

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, JULY 9, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this morning the news media reported that because of the postal strike, fewer than 3,000 Grade XI public examination papers had been received for grading by the examination marking board. While the media quoted a spokesman for the marking board, in fact, no officials of my department were contacted.

The information, Mr. Speaker, is quite inaccurate. In fact, 98 per cent of the approximately 50,000 papers written during this year's public examinations have been received and will be graded on schedule.

This year approximately 8,500 students wrote public exams at 200 centres during the period from June 17 to June 26. In order to expedite the marking process, papers were forwarded to the department at the end of each examination day. When the postal strike began, my officials determined that all but 1,700 papers had been received. Yesterday, through the co-operation of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers and the Regional Director of Postal Services, my department obtained approximately 1,000 papers which had been located at the postal distribution centre on Kenmount Road. If the remaining 700 papers are located and delivered by the end of next week, complete results for all students will be released on schedule by mid-August.

In the event, Mr. Speaker, that we are unable to obtain the remaining papers in time,

MS VERGE: all available results will be released on schedule. We are able to issue complete transcripts for approximately 8,000 students. The remaining students, approximately 500, will obtain results for all exams available for grading, and will be issued a complete transcript when the outstanding papers are received and graded.

Exam results are normally mailed directly to students. However, if the strike continues, the results will be released through school board offices.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde has about a minute.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the minister has informed the House of a situation regarding the marking of the public examinations.

I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the minister could indicate - she said 98 per cent of the 50,000 papers have, in fact, been delivered to the marking board and there are approximately 500 yet underdiscovered- you are still looking for 500 papers.

MS VERGE: Approximately that number, yes.

MR. F. ROWE: Right. The two points I would like to raise, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the minister's statement is this: I understand, as well, that there is one set of shared evaluation of marks that have not been received from one school in the Province. I was wondering if the minister could undertake to find out what the situation is with regard to that one set of shared evaluation marks from that one school -I am not sure of the name of the school - and, you know, exactly what plans are being

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3180

SD - 1

MR. F. ROWE:

taken by the government to recover the 500 papers that are still missing?

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know as the minister indicated that if there is still a strike when the marks become available, they will be delivered presumably to the school boards by hand or through some other mode of transportation and from the school boards to the various high schools under their jurisdiction, and that presumably is the contingency plan that the government is planning to use and there appears to be no problem with that.

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is a problem and hopefully it will be solved and we accept it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Further statements?

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to

announce the appointment of Miss Anne M. Perry, B. Comm., C.A., to the post of Assistant Comptroller General (Financial Controls), with responsibility for the operations of the Divisions of Government Accounting, Internal Audit and Financial Systems.

Miss Perry was born in St. Albans and is a graduate, in Commerce, of Memorial University of Newfoundland. She entered the Public Service with the Department of the Auditor General in 1969.

In 1977, Miss Perry was appointed the first Director of Internal Audit Division in the Department of Finance and was subsequently appointed Director of Debt Management.

She is a member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Newfoundland and the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3180

SD - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about thirty seconds.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we welcome the appointment and we wish Miss Perry well in her new endeavours.

MR. SPEAKER: Further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question - I wonder could the hon. gentlemen tell us if the Premier is going to be in his seat today to answer questions?

MR. MARSHALL: The Premier is attending a meeting but will be here later.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will save the questions I have for the Premier until he is here then, they are so important.

I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), some time ago I put a question on the Order Paper about the extending of a power line across the Exploits River at the junction of the Bay d'Espoir Highway and the Trans-Canada Highway and yesterday in an answer that we given to me by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) he said that there was no cost incurred on behalf of the people of this Province and then in his next paragraph he says, 'The cost to the Public Treasury was \$25,000 and this was incurred by the Department of Highways for highway lighting'. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House now that the Minister of Mines and Energy has confirmed that \$25,000 of taxpayers' money was spent to light this intersection of the Trans-Canada Highway, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if indeed there are lights at the intersection of the Bay d'Espoir Highway and the Trans-Canada Highway and, if so, how many lights are placed on that intersection?

July 8, 1981

Tape No. 3181

IB-1

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement and get the answer either later on today or tomorrow. I will try and get it this afternoon for the hon. gentleman and let him know.

MR. NEARY:

That is fine, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon.

member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

While the hon. gentleman is at it, perhaps he can also get me the information of why only the intersection of Bay d'Espoir-if indeed there are light there, and I would suspect there is not a light on that intersection, there has never been a light there and therefore I would like to know what happened to the \$25,000. If indeed the lights are not there, I would like for the hon. gentleman to tell us what the \$25,000 was paid out for. And would the hon. gentleman undertake to tell us why a policy was just designed for that particular intersection and none of the other intersections were considered by the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

My question is also to the Minister of Transportation and it is with regards to the airstrips in Coastal Labrador. The federal government is responsible for building them and unfortunately we are still waiting in the Southern part of Labrador. But Cartwright is a provincial airstrip and Labrador Airways now uses Cartwright and Mary's Harbour three times a week, flying from Goose Bay, Cartwright, Mary's Harbour, St. Anthony, Gander and St. John's and returning. Unless there are some high frequency beacons and lighting in the airstrip at Cartwright - the federal government is looking after the one in Mary's Harbour and is going to do it - unless this is done in Cartwright-and the problem is having a power line to the airstrip site - unless this is going

MR. HISCOCK: to be done, then Labrador Airways will have to do away with their flight into Cartwright and curtail their services come September with the shorter days. Could the minister inform us if we are going to get high powered, non-directional beacons as well as lighting on the airstrip in Cartwright?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. We have ongoing discussions with the federal Department of Transport as it relates to the airstrips on Coastal Labrador. And hopefully the process that has been in place for some time now will be speeded up over the next number of years and we will complete the total of fourteen airstrips that have been planned. As it relates to Cartwright and the beacons necessary, I am afraid that I do not know at this time but again I will find out for the hon. member and give him the information.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary.

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

MR. HISCOCK: As the Minister of Transportation said, there are fourteen airstrips that are going to be done and these fourteen airstrips are being done by the federal government. But the one that is not being done is Cartwright. And according to the letter that I have here from the Director of Air Operations that it is because 'the Twin Otter service retaining its present level of summertime schedules we are not able to provide yet all the support facilities necessary to enjoy a similiar service during the short days of the Winter period.' I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation to make sure that his department undertakes to make sure that we do have lighting

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3181

IB-3

MR. HISCOCK: and high power beacons for
Cartwright or else we will have to go back another ten
or fifteen years, the way the service was before.

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3182

EL - 1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe). We are fortunate in my district to have a crusher in the area that is crushing stone, Mr. Speaker, but the disturbing fact about it is that the 4,000 tons of crushed stone that the crusher is presently crushing will be used to build up the shoulders of the road and not to be placed on the dirt sections of road in the district. I was wondering if the minister could find some funds in this year's budget, or has he got any extra funds to provide some crushed stone to be placed on the badly needed roads in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, in that particular area of the Province, as well as all other areas of the Province, there is a regular maintenance programme ongoing. The Budget has already been announced and the projects for this year are in place and I do not see where I can find additional funds to increase the expenditures in the hon. member's district or in any other district at this particular time.

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand from the foreman with the Department of Highways in that area that they are not allowed to do any upgrading work. As a matter of fact, they were doing some upgrading work that was necessary on the roads and they got caught and they were ordered to stop immediately. They are only allowed to do maintenance, like put in culverts

MR. HANCOCK: and build up shoulders of the roads which is not very sufficient for the road work that needs to be carried out. So I would like to ask the minister at this time, is he aware that the plant in Trepassey may close, one of the largest plants on this Island, because of dirt roads in that area where we have nothing - the roads are not fit to drive over, the vans are being destroyed. I ask the minister, is he aware of the problem that exists and does he plan on doing anything about it?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, there is a regular programme of road maintenance throughout this Province and the department forces are very capable of carrying out their mandate as it relates to the amount of funding and the number of personnel that they have. They are doing a very good job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: It is very obvious that the minister does not visit communities around this Province very often, especially my own district. The roads are not fit to drive over, I can inform the minister. And is he aware, I ask him is he aware that the van drivers in that area are planning on picketing the roads so that the plant in Trepassey will not be closed because of bad road conditions.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: The minister is not going to answer the question.

MR. WARREN: No, no answers.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) since the matter involves justice, natural justice, justice being denied our people. The minister will recall that I directed a question to the Premier a few days ago concerning the discrimination, the disgraceful dis-

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, the hon. Minister of Natural Justice, perhaps.

AN HON. MEMBER: Supernatural Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, not Supernatural. Natural Justice is difficult enough to dispense but Supernatural would be outside of the hands of all hon. members here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is government policy here, obviously, not the Department of Justice, you know, policy as such. The Department of Justice stands for natural justice and does all it can to encourage its recognition and practice and respect for natural justice and its encouragement and enhancement and development throughout the Province.

With respect to the question of local preference and the question of mobility, of course, I think the government's position is quite well-known with respect to the offshore and certainly a policy of local preference whereby when Newfoundlanders who are qualified are available then certainly they are employed.

With respect to within the Province, certainly the mobility rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians through the Province is recognized. There is also an aspect - there are two perspectives on this, obviously, two perspectives; one, the mobility of residents throughout the Province, and also, of course, in a number of areas especially those where unemployment is very high and there are activities generating employment within those areas then there is the, I think, understandable desire of people living within that area to also be able to work

MR. OTTENHEIMER: and, you know, that could be designated as a partial, internal, local preference, I suppose, you know, it could well be.

But I think all hon. members are aware of what the situation is. It is not a negative one of denying people, I suppose, it is an affirmative one of making sure that when there is a very high level of unemployment in a specific area, and there is employment generating activity there that the people in that area in which the activity is taking place, in an area which has a very high unemployment ratio, then obviously they do expect a certain aspect of local preference.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary,

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

MR. LUSH: Can the minister identify for the benefit of the House areas where the government have in effect this - I do not know what we call it, it is not a local preference policy, a regional preference policy whatever; can the minister identify these areas, whether it is the Upper Salmon, the Cat Arm, can the minister identify the areas where only the people that have been classified, have been identified for workers around that particular site or from a certain area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I do not think there is any question of classification or that, I do not think that is operative, but it would not come to my attention, you know, specific areas where employment generating activities are taking place and where the local requirements and needs of unemployