind tower out there – and I realize, from a manufacturing standpoint, some of these blades and stuff have to come from away.

I guess what I'm asking is: Are there guidelines that dictate that, from a purchasing standpoint, the same as the Accord? The Accord is very strong in those words. Is it the same for offshore wind with regard to local procurement?

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

**A. PARSONS:** With respect to benefits, this legislation will expand the benefit principles to these offshore renewable energy projects. Proponents are required to have a benefits plan and provide full and fair opportunity to Newfoundland and Labrador residents for contracting and employment opportunities. I think the language is good, I think it protects us but I think the point you're making is that we always have to be vigilant.

I don't know if we can make the wording any stronger and not get ourselves in trouble with trade agreements, but I don't think for a second you can just expect contractors to come in and do what the law says or what's right. We've had similar situations recently, actually, and not in this industry but ones that you've reached out to me on where –

let's just say in the mining industry – people have brought these concerns forward, we wouldn't know these until they happened.

We have since gone back to those companies to say here's what our information is; it's on you now to show us or else. It's the same thing here.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Obviously, with our offshore oil and gas, we know that there's a framework for royalties and stuff. Is there any kind of framework in place for wind?

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

**A. PARSONS:** The only thing we have now is the fiscal framework for onshore wind. We have not developed the offshore framework. Still a fair amount of work to do to figure out that and what the economics of that are. So that part is not done yet.

That will be, obviously, the next step forward in figuring this out.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** You explained this earlier but, just for clarity, I'd like for you to explain it again and it's the whole idea of the legislation and the timing. Last week, when you introduced the legislation, we knew the discussion. We wanted it to come forth this sitting and get through it. Federal Parliament took way more time and, obviously, they're the architects of this and we know that and the people who are involved.

Is there a reason why the legislation wasn't brought in last fall? That's the first question. The second question is there was an incident here last fall when we had wind protestors here in the House and there was a comment made about legislation that was

going to come forward on wind. Were you referring to this specific legislation as that or is there a different piece of legislation coming forward for –?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I cannot recall for sure. The only other one would be the renewable energy act which I don't know if I was talking about that.

What I would point out is the good start about this is that the federal government did the lion's share of the work for Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia is in the same boat as us, except they got ahead of the draw quicker in terms of, I think, they got it done in their legislature just before Christmas.

They had some issues, especially when we did the House of Commons hearings, with their Indigenous partners. In fact, they had to have some conversations there and it actually went back and we came back in front of the House of Commons again.

At that time, we had some conversations with the FFAW. My feeling all along, especially with we knew there was new leadership coming in with the FFAW, and that was one of the bigger concerns put forward were harvesters – so we felt it was of the best interest to make sure we have that conversation.

You didn't want to bring the legislation to the House without feeling we're on the same page. I feel like we are on the same page. At least there's a working relationship. We probably would have had it. This is the first opportunity to bring it in.

Coming back to the comments about rushed. I mean, you think about it. We could have had it here in the fall. We probably would have had more trouble because I don't know if I would have satisfied what the FFAW was looking for or that comfort level,

that conversation level. I feel better about it now and that's why I'm happy to put it here.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** So the minister said, a few minutes ago, that the offshore framework – and you can correct me if I get this wrong – is not yet completed. But today, obviously, the federal government released what looks like offshore framework. How do we know we're going to get the maximum benefit from this?

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

**A. PARSONS:** What I can put out – and I want to make sure we're on the same page – the Offshore Wind Predevelopment Program is an Offshore Wind Indigenous And Coastal Communities Grant Funding – Call for Proposals, which aims to help create the enabling conditions for wind development off the coast by conducting science-based activities and supporting engagement with Indigenous and coastal communities. It's an investment which will grant funding to support Indigenous and coastal communities' engagement on offshore wind development.

So the reason we can do that is this is giving them money to do the consultation and science work that they want to do, which doesn't have anything to do with a province making the award of it. We still have a lot of work left to do on that part, but that doesn't mean that these communities and Indigenous leaders can't do the research they want to do with federal funding.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Again, I'm not harping on this announcement, but the announcement doesn't take effect, obviously, for Newfoundland, until our framework is done,

this bill is passed. It had to be in there in order to keep Newfoundland and Nova Scotia on par. I still struggle with the fact that it came out ahead of our legislation sitting and it being passed.

Did you know this announcement was being made today?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I didn't know about this specific program, which in the grand scheme of things, when you're talking about \$10,000 per recipient, it's not a massive program. I'm actually looking at it now and I can already see a mistake in the press release that they put out. So, look, there's times when the feds are doing stuff and I'm sat here going, what are they doing, why are they doing it, but the feds are always going to be feds. No matter who's up there, they're always going to do their thing.

I appreciate the fact that sometimes, also, you can't win. If they had done this with just Nova Scotia, we would probably have people down here getting upset, how come we're not included, because we're moving in that direction.

All will happen with this is that if somebody today picked that up and said I'm going to apply for that, the federal government officer would probably say to them, well, Newfoundland and Labrador hasn't passed this yet, so you're going to have to wait. The program is there; I'm glad to know about it. We'll hold your application on file, and then when and if the province passes this, we can deal with it.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** As we sit here right now, are there any companies that are interested in generating wind offshore in Newfoundland, and can you provide any details on that?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I've had very few recent conversations on offshore wind, for a few reasons. Number one, a lot of places that are doing offshore wind are trying to green their own grid, and that's not necessarily where we need to go, given where we are. They need it, as opposed to us.

The second part is that, right here now, onshore is economically the best bet. That is the most feasible; that is where the capital is going. A lot of places consider offshore because they don't have the space and they don't have the ability, they don't have the wind to do it onshore.

The third thing is – I can remember having an offshore wind conversation when I was in Opposition with a crowd about the West Coast. We talked about it and everything else but it just wasn't going anywhere. That's not where the province was going at that time. Right now, with this here, I'm hoping this stirs some of those conversations. We'll be happy to have them, but there is still work to do on our end.

I can tell you the bandwidth we consumed trying to get the onshore ready in terms of fiscal framework and everything else has been massive and we still got other things. It's sort of off the subject, but we only have so much staff and we're also working on a royalty regime for offshore gas, which I still think is an opportunity.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** I hope so.

So just to go back to your point there, and I'll get in my hot tub time machine and go backwards. In 2015-2016, Beothuk Energy, Copenhagen Infrastructure and now, I believe, maybe Cenovus or someone has bought into this whole idea of what they were kicking the tire at. At that time, I know

that they had applications in for offshore rights, I guess, really, to develop wind energy.

Do they still hold those rights because if my memory serves me correct, they had a lot of the West Coast and other areas totally tied up?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I'll be honest, I don't know where that sits. I haven't dealt with that. That would have been prior to my time. That's an answer I can absolutely provide to you either in the House or outside of the House, not a problem. I don't believe that they have those rights, but I can honestly say I haven't dealt with it in any way, shape or form.

CIP, in fact, moved their interest to onshore and partnered with ABO for the onshore project. Whether they start looking at offshore again we'll see, but that's an answer and I'll get you better one after.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** I think it's an important question that we need to get answered and, I'll be honest, I don't necessarily understand how the application went and what rights they had because it was offshore. But I do know that they had applications in for specific areas that would give them the right to develop and it blocked out a lot of other players at the time.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I just got a note here – thank God for technology – offshore rights were fully federal at the time.

As soon as I get the message sent to me it's oh, yeah, that's right. That's why we're doing this, because everything offshore was

federal. With this new agreement, we have an MOU right now where we have certain inshore rights that belong solely to the province, you know, the jaws of land and things like that. There's an MOU that hopefully will be finalized and there's a map. Everything else outside of that now would be joint obviously, but prior to that, it would have been federal.

So I don't know where that sits but we can find that out.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** I guess the question is what would happen to those applications in the fact that they were federal and now they may come under provincial jurisdiction? Does that mean we absorb that or does that mean they're no longer valid?

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

**A. PARSONS:** That's a good question that might require some analysis by JPS and everybody else. Put it this way, number one, I don't know if it's an issue; but number two, if it is an issue, I would have no problem ensuring people got you the information.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** I know this is fresh and I believe we have a responsibility to do this too, but obviously the federal Liberal Party has a new leader. Has there been a commitment from him or have you guys reached out for a commitment from him in support of our offshore oil and gas? Because there's no need to mince words, we know what happened from 2017 until 2025, really. And listen, I'm not doubting that we as a province pushed but we were pushed back on.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I don't believe, and I certainly don't speak for the Premier, that any reach has been made, certainly not from our department yet. I still have a relationship with the current minister of Natural Resources. Nothing has changed from that perspective. He has absolutely been supportive. I have a lot of good to say about Minister Wilkinson. He has been really good to deal with and supportive.

In terms of the prime minister-elect or whatever you would call him now, maybe that reach out will occur on a first minister's level after he's sworn in. I think that will come. I think it's a good point. I think it's a conversation that needs to happen, but I would imagine with everything going on up there, it will take a little bit more time just figuring out the lay of land there and what he's doing, but I take your point and agree to it.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** So, again, I made this point earlier when I spoke and I guess I'll try and get a direct answer on it. It still bothers me that the decision was made to include renewable energy in the same legislation and the same regulator as oil and gas.

Do you think there would have been any merit in writing a new piece of legislation specifically for renewable energy? I know you're going to come back and say mirror legislation, but just get aside from that and make sure there was no concerns about the impact it would have on the Atlantic Accord.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I'll put it this way. Yes, the province could have done that, but it would have had no effect or authority whatsoever because it's purely under federal jurisdiction. The feds, depending on their mindset, could have chose to go any way they wanted, including ways that were not

conducive. They could have left the Accord alone and said, do you know what, we're not going to work with you on offshore wind.

So we did not have that ability to develop recognizable legislation which is why we went with this route. I don't disagree with the point you make. Yeah, there's a merit for that but in the grand scheme of things, when the feds come to you and say we want to jointly manage it with you, we have regulator that everybody is happy with that seems to work really well, we're going to add this into all these other things, we'll change a little bit here and there but your offshore oil rights stay the same, we thought that was a good way to go.

In some cases, too, you don't have two pieces of legislation that you got to monitor and do this and do that. You're still dealing with the same body here up in Ottawa. I get the point, but I think this is why we had to go this route.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** So last Thursday, the minister said this isn't a case of Ottawa dictating or shoving this down our throats. Are there any specific examples that the minister can give that shows where we got the language in this legislation that we wanted so that we're successful in making sure this is the right legislation?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I would suggest that it's easy for me to sit here and say we pushed back but what I can endeavour to do is see if there are any – I'll put it this way, tons of phone calls – tons – but there were letters. So what I can do is try to find some of that correspondence which would prove the point that you're seeking.

I can tell you my personal experience is that the federal government never came at us

with any sort of negative intent – we're going to do this; we're going to trample all over you. That was never the mindset. At a bureaucratic level, absolutely – it was not even always politician driven; it was bureaucratic. There are times when bureaucrats from Ottawa who have no idea about any of this would say, well what about this? We would have to push back and say no, this is why you can't do that.

A lot of that happens at the bureaucrat level, so I feel good about the process. I don't feel like it was forced and that's one of the reasons it took a fair amount of time. This was ongoing a couple of years back because it required that amount of time to have these conversations to make sure that they understood the point of view of the province.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Again, I'll reiterate what I said when I spoke earlier. I don't really care who is in Ottawa. I don't really care who the sitting environmental minister is right now. My concern is, come next week when the new prime minister is sworn in and he decides who he wants in his Cabinet, if he doesn't decide to go to the polls, or if he goes to the polls and he wins, that someone like Mr. Guilbeault is back in that seat.

He has proven, through his language and through his actions, that he really doesn't care about, not only our offshore oil and gas, but I would argue possibly the province when it comes to our requirement and our necessity for oil and gas. Does that not concern you at all?

And so we're clear, I'm not trying to get you (inaudible) –

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

**A. PARSONS:** No, not at all.

What I would say is that there are certain things that are completely out of our control. No matter who is there, the prime minister has the prerogative to put who they want in that chair.

Perhaps I can say it like this. I would prefer that the next prime minister put someone different in that chair.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** The legislation is going to allow the federal or provincial government to fund a request of the offshore regulator. Are there any requests now being prepared to the regulator?

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

**A. PARSONS:** No. I think the main one on that is that the federal government may want things done bilingual, and if they do, it's their responsibility to fund that. That wouldn't be a provincial responsibility; obviously, we wouldn't have any issue with it either, but it would be their cost.

Other than that, I'm not aware of anything else that's in front.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** This is probably my last question.

I don't think I can explain it any simpler than I did earlier. This legislation allows for the operator, as an example, if there's a smaller find offshore, to work in conjunction with the C-NLOPB to regulate. Does that give the C-NLOPB the ability to dictate and say that they have to do this, or is it two operators have to come together and approach the C-NLOPB? Because we know that these

operators don't necessarily always work together.

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

**A. PARSONS:** What I would say to you is that it does not give the regulator authority to dictate, which is unfortunate. That's a conversation I've had recently with other people about the need to try to force co-operation amongst players in our offshore. The problem is, again, it does require conversations with Ottawa as well.

What I would say is, look, I don't come at this with the background in the field, but I've always welcomed people giving me their thoughts on this who have been doing this a lot longer than me, and I've had a few people recently – in fact, you've given me your thoughts on different things and I take all that in.

I think that it's incumbent on the province to continue to challenge to ensure that we're getting the best use of our offshore and it's not always the company – sometimes we have to find a way to help those companies do that rather than expect them to take the altruistic step themselves.

**CHAIR:** I'm just going to check with the House. Are you concluding because I was going to move it around? I think you're (inaudible) –

**L. PARROTT:** No, I'm going to ask one more question.

**CHAIR:** Okay, one more question.

The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Under this legislation and the ability for proponents to come together and work together, obviously one of things that is near and dear to me and I believe that we really, really should be trying to get moving is LNG.

The LNG deposits in our offshore, for people who don't understand, we pump gas up, we pump gas back down and we're one of the only jurisdictions in the world. We cap it and we keep it there. There are large amounts of LNG offshore that we could utilize for sale in other jurisdictions throughout the world, for use here, for thermal generation, for all kinds of different things.

Is it your opinion that this bill would make that more accessible? Because my mind goes to a place where we now have the ability for the three or four operators offshore who have individual LNG deposits to possibly come together and utilize one pipeline into shore.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I don't know if what we're dealing with here today changes any of that, which is part of what we're dealing with – we're not changing a whole lot when it comes to our offshore oil. In fact, that was one of the fears that has been expressed to us is to make sure that it was entrenched and protected.

What I would say is that, as a province, we're trying to do what we can to help that industry. We have funded people that are exploring it. We're funding getting the royalty regime figured out. We still have to work with the players because you know just as well as I do, a lot of them didn't give one lick about whether this was something they wanted to do or not.

I think the provincial government, probably, well over 10 years ago, could have made some decisions to go down that route but that wasn't the mindset at the time.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you, Chair.

I just want to start off there with a couple of questions. Once this bill receives Royal Assent, what steps have to be taken place by either government or the new C-NLOER for bids for parcels to open up? Are we close like Nova Scotia once this has Royal Assent, or is there still a bit of legwork that has to be done beforehand?

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

**A. PARSONS:** There is absolutely legwork that has to happen on submerged licences, the process that we want to go through. This was just to figure out the legislation for the jurisdiction of it all.

So there is still some legwork to do, but this allows us to commence that work. The good news is that we can look to the board and the regulator to help provide guidance on that. They've been doing this work. They've been dealing with both the offshore we have here in terms of oil, as well as what the offshore looks like in other jurisdictions whether it be in Aberdeen or you name it.

I think we can move fairly quick on it but, at the same time, I'm trying not to downplay how much work is required here.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** From that work that you were just talking about, do we have timeline from when this work is going to be completed and to first call for bids, or is that a little bit a way away yet?

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

**A. PARSONS:** A little way away yet. I can't put a timeline on that because I don't have any ability to promise that we could even stick to it.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Under clause 4, why give the LG in Council this flexibility by amending the definition of an offshore renewable energy project like this? Does it give government the power to exempt certain projects or works from the legislation?

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

**A. PARSONS:** There was a little bit of trouble here. Can you tell me what section you're looking at?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Clause 4.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Clause 4, "The Act is amended by adding immediately after section 2 the following ...". Is it section 2.1, you're talking about that one?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** That's correct.

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

**A. PARSONS:** "Subject to section 7, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations amending the definition of offshore renewable energy project to add or remove a work or activity related to renewable energy that is carried out in the offshore area."

Part of amending this is how we do get that jurisdiction over the inshore. So subject to section 7 is the clause that give us those protections as well. That's my understanding of what I'm getting here as well.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** All right, perfect.

And given the definition between inshore and outshore, how is that definition agreed upon between the two parties, between federal and provincial? Where does the ambiguity lie in that to make sure that one is separate from the other?

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

**A. PARSONS:** There are a couple of things. There's an MOU signed between the feds and the provincial government. I think it was signed in Ottawa, I'm going to say, a minimum of two years ago. I remember – I could get this wrong – there was a press release out in December and it laid out the coordinates of what the inshore was.

That's the agreement there and everything outside out that would be the jointly managed area, so that was part of the negotiation. That was fairly long process to come to that agreement point. We will have to bring regs in that defines that inshore area so that's still to come as well.

The work right now, I'm reading here, involves sort of making sure that we have the detailed coordinates in the regulations, but they would be pursuant to the publicly signed MOU.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Okay, perfect.

Under section 30, what kind of cases might arise where one government will have to have satisfied requirements? Would it fall under the category and have to be paid for entirely by the government? Does this potentially open up any major liabilities for the provincial government?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Okay, I just want to make sure I get the right section here. I got a bill that's falling apart. What section was it?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Section 30.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Now, what I got here for section 30 is: The exercise of a power or performance of a duty?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** I believe so, yes. I just have to make sure I got that right, too, myself.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I'm reading section 30, what page?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Page 22.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Section 30 I'm reading as the regulator's decision is final. "The exercise of a power or the performance of a duty by the regulator under this Act is final and not subject to the review or approval of either government or either minister."

I think that just doesn't change the language; I think that's what it already was. It's not one minister or the other saying we're going to change. Obviously, as I've explained, some of these things, the

provincial government has the final say. Some of these, the federal will have the say depending on the funding and stuff.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** So you are saying that there should be no large liabilities or anything open up from any of that.

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

**A. PARSONS:** No.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Okay. Thank you, Chair.

Under section 35, does this mean that there are no means to appeal decisions or actions by the regulator, not even in the courts under section 35?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Section 35, is that the one where it says: Section 30 of the act is repealed?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Under section 35: The exercise of a power or the performance of a duty by the regulator under this act following that requirement of the review of the act. Yeah, I think that one is misnumbered.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I think if anything, a lot of these are housekeeping where they change board to regulator due to the name change in the title. Every one there, sections 36, 37, 38 and 39, all those are housekeeping in nature.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you, Chair.

Okay, fair. Thanks for the clarification on that.

Section 55, is it possible that the petroleum reserve area of an offshore renewable reserve area could overlap and how would we justify that work within the board if there's an overlap?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I want to make sure I'm hearing right here, you're saying: The regulator may, by order – page 29 right?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Yes.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Okay.

“The regulator may, by order, prohibit an interest owner specified in the order from commencing or continuing work or activity on the portions of the offshore area or a part of the offshore area or a part of the offshore area that are subject to the interest of that interest owner, where there is (a) an environmental or social problem....” Is that the question?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Yes. If there was an overlap between renewable and offshore petroleum, how would they make sure that there's no effect there?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I think what it comes down to here is that, at the end of the day, the regulator has the authority by the legislation to ensure any operator doesn't undertake action that's deemed dangerous. Whether it's because of weather, because of an environmental or social problems, that gives them that authority to shut down. I'm not so worried about the overlap because, at the end of the day, they're 100 per cent responsible for offshore safety.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** This is section 59: If there's a direction issued under subsection (1.1) there is not subordinate legislation. What weight does that carry and will it still be enforceable; if so, how?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Okay, just to make sure I got it again, section 59 on page 36?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Yes.

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

**A. PARSONS:** So you're saying, "The regulator is not required to issue a petroleum-related interest as a result of the call for the bids." Then, subsection (2): Where the regulator has not issued a petroleum-related interest with respect to a particular portion of the offshore area specified in a call for bids within 6 months the regulator shall, before issuing a petroleum-related interest, make a new call for bids.

To be honest with you, I think it allows them not to have to issue it if they don't feel the need to. If it's not the right, I think it allows them too, if somebody doesn't bid in an

amount that's proper. It's okay if they put out a call for bids, they're not legally obligated to have to issue an interest. They reserve that ability to not do that.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Okay. Thank you, Chair.

I guess it's not under a section, and I know you touched on it with the Member for Terra Nova, but we've had some feedback from some other labour groups and that. They're worried about the strength of some of the benefits agreements when it comes to employment, construction opportunity and things like that.

I know you touched on that some of the trade agreements don't allow us to use certain language when there is that, but this is a new industry with the offshore wind, what certainty would be there to make sure that we train people to do more of the work, because we know that it's really heavily European companies right?

There's one, I think, operating in the United States. They're having some issues with their local employees not getting the work because they're not trained in some of the new technology. What strength or opportunity would there be to make sure that we protect that kind of aspect of it? I know it's a very niche industry right now in Europe or it's mostly dominated by Europe, but to make sure that we actually have that opportunity here?

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

**A. PARSONS:** If you look at the benefits agreement language, it says that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are to get that fair consideration. It doesn't say first necessarily because, at the end of the day, similar to what I've been told when our offshore for oil started, there was a lot of international experience brought in because

we didn't have that here. We had to build that experience and we may have to do some of that here again.

The good news, though, is that we're a little bit ahead of the game as well. We do have our post-secondary institutions that are starting that work. I know that the Department Responsible for Labour – there are a bunch of different departments working on ensuring that we have the skill sets here. I think if we had the skill sets, I think the language stands up to scrutiny but, as I said before, it does require vigilance amongst people to let the government know if they feel that they're not getting that opportunity and then it's up to government to prosecute that to make sure that we are getting fair opportunity.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you, Chair.

Yeah, and I know. We've had some labour groups reach out and they did name names of companies and stuff that are very dominate in the industry. They're very known for: We have our crew. They're on ships. Their whole industry, their whole business is onboard – I think it was described as floating cities – and they show up to an area, they do the work out there and then they go on to the next project.

There was a lot of concern about this, how they operate and how that industry kind of operates in the offshore. They wanted to make sure that the language – they were worried about the language, and fair enough. We just want to make sure. It's pertinent to this but it's also pertinent to background action as well to make sure that we're ready for when it shows up.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I would say an absolutely fair concern. I don't blame anybody for

thinking that, especially when it's a new industry.

The company has to file the benefits plan. We will have access to it. They can't just say we're going to do it; they have to show how they're going to get that full and fair opportunity. They have to demonstrate with those positives as opposed to just no action at all. They have to demonstrate positive action on that. It's not just the case of – oh, we posted an ad, here we go. There, it's great and wonderful.

