

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I want to refer hon. members to the point of order raised on Tuesday, December 1st, by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) concerning the parliamentary rule that when the Speaker is speaking or rises to preserve order he must always be heard in silence. And he referred specifically to interruptions given by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) while the Speaker was giving a ruling. May I remind hon. members first of all that Beauchesne is very specific in terms of providing guidelines available for the Speaker in dealing with such a matter and I will not repeat them. They have been pointed out on numerous occasions in this House.

I have reviewed the Hansard of the day and find that indeed there were several interruptions while I was attempting to offer a ruling. And clearly that was most certainly out of order and such a practice cannot be permitted.

The point raised refers to the authority that has been invested in the Chair and it is a matter which clearly reflects on the decorum and dignity of this House as well as any other parliament. It is one of our most sacred parliamentary rules. To emphasize this point I quote from the nineteenth edition of Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice as one reference, page 441, where it says in part, "Whenever the Speaker rises to interpose in the course of a debate, he is to be heard in silence, and any Member who is speaking or offering to speak should immediately sit down," It goes on to say that the member who does not maintain silence or who attempts to address the Speaker when

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): he is standing is immediately called to order. Then it goes on to say, "A Member who persists in this type of behaviour may either be directed to withdraw from the House for the remainder of the sitting or named for disregarding the authority of the Chair."

Thus the procedure is clear and notice of warning of such action by the Speaker is not necessary. In this case there was clearly a breach of order and I draw it now to the attention of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as well as all other hon. members. And I point out again that I have the responsibility not to permit these types of irregular breaches of order and hon. members expect me to exercise that authority which demands that I protect the rights and privileges, not only of members but of the House itself.

As I have that responsibility, so too do hon. members have the responsibility of supporting the rules and in that they are helping to preserve the dignity and decorum for which we all strive. And I sincerely ask all members for their co-operation.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the issuance of a White Paper on science policy for the Province. Its title is Towards a Science Policy for Newfoundland and its purpose is to stimulate and form a basis for discussion of the steps to be taken by this government to increase the amount of scientific research and technical development being performed in the Province.

This government has enunciated in the document

MR. WINDSOR:

Managing all our Resources, its policy of maximizing economic and social benefits to the people of the Province while retaining a balance between rural and urban life style.

Long term development will be based on the control, management -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate hon. gentlemen opposite may not have the intelligence to understand this issue but I think they should at least give me the courtesy of being allowed to make this statement.

Long term development will be based on the control, management and development of the Province's renewable resources. The economic rent extracted from both renewable and non-renewable resource developments is intended to be applied to further developing the primary, secondary, and tertiary activity based upon renewal resources, in order to ensure long term economic and social stability in the Province.

Research and technological development will be vitally important in this Province. In Newfoundland particularly, where there is a relatively restricted manufacturing base, R and D must in many instances be established ahead of new industry and act as a spur and an attractive force. On the other hand, great efforts must also be made to raise the level of technological development applied to our existing industry and also arising from it.

Spending on technically oriented R and D in this Province has traditionally been extremely low, amounting even in recent years to 0.05 per cent of the gross provincial product - and the bulk of this has of course been government initiated.

Most of our private sector firms are engaged in resource extraction using technology

MR. FLIGHT: developed elsewhere. Secondary and tertiary manufacturing is very limited and technical achievements in this area are generally confined to productivity rather than innovation.

Federal programmes and initiatives to increase private sector participation in research and development have been relatively fruitless in this Province simply because there is limited private sector capability available. Compounding the difficulty is the fact that Newfoundland has fewer managers, in relative terms, than in other areas of Canada. Thus, besides the lack of private sector physical activity, there is the hidden lack of capacity arising from a reduced awareness of the value of technical, innovative action to the business future.

The strategy developed by this government in the early mid-seventies recognized these factors and concentrated upon the long term importance of marine and marine related industry to the development of the Province. The lack of a Newfoundland private sector scientific capability in this field led to new initiatives aimed at creating a core of technical competence in the pure and applied sciences relating to our marine environment, the ultimate intent was the development of a significant, technically sophisticated, private sector.

The first organizations founded through the combined initiatives of many people - both outside government and within - were the centre for Cold Ocean Resources Engineering (C-Core) and the Newfoundland Oceans Research and Development Corporation (NORDCO).

MR. WINDSOR: When these organizations were founded it was clearly recognized that one of the objectives was to assist in the establishment of a new technically sophisticated private sector capability through a combination of spinoff from these organizations and magnet effect attracting firms and organizations in related fields. The results to date indicate that this approach could be successful and there has been a significant increase in private sector technical capability, particularly in technical services in the Province in the last five years.

The federal government has since responded by announcing the establishment in St. John's of the Arctic Vessel Marine Research Institute (AVMRI) through the National Research Council.

The current White Paper advocates that the priority area for scientific and technical thrust in the immediate future should continue to be in the marine sciences as they relate to the Newfoundland environment. There is very considerable common ground between marine technology applied to the fisheries, to oil and gas development and marine transportation and sub-sea mining.

Analysis from this perspective indicates that secondary and tertiary needs of the fisheries in such areas as biological research, ice and cold ocean research, resource harvesting technology development (including vessel design and maintenance, location and detection device development, etc.) are priority areas with applications in the other marine areas.

This emphasis on marine technology is not to the exclusion of development in other sectors. The White Paper recognizes the need for continued research in forestry, for instance, to regain ground lost to the

MR. WINDSOR: spruce budworm, to assist the development of the Labrador wood resource and to encourage the manufacture of downstream products. It is also clear that a successful sector development strategy results in the diversification and spinoff which itself must be nurtured by continued research and development effort in many fields.

Nevertheless, the importance of having clearly defined and limited goals can not be over emphasized. In cases where national goals have been well defined in the past - Japan, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are examples - there have been relative success in industrial development. Other countries in which objectives have been less well defined - and Canada at large is one of these - have been less successful.

Canada's development strategy requires the selection of a few national goals having wide internal opportunities - and what is true for Canada is doubly true for Newfoundland because of reduced economic, fiscal and other powers. Therefore, in our case, priorities and goals must be even more clearly focused and there must be a degree of commonality of goals between the federal and provincial governments to achieve overall success. The emphasis on marine sciences in the Newfoundland environment is compatible with Canada's stated objective of developing marine resources and capabilities.

The federal government has established what at present appears to be an optimistic objective, that overall research and development expenditures should reach a level of 1.5 per cent of gross national product by 1983. Our White Paper proposes that Newfoundland's goal, over a somewhat longer period, should be half that level of commitment relative to GPP and that it should be concentrated in the applied sciences rather than in pure science or in less technically oriented disciplines.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The specific recommendations which are made in the paper for initiation activity to being about progress towards these goals are as follows: A Newfoundland Science Council be established substantially in accordance with existing legislation to act as an advisory body to government and to provide a means of communications with a scientific community at large. The Council would also act as a source of advice in the future evolution of science policy in the Province. As an initial responsible it is recommended that the Science Council review the goals of the present organizations in the marine science areas and advise government of steps to be taken, if any, to delineate these roles further, and to recommend a programme to achieve and enhance capability.

The Newfoundland Science Council be requested to investigate and define the need for common user facilities and recommend a programme and mechanism to carry out this function.

The priority area for government's scientific thrust in the immediate future should lie in all aspects of the marine sciences as they relate to the Newfoundland environment.

Government expenditures be directed at scientific and technical areas of the applied sciences oriented towards appropriate technology. Priority in the pure research area should be given to those factors considered essential to the immediate advancement of the applied sciences.

Government develop new programmes to augment the efforts of the natural sciences and Engineering Research Council to accelerate development of technical manpower in the designated priority areas.

MR. WINDSOR: Government develop new programmes aimed at providing increased technical capacity in the private sector and stimulating the development of new small high-technology firms in designated priority areas.

A five year goal of achieving an overall Provincial expenditure of 0.75 per cent of G.P.P. be established, with -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh;

MR. WINDSOR: - government expenditure to be increased to 0.3 per cent of G.P.P. in that period.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present this white paper on science policy and to solicit active discussion on all its aspects. I wish thereby to ensure that the government proceeds with confidence to bring about rapid progress in the development of technology which is appropriate to the nature of of the Province and which works for the long term prosperity of its people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has about four minutes.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a new one, a new one for sure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday that this government is not without, certainly not without a philosophy, and not without a method of coming up with empty platitudes, Mr. Speaker, and certainly not without announcing their philosophy by a skillfully orchestrated propaganda campaign, not without that kind of activity.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we have had all kinds of studies over the past four or five years. The first thing that we got thrown on us was a restructuring of government and that was supposed to do great things, this great restructuring. Then a little later we got the blueprint for development. I do not know what that was, the blueprint for development. I do not know whether it was scientific or whether it was psychological or whether it was physiological -

MR. FLIGHT: Or fictional.

MR. LUSH: - but we had the blueprint for development. Then after that, Mr. Speaker, came the Five Year Plan.

MR. FLIGHT: And we are still into that.

MR. LUSH: And we thought that was to be the great blueprint but now they have a new one.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all of these grandiose plans, the blueprint for development and the Five Year Plan, all of these have resulted in a big zilch for this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: We did not even get the Titanic.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, call it anything, call it a scientific planning programme if you want, call it a physiological programme, call it a psychological one, call it an environmental one; if it is going to bring more jobs to the people of this Province we will agree with it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: But the past record, Mr. Speaker, does not indicate too much coming from any of these grandiose plans, and I must say for my own part I am not too optimistic about this one.

MR. LUSH: I am not too optimistic about this one, Mr. Speaker, but I wish the government the best of luck with this brand new scientific plan, I expect the first ever initiated in this Province, the very first initiated, Mr. Speaker. But I would ask this. I would caution the minister. I would hope that we can co-ordinate all of those studies. I would hope now that we can co-ordinate this scientific programme with all of the other programmes that have preceded it.

The minister talked about a scientific investigation of the forestry. We have just finished a Royal Commission on it; we are expecting a last report from that shortly. So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope now that we can bring about some efficient, some effective co-ordination between all of these programmes, this new one now, the scientific programme, and let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that this co-ordination will result in the greatest job creation programme that the people of this Province ever witnessed and the most prosperity that we have ever seen. We hope that will happen, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements?

ooo

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Before we get to Oral Questions,

I wonder if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) by leave would allow us to have a few words about Canada's new Constitution and probably dispatch a message of congratulations to the Prime Minister for piloting this Constitution through the House of Commons.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, there is a time and a place for everything. We are delighted about the new Constitution; the architect sits immediately on my left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

In due course, Mr. Speaker, we will debate that amongst many other things, In the meantime, the government is soundly in control of the helm of government. The hon. member, when he gets here or when his great-grandchildren get here in the year 2050, he can then call the order of business.

ORAL QUESTIONSMR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). I would like the minister to tell the House, would she outline to the House the programmes or votes in her department that have been cut as a result of the general cutback, the \$16 million cutback and the \$16 million freeze that the Province has to live

MR. FLIGHT: with as a result of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) announcing that programme and directing the various ministers to cut back in the various departments.

Would the minister indicate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - the number of programmes that have been cut back in her department, the Department of Municipal Affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say that not one cent was required to be cut back in municipal grants to municipalities, not one cent was required to be cut back in water and sewer projects -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MRS. NEWHOOK: - and not one cent was required to be cut back in cost sharing-programmes. And, Mr. Speaker, you know, this is the responsible manner in which our departments are responding to government's directive.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the minister is aware of what is happening in her department or informed or not - but she is not. In my own district, in the district of Windsor - Buchans there is a half million dollars worth of capital works approved by Municipal Affairs that will not be done until the Spring of 1982. Now that is a half a million dollars in one district out of 51, and that is a half a million dollars that will not be required to be expended by Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: So I will ask the minister how she reconciles her answer with the fact that over half a million dollars in one district, in the district of Windsor - Buchans has been deferred, expenditure by her department committed for 1981 has been deferred until 1982, how she reconciles that with the statement she just made?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member there is referring to guaranteed funding for capital works and the cutbacks that we were referring to is in operating accounts. That has nothing at all to do with it.

MR. PATTERSON: He does not know what he is talking about.

MR. FLIGHT: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) A final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the programme I am referring to is the sixty/forty cost-shared programme and the municipality put up forty per cent but the Province of Newfoundland puts up the other sixty. So in the case of a \$500,000 cutback there is well over \$300,000 not being expended in this year by Municipal Affairs. And that is a saving, Mr. Speaker, that is an expenditure they do not spend. It may be cost-shared only in the sixty/forty. I am not talking about the municipality's forty per cent. I am asking the minister how many millions of dollars is not being expended in 1981 by the Department of Municipal Affairs? How many millions of dollars under the sixty per cent that she would have had to provide to the various municipalities to carry out these projects, how many millions has not been expended in 1981 and will be done in 1982, has been deferred to 1982?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is still referring to capital works funding which is not pertinent to any cutbacks.

MR. FLIGHT: Why did it not go ahead?

MR. NEWHOOK: I do not know the reason why that has not gone ahead. I guess it is because of the design or the weather or whatever. The delay would be, I guess in the design.

MRS. NEWHOOK: of the roads programme or the municipality itself and has nothing to do with any cutbacks. That will go ahead next year. So it does not make any difference really when it is capital works.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Of course I yield to my friend.

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I will tell the minister. The minister indicated to the House she does not know why these programmes have not gone ahead. I could tell her why they have not gone ahead. The capital works programme was announced in June of 1981, and the minister's department made it impossible, the way they handled the councils, the way they strung them out over the Summer, made it impossible for the councils to go to tender in time to get the work done this Fall. That is why they have not gone ahead. And I want to ask the minister again, -and it could well now appear now, looking at the \$16 million cutback, making it impossible for the councils to call tenders under these contracts, may have been by design. But I want to ask the minister again, how many millions of dollars is not being spent by the Department of Municipal Affairs, under that programme we are talking about, during 1981? How many millions of dollars, for whatever reason?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I just cannot quite understand the hon. member there, the question he is asking, because what I am saying is that capital projects have nothing to do with any cutbacks. You know, it is guaranteed funding and it has nothing to do with our operational expenses for this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS:

I yield to the Deputy House

Leader, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a quickie for -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I understand that the hon. member for Grand Bank, whom I had recognized, yields for the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. THOMS:

Right.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

I thank the hon. member for Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, for yielding to me to ask this very important question. Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), and I can

MR. LUSH: understand her being absent from the House today in view of the sad state of affairs in education, so in view of her absence, Mr. Speaker, I will direct a question to the Premier. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) appears to be at variance with school boards throughout the Province respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the \$20.3 million dollars allocated for the reorganization of the new high school programme, and in view of the fact that the Federation of School Boards in its report made public yesterday stated that the \$20.3 million allocated by the government over the next three year period for the reorganized new high school programme, in view of the fact that they have said that this amount of money is grossly inadequate - not inadequate, Mr. Speaker, but grossly inadequate - in view of the statement by all of the school boards throughout the Province, I wonder if the Premier can state to hon. members what his position is on this particular matter, his government's position with respect to the allocation of this \$20.3 million for the reorganization of the high school programme?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) wishes to comment upon the absence of the Minister of Education, and I suppose I must be given the latitude to respond even though it did not form part of the question per se. The Minister of Education is meeting other Ministers of Education in Canada today in Toronto to discuss the serious situation in which we find ourselves in educational financing, especially post-secondary education, as a result of cutbacks announced by Mr. MacEachen in the federal budget recently.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) is trying to organize and be part of a group of people who want to express their deep, deep concern with the course of educational funding in this nation. Therefore, I think her absence is quite justified as it relates to that, because she must, on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland, present our position on the cutbacks on post-secondary education which will total \$77 million cutback in Newfoundland over the next five years.

On the whole question of capital funding in education, as in health and in all the social areas of government, there is a crying need for many, many more dollars. I would like to suggest to the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) that when we face a \$77 million cutback in one

PREMIER PECKFORD:

aspect of education, that it has serious repercussions for other aspects of education in just how many education dollars can be put forward.

As it relates specifically to \$23 million or \$21 million of funding that has been provided by the government to assist the Denominational Educational Committees and the school boards to provide adequate facilities for the reorganized high school programme, that is on top of, as the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has already indicated, funding in the other areas of primary, elementary, and education in other school buildings.

I guess everybody in Newfoundland recognizes that there is a crying need for even more, as I said, as there is for more money for social services, for chronic health care, chronic care beds in the senior citizens homes and in the other institutions. We are going to try and continue, Mr. Speaker, to do the best we can to provide sufficient dollars to assist the educational community. Obviously there has to be a limit, but we are going to do our part and we have committed these funds now, and of course the presentation given to government last Friday by the school boards will be studied, as the Minister of Education said, and the various positions by the government will be made known on that report as soon as possible.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is no wonder that we are in the trouble we are in when the Minister of Education has to go to the Mainland to find out what we already know and that is that there are going to be no cutbacks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there are going to be no cutbacks.

But secondly, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the \$20.3 million was allocated long before the government know what they thought they knew, in other words it was before this programme was announced, the \$20.3 million was allocated.

So in view of these circumstances, and in view of what school boards are saying, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that they are saying that there are many school boards on the verge of bankruptcy -

MR. THOMS: And that you mean 'Verge'?

MR. LUSH: - is the Premier contemplating any steps to offset bankruptcy by school boards in the Province, and to monitor the situation with respect to the dollars allocated for the reorganized high school programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed-

MR. FLIGHT: You should be too.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I am embarrassed, am very personally embarrassed that the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), who has been a part of the same profession that I had been a part of, cannot add or subtract, because everybody in Canada who has looked at the federal budget from objective, independent, economic institutions and agencies have said, and Mr. MacEachen has said himself in the budget, that there will be cutbacks in post-secondary education. So I completely disassociate myself from the member for Terra Nova, completely.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have no connection, Mr. Speaker, with the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) whatsoever. I was a part of a profession that he was also a part of for a number of years, but I disassociate myself from his addition and his subtraction, from his mathematics. There are cutbacks in education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number two, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) in trying to say that we did not know anything about the federal budget when the \$20.3 million was allocated is correct. But the whole question and the whole issue at stake here is the member for Terra Nova asking the government whether we are going to provide additional funds over and above the \$20.3 as the school boards are asking because they say they are grossly under funded. And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the member for Terra Nova talked about capital funds, \$20.3 million, then he got up with a supplementary question and talked about school boards going bankrupt as it related to operating. So I would refer the hon member for Terra Nova to the comments made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) a few minutes ago in answer to a question from the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) when the minister tried to educate the member for Windsor-Buchans in the difference between capital funding and operating funding. On the operating side in school boards, there is no question there is a very serious situation existing. That is the reason why the school board association presented their brief on Friday. And that is the reason why Cabinet and the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) are considering it now. And as soon as that report has been assessed by the Department of Education and by the Cabinet we will inform this House, if it is open, and we will inform the people of Newfoundland the actions we will be taking as a result of those recommendations.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I will not refer to the rather low

MR. LUSH: personal comments made by the Premier. Ever since I have been a member of this House I have never indulged in that kind of activity and I want to say that I have every reason to disassociate myself from the Premier of this Province, but I will not do it. I will not do it.

But, Mr. Speaker, the question to the Premier very emphatically is will he now in respect or in view of the fact that the Federation of School Boards have said that the \$20.3 million is grossly inadequate, will the Premier now and his government accept that fact, that the \$20.3 million, coming from all the school boards in this Province, this statement coming from all the school boards, collectively, that \$20.3 million is inadequate, what is the Premier's position and his government's position on this statement made by the Federation of School Boards?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, first of all I am not a bit concerned whether the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) wants to associate himself or refuse to associate himself with me or anything I say. I associate myself with the comments of the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) in Ottawa who said he will be cutting back, as Minister of Finance for Canada, in the educational funding available to the provinces. And so Mr. MacEachen should perhaps get in touch with the member for Terra Nova, or vice versa, and perhaps he can associate himself with that hon. gentleman in Ottawa. Secondly, as I have already indicated to the member for Terra Nova, there is a presentation that was made by the Federation of School Boards to the government of this Province and that was done last week. That report is now being assessed by the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) and

PREMIER PECKFORD: her officials and will be assessed by Cabinet, and in due course the government will respond as to how they feel about the recommendations contained in that report.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! If I might I would like to recess for just a few moments. There is a matter which has arisen which I would like to check into. We will resume Question Period and there is still the appropriate amount of time remaining.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I apologize for the interruption but I think we can proceed and according to my calculation we still have thirteen minutes remaining in Question Period. I was about to recognize the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). A week or so ago the minister indicated in the House

MR. THOMS: that the latest proposal by the Lake Group Limited, he hoped to have the matter before Cabinet by this Thursday. And I am wondering now has a decision been made and if a decision has been made what that decision is? If a decision has not been made, I am wondering when this House and the people of the South Coast, including the people of Gaultois, can expect a decision to be made?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be making no comment on the proposal because of the fact there are four parties involved in the negotiations regarding the proposal which are, of course, the Bank of Nova Scotia, the company concerned, the federal level of government and ourselves. And our position is we will make no comment on the manner in which we are dealing with the proposal, the manner in which we are assessing or dealing with it, at least until I sit down at a private meeting, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries and myself, with the federal minister, Mr. LeBlanc and his senior staff. We are planning a meeting now for next Tuesday morning based on the fact that Monday there is a general meeting of minister from Atlantic Canada, the Ministers of Fisheries meeting with the federal minister and his senior staff, to discuss the general problems of the industry and the plans for '82. That is a full day meeting on Monday; the plan now is to meet with the minister, if at all possible, on Tuesday morning to discuss indeed the proposal put forward to two levels of government.

MR. THOMS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the minister that this proposal, I would assume, involves the expenditure of some considerable public money and I think the people of this Province deserve to know what the proposal is all about. Now every time that I approached the federal

MR. THOMS: government I am advised that they can do nothing until a decision has been made by the provincial government. And I think it is absolutely imperative -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMS: - it may be right or it may be wrong -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - but this is what they are telling me, that a decision first has to be made by the provincial government. Now would not the minister let this House know at least when we can expect a decision so that we will know what to look forward to and when to look forward to it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be informing the House in the same manner as I informed the House a few days ago on the successful conclusion of negotiation on the Hermitage and Belleoram plants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: And what I am saying now is that until the negotiations are concluded, successfully or otherwise, I will not get involved in negotiating in public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMS: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: My question is if there are any negotiations in private, I do not know, I cannot find out. But is the minister now then prepared to say that any decision made in connection with any proposal made by Lakes will not be accepted by this government unless the re-opening of the Grand Bank fish plant and Gaultois, for my friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), and the plant in Gaultois will be re-opened under that proposal?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman

can pursue as vigorously or otherwise all he wants on the issue, I am not going to get involved in negotiating it through the public or in the public. We have listened, the Premier and myself have listened very attentively to the concerns of the people from Grand Bank, we have listened very attentively to the people from Gaultois yesterday, a delegation in from that community, we have listened very carefully to what

MR. MORGAN:

they have had to say regarding the problems of the fishery in these two communities. And I, yesterday, with my colleagues from the area, met with the people from the Fermuse area and also their concern is the Lake Group and the Lake Group proposal and the plant in their community. We will continue to listen to the views and opinions of all parties concerned, but we are not going to get involved in negotiating with the other three players in the negotiations in public. So he can pursue further if he wanted to but I am not going to comment any further than that.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I yield to

my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

MR. HISCOCK:

My question is to the Minister of -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

My question is to the Minister of Transportation concerning the Straits road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay. When the Coastal Labrador DREE Agreement was signed, \$14.6 million from the federal government went into it. It was their understanding that the road would be upgraded to Red Bay and paved to Pinware. Now the Premier has informed the council at Red Bay that unless more money coming from the federal government then it will not be upgraded from Pinware to Red Bay. Is this the policy of this government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Trans-

portation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, the original proposal to do the particular road on the Straits of Labrador

MR. DAWE: was to include all that particular stretch of road. Unfortunately the federal government saw fit to reduce the level of funding some \$6 million to \$8 million, so it required this Province in conjunction with the DREE committee to make certain adjustments to that proposal. Had the money been forthcoming at the beginning, the total road could have been done. What is being done is being done with the best management in mind with the amount of money we have available, the staff we have available, with the programme in Labrador, and the road will be done to the levels that that amount of money can be used for. Unfortunately, there is not enough money there to do it.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Various groups in my district had a meeting last night, the Chamber of Commerce, the Tourist Commission and other groups, and they had a meeting with DREE officials as well as transportation officials and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and in that meeting they said if they were not going to get the road upgraded all the way to Red Bay and paved, then they were quite content to do away with the pavement from L'Anse-au-Clair to Pinware so they could get all the road done up, and everybody in this House and in this Province realized that the worst part of that road is from Pinware down to Red Bay.

Now that the residents, these organizations in the district are quite prepared to give up the pavement, is the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) quite willing now to say we will call off the pre-tendering contract from L'Anse-au-Clair to Pinware and allow the reconstruction from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay take place?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms)

portation.

The hon. the Minister of Trans-

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if the people of coastal Labrador are willing to give up their pavement. Had the federal government seen fit to include enough funding in the original agreement to do the roads there would not be any question being posed now. As it relates to newspaper articles concerning a meeting that was held, I will have to wait and see, Mr. Speaker, until I get the official report from that meeting and that will be assessed at that time.

MR. HISCOCK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

member for Eagle River.

A final supplementary, the hon.

MR. HISCOCK:

With regard to funding, we all know that we can ask for pie in the sky and do not necessarily know that we have got it. \$14.6 million there now is the federal government's and I am asking the question, if the federal government is not going to be giving any more money because they have given \$39.5 million into the DREE agreement, is this

MR. HISCOCK: Province is prepared to put more money into that road?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, this government is prepared to put as much money as is financially possible into all the roads in this Province, and in due course, with or without the federal government, this Province will complete an adequate road system for the residents of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I notice the hon. the Premier is not in his seat. I am sure he is within hearing distance of the question I am going to ask. I only wish he were here. I am forced to direct my question to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who, I hope, is in a position to answer for the Premier. It has to do with statements the Premier made today, his attack on the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had enough confrontation politics in this Province in the last two years. Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if this is now the policy of the administration, to launch into a spontaneous outburst, an attack on all those organizations and individuals who want to criticize the government policy as it relates to the economy? Is this the new policy now, the new philosophy of the administration, to attack the Board of Trade, the Newfoundland Federation of Labour and anybody who criticizes government policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting that half the Chamber is in darkness, because on that side they have been in darkness for a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any comments made by the Premier. I recall having seen comments made by the Newfoundland Federation of Labour in the paper this morning drawing issue with their interpretation of government policies with which all of us over here disagree. I suppose it is a free world, and certainly it is a free world; anyone is entitled to criticize any group of people including the government, but certainly it operates both ways as well, that the government is entitled to make comments on criticisms that are made by persons or bodies.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Premier did make such statements? I actually heard his voice on radio station VPCM today being very nasty and rude with the Federation of Labour. Now, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if this is the new philosophy, the new policy of the government, to drag a red herring into any criticism that may be directed their way? Instead of answering the criticism of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour concerning the government's handling of the economy, is it the new policy of the government to launch into an attack on those who dare to criticize the policies of this administration?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any tirade or any attack as such. I am certainly aware of the fact that the Premier made a comment, and his

MR. MARSHALL: comments, as far as I am concerned and, I suppose, most people in Newfoundland, were very legitimately made and well taken. The point of the matter is if people wish to criticize they are certainly entitled to criticize, but also, a government, when its policies are attacked from time to time, are certainly at liberty, surely, to respond. This is what the Premier did today. And, you know, the other implications of the hon. gentleman's question contained innuendoes and imputations; that is his colouration of it and it is very much his colouration of it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if it would not be better for the Premier to deal with the matters that were raised by the Federation of Labour, namely, record unemployment, the high cost of living, the crisis in the fishing and mining industries and in the forest industry, would it not be better for the Premier to try to clarify government's position rather than accuse the Federation of Labour of taking the place of the NDP in this Province? Is that not innuendo and smear, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I am really not going to answer that question. That question contains inferences and innuendoes in itself. The fact of the matter is that this Province is wrestling daily with the economic situation of this Province. It has not done too bad a job when you consider everything, when you consider the interest rates under which the economic community has to labour and many other factors as well. The performance

December 3, 1981

Tape 4004

EC - 4

MR. MARSHALL: of this government has been
seen in the way in which its budget has been carried
out and the measures taken by

MR. MARSHALL: the Finance Department, the measures taken by the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and other ministers in this government is certainly very credible and, you know, I think the government has gone a long ways to try to counteract and it has been successful in most areas.

MR. FLIGHT: Look around the Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The time for oral questions has expired.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition, or I should say, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present three petitions on behalf of 3,273 residents of Central Newfoundland.

The prayer of the petition is that, "We, the undersigned, are strongly opposed to any increase in the" -wait now, one second, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN: Can you not read?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is dark, boy. It is dark.

MR. LUSH: We are not under the lights, see, like you are.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is, "As pick-up owners we are strongly opposed to any increase in the registration of these vehicles. We feel the classification of pickup trucks as commercial vehicles is unfair as they are as much a family vehicle in many areas as the automobile. We hereby formally protest these increases and want them revised or have the registration period extended."

Mr. Speaker, this petition comes from districts in Central Newfoundland. It came about through a release which I had made earlier this year, sometime in September, in which I had complained about the increase in

MR. HODDER:

the cost of pick-up trucks.

I would read a letter which accompanied the petition which said that, "In September 14th. of this year you issued a statement in which you opposed the provincial government in classifying all pick-up trucks as commercial vehicles and increasing the registration fees from \$60 to \$92. Your release was used on CK Country's Action Line in Grand Falls and as a result stimulated considerable concern amongst residents in the show's coverage area." So that was where the petition was started.

As a result, this petition has accrued a number of signatures from concerned residents in the following areas of the Northern Peninsula, White Bay district, Green Bay district, Windsor-Buchans district, Grand Falls district, Exploits, Lewisporte, Fogo and Bonavista North and they asked that I would present this petition to the House of Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, pick-up trucks have become, and have been for many years, the major vehicle used by rural Newfoundlanders. In the last budget the government increased fees from \$60 to \$92, an increase of \$32 on pick-up trucks over 2,722 kilograms. Mr. Speaker, the pick-up truck is essential to many rural Newfoundlanders to transport firewood, and in general to transport goods purchased for their homes. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, it is exceedingly obvious now that all governments are asking people to conserve on energy and one of the ways that they are being asked to conserve, through the CHIP and the super CHIP programme, is to change to wood burning furnaces and wood burning stoves. And in order to do this many rural Newfoundlanders must have pick-up trucks. And it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, to arbitrarily class every pick-up as commercial and I might say that the only pick-up trucks that are not classed as commercial are those that have campers on them. And of course campers are only on them for a short

MR. HODDER:

time in the Summer.

This policy, Mr. Speaker, tends to hurt those who can least afford it. This policy also tends to hurt those who live in the rural areas of the Province, as opposed to the urban areas, but Mr. Speaker, many times they must travel to urban areas for goods and services.

There must be a more realistic method of determining the number of pick-ups used for commercial purposes in this Province. Not only is it unfair, Mr. Speaker, but trucks which can only be purchased

Mr. Hodder:

by major companies, trucks which range as high as 18,000 kilograms, were given the same \$32 increase. In other words, Mr. Speaker, whether you were a company who owned a transport truck, the largest truck that travels on the road, the most expensive truck that travels on the road, or you were a local fisherman who used the truck to handle his firewood, Mr. Speaker, in the last budget the amount was the same, it was \$32.

And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to praise the Open Line host, Mr. Lewis of CKCM, who brought this matter up. And I would also like to say that I would like to congratulate all those people who took the trouble to take this petition door to door throughout Central Newfoundland and Northern Newfoundland and the Northeast Coast in their own communities to garner this number of signatures.

And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the major petition comes from throughout Central Newfoundland from various communities. The other two petitions which I have here comes from Conche and Pacquet on the Northern Peninsula.

So, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the petition and have it sent to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation to the petition.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the petition. There are a couple of things which, whether they were intended or not, sort of give some false information in the hon. member when he was presenting it. It is true that pick-up trucks are considered to be a commercial vehicle, and the designation of commercial vehicle is the same in all provinces throughout Canada. The increase of \$32

MR. DAWE: applies to pick-up trucks above
6,000 pounds gross weigh.

MR. FLIGHT: They are all pick-ups.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I own a pickup which is
a C-5. The increase is \$15 on that pick-up the same as it is
on a large passenger vehicle. My father owns a fairly large
pick-up that is also a C-5 pick-up and its increase will be
\$15. Small Datsun pick-ups and the compact pick-ups are the
same classification as small cars and the increase will be \$8
on those pick-ups. This particular information has been given
to the pick-up owners as their registrations become due and
they are notified accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, this government introduced
that method of determining -

MR. HANCOCK: What is a C-6 plate, !Ron'?

MR. DAWE: Over 6,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: This government decided, Mr. Speaker, for
the very reasons outlined in the petition, not to increase pick-ups,
the commercial pick-up vehicles for the same rate, realizing
that the smaller pick-ups and the half ton pick-ups were used
by people for family use and for that very reason as indicated
by the hon. member. Therefore, the increase was not as
significant to the small pick-up owner as it was for the
larger vehicle.

As it relates to the \$32 applying to
large trucks the same as the larger pick-ups, there was a
significant increase in the transport trucks and the larger
trucks a number of years ago and it was felt that this time
it would not be just to increase the amount of money applied,
the registration fee applied to those vehicles at this time.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the petition, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I am pleased to support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and point out the inaccuracies in the minister's trying to cover the situation as it is. Every pick-up in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that has gone through the Motor Registration Division, and any pick-up in the half ton category, which is the pick-up we are talking about - we are not talking about Couriers and Datsuns, we are talking about half ton pick-ups, the common -

MR. DAWE:

You are wrong.

MR. HODDER:

That is what you -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Are 10,000 people wrong?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Order!

Now the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is appearing to enter into debate and that is not the purpose of speaking to a petition.

MR. HODDER:

Well what do you do?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), being the Opposition House Leader, is fully aware that he may not interrupt the Speaker when he is giving a ruling. I indicated that at the beginning of the sitting.

I am telling the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans that he is beginning to enter into debate and I want to caution him because that is not the purpose of a petition. He is supposed to confine his remarks to the prayer of the petition and to the number of signatures attached thereto.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans,

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no desire to enter into debate, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think it is right that the minister responsible for this action, the action that is going to cause so much misery to so many people, should get up and cloud the issue that way he did it. I do not think he should call the Registry of Motor Vehicles, he should call and talk to the people in the Department of Registrations across the Province.

And this petition, Mr. Speaker, relates to the Opposition by the owners of vehicles in this Province -

MR. HODDER:

Pick-up owners are not -

MR. FLIGHT:

- against the increase -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- that they have been put to

over a fifty per cent increase, and it is the only classification, Mr. Speaker. The minister did not point out that that is the only classification of vehicles that that size of increase applies to. The same increase, \$32.00, from \$60.00 to \$92.00, is \$32.00 across the board for every commercial vehicle, but the minister forgot to tell us and tell the House that only the vehicles in the half-ton bracket that weighs, as he says, 6,000 pounds. Vehicles weighing 24,000 pounds, commercial vehicles made for - Day and Ross vehicles on the road, Mr. Speaker, the biggest trucks on the road is only increased by \$32.00. Why does he not work out the percentage on what it is costing the people to run vehicles on these highroads. Work out the percentage as it applies to pick-ups, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply a case of the government looking and saying where can we get

MR. FLIGHT: the most return by increasing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: - where can we get the most increase. And they recognize, Mr. Speaker, that over the past few years for various reasons, hundreds and

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ch!

MR. FLIGHT: - thousands of Newfoundlanders have gone to the pick-up for the primary source of transportation, and thousands of Newfoundlanders have bought pick-ups as second vehicles, Mr. Speaker, for \$400 or \$500, in order to enable them to get cheap firewood. And what happens? The minister allows and instructs the Motor Registration Division to identify the class of vehicle that would generate the most revenue.

MR. HODDER: 'Ron', do you want a copy?

MR. DAWE: No.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans has the floor.

MR. FLIGHT: And Mr. Speaker, it is a sad, it is very sad that when it was determined what was the greatest number of vehicles that an increase in a license could apply to, how could the most money be generated, from what class of vehicle could the most money be generated, it was the half ton pick-up, and he hit them where it hurt. He hit them where it hurt and the minister knows that, Mr. Speaker.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Further petitions?

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for
Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to
present a petition today on behalf of 162 people in the
community of Little Burnt Bay in the district of
Lewisporte.

The prayer of the petition,
I will read it for the record: "As pickup owners, we
are strongly opposed to any increase in the registration
of these vehicles. We feel the classification of pickup
trucks as commercial vehicles is unfair, as they are as
much a family vehicle in many areas as the automobile."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: "We hereby formally protest
these increases and want them revised or have the
registration period extended."

As I said, Mr. Speaker, these
people are very concerned about increases in the cost
of registering pick-up trucks. As speakers before me
have explained, the pick-up truck has become, in rural
Newfoundland, the primary source of transportation,
not just for getting firewood and all that, but for
taking their kids to school or going to visit the
doctor or bring their rabbits home or whatever. It
is the main source of transportation. And with the
cost of everything in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker,
and the difficulty in people obtaining jobs, one would
think that the government would try to be fair to
people. It is about time they tried to be fair to
people.

MR. WARREN: Right on!

MR. WHITE: With 12,000 fewer people working in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, than there were last year at this time, goodness knows, if people outside of St. John's and the major urban areas do not need a break, because that is where the unemployment rate has really gone up.

So I would say to the government, if they find themselves unable, Mr. Speaker, to do the big things like creating major projects and so on, at least try to do some little things and make it easier for people to live in this economically strapped Province at this particular time.

I would ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the petition, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the petition presented by my colleague, the member for Lewisporte, again, Mr. Speaker, a petition objecting to the increases, the incredible, the exorbitant increases, the excessive increases to registration with respect to pick-ups.

Mr. Speaker, I think the degree of severity and the degree of the people's chagrin is indicated by the fact that there was no such opposition to increases in registration for automobiles, for cars, that there were no petitions presented to the hon. House. I suppose I heard of no great outcries; certainly people object to any kind of an increase, but not to the degree, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen here today, as illustrated by the petitions presented by my hon. friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and from Lewisporte (Mr. White).

MR. LUSH: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, looking at the numbers, I think my hon. friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) presented a petition on behalf of over 3000 people and I do not know what the numbers were with respect to the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) but, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about over 3000 people,

MR. LUSH: and certainly just these numbers indicate the severeness of the problem and certainly indicate how dissatisfied people are with these increases as they relate to pick-ups. And, Mr. Speaker, without belabouring the point and sounding too repetitious, certainly the pick-up in Newfoundland is one of the most widely used vehicles; it is used as a family vehicle and used extensively in terms of getting firewood, doing chores around the home, Mr. Speaker. It is the most used vehicle in this Province and it is unfortunate that the government had to try and seek a means of getting extra revenue through increasing these registration fees to these people in Newfoundland, right where it is going to hurt, Mr. Speaker, going to hurt these people tremendously. \$92 might not sound like a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, but it is. That is a lot of money for a lot of ordinary Newfoundland people who buy them, and some of them they are going to have to scrape the bottom of the barrel, Mr. Speaker, to get their trucks registered to be able to supply their homes with firewood, pick up the groceries or whatever people do with pick-ups. And as I have said before it is very widely used in this Province and it is unfortunate, it is extremely unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the government had to go to this particular area to try and pick up extra revenues for the Province. It is indeed unfortunate and I would hope that after the very substantial case presented here today in support of these petitions, I would hope that as a result of that, as a result, Mr. Speaker, of the concern of these people to take the initiative to sign these petitions and circulate these petitions, it certainly demonstrates their concern, it certainly demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, how this measure is going to hurt them financially, and, Mr. Speaker, it demonstrates their concern the fact that they have taken these petitions around, reacted to this petitions and signed them.

So, Mr. Speaker, that should be certainly the message to the government, they should have gotten the message from these petitions presented. I hope they get the

MR. LUSH: message and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will certainly listen to these concerned people, listen to these ordinary Newfoundlanders, listen to these people that are finding it very, very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to exist today. I hope the government will get the message, I hope they will heed the message, and I hope they will rescind this particular legislation which requires them to pay thirty-two dollars extra, a total of ninety-two dollars, to register these pick-ups, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further petitions.
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of sixty-seven residents of Carmanville in the electorate district of Fogo.

The prayer of the petition reads, Mr. Speaker, "As pick-up owners we are strongly opposed to any increase in the registration of these vehicles. We feel the classification of pick-up trucks as commercial vehicles is unfair as they are as much a family vehicle in many areas as the automobile. We hereby formally protest these increases and want them revised or have the registration period extended."

Mr. Speaker, there is no secret in Newfoundland that most of rural Newfoundlanders have and use pick-up trucks, and they are used, Mr. Speaker, in one of our most primary industries and that is the fishery. They are really an essential part of the fishery as fishermen in the Province have to haul their nets and gear and so on in them.

Mr. Speaker, it is also true that we have seen in this Province, and I suppose in all of the Western World, a huge increase in the cost of fuel. And the people of Newfoundland have been resorting to using pick-up trucks to haul firewood as a substitution for oil and electricity. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that just when the federal government of this country are assisting homeowners to convert from oil

December 3, 1981

Tape No. 4009

SD - 3

MR. BENNETT: to wood that we have a provincial government, who is supposed to be the champions of the downtrodden, we have a provincial government who, to gain a few more tax dollars have to almost make this substitution

MR. TULK:

impossible. Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the House and to the minister concerned that most people in rural Newfoundland, or indeed anywhere in Newfoundland, cannot afford two vehicles. So as the petition said this pick-up truck in Newfoundland for many people is the family vehicle. And, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to look at how this tax - and that is what it is a tax - how this tax was brought in. Mr. Speaker, to look in last year's budget there is a very vague reference to this tax and that it is coming. The budget says, 'There will be varying increases proportionate in nature applied to the registration of commercial vehicles and motor cycles.'

MR. FLIGHT: Proportionate.

MR. TULK: Proportionate. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a misleading way for any government to perform. Nobody in rural Newfoundland regards a pick-up as a commercial vehicle although we all know it as a C license plate. They are regarded as family vehicles. They are regarded as vehicles to be used to substitute the family's income. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the government, in shame, in absolute shame should remove the tax - and again that is what it is, a tax - from the pick-up truck. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the petition that I have presented be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Would one of the clerks please take the petition?

To the petition. The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to stand for a moment and speak in support of the petition just presented by my colleague from the district

MR. CALLAN: of Pogo (Mr. Tulk) on this topic of C license plates, pick-up trucks used for obtaining firewood and many, many other uses around rural Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, perhaps at the same time that I am speaking I can clear up a couple of little misunderstandings. First of all, I own a light duty half-ton pick-up myself and the mass or the gross weight of that pick-up is 2,722 kilograms. Now, Mr. Speaker, 2,722 kilograms is just over 5,000 pounds. And I was just on the telephone to the Motor Registration Division of the Department of Transportation and they informed me that the gentleman who owned the pick-up last year paid \$60.00 to license that pick-up and it will cost me \$92.00 when I license that second-hand pick-up that I bought. It will cost me \$92.00 when I license that in the Spring. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what type of vehicle or what type of pick-up that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) was talking about, but the pick-up that I bought second-hand a couple of months ago is a half ton pick-up, it is light duty, it is a C6. It is not a super cab or a club cab or anything of that nature. It is a simple Chevy pick-up and the mass or the gross weight is 2,722 kilograms, which I am told converted is just over 5,000 pounds and under the old system anything that was 5,001 pounds would automatically go to 6,000 pounds. So the minister said just now that it was anything over 6,000 that goes up by more than fifty per cent, from sixty to thirty-two. So, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) indicated that I was in a conflict of interest situation by supporting this petition, but I am a rural Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, like many hundreds of people or thousands of people who are

MR. CALLAN: concerned about this matter around the Province who used their pickup trucks for obtaining firewood so that they can save on their oil bill and many other things which are not classified as commercial activities. I use it to drive to and from St. John's and to and from getting wood and so on. So it is a pleasure vehicle, Mr. Speaker, for me just the same way that a car is for most other people. And, as I say, I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the government will take in earnest the sincere views and protests expressed by these, I think, close to 5,000 people altogether and of course there must be, there are scores of thousands around the Province, I am sure of that, even in my own district alone there are thousands who have not signed that petition at all. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): To the petition, the hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Yes. As usual, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition failed to get their facts straight or to deal with half-truths or misinformation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated a little earlier in response to the previous speaker that vehicles less than 6,000 pounds would be classified and were classified as far as Motor Registration is concerned as a C5 pick-up, which carries with it an increased fee this year of \$15 the same as for a large passenger car.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: The fact that the hon. member's pickup, the present one he has, is listed as a C6 was a decision that was made by the original purchaser to increase -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: - his ability to carry heavier loads than you could carry if you had a C5 plate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, all the hon. member has to do is re-register his pickup.

MR. HODDER: The poor man (inaudible) he just cannot do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DAWE: All the hon. member has to do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. members to my right have had an opportunity now, and the minister should have the right to comment as well.

The hon. minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: It is very difficult,
Mr. Speaker. As soon as you strike a nerve, Mr. Speaker, you know, they sort of agitate. Perhaps that is what the smoke came from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DAWE: I will just reiterate again, Mr. Speaker, that C4 -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) from Lawn to Fortune, ask him about it and his pick-up truck.

MR. DAWE: The C4 pick-ups, Mr. Speaker, the small Datsuns and Couriers and that kind of a vehicle, the increase in the fee this year is \$8.00 on those pick-ups. Anything up to -

MR. MOORES: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
A point of privilege has been raised by the hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I just arrived in the House to read what somebody distributed in the House, a letter from

MR. MOORES: the editor of the Muse, the Memorial University student newspaper, and part of that -

AN HON. MEMBER: What does that have to do with licencing vehicles?

MR. MOORES: Do not be so stupid, boy.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member should get to

his point of privilege.

MR. MOORES: How ignorant is that man?

- and the part of that distribution, the letter that has been distributed alleges that in 1972 I threatened legal action against

MR. MOORES:

the Muse for refusal to take one of my political advertisements. The first I have ever heard of it, Mr. Speaker. Complete fabrication. They do not know what they are talking about.

MR. FLIGHT:

They are not placed on the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

With respect to the point of privilege, I am not aware or familiar with the document that the hon. member refers to, but I would firsthand consider it to be in the same category as the many others and that you have taken the opportunity to clarify something.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, the increases in pick-up trucks were as I stated and not how the members opposite, or the petitions, in fact, insinuated that the increase of \$32.00 applies to all pick-ups. It does not, Mr. Speaker, it only applies to commercial vehicles over 6,000 pounds and anything below that—the hon. member has his vehicle registered inadvertently or mis-registered or registered as how the original owner wanted it registered, then you can go back and make the necessary representation to Motor Registration to have your truck listed as a C-5 and your increase will be just \$15.00.

MR. CALLAN:

(Inaudible) knew it (inaudible)

MR. DAWE:

If the hon. member knew about it, why did he stand on his feet and let it be known that he was paying \$32.00 if he does not have to?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any further petitions?

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I wish some of those petitions came from the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans has a petition?

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have petitions here from Central Newfoundland, petitioning the hon. the minister to reconsider the increase in pick-up rates, pick-up licenses for 1981-82. And, Mr. Speaker, the pick-ups that these petitions relate to are pick-ups in the category that is going to go from \$50.00 to \$92.00. I do not care what is going to happen to the pick-ups in the category he is talking about. I am talking about this petition relates to people who own pick-ups in the category that is going from \$60.00 to \$92.00. And the minister owes the people of Newfoundland and the people who own these - who signed these petitions an apology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: He is covering up. He is grossly covering up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: A cover up.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, in these times of ever increasing costs of living in this Province, -

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would just like some clarification. Is the member for Windsor-Buchans presenting a new petition? If he is, I understand that the standing orders of the House are such that the hon. member is supposed to give the prayer of the petition, the number of signatures on it and get on with it instead of getting into the realm of debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the point of order,

Standing Order No. 90 says, 'a petition to the House shall be presented by a member in his place who shall be answerable that it does not contain impertinent or improper matter and every member offering a petition to the House shall sign it with his own hand.' And all the rest of it.

'Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and material allegations that it contains. In no case should the hon. member occupy any

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

more than five minutes.

The hon. member should confine himself to the prayer of the petition.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition, signed by - I intended to leave this, Mr. Speaker, - signed by 395 people from the district, the great historic district of Exploits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, included also in the petition are ninety-odd names from the community of Pollards Point, I think it is, in the district - the great historic district of Humber -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the case of Exploits I am sure the hon. member will support this petition; had the petition been given to him I am sure he would have presented it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in presenting this petition. And I want to point something out -

MR. SPEAKER:

The prayer.

MR. FLIGHT:

- the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that the government - do you wish me to read the petition, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. FLIGHT:

"As pick-up owners we are strongly opposed to any increase in the registration of these vehicles. We feel the classification of pick-up trucks as commercial -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER:

You are killing time now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Now, I understood clearly what the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has said. I do not believe that it is

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): very much in order in this House, in terms of the dignity and decorum of the House. The hon. member clearly made an accusation to the Speaker that I am trying to kill time. Now, if the hon. member for Port au Port does not withdraw those remarks he will leave me with no other alternative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I call on the hon. member for Port au Port to withdraw.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I will try to wind this debate up. I think what needed to be said has been said. But I want to point something out here, Mr. Speaker, that sometime in the last couple of months I heard the Premier of this Province, and I totally agreed with him, saying to the people of Newfoundland that given the ever increasing cost of energy, electricity, fuel, interest rates, mortgage rates, that something should be done. We had to be concerned for the ability of rural Newfoundland to survive.

And we have here, Mr. Speaker, an action that flies in the face - this is a case of the most dispicable gouging that every could take place and the people being gouged are the people who can afford it least, Mr. Speaker, the people who bought pick-ups, secondhand or otherwise, paid anywhere from \$300 to \$4,000 to have a pick-up that could go out and help them keep the cost of living down, to get fireword, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Now what we have here is a case of the Minister of Transportation laughing at the arguments being made, when he should be using his influence -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is getting out of hand. I mean the hon. gentleman is presenting a petition. He has got to confine himself to the prayer of the petition under the rules, Standing Orders of the House -

PREMIER PECKFORD: And he is attacking the minister.

MR. MARSHALL: - and confine himself to the number of names involved. And the hon. gentleman is obviously getting into the area of debate and involving the minister, and what have you, in his presentation. He can present his petition, Mr. Speaker, without entering into debate.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the only reason the House Leader opposite got up on a point of order was to try to muzzle this side. Because this particular issue shows, Mr. Speaker, just exactly what this government is trying to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Another point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: They do not raise taxes, but they raise fees everywhere they can. And this particular issue shows just where they are raising them. And 5,000 people have written in to tell, Mr. Speaker, this government what they think of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): It is a point of order. The rules are clear, I just repeated them for all hon. members, and I must ask the hon. members to try to adhere to the rules. They have the responsibility as well as I have.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans has about fifteen seconds.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, somebody used the word "deceit" I do not know if it is parliamentary -

MR. MOORES: Yes it is.

MR. FLIGHT: - or not, but I mean this is as close to deceit as one could ever get.

MR. MOORES: It is parliamentary to say -

MR. FLIGHT: We have the budget, Mr. Speaker, pointing out that we will have increases in licences proportionately across the board. This group of vehicles was picked, Mr. Speaker, picked out and it will have over a 50 per cent increase. And, Mr. Speaker, it was identified by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and approved by the Minister of Transportation.

MR. FLIGHT:

(Mr. Dawe), Mr. Speaker. It is a clear case of gouging, Mr. Speaker, gouging of the people who are hurt most by gouging.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

Further petitions?

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the same petition?

MR. HISCOCK:

Yes.

MR. BENNETT:

I am speaking to that petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK:

I yield to the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member yields.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

I rise to support my hon.

colleague in support of that petition, Mr. Speaker.

To me, it is deplorable,

Mr. Speaker. The platform used by this government when they were elected was that there would be no substantial increases in taxation to the people of the Province, there would be no increase, Mr. Speaker. Now we find the back door has been broken into and all kinds of tax increases have come about.

Pick-up trucks, Mr. Speaker, are a way of life for the people of Newfoundland and there is no way that this Province can carry on without the use of half-ton trucks, small trucks. They are used in every aspect of industry, in the fishery, in the timber, in the development of land, in industry generally, and there is

MR. BENNETT: no way that our people can do without half-ton trucks. They have become a way of life, they are the family vehicle. I do not see substantial increases in big motor cars that a lot of us can afford to drive.

Mr. Speaker, on top of the exorbitant cost of the now licencing for these vehicles, comes an increase of forty-four cents a gallon in gasoline that these pick-ups have to use.

Mr. Speaker, these pick-ups today are costing as much as \$10,000 to purchase and, on top of that, you have 11 per cent sales tax inflicted on the backs of these people and everything that goes into that half-ton Mr. Speaker, and it is just getting way out of whack. To me, the government is blocking every way possible to have people survive and be self-sufficient and independent. To me, it is just terrible and I wish the government would take another look at it. Because if they are going to continue on the way they are going, with this kind of abuse of power, Mr. Speaker, they are just going to sacrifice the whole Province.

I understand we have more than 12,000 people less on the work force in the Province than we had last year, I suspect, fewer people than last year on the work force, and these people have had to go away. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that more people are buying half-ton pick-ups all the time. Because they want to supplement the energy costs to their homes and their businesses, they have to have half-ton pick-ups.

I certainly support the petitions that have been put forward here today, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) will do something about it.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I submit that you will see more petitions of this sort coming forward. I expect to see them coming from my district. I do not have one here today but I would suspect that you will see more coming forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further petitions?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, this is not a petition from my district because we have no roads.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: However, Mr. Speaker, it is a petition from the district of Exploits, from the town of Botwood.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the prayer of the petition: "As pick-up owners, we are strongly opposed to any increase in the registration of these vehicles. We feel the classification of pick-up trucks as commercial vehicles is unfair, as they are as much a family vehicle in many areas as the automobile. We hereby formally protest these increases and want them revised or have the registration period extended."

Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of this petition, I would believe that the hon. the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) would also support this petition, because it does show that this government is placing a burdening expense upon the owners of pick-up trucks. This extra increase for the owners of pick-up trucks is another way by which this government is increasing taxes not directly, but indirectly. And, Mr. Speaker, who is suffering? Anybody who has a

MR. WARREN:

pick-up truck. And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by 36 residents in the town of Botwood. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if other areas of the Province, down around the South coast and so on, knew that this petition was on the go, I am sure if the House was open for a few more days, there would be many, many more petitions coming from other rural areas of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, as my hon.

colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) said, those pick-ups are the sole means of the ordinary Newfoundlander saving a few dollars on the cost of electricity and on the cost of oil. And here this government on the one hand is saying, 'Look, you have to cut down but, however, we are going to charge you extra on the registration of your vehicles.'

You will note, Mr.

Speaker, that the federal government is offering up to \$800 for the conversion from oil to electricity, but on the other hand, at the same time this programme is coming into effect, we see this government saying, 'Okay, if you are going to put a wood stove in your house we will have to charge you, because you are going to need a vehicle, a pick-up to get your wood.'

Mr. Speaker, it just -

MR. HOLLETT:

of Crown land?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

MR. STAGG:

reasonable price of land.

MR. SPEAKER:

Torngat Mountains has the floor.

MR. WARREN:

And what about the price

Order, please!

(Inaudible) about the

Order! Order, please!

The hon. the member for

It just shows, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN: it is another example of how this government has initiated behind the back door another way to really put the dart into the average Newfoundlander.

I support this petition and ask that it be placed on the Table of the House and referred to the department that should do something about it.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition in the absence of the member for the area which it has been presented for. Seeing that the member is not going to support it, then I will support it on behalf of his constituents.

I think there is a message in this petition, and I think it is a message to this administration; and this message is basically saying, 'We are tired of being overtaxed, we are tired of having government put their hands in our pockets, and we are tired of having the government say they are not increasing taxes directly but here they are indirectly.'

Now, as was pointed out before - this half-ton pick-up - it is not only the \$32 increase, Mr. Speaker, it is the 11 per cent sales tax, also the 28 per cent indexing and a number of other things. But, Mr. Speaker, as the majority of members in this House - in concluding I think that this government is putting the boots to our people, to rural Newfoundland, destroying rural Newfoundland. I hope that this government will take a message from this, that rural Newfoundland is no longer going to have everything booted down their throats. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: It will be some good to get

MR. HANCOCK: our of here for two weeks.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. the member for
Stephenville to the petition.

MR. STAGG: I would like to have a
few words on this petition and they are a few words of
general

MR. STAGG: commentary concerning the prayer of the petition, and some of the general commentary of my hon. friends opposite.

Hon. members opposite are very quick to get up and criticize the government when it raises its fees on any matters. But I would like for hon. members opposite to address themselves to the fishing licence fees in this Province -

MR. WHITE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: - that their hon. friends and colleagues in Ottawa -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: The fees have been raised at least 100 to 150 per cent over the past year.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order! Order!

MR. STAGG: Completely out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White).

MR. WHITE: The point of order is quite simple, Mr. Speaker. That is all. Relevance! Relevance!

MR. STAGG: Not relevant? Oh! Okay.

AN HON. MEMBER: 150 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have heard enough to the point of order. The hon. member was not addressing himself to the petition and, therefore, he should do so. The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, that is the only thing I have to say. I want hon. members to be consistent in their objections (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Sit down! Sit down!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order! Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I am absolutely flabbergasted

and amazed that a former Deputy Speaker of this House would challenge Your Honour's ruling in the way that he did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present

a petition on behalf of seventy-one voters, seventy-one residents of Jackson's Cove. As hon. members know Jackson's Cove is in that great district of Green Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

And I would hope, Mr. Speaker,

that these seventy-one petitioners who reside in the district of Green Bay will hear their member rise in this House and support this petition. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that, "As pick-up owners we are strongly opposed to any increase in the registration of these vehicles. We feel the classification of pick-up trucks as commercial vehicles is unfair, as they are as much a family vehicle in many areas as the automobile."

"We hereby formally protest these increases and want them revised or have the registration period extended."

MR. WARREN:

It is a big joke.

MR. THOMS:

It is a big joke (inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. NEARY:

It is becoming increasingly obvious in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that we have a St. John's dominated and oriented government who do not understand, they do not understand what happens in rural Newfoundland. In rural Newfoundland as Your Honour knows, and right in Your

MR. NEARY: Honour's own district- I suppose they do not consider themselves rural, but look at the number of pick-ups that are in Conception Bay South or in Green Bay that people consider and use the same as you and I use a car. And this is the prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, that where people, homeowners, family men, where they have a pick-up that is used for family use, that is used the same as people in St. John's use automobiles, use cars, they want the registration to be the same, and not

MR. NEARY: \$92.00. Ninety-two dollars, Mr. Speaker, is too high a price to have to pay for a pick-up that is used to go and get a bit of firewood, to pull water, to haul water in communities -

MR. STAGG: To carry the fish licences -

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. STAGG: To carry the fish licences

(inaudible)

MR. NEARY: To carry water in their pick-ups. Where you have a large number of homes in rural Newfoundland where they do not have a central water supply, they have to go down to the hydrant or down to the pond or the well and get water and haul it in their half-ton pick-up.

Mr. Speaker, the pick-up to a family in the rural parts of this Province is a matter of life and death. They would gladly have a motor car if it was any good to them but they need the pick-up so they can put a couple of benches in it to drive their kids to school, put a barrel -

MR. MORGAN: That is illegal.

MR. WARREN: It is not.

MR. NEARY: To take their family to school?

It is not illegal for them to take their family to school.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL: It is very dangerous.

MR. NEARY: Listen to the townie -

MR. HANCOCK: It is illegal for you to practice law over there, but it does not say you cannot do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Listen to the townie who does not understand rural Newfoundland. One of the reasons - the hon. gentleman is one of the reasons and probably the big

MR. NEARY: reason that we had that kind of a decision in the Cabinet. We have a Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, made up of about seventeen members -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!
The hon. member is straying now from the prayer of the petition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if we did not have a Cabinet comprised of seventeen members of which six are from St. John's -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Sit down. Stop making a fool of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour, you have just indicated to the hon. member that he was straying from the petition when he was talking about the Cabinet and the makeup of the Cabinet, and he still persists in doing so.

Now there is a remedy -

MR. HANCOCK: That is the reason why we have the division.

MR. MARSHALL: - for somebody who, as the hon. gentleman is often doing, flagrantly violating the rulings of the Chair, and that should be taken.

MR. HANCOCK: La, la, la, la, la. Where is the violin?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think it is necessary for the Chair to repeat the ruling of the Speaker just a matter of a few minutes ago.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has about forty-five seconds to clue up his remarks to the petition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition of all these people in Central Newfoundland, in various districts, be they Liberal or Tory. And I support the prayer of the petition because, as I indicated a few moments ago, the use of a pick-up for family purposes is a matter of life and death. They cannot do without it in rural Newfoundland. They need it and I think the government, Mr. Speaker, showed that they had no heart, no heart at all when they made the registration of that pick-up, which is the same to them as a car is to members of this House, I think they were very cruel and callous to up the registration fees from \$60.00 to \$92.00.

And it gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to lay this petition on the Table of the House and refer it to the St. John's members to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Steve, Steve! Come back here.

MR. HANCOCK:

To the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

To the petition, the hon. member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as supporting the petition so ably presented by my colleague from -

MR. NEARY:

LaPoile.

MR. HANCOCK

LaPoile, yes. I get mixed up in LaPoile and Port aux Basques.

This petition is - I am sure in the future, once the people in other parts of Newfoundland discover that petitions are coming of this nature, that we will see a lot more of those in the future, Mr. Speaker, especially in areas like my own where we have large sections

MR. HANCOCK: of dirt road. And I would like to go on record as saying that the people in St. Mary's - the Capes would not mind paying \$92.00 a month for a half-ton pick-up if they had some roads fit to drive over, Mr. Speaker. And I am sure there are other parts of the Province that are in a similar situation, compared to the people in Jackson's Cove, Mr. Speaker.

This government promised some two years ago that it would not increase sales tax, Mr. Speaker. This government has turned into a more corrupt bunch of people than Al Capone. They would make Al Capone look small, Mr. Speaker. They do not increase taxes in one way, but look what they do here. And we have a prime example of what happens today, where we have

MR. HANCOCK: petitions coming in. They increased license plates from \$60.00 to \$92.00. Why put up sales tax, Mr. Speaker? You do not need to increase sales tax when you can get revenue of this nature. I would like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as supporting this petition, and I am looking forward to the day when I will be circulating those in my own district to present in the House of Assembly.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank on a new petition.

MR. THOMS: On a new petition, Mr. Speaker, yes. Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I would like to present to this House on behalf of 101 people of the historic community of Ming's Bight which, Mr. Speaker, I believe everybody knows is in that great Liberal district of Baie Verte-White Bay, but which is presently, of course, and temporarily, represented by Benedict Arnold in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. members should refer to other hon. members by their portfolio or the district that they represent.

MR. THOMS: I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member withdraws. The hon. member for Grand Bank to the petition.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a similar point of order with respect to that -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: It is not just, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman referred to another member by another name, but he referred to him by the name of Benedict Arnold which, in his own distorted mind, he gives this description of the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and it

MR. MARSHALL: is supposed to, in effect - Benedict Arnold as we know was a traitor in the United States.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: I think really, Mr. Speaker, he may have withdrawn it, but he should have enough couth as well to apologize to the House and the member concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Well the hon. member has withdrawn and that is what the Chair requires.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that hon. members of this House - I will not bother to read it, it is similar to the other petitions that were presented in this House, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that it serves a good purpose to present these petitions as individual petitions, so that it can be gotten through to the press of this Province and to the people of this Province exactly what this administration is doing. In this particular case they are gouging again the ordinary, average, everyday Newfoundlander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: It is nothing more or less than a gouging, grasping administration looking for every extra dollar they can get. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, left in this Province that a Newfoundlander can do without first having to pay for it, and now we find that the vehicle that is used -

MR. BAIRD: (inaudible)

MR. THOMS: And if the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) - okay, he is in a very affluent district. He can probably go to church on Sunday morning and there is nothing but Cadillacs and Mercedes' and all those big cars parked at the church. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell the member for Humber West

December 3, 1981

Tape No. 4018

ah-3

MR. THOMS: (Mr. Baird) that if he goes to church in Lamaline he does not see any Cadillacs, he does not see any Mercedes. What does he see? He sees pick-up trucks.

10667

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: And this is a pick-up truck that is an all purpose vehicle.

MR. NEARY: It is an all terrain vehicle.

MR. THOMS: They take fish from Lawn and from Lord's Cove to the different fish plants. They pick up their groceries, they go to church, everything - it is an all purpose vehicle for the people in the outports of Newfoundland. And what do we find this administration doing again? You know, you talk about increases, Mr. Speaker - from \$60 to \$92. I could see a licence going from \$60 to \$65 or even \$70. I mean, you could not argue against that as strenuously as you could against a whopping increase such as this, and this from a Premier and this from an administration who only two short years ago told the people of this Province there would be "no increases in taxation for the first three years of my administration."

MR. WARREN: What a disguise.

MR. THOMS: What a deception.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. THOMS: That is true. He went around this Province day in and day out and there was not going to be a tax increase for the first three years of his administration. And what do we find now? We find a bankrupt economy, a bankrupt Province, a Premier bankrupt of ideas, an administration bankrupt of ideas and what can they come up with? What can they come up with? Another example, something else to gouge the ordinary, everyday poor people of this Province. And that is all the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can come up with. The Minister of Finance should be dearly ashamed of himself, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to present this petition to the House and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. member for St. Barbe

to present a petition.

MR. BENNETT:

Yes, I just want to support what my colleague presented so ably, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to remind the hon. House that the half ton pick-up indeed is a vehicle of very good convenience for this Province. A lot of our children, Mr. Speaker, would not be able to have Summer holidays without the half-ton pick-up. It is a vacation vehicle, it is an all purpose vehicle. It is a vehicle that is used in every lifestyle. Even hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, who today drive Cadillacs have admitted today that they own pick-ups. How can the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) operate a farm without a half-ton? I venture to bet that he does have one. Mr. Speaker, it is a very versatile vehicle and I certainly would want to see more support from the hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BENNETT:

- because they know themselves, in their own hearts, that the people they are gouging- they know the people are being gouged when it come to inflicting such heavy licence registration on half-ton trucks. There is no way that this economy can stand it, there is no way these poor people can stand it, People who can only afford to drive half-ton pick-ups, Mr. Speaker, these are the ones who are becoming victimized.

On top of all the added expense, Mr. Speaker, in purchasing a half-ton, they buy a half-ton because they cannot afford to buy a motor car. It is a more versatile vehicle. It burns more gasoline, consequently, the government gets their share of the pie from the gas, because they do get forty-four cents for every gallon of gasoline that goes into a half-ton pick-up. Mr. Speaker, the pick-up does burn more gasoline. And, we do have some bad road conditions where a half-

MR. BENNETT: ton pick-up is more logical. It is certainly more logical to use a half-ton, especially with Winter conditions. Now, you can put chains on your half-ton, and if the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not going to do a decent road clearing programme this Winter, at least people can get over the high roads with half-ton pick-ups with chains on them, at least.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support my hon. colleague and all the other hon. gentlemen and I hope the Minister of Transportation will support it and all the hon. gentlemen in the House of Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Further petitions?

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: I have two petitions, Mr. Speaker, and I am very proud to present them to the House of Assembly, and they are being presented on behalf of 203 people from the rural community of LaScie.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
If I may interrupt the hon. member before he gets into the prayer of the petition, rather than interrupt him in his speech, pursuant to Standing Order 31(H) and it being five o'clock, I can now inform the House that I have received notice of three motions for debate at 5:30 when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House.

Number one, notice is given by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) arising out of questions asked to the hon. the Premier, and the subject matter is allocation of \$20.3 million for the re-organized high school programme.

Notice is given also by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) arising out of a question asked to the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and the subject matter is the Straits road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay.

And thirdly and finally, notice has been given by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) arising out of questions asked to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and the subject matter is the Lake Group Limited.

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): -has about four minutes and forty-five seconds.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I, as I say, am pleased to present these petitions containing the signatures of 203 people from the community of LaScie in the district of White Bay, -

MR. MOORES: Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. FLIGHT: Baie Verte - White Bay and Mr. Speaker, if there is a community that exemplifies the people that are going to be hurt by the action of this government with regards to raising the license fees for pick-ups, the C6 type pick-up, the type that is being referred to in these petitions, Mr. Speaker, it is a community like LaScie. It is all the LaScies of Newfoundland, rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, where people over the past few years trying to cope, trying to cope with the ever-increasing cost of living, recognized that by going out and cutting their own firewood and hauling it home, they would save a few dollars on their fuel bill.

And, Mr. Speaker, it must have become obvious, because it is as obvious as the eyes in your head, that of all the increases there is one classification and one classification only-and the members representing the various districts should go to the Motor Registration and ask to have the situation explained there is only one class of vehicles that has been increased in excess of fifty per cent and that is the class of vehicles, the pick-ups, the C6 plates, the 5,000 pound pick-up that is the only type of pick-up. That is what this petition is referring to, the half-ton pick-ups being used in this Province by people for the various reasons that have already been pointed out. And I would like to hear the minister explain, Mr. Speaker, how he can justify increasing the licence plate of those pick-ups by \$32.00 from \$60.00 to \$90.00, while allowing a vehicle that is making money on haulage in this Province,

December 3, 1981

Tape No. 4020

RA - 3

MR. FLIGHT: the tractor trailers that we see
crowding our highways, by allowing those increases to be
\$32.00 as well. But the percentage, the percentage in gross
weight -

MR. FLIGHT:

In other words, the operators of fleets across this Province are facing a \$32 increase. The poor person from LaScie with a pick-up is facing a \$32 increase. Now where, Mr. Speaker, is the justice in that? The man who can afford it the least, Mr. Speaker, is being hit. It is very obvious - and what this petition is complaining about - it is very obvious that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) went to Motor Registration and they identified the classification of vehicles which, by allowing this kind of an increase, would give the most income to the government coffers, to the Exchequer account. And they were identified, Mr. Speaker, to be the half ton pick-up. Well, I tell you, it was cruel, Mr. Speaker. The word 'gouging' has been used here. It is the worst kind of a case of gouging.

Somebody mentioned a minute ago, Mr. Speaker, relative to the petition, that not only is the man who owns a pick-up hit by the Government of Newfoundland for \$32, penalized for trying to keep his cost of living down by \$32, gouged in order to get a few more dollars to help offset some of the cutbacks the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) referred to, but every time he pulls in to the pumps - what we should remember, Mr. Speaker, is not only did this government increase his licence by \$32, but every time he pulls in to the pumps he pays more and more for his gas, because now, Mr. Speaker, the revenue to this Province from gas is on a percentage basis. Every time the price at the pumps goes up, the cost to the person who has just been gouged by \$32 goes up as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an act that has any compassion for the poor, ordinary people of this Province. This is a deliberate act,

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, to gouge.
This is a deliberate act to squeeze dollars out of the people of this Province who can afford it least. It is the people of LaScie who are going to hurt under this legislation, it is not the St. John's people; it is the people from Placentia East, Mr. Speaker, the communities of Placentia East, the LaScies of the world that are going to be hurt by this. It is not going to be the people of St. John's, it is going to be the rural districts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: And the member over there, Mr. Speaker, supports it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. FLIGHT: The members representing rural Newfoundland sit there, Mr. Speaker, quiet. Not one of them have stood to support the petitions and to support the requests of their constituents, not one of them, Mr. Speaker, has risen and the word will go out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the petition, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to stand up and support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: In fact, Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of this petition, I would like to thank the

December 3, 1981

Tape 4021

EC - 3

MR. WARREN: hon. the member for
Placentia (Mr. Patterson) for sending me over this
little brochure 'A Step Forward With Peckford' -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - because

MR. WARREN: by following this petition, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you one thing, that the drivers of those pick-ups are not stepping forward with Peckford.

Mr. Speaker, I assure hon. members of this House that I believe the message has gone out this evening from all those petitions, that this government has really put the screws to the average Newfoundlander. Mr. Speaker, we not only have 12,000 unemployed, but also what are we doing? We are trying to have more people unemployed by really putting the screws to them in charging them extra on motor registration, on marriage licences, one moose licences, on rabbit licences, on everything, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member is straying now somewhat from the petition.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I would like to go on record as supporting this petition because it definitely shows that the people outside the overpass are so upset with this government and the way this government is trying to manipulate them, that this is only an indication of what is going to happen with this government in the days to come. There are going to be mass demonstrations, Mr. Speaker, to show this government that they are really putting it to the people. I can only support it and say in finishing we are not stepping forward with the Premier, we are definitely going back.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the same petition?

MR. MOORES: No, I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Further petitions. The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Unless the House permits me I cannot speak in support of that petition, right?

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise and present this petition similar to the ones that have already been presented relating to the increase in fees for registration of pick-ups; 311 signatories from the once prosperous mining community of Baie Verte in the district, of course, of Baie Verte - White Bay. And if there is ever a time, Mr. Speaker, in this Province when something can be referred to as nefarious and ignominious, it is this disclosure in this House today that the Government of Newfoundland has again been successful -

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible) member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) a few big words to be nice.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. THOMS: Can you not keep the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) quiet, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Do we have to tolerate punks like him?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) hanging over my head.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for Carbonear to the petition.

MR. MOORES: I really do not mind, Mr. Speaker, it is the government's time we seem to be using. Right now it is the government which is all upset with this procedure this afternoon. If the Minister of Fisheries wants to continue, I will just remain silent.

MR. MORGAN: I do not see why not. You are not saying anything anyway.

MR. MOORES: He does not understand the meaning of nefarious or ignominious so he is all upset now.

MR. HOLLETT: He just does not understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please! Order!

The hon. the member for Carbonear has about three minutes left to speak to the petition.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, if there is ever a time in the history of the community of Baie Verte that they need government support and government help in any way they can get it, it is right now. And here we have 311 good, solid citizens of the community of Baie Verte indicating to the Government of Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

The hon. member now has about a minute and a half remaining.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Lots of time. Lots of time.

MR. MOORES: Lots of time.

MR. MORGAN: Oh my, oh my, oh my. The pain of it all.

MR. MOORES: I would prefer actually that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) be allowed to continue the circus himself. I am quite prepared. I mean, the galleries, the press gallery, the people of the House, they are all getting an indication now as to the real substance of the Minister of Fisheries. He got all upset because he could not understand two big words 'nefarious' and 'ignominious'.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. member, in the minute remaining, should address himself to the prayer of the petition.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: His lack of schooling, his lack of formal schooling came through.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: And he demonstrates the meaning of both words.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a fairly large word; nefarious.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it certainly is,

MR. TULK: A living example.

MR. MOORES: - a pleasure.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) marijuana

and you will all be happy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on. You might as well you can (inaudible) that way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MOORES: You see, Mr. Speaker, I would rather not have to get up here and speak in support of this petition, I would rather that the people of this Province never, ever have to petition this House because a petition in itself, Mr. Speaker, indicates poor government.

MR. FLIGHT:

Right on.

MR. MOORES:

Whenever a group of people, whether it is five or five thousand have to resort to this type of tactic to get some fairness and justice from their government, then, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it reflects a failure, a failure of this House and a failure of the government of the Province to come through with meaningful programmes and policies. This is not the only instance of the people of this Province being misled and deceived by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and his cronies on the other side.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To the same petition, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, very proud to be able to stand here this afternoon in support of this particular petition that has been presented by my learned friend for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) on behalf of the people of Baie Verte. I would have to ask the question, where is the member for Baie Verte, and why is he not presenting the petition on behalf of the people of Baie Verte?

MR. HANCOCK:

He is going to speak.

MR. TULK:

He is going to speak.

MR. THOMS:

And why has he not spoken in support of the petition of the people for Baie Verte -

MR. TULK:

He is going to do it now, he just has to (inaudible).

MR. THOMS:

- or Ming's Bight?

Mr. Speaker, if you can just imagine - you do not have to imagine, but just think of the economic depression that is not only prevalent throughout the Province of Newfoundland today, it is worse in Newfoundland than

MR. THOMS: it has ever been, certainly as long as I have lived in this Province. But can you imagine in a district, for example, like the district of Grand Bank where the Grand Bank fish plant is closed down, directly affecting some 730 fishermen and fish plant workers, and then indirectly, of course affecting all those who come from Grand Beach, Lamaline, Lord's Cove, Lawn, to sell their fish to these fish plants?

Now, these people use the pick-up truck to transport their fish to the fish plant.

MR. CALLAN: Like I do.

MR. THOMS: But here they are at the present time, Mr. Speaker, unemployed. And I think one has to go to the district of Grand Bank, or a place like the district of Grand Bank, where the people are unemployed, where their only security for the future of the town is closed down without any indication whatsoever when or if it is going to reopen. Now, at this time all these people who have pick-up trucks are either on welfare, if they can get it from this administration, or they are on unemployment insurance. Now it comes time to licence their family vehicle, the pick-up truck, in order to take their bit of fish to the Fortune fish plant or to go and pick up their groceries -

MR. CALLAN: Their bit of grub.

MR. THOMS: - or to go to the

MR. THOMS: fish flakes or the wharf, or to go to church. They suddenly find now that instead of sixty dollars they now have to pay ninety-two dollars. Mr. Speaker, what a root that is to the people of this Province and particularly -

AN HON. MEMBER: A what? A root?

MR. THOMS: Yes, a root right up their rear ends. And that is where this administration likes to give it to the people of this Province, right up the rectum, Mr. Speaker. That is where this administration likes to give it to the people.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, how degrading. How degrading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: The Minister of Fisheries- you do it just like your Premier.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this administration - and this is what these people are protesting against, they are protesting against the ordinary, average, everyday. Newfoundlander, who owns a pick-up truck, having the registration fee raised from sixty to ninety-two dollars.

MR. NEARY: Over 50 per cent.

MR. THOMS: Over 50 per cent. Now what we need, as somebody suggested here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is a Premier with some heart, We need an administration with some heart, we need a Cabinet with some heart and we need a Minister of Finance with some heart. And we need some government backbenchers in this House with some intestinal fortitude. We need some government backbenchers, who are not going to be asleep all day like my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), with some gumption, somebody who is prepared to say to the Premier of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - to the House Leader -

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please! Order, please!
Order! The hon. member is straying now from the prayer of
the petition and he has about ten seconds left.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, what I am doing is
I am asking, I am begging with the government backbenchers to
say to the Premier of this Province, to say to the Minister
of Finance (Dr. Collins), "We are not going to let this happen.
We are just not going to let this happen". I am asking them
to have the gumption and the intestinal fortitude to do that.
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. member's time has
expired.

I would like to welcome to the
Speaker's Gallery on behalf of all honourable members, concillor
Leo Kelly from the city of Corner Brook. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-
White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I want to have
a few words to say on the last two or three petitions that
have been presented by people on the other side of the House.
It is seldom that I try to avoid following the hon. gentleman
who just spoke. But for the second time today he had to squirt
his poison. And just in case there might not be another petiti-
ion to speak to, and in view of the time, I choose the opportunity
to speak now. But I will say that I hasten to speak after
the hon. gentleman because I do not like lowering myself to
speak after him with the kind of venom and dirt that comes
from that hon. gentleman when he speaks.

I do want to, having said
that, compliment the two previous gentlemen on the other side

MR. RIDEOUT: who did an excellent job in presenting petitions that were sent to them by some form or other by representing communities in my district. They did it honourably. They did it without dirt and they can be proud of the way they did it. That, Mr. Speaker, is the distinguishing trait between some gentlemen over there and some others.

Now, the hon. gentleman who took his seat wondered where the member from Baie Verte-White Bay was, he was not presenting the petitions. It is very simple, Mr. Speaker, they were not sent to me. Those

petitions were not sent. Those petitions, they were -

MR. STAGG: They were solicitations!

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I did not shout

at the hon. gentleman when he was speaking, and the least he can do is have the courtesy of doing the same thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the House how those petitions came about. They came about, Mr. Speaker, as a result of a press release made by the hon. gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) which was carried on the radio stations in Central Newfoundland and, I assume, all over the place. There is nothing wrong with that. The moderator made it a point of asking people to support the prayer of those petitions. And they were collected, I assume, by the moderator and sent to the hon. gentleman who has apportioned them out among his colleagues.

MR. RIDEOUT: If the petition was sent to me I would present the petition in the House, because I am duty bound to present it, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I hope to be presenting one from my constituency tomorrow. But I would have presented it.

Now having said that, let me say too that the material allegation contained in the press release by the hon. gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) I do not think tells the whole story. People were under the impression that every pick-up or half-ton pick-up was to be increased by thirty-two dollars.

MR. FLIGHT: So they are.

MR. RIDEOUT: And, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. That is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: And the people in LaScie believe that, the people in Baie Verte believe that, the people in all the coverage areas -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order!

MR. RIDEOUT: - Mr. Speaker, that were handled by that Hot Line show out of Grand Falls believe that because the hon. gentleman for Port au Port told them that. I checked on that way back in September and I know, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people have C5 pick-ups registered now, for whatever reason, and C6s and C7s. And they can have those re-registered as C5. And if they are C5 and if they are less than 6,000 pounds, then it is not a thirty-two dollar increase.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: And, Mr. Speaker, it is not fair, it is not right -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: - for members of this House to incite the public with facts that are wrong. And not only wrong but that are untrue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that I will present any petition from any place in my district that comes to me. Unfortunately, I had to follow the hon. gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) when I spoke and that is the most disgusting thing about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Order 2, bill no. 99.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Companies Act. (Bill No. 99)

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 3, bill no. 100.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Provincial Parks Act". (Bill No. 100)

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 4, bill no. 118.

A bill, "An Act To Amend And Revise The Law Providing For Accessibility To Buildings For Physically Disabled Persons." (Bill No. 118)

On motion, Clauses (2) through (4) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Shall Clause (5) carry?
MR. MARSHALL: Clause (5), Mr. Chairman.
MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): On Clause (5) the hon. the
President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: There is an amendment. And I move that subsection (1) of section (5) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted. Subsection (1) will then read, "This Act does not apply to buildings existing at the commencement of this act, except such building or class of buildings as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time prescribe". And further, in that same subsection, subsection (2) of section (5), the act is amended by striking out the words, "Notwithstanding that the time period prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under subsection (1) has not expired, where a building conforms", and substituting the words there, "Where on the commencement of this Act a building conforms".

Now, the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that the government wishes to enforce this act and make sure that the provisions of this act comply with the provisions of it. But with respect to existing buildings it may, in the case of existing buildings, prove a little bit difficult to bring the act completely to bear on existing buildings. And we want to bring in regulations that can make the evolutionary process with

MR. MARSHALL:

respect to existing buildings a little bit more balanced and easier for both parties.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the member for Grand Bank on the amendment to Clause (5).

MR. THOMS:

I thank the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) because I was rising at the same time as the hon. member was rising to suggest that we take a closer look at the existing provision in this particular bill. And this is what I was wondering if - what I would like is for you to read it again, there was a bit of noise over here and I could not hear exactly what you were trying to -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

As the hon. member will appreciate, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult in legislation like this on existing buildings to put down all of the criteria immediately and we have to look at it carefully. In order to do it, we propose that subsection one be replaced with the following: 'The act does not apply to buildings existing at the commencement of this act, except such buildings or class of buildings as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may from time to time prescribe.' So it will not apply to existing buildings but at the same time, so that the hon. member will appreciate it, the government intends to look at it very, very carefully, and it is not to say that existing buildings are going to be exempt. They are exempt, but it means that the act will be made to apply to them, but it will have to apply to them balancing out the present interest. In other words, you have to

MR. MARSHALL: make the best of the present situation.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: When I first read this amendment revising the law providing for accessibility to buildings for the disabled, one of the first things that crossed my mind when it said 'existing buildings' was that was the economic factor that the government has to look at before they order a building to be made adequate for the disabled. Because you may find that in a situation where somebody has a large building or a large number of apartments, that it really is an economic hardship to just, if I could use the word, willy-nilly say, 'Look, that building has to be made accessible to the handicapped or these apartments have to be made accessible to the handicapped.'

Somebody mentioned something to me in connection with this, that there is a building, I understand, right now in St. John's that has a number of apartments that are accessible to the handicapped and they cannot rent the apartments and, of course, they cannot rent the apartments to other people because, as you know, handicapped - you know, certain basins are lower and this is lower and that sort of thing, so that they cannot rent them to the average renter in the city and they have to remain empty. I think all these are factors. And to me, it makes no sense to order somebody to spend a large amount of money to make a building adaptable to the physically handicapped if you are going to drive that person or that company into bankruptcy. That makes no sense.

MR. THOMS: Now it is different with buildings that are going to be erected, because then you can build your cost into those buildings, but to force somebody to go back and to make huge renovations to large buildings or to a large group of apartment houses or anything of that nature, then it is something that you should take a long, hard look at before doing; and hopefully this is the type of situation that your present amendment is trying to correct. Thank you.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): On the amendment?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, on the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you.

I would ask the hon. the President of the Council - there are a lot of buildings, particularly in St. John's, in various stages of construction. The minister does not have to stretch his mind very far to think of buildings that are in various stages of construction that when completed will now - for the purpose of the word 'existing', will the buildings that are now under various stages of construction be under that category, 'existing' category?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. THOMS: They will? So, Mr. Chairman, we are talking, you know - I think in today's paper there is something like \$20 million in capital construction going to take place in St. John's. There are buildings here now worth millions of dollars that the people will have to use for the next thirty years, and those buildings are going to be -

MR. MARSHALL: They are in the course of construction, yes.

December 3, 1981

Tape 4026

EC - 4

MR. FLIGHT: Existing?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, they are existing.

MR. FLIGHT: Then, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid, personally, we have probably gone too far with the interpretation of 'existing'. There is no reason why buildings in the early stages of construction cannot comply with the regulations laid down by the government

MR. MARSHALL: We are doing the best we can in the circumstances. That is what counts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

MR. HANCOCK: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh I am sorry, the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: No, Mr. Chairman. Having been around handicapped people and knowing the cost of what a new building is to put up and what the rent of that building is going to be compared to what the rental value of an older building would be, I cannot see why it is not compulsory to take the ground floor of any apartment building and convert it and make it accessible to a handicapped person.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I can answer that for the hon. member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. HANCOCK: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member is making a very valid observation. What this amendment is going to do is it is going to allow a latitude to the government to be able deal with specific instances. I mean, we are going to pursue this act to try to make it apply to all buildings, both existing and in the future. But we have to do it this way in order to have it tempered with some kind of reasonableness.

MR. HANCOCK: You are not saying that older buildings will not be converted.

MR. MARSHALL: No, no.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, the first floor level of an apartment building will not be converted.

MR. MARSHALL: No, by no means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment on this whole matter. In past months I have had a number of cases, and one particularly dealt with a school where a handicapped child could not get into that school or had great difficulty in getting into that school. You know, I would say to the minister at this point that I hope that this amendment will not make it such that - because when I saw this bill I thought, 'oh, oh, here we have the solution the school board will now have to build that ramp'. But now I am not sure if they have to build it or not, maybe the minister -

MR. MARSHALL: We will be (inaudible) public buildings, you know, of that nature. Public buildings of that nature must have (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I came in on the tail end. I was out when the amendment was moved. But it seems to me this amendment is -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
I regret to interrupt the hon.
member -

MR. NEARY: I move the adjournment, Mr. Chairman.
I move that the Committee rise,
and report no progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Mr. Speaker, the Committee

of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred and reports having passed Bills Nos. 99 and 100 and made further progress on Bill 118 and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chairman of the Committee

reports that it has considered the matters to it referred and directed him to pass Bills No. 99 and 100 without amendment.

On motion report received and

adopted, bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

It being 5:30 a motion to

adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The first matter for debate raised by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush),

MR. FLIGHT:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!, Order!

The first matter for debate

raised by the hon. member for Terra Nova, is the allocation of \$20.3 million for re-organization of the high school programme?

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, for days now I have been

attempting to get an answer to the question of whether or not \$20.3 million, as allocated by the government in the 1981-1982 budget, is to be used for the re-organization of the high school programme over a three year period. I have asked the question Mr. Speaker because - I have raised the question because school boards throughout the Province have been flexing their muscles in recent weeks saying that it is totally inadequate. Now, Mr. Speaker, why the government refuses to answer the questions as to

December 3, 1981

Tape 4027

PK - 4

MR. LUSH: whether it is inadequate or adequate - indeed
they have answered the question, they said that it is adequate.
The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has

MR. LUSH: said that it is adequate. But I ask the minister whether, since the money was allocated, whether since then there have been studies to indicate whether or not the government may have miscalculated, whether they were wrong. But, Mr. Speaker, no. So quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, they are saying that the school boards are wrong, that the school boards in this Province do not know what they are talking about. This is what they are saying.

The minister on several occasions now has said that the amount is adequate and that their studies and surveys prior to allocating this amount of money were correct. Whereas school boards are saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is grossly inadequate, that it is woefully inadequate. Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly the government have an obligation to tell the people of this Province whether this amount of money is sufficient, to tell them and to tell school boards, Mr. Speaker, where they are getting off. Because if school boards are telling us that this is an inadequate figure then someone has the responsibility to allay the fears of the people of this Province and to ensure them that the monies allocated are indeed sufficient. Mr. Speaker, school boards are saying that it is totally inadequate. Indeed the figure being floated around, Mr. Speaker, by school boards is that the figure should be closer to \$50 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is quite a discrepancy, when the government has said that \$20.3 million will do the job and school boards are saying that it is closer to \$50 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier today indicated that he could not answer the question because if he said that it was inadequate this meant that the government had to come up with more funds. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty stupid. The people want to know the truth and the truth will out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: The truth will make you whole, will make you greater.

MR. LUSH: So the government have no reluctance at all to indicate that there is not enough money to provide water and sewer projects to all the communities that need them. They have no reluctance or hesitancy with respect to saying there is not enough money to pave roads. So, Mr. Speaker, why are they not coming out in answer to this question, and if there are insufficient monies allocated, tell us what they plan to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier again uses the pat answer, the routine answer, the sob answer that we have been used to getting in this hon. House and that the people of this Province have been used to getting. He cannot say that it is inadequate because this would mean more funds and we cannot have more funds, Mr. Speaker, because of the federal government, because the federal government have cut back monies with respect to post-secondary education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the time to go into the EPF programme, to explain why the Premier is not telling the complete truth with respect to the EPF programme. And, Mr. Speaker, I would just merely say that the EPF programme is composed of four components. And the one that is causing the trouble is the revenue guarantee, one which, Mr. Speaker, was brought about in 1977 and which was to be phased out in a five year period from 1982.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. BENNETT:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave we would have to stop the clock.

By leave we would have to stop

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

December 3, 1981

Tape No. 4028

IB-3

MR. MARSHALL: By no stretch of the imagination,
Mr. Speaker, the five minutes that the hon. member has taken
in bringing

MR. MARSHALL:

up an issue that is supposedly a matter on which he was dissatisfied with the answer. He spent five minutes elaborating his question, Mr. Speaker. And having listened to him for five minutes he did not make any more sense than when he asked the question in the first place. The fact of the matter is, that the hon. gentleman is taking up the call of the school boards, that the monies are inadequate. Mr. Speaker, as far as this government is concerned this government would that this government could give much more money, not only to school boards but to universities, to hospitals, to pave roads, to do everything that has to be done in the way of public service in this Province. And we look forward, Mr. Speaker, in the years to come, in the next few years and the immediate few years, that we will be in a position hopefully to alleviate the problems that our people are facing and are labouring under as a result of our unfavourable financial situation.

But how foolish it is, Mr.

Speaker, for a man to get up in this House and say that the amount of money is inadequate or is it adequate or do you agree with what the school boards say and the Premier does not get up and say this and he does not get that. And, Mr. Speaker, did you note at the end, did you note it when the great apologist again, he brought up - I did not mention it, he did - about the EPF. If the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to defend the government the best thing for them to do it is to go up to Ottawa and sit up in the little backbenches with the mute people who are up there, who see our terms of union jeopardized and sit back like quiet little mice, who see the possibility of the university being desecrated as a result of the cancellation, the reduction of the EPF programme. But do you notice how he gets up, like he has a guilty conscience, Mr. Speaker? And he has a guilty conscience because on the one hand he is a Newfoundlander and

MR. MARSHALL: on the other hand he has got to try to support the Liberal Party of Canada. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, he is a walking schizophrenic.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

The second matter for debate raised by the hon. member for Eagle River is the Straits Road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, in rising on this I am rather pleased that the federal government--as much as we are accused of supporting the federal Liberal government, the people in Labrador are quite proud that they have a federal member in the Cabinet and that \$39.5 million has gone to Labrador and \$13.5 has gone to fisheries. And that the reason why we have the upgrading of the road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay, in the first place, is because of the federal government. And it was their understanding and my understanding and the understanding of the people on the Labrador Coast that this money would be given on the condition it would be upgraded from L'Anse-au-Clair all the way to Red Bay with pavement to Pinware. Now we find out, the Premier says, unless we get more money we are not going to continue with the worst road in Canada, the worst part of the road in this Province and in Labrador, unless we get more money from Ottawa. And the people in Labrador, with the new Labrador Rights Organization, are asking why are we part of this Province. Well, all I would say, the reason why we are part of this Province and any other district in this Province is the benefits we get from being in our own Province.

This government has not done anything for the past ten years. It has been a Liberal government which has put anything into Labrador. I would like to ask a couple of questions. And LSDA, the Labrador

MR. HISCOCK: South Development Association, has recommended doing away with the pavement and do the road all the way to Red Bay. First of all, I do not think they have that right. That should go to the people on a door to door Ballot box or a ballot box in the communities. And I, for one, feel that these organizations should fight the provincial government and make sure that the provincial government take their responsibility and as part of this Province to continue with the road down to Red Bay. And not only that but put in the water and sewerage and the airstrips and the road from Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour. We are not getting anything out of the provincial government, from this government, down on the Labrador Coast or in Labrador generally. And the quicker the people of this Province realize that the frustration down in Labrador will only be done away with when we get rid of this P.C.

MR. HISCOCK:

administration, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Nothing only (inaudible) up there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

And if it was not for Ottawa we would have nothing down there.

But I want to ask the minister a couple of questions. Number one, is the road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay going to be continually upgraded if we do not get any more funds from Ottawa? Number two, if it is, how long will it take? Number three, if the people are willing to give away the pavement, will the Provincial Government do the road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay, and how long will the people have to wait for the pavement thereafter? These are some of questions that the people on the coast want answered. They are quite content -- one of the things that is most remarkable, Mr. Speaker, that I found since I have represented Labrador is that they ask for so very little, that they are so patient, that they are so considerate in asking. They do not want pie in the sky, but they do want their rights. And they are quite content' Mr. Speaker, the people in Red Bay, to have an upgraded gravel road until three or four or five years time when hopefully the federal government will help with regard to Basque whaling ship site. These are the things that I am going to be fighting for for Labrador. I am going to fight so that the road will continue, that it will go all the way to Red Bay, it will be paved eventually all the way to Red Bay. We will have a drier on the Labrador Coast. We will end up having hydro on the Labrador Coast, water and sewerage on the Labrador Coast and better schools. And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the majority of this is going to be done by a Liberal government that is in Ottawa. And we have to take this arrogance from this Provincial Government, by ending up saying that we cannot do anything unless we get more

MR. HISCOCK: money. All I can say is thank God we have an M.P. and a minister in Ottawa representing Labrador, because if we did not, Mr. Speaker, if we did not well, then, I would say the frustration down in Labrador would be that much greater. And you talk about the riots back in the 1930s, in Sir Richard Squires' time, they would be nothing, Mr. Speaker, compared to the way the people of Labrador feel.

So in concluding, I would like to ask this government, this administration, this Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to live up to their responsibility, that they have been elected to provide services throughout all of this Province. And I think that Labrador South, the Eagle River district, is part of this Province and we deserve more attention than we are getting.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know where the hon. member was with his fighting spirit when Ottawa decided, after months and years of pushing for a Labrador Strait's agreement, when they cut-back the agreement for \$100 million down to \$39 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: And that is the reason the strait's road is not being done. That is the reason adequate water and sewerage projects are not being done, and that is why the infrastructure on the Strait's road is not being done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Where was the hon. member then?
Where was his member in Ottawa?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. PATTERSON: You are supporting
the selectors, the selectors in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, of course the
amount of money being used is not enough and it is all because
the hon. member opposite and his so-called colleagues up in
the federal government in Ottawa did not have enough concern
about the people of the Straits of Labrador -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: - to do what the Province
has been pushing for for a number of years, to help us do the
work that is necessary in that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: The hon. gentleman as usual
in his speech, said nothing, absolutely nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true.

MR. DAWE: He did not support his position
at all.

MR. GOUDIE: It is typical.

MR. DAWE: All he did was rant and rave
about useless little bits of information.

MR. HANCOCK: You better watch what you
are saying now, you can get yourself in trouble.

MR. DAWE: As it relates to when the
road will be done, I am not a clairvoyant, I cannot answer that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DAWE: Yes, if the federal government
will not live up to their obligation. Yes, if they do not
address to the concerns of this Province in the DREE submissions
for Trans-Labrador highways and for other necessary -

MR. GOUDIE: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: - projects in the Province,
the road will be done in due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: The roads are your responsibility.

MR. HISCOCK: Got enough pavement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the DREE Management Committee were the people who recommended the position that the Province has taken now with the DREE agreement on the Strait's road, and they will be proceeding in the manner that is best suited to utilize the amount of funding we have available, and that is to upgrade and pave the road from Blanc Sablon into Pinware.

AN HON. MEMBER: Something like that.

MR. DAWE: Right? It is determined that to do a gravel road with the amount of funding we have available could be possible, but that the maintenance costs because of the high elevation, because of weather conditions, that it would be just, in some cases, a waste of money. Because you would have to go back and completely repair the gravel road conditions, there would be washouts.

MR. DAWE: It is using the money in the best possible way and we will be going back - and if the hon. member wishes to fight and support the position of this Province, we will be going back and looking for the additional funding, so not only that particular piece of road, but all other necessary secondary roads in the Province can be completed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The final matter for debate is raised by the hon. the member for Grand Bank and the subject matter is the Lake Group Limited.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

One of the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: If I could have my five minutes, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it, from both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence and he has requested so.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

What I am talking on is a very serious subject, both to the people of Grand Bank and to myself and to my friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart).

One of the questions that I wanted to ask the minister in Question Period today was, if a decision regarding the Lake Group proposal that is before the provincial government at the present time

MR. THOMS: is not made pretty soon, what happens to the allocation of the Northern cod stock which is allocated for January of this year? What happens if these are not caught by the Lake Group in January or February of this year?

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that I have been having with this whole question surrounding the economic situation in Grand Bank and the close down of the plant is that every time I go to a federal minister - and I have talked to the hon. Romeo LeBlanc in connection with this matter, I have talked to the hon. Gerry Regan in connection with this matter and others on a federal level, and the answer that I get is, 'Look, we have to wait for the provincial government to make a decision and then -

MR. MORGAN: Wrong.

MR. THOMS: I am only saying what I am getting from Ottawa, okay? This is what I am getting. It is provincial responsibility, jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: If I may have my five minutes in silence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: These are the answers that I am getting. Now, I want the provincial government - now, Ottawa may not like me for saying this but I do not care because I am interested in the people of Grand Bank and the people of Gaultois in this matter - I want the provincial government to make a decision, a favourable decision one that includes the reopening of the Grand Bank plant, one that includes the reopening of the Gaultois plant, and I want that decision soon, because I want - I guess I want pressure to be

MR. THOMS: brought to bear on my federal friends in Ottawa to get something done here.

The statement made by the minister in connection with the Connaigre Peninsula plant said, 'It also lifts the cloud of uncertainty that has been hanging over the economic future of these people for some time.' Now, I have said it before, Mr. Speaker, but it is the uncertainty in the Grand Bank and Gaultois situation which is one of the problems. The people are there, they do not know what is going to happen to their town. They have no indication whatsoever of what is going to happen, whether the plants will reopen or whether they are going to remain permanently closed. And, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I am afraid of is this - and I have had it said to me over the past number of days - that if we cannot get an indication of what is going to happen in Grand Bank, then come Christmastime, we are going to be looking elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of constituents affected by the Grand Bank plant who do not want to be on welfare. Last Saturday, I spoke to a man who had been with the fish plant in Grand Bank for twenty-eight years. This is the first time he has ever been on unemployment insurance. It is foreign to him. He does not like it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Time is up.

MR. THOMS: Yes, the time may be up for Grand Bank too. Whoever made that remark, the time just may be up for Grand Bank and that is what I am talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order!

December 3, 1981

Tape 4031

EC - 4

MR. THOMS: That is what I am talking about, the people of Grand Bank and the people of Gaultois, the people of the district of Hermitage, my friend's district. Do you not care about what happens to his district?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important -

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Do you not care what happens in your own district?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order!

MR. THOMS: Would the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) like to have something - I will give him leave to speak from now until eternity on this matter if he wants to.

Mr. Speaker, if, come the end of this year we do not have a decision or some indication from both the provincial and the federal levels of government then, if the fish plant reopens after that, we may not have a work force left there. I have had several, any number of people, who have said, 'If we do not have an indication by Christmas then we are going to look elsewhere in the Province and we are going to look elsewhere in the country.' And the people of Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, do not deserve that. So I am begging the Premier of this Province, and the Minister of Fisheries, to move and to move quickly and to give us a decision.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder, when we have problems in the industries and when we have problems in our Province and we need a kind of level-headed and cool-headed attitude towards these problems, I sometimes wonder if the members of the Opposition are genuinely sincere in wanting to see these problems resolved or whether or not, Mr. Speaker, they want to play cheap party politics with them. And I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition is not going to drag me into a position of playing cheap politics with the lives of thousands of plant workers, with the lives of thousands of fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I am not going to get involved in their cheap party politics. Because, Mr. Speaker, the matter of concern being now discussed, the Lake Group Company, is of major concern to hundreds of plant workers in Bonavista. I would go so far as to say even further than that, hundreds of fishermen in the area. It is a concern of the same people up in Fermeuse. It is a concern of fishermen in Englee. It is a concern of fishermen and plant workers in Fortune. Because it is not just the Grand Bank plant, it is not just the Gaultois plant, it is the Fortune plant, the Fermeuse plant, the Englee plant, the Bonavista plant. Because we are talking about a very serious financial problem of a corporate citizen, a major corporate citizen in the fishing industry which has twenty-seven trawlers and six large plants around the Province. We are talking about the lives of thousands of plant workers and fishermen. And I am not going to get involved in attempting to be led into a kind of a political trap by saying, 'We have got to put the pressure'.

I have been saying for the last six months in this Province, It is time for co-operation between the levels of government, co-operation. And, Mr. Speaker, in the last few days -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order!

MR. MORGAN: - when Mr. LeBlanc openly criticized the provinces and criticized the ministers for the problems in the industry, was there a response from Morgan? There was no response from this government here. There was a response from Nova Scotia, a loud, loud complaint from Nova Scotia, in fact a vicious row between the Minister of Fisheries in Nova Scotia and Mr. LeBlanc. But I am saying, Mr. Speaker, the problems we have today in the fishing industry are far beyond political partisan politics. It is too important for that, and I am going to work in every way possible in a spirit

December 3, 1981

Tape No. 4032

IB-3

MR. MORGAN: .. of co-operation with my counterpart in Ottawa, and other ministers in Ottawa, to try to find some sensible, reasonable solution to the fishing industry problems we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m.