They will have to demonstrate and we have the ability as the province to keep an eye on that and to check into that. Not often I've seen it, but we've actually done in recently in a different industry where we got complaints, we followed up and we're actioning it.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Speaking of action and stuff like that, would it be responsibility of the renamed regulator, the C-NLOER? Would they have a role to play in monitoring benefits agreements in that area as well?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Absolutely.

Right now, when it comes to our offshore, we absolutely work with the regulator on all aspects when it comes to safety monitoring. They have the ability to work on our behalf to ensure that we're getting that full and fair benefit. I've had different times already in our offshore where I'll get a complaint from somebody and we'll reach out and give them a shout to make sure that things are as they should be. The question is vigilance.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you.

I know in another section when it comes to the regulator and they're also responsible for offshore safety, and there have been some recommendations and stuff that have been made over the years.

When this legislation was being opened up and some of the recommendations for that, was there any consideration of doing those amendments or changes at this time, or are we still working with the feds and stuff to make sure that some of these recommendations are implemented over time in these regulations?

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

**A. PARSONS:** It's my understanding that that's a separate process that we didn't – this was very much concentrated on, (a), getting the coverage of the offshore renewable, (b), doing some housekeeping on the Accord as we had it to ensure – just some changes housekeeping, mainly on oil, nothing significant. I am not aware of any other action on the recommendations.

I would say to you that if that's something you wanted to discuss further, I'd be happy to have a conversation. I don't know if it actually formed part of this or not; I really can't say.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**CHAIR:** Order, please!

I'm just going to ask for a little co-operation. The conversation is getting a little loud. We need to have this important exchange being heard and recorded.

Thank you for your co-operation.

The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you, Chair.

I know having the C-NLOER now and some of the conversation of offshore safety and

that, has there been any conversation with the federal government regarding a separate entity for offshore safety that could be an oversight or anything like that? I know it's been recommended and talked about over the years. Have any of those conversations been had with our federal counterparts on beefing up the offshore safety side?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I can honestly say that's not been a huge conversation that I've had; it's not one that I'm opposed to, but it hasn't been one that's, sort of, been brought to me.

A lot of the issues – like, there's what I deal with and then there is what's brought to us. That hasn't generally been brought to me by many people that I've dealt with. Primarily I look to Energy NL. We take a lot of guidance from them as the advocates for companies and for workers or for the unions.

I haven't had it brought to me; it doesn't mean I wouldn't consider it or have that conversation.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** I guess changing gears a bit there; so when it comes to offshore wind royalties, how would that framework be developed in conjunction with the federal counterparts?

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

**A. PARSONS:** So what I would suggest is there's a lot of work to do on that. We will likely, similar to our onshore royalty arrangement, we did look around the world, did a jurisdictional scan. There weren't many to rely on there. I think we'll be better off, because we are far from the first ones to

do offshore wind. So again, that's still a pile of work that we will start to undertake now. So a bit early for me to say how this is going to work.

The biggest issue to me, to be honest with you, is royalties are fine and dandy, but we have to ensure feasibility and viability. We have to help them get to that point where they can generate royalties, and that takes some time.

I think we'll go at it from the principle that we want a full benefit that is owed to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians for the use of resource, but at the same time recognizing that part of the benefit is job creation, economic development, construction, you name it.

So always willing to listen to people on that and thankfully if there are a lot of people that have input, insight and expertise.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you.

I guess that's a conversation for further down the road when we get to that point. Going with that, the royalty scheme, is that a separate conversation than the inshore royalties scheme, or is that inshore royalties scheme going to be mirrored, I guess, from the onshore royalties scheme, or is there going to be some nuances there?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I wouldn't be able to tell you whether the two are apples and oranges or apples and apples. I'm sure we can look to the onshore royalty regime fiscal framework to see if there are any comparisons. There may be some differences there. So that's one of the considerations that the smart people in the department will do.

Like I say, I can honestly say, I don't know yet because we haven't done that work, how applicable it is but it would be one of the guiding points, I would assume, we'd look at that and see how it works.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** And I guess for the regs on all this and I know you talked about there's still legwork and stuff to do, but what are we looking at in timelines for the regs for a lot of this new amendments to come down through, or is that still going to be quite the process yet to get to that point?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Still a long process to go, so I don't want to put a timeline on it. What I can say is that I think there will be more information to give in the coming weeks and months as we move into that. That's a conversation we can have in person or email or whatever.

I just don't know what it looks like. I don't want to say a timeline and then people say to me that's out to lunch. You'll never succeed. Because we are, as a department, working on so many other things at the same time. It could be a resourcing question. It could be a demand question, whole bunch of things.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you.

That was my final question.

Thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

**P. DINN:** Thank you, Chair.

Now, my colleague from Terra Nova has covered quite a bit and I think he may have touched on this. While I was waiting for this question, I think the Member for Lab West touched on it even more. It's only one area. It's the employment benefits piece of it.

Under the implementation acts, I think it's section 45 that deals with employment. I don't think it's in there, the actual act, because he only changed some words here. But it speaks to first consideration for training and employment that would be covered in employment benefit packages. Of course, you mentioned the trade agreements and just for those who are watching this hour of the night, you're talking about the agreement on internal trade. Chapter 7 in that agreement is on labour mobility, which is designed to allow for free movement, with the exception of legitimate objectives that a province or jurisdiction may have.

So when we're talking about this piece of legislation, where it's not here, section 45 would be as it is, with whatever minor changes for oil and gas – correct?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

**P. DINN:** For renewable projects out there, there's really no onus on a proponent to employ Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. It's something that we would have to either negotiate or figure out as we go by. Am I correct on that?

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

**A. PARSONS:** There will be. So every company will have to provide a benefits plan. And you're right, the Member touched on this. The only difference is we can't use

the word "first." But it's a full and fair opportunity, and they have to demonstrate that through their plan and through questions and through demonstration and by providing, like, reports that we review. There are a whole bunch of those things.

What I would suggest – and I'm probably the last one to talk about the effects of labour mobility on that; there's a different minister that could handle that better. I would suggest that the people within the various departments – we've been doing royalty agreements, thankfully, on oil and gas, on mining. We're starting to move into getting those agreements signed on onshore wind. It'll be the same thing here, that it will be full and fair opportunity for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

How does that look at the beginning? As the Member said about starting off, do we have that expertise or not? It won't be up to us to prove – like, the company is just not going to say no, you don't have the people to do it. They will have to show us, if they can't, why.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

**P. DINN:** The reason I ask it, because even with the implementation acts, which is clearer, first, in consideration for training and that. I know even through enforcing that, there has been concerns over the years. You can't hire an Italian cook unless he speaks Italian, you know, and that's the most important thing on a rig is the cook. I've gone through stuff like that.

So I just wanted to get a clarification on that, that they won't be coming in and saying no, we're bringing in all our workers and there's no opportunity.

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

**A. PARSONS:** I absolutely get the concern. I would share the concern. I think all of our plans are designed not to allow that, but a

lot of times you don't know what happens until it happens, which is why we have the ability to deal with it after it's been reported.

As I've said a couple of times here, I've heard those things in the past. Sometimes they're not always validated. Recently, I've seen a case where, I think we may have validated that and we're going to take action because that's what we all want. I mean, we're not going to have our workers shut out so somebody else can bring in someone from elsewhere, non-unionized. We don't want that.

I'm always open. I will say I don't generally deal with that as much as the other ministers. I deal with the benefits plan, but some of the inner stuff, there are probably people smarter than me more hands on with it.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise, you're done?

**P. DINN:** Thank you. That's good, yes.

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

**P. LANE:** Thank you.

Minister, we're talking about wind but I don't know if it was you mentioned or the Member for Terra Nova, somebody mentioned earlier on tonight, quite a while ago I'll say, I believe it was you who said in Nova Scotia there are tidal projects that are –

**A. PARSONS:** That was the Member for Terra Nova.

**P. LANE:** Okay. Anyway, he said there were tidal projects happening.

So does this amendment now cover tidal or, if we wanted to do tidal, do we need to come back and make yet another amendment? Is that covered now with this?

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

**A. PARSONS:** For my take on that, I would say I've never had a single proponent come to us to talk about tidal. In fact, I think the tidal one in Nova Scotia, over in Fundy, has actually had some difficulties and, actually, there's some litigation ongoing there.

What I would say to you is, if it's deemed an offshore renewable energy project, it would be covered by this. If it's inshore, then it would be solely under provincial jurisdiction and we would deal with it without the Accord.

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

**P. LANE:** Okay.

I'm just trying to get an idea of what this is going to look like, because I've never seen them actually. I've seen windmills but I'm just trying to picture, is this going to be something now that you're going to have a bunch of windmills on the offshore? Or is this the case of: You go down to all these little communities and then, what was once their bay, the arm, the harbour or whatever, it's just going to be lined off with windmills? I'm just trying to get a sense in my mind what it's going to look like.

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

**A. PARSONS:** The problem is the Member is discussing a theoretical and the problem is I haven't had any plans put in front of me. So what you're suggesting could be the case, but, to me, I don't know. I haven't had any specific offshore projects brought to me whether it's inshore, within our MOU territory or offshore in any capacity. I've seen what they've done elsewhere but we haven't had anybody come here.

I would suggest the biggest thing that drives any of this is economics: What makes

sense financially and can you find the capital to do that? What is the purpose of what you're doing? What are you generating? Are you generating electricity that you're going to build a line into? Then you have to get into signing a PPA with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. So depending on the cost of generating and building that transmission, it might not be feasible. Hydro is not going to buy power just because it is offshore wind generated unless it makes sense for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

What I would say to you, I don't know. It could be anything but we haven't even had that put in front of us. Then it comes down to what type of project. It could be – I've heard some chatter about the possibility of wind turbines being implemented offshore to power offshore rigs, to electrify the rigs to get them off their current carbon source but I haven't even seen exactly what that looks like in terms of numbers.

That's a big discussion there because that kind of stuff, too, would probably get you in the game for federal incentivization through credits and whatever else.

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

**P. LANE:** Yeah. I thank you for that, Minister. I was trying to get a picture in my mind's eye of what we're talking about; because you're right, it is something new.

I know they have it in other jurisdictions but just from the layperson's point of view. If someone were to ask up at the coffee shop, so to speak, and said: Well, I heard you passed this legislation last night allowing for offshore wind. What's that going to be like? Am I going to look out Petty Harbour now and it's going to be a line of windmills or is it going to be, like I said, the offshore – what is it? I guess I'm just trying to understand, potentially, what we might be looking at.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Absolutely. The thing is, I can't say anything now for fear of not wanting to scare anybody but, at the same time, not wanting to overwhelm anybody because I'd only be guessing at this juncture.

Any project will go through an environmental assessment and a number of other factors before they are ever approved. So, to the people of Petty Harbour who may not want to have that view taken away, that would absolutely be a consideration. Right now, just in case there's someone from Petty Harbour watching, there's nothing proposed. We haven't seen that; there's no need to worry yet.

This is just allowing us that ability to see if there's an interest in that and to know what the jurisdiction is and know what the management, but who knows how far away that is.

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

**P. LANE:** I appreciate that. For the record, nobody from Petty Harbour contacted me. That was just random – I could've said any other community. I could have said Lumsden, but it was just a random thing I just picked out. I guess, again, I'm just trying to understand what it might look like and if we're talking 10 windmills, 100 windmills, 1,000 windmills, all that kind of thing.

I guess, what you're telling me is, at this point, we don't know until something comes forward and we'll deal with it then, basically.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Yes. You will hear about it long before it's ever developed, the same as the onshore ones now. There's nothing that

has been established yet, but everybody has a general idea of what it looks like.

What people need to realize is, they're not going to look out their window one day and see it stood there. Everybody will know well in advance what's coming, why it's coming and if it's coming and have a say about that. That's just the nature of this whole industry.

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

**P. LANE:** Sure, I understand. I appreciate that.

We talked to other Members here about jobs and, obviously, we would all like to see as many jobs as possible that would come from this. I'm just wondering has there been any research at all done to give a sense of once those windmills are built, whoever puts them there – hopefully a lot of Newfoundlanders – what kind of ongoing employment would be associated to them? Would there be people working here that are going out repairing them, oiling them, greasing them, doing whatever they're doing?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Really good question.

I would say I don't have that in front of me. Every project is different in terms of what the capacity and size of it is. What is it they're looking to transmit; if we're talking about megs versus gigs, the size of the turbines, you name it.

My general impression is that a lot of the economic benefit comes from the construction side of this and that the ongoing operations are far different from oil and gas or even mining; it is far less people. Still a sizeable number of people, don't get me wrong. It's nothing to sneeze at, but I've told a lot of people this a lot of times: Do not think that it is the same as oil and gas once

you get going because the construction is definitely different than the operations.

Even that number depends on what's put in front of us so it's all a guessing game. Generally, the bigger it is, the more they're looking to do, the more people they're going to need to build it and, possibly, the more people they're going to need to do the operations and maintenance.

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

**P. LANE:** I appreciate that.

Again, down that same vein to some degree, and I know that we're only speculating here, but I would assume that if we're going to have agreements in place – well, first of all, I just want to talk about the hiring and the jobs, which has been brought up. Just so I understand that, you're comfortable with the language that relates to employment opportunities, best opportunity, or whatever the wording is there, as opposed to, you have to hire Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, but I'm assuming that if we're going to negotiate with a company, they're going to come here and they put forward a proposal, regardless of what language is necessarily in the Atlantic Accord, we still have the right to say no, b'y, we don't want you. I mean, if you're not going to provide any benefits and guarantee that you're going to provide benefits, why would we let you even do it unless there's some benefit to us?

So regardless of the language in here, we're still going to negotiate benefits agreements that are going to include combinations of royalties, employment and so on, and if it's not worth our while, then get packing, I would think.

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

**A. PARSONS:** Absolutely. There's no project of any nature of any industry or any

resource that will be developed without the consent of the provincial government. The whole point is they have to show us what the benefit is to the province.

There have been many things that have been proposed here over the last number of years, not necessarily in my shop. I remember hearing about one thing out in Lewisporte, like, garbage or something. We talk about tires or this or that and, at the end of the day, the government has made decisions not to do it, so the same thing exists here. Nobody is forced into anything.

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

**P. LANE:** I guess we talk about the jobs, the benefits, but it would be the same thing with spinoff in terms of service and so on. That would be part of it as well, to say, like, if you need supplies while you're out doing your work or if you need parts or if you need whatever, that you're going to buy it from local companies here in Newfoundland. You're not going to be shipping it in from Ontario or Europe or wherever the case might be, or the US. You're going to utilize Newfoundland companies?

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

**A. PARSONS:** I don't necessarily know that the secondary is included in that. The biggest thing we've talked about is what they can absolutely control in terms of jobs created and things like that.

When it comes to the purchasing, I mean, there are a lot of things to take into consideration. Right now, if they were to do anything, I think a company would do something in Newfoundland and Labrador rather than the States if they're dealing with tariff issues or vice versa, things like that.

I'm not aware that the secondary spinoff or supply and service side is there. I know when it started off here, we didn't have that.

It's built up to the point now where it makes all the sense in the world to do that in our offshore oil. Do we have that secondary supply and service side necessarily right now, or that supply chain that will be necessary for offshore wind when we start? I don't know. But the goal is to get it to that point where they have to do that.

I'm happy to have that conversation about how do you incorporate that, but it's not something I've seen much of.

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

**P. LANE:** I'll just say, for *Hansard* if nothing else, I believe we should be trying – I'm sure you'd agree – to incorporate this. No different than sometimes when you hear if there's an oil and gas project or a mining project and so on, a lot of times the companies themselves have done these – it's not a job fair. I'm not sure what you would call it but, basically, they had these things in communities saying, if we build this here, we're going to open up a mine here, we're going to do oil and gas, whatever, that these are opportunities for local companies to bid on service work, bid on supply work, bid on whatever.

Like, Harvey's, for example, down on the wharf, they bring in all the goods from a toothbrush to drilling equipment to the offshore, back and forth every day, local Newfoundland company Stevedoring here at the St. John's Harbour and so on. I would like to see the same type of thing happening with – if they had to have a laydown yard with windmill supplies, that should be happening here, done by local companies, would be my point.

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

**A. PARSONS:** When you first asked that – maybe it's the hour of the night and my mind was gone to a different talk when we talked about secondary. The benefits

agreement does apply to maximizing all opportunities for Newfoundland and Labrador companies.

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

**P. LANE:** There you go. Perfect.

The last question, I'm just wondering about, like, offices and stuff. I'm not sure how that would work. I mean, I know with oil and gas and so on, they've utilized office space, say, for example, in downtown St. John's and stuff for some of these companies. I'm going to call them windmill companies for lack of a better term. Would there be some requirements they must have some corporate office space and that type of thing in Newfoundland? Would that be part of it as well?

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

**A. PARSONS:** Absolutely. That's one of the things that we've been talking about. So I look at the onshore wind. Every one of them now has a Newfoundland and Labrador address, a Newfoundland and Labrador storefront in many cases. Maybe some differing on the numbers that are there, but we would want the same thing here. You want to have that corporate presence.

I think, personally, it makes sense and so the long and short is that there will be no company in our offshore, that is operating offshore, that doesn't have some kind of presence in the province.

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

**P. LANE:** That concludes my questions. I will say that, for the record, I've listened intently to every question asked here tonight, numerous questions by the Member for Terra Nova and the Member for Lab West. I've had some questions and I just want to say, I appreciate, Minister, that

you've given your best to answer every question. I do have a lot more confidence, perhaps, than I might have had two or three hours ago. I'll put it that way. I do appreciate that.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Any further speakers?

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

**CLERK:** Clauses 2 through 6 inclusive.

**CHAIR:** Shall clauses 2 through 6 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clauses 2 through 6 carried.

**CLERK:** Clause 7.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 7 carry?

The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

**L. PARROTT:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, I guess throughout the conversation tonight, in my mind, I'm still not convinced that through legal avenues or other places that we have the certainties that I would like to have. I do believe that government believes that they're in place. I

think that there are proponents inside of industry that believes they're in place, but I also know with absolute certainty that there are proponents that don't believe they're in place and that it doesn't give all of the assurance that we need.

So I'm going to introduce an amendment. The amendment reads as follows: The Member for Terra Nova moves the following, seconded by the Member for Conception Bay South: That clause 7 of the bill be amended by adding immediately after subsection 7(1) of the act, the following subsection (1.1).

Section 7(1.1): Before a regulation is made under subsection 5(1), section 29.1, subsection 41(7), section 64, subsection 67(2), section 118, subsection 122(1), 125(1), 149(1), 162 (2.3), 163(1.02) or 202.01(1) or section 203 of the federal act *Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Act* the federal minister shall consult the provincial minister with respect to the proposed regulation and the regulation shall not be made without the approval of the provincial minister.

Chair, I believe this just strengthens our stance here. It gives us verbiage that puts us in a place that makes us comfortable and I believe it only makes this bill stronger.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The Committee will recess for a few moments to consider this proposed amendment.

Thank you.

### **Recess**

**CHAIR (Trimper):** Order, please!

Are the House Leaders ready?

Government House Leader, are you ready?

**L. DEMPSTER:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

Order, please!

We've reviewed the proposed amendment by the Member for Terra Nova and we find that the proposal was beyond the scope of the intended legislation; therefore, it's out of order.

Any further speakers?

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

**P. LANE:** Thank you, Chair.

I didn't plan on speaking but I just wanted to say, for *Hansard*, if nothing else, that although it may have gone beyond the scope, I do feel that would have strengthened this bill and had it been in order, I would have definitely supported it.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 7 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Clause 7 is carried.

On motion, clause 7 carried.

**CLERK:** Clauses 8 through 60 inclusive.

**CHAIR:** Shall clauses 8 through 60 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clauses 8 through 60 carried.

**CLERK:** Clause 61.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 61 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Nay.

**CHAIR:** Well, I heard more nays than ayes.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Division.

**CHAIR:** Division has been called.

Thank you very much.

Call in the Members.

### Division

**CHAIR:** If the House Leaders are ready, we'll proceed.

House Leaders ready?

House Leader from the Opposition?

He's not going to look at me now; I'm going to assume he's ready. Anybody objecting?

Fine, we're going to turn off the chimes. Not seeing any objection, so we're going to proceed with Division.

Thank you.

All those in favour of supporting clause 61, please rise.

**CLERK:** Lisa Dempster, John Haggie, Andrew Parsons, Bernard Davis, Gerry Byrne, Siobhan Coady, Pam Parsons, Elvis Loveless, Krista Lynn Howell, Steve

Crocker, Sarah Stoodley, Paul Pike, Scott Reid, Sherry Gambin-Walsh, Lucy Stoyles, Jamie Korab, John Hogan, John Abbott, Jordan Brown, Paul Lane.

**CHAIR:** All those against supporting clause 61, please rise.

**CLERK:** Tony Wakeham, Barry Petten, Lloyd Parrott, Helen Conway Ottenheimer, Joedy Wall, Lin Paddock, Loyola O'Driscoll, Lela Evans, Paul Dinn, Craig Pardy, Pleaman Forsey, Chris Tibbs, Jim McKenna.

Chair, the ayes: 20; the nays 13.

**CHAIR:** The ayes have it. Clause 61 has been carried.

On motion, clause 61 carried,

**CLERK:** Clauses 62 through 264 inclusive.

**CHAIR:** Shall clauses 62 through 264 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Nay.

**CHAIR:** I think the ayes have that one.

Thank you.

On motion, clauses 62 through 264 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:** A bill, An Act to Amend the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland and Labrador Act. (Bill 90)

**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 90 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 bill without amendment, carried.

**CHAIR:** Thank you very much.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

**L. DEMPSTER:** Thank you, Chair.

I move that the Committee rise and report Bill 90 carried without – pardon me?

**CHAIR:** Seconder.

**L. DEMPSTER:** Seconded by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

**CHAIR:** He was looking for a roll.

It has been moved and seconded that this Committee do rise and report that Bill 90 has been carried without amendment.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

Thank you very much.

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

**SPEAKER (Bennett):** Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Lake Melville and Chair of the Committee of the Whole.

**P. TRIMPER:** Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that we have carried Bill 90 without amendment.

**SPEAKER:** The Chair of the Committee of the Whole reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and directed him to report Bill 90 carried without amendment.

When shall the report be received?

**L. DEMPSTER:** Now.

**SPEAKER:** Now.

When shall the bill be read a third time?

**L. DEMPSTER:** Tomorrow.

**SPEAKER:** Tomorrow.

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

This House do stand adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 10 a.m.

**L. DEMPSTER:** Thank you, Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Motion 5.

I move that notwithstanding Standing Order 9, this House shall not adjourn at 5 p.m. on Wednesday, March 12, but shall continue to sit to conduct Government Business and, if not earlier adjourned, the Speaker shall adjourn the House at midnight. That is seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

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

Motion carried.

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader, that this House do now adjourn.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

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

Motion carried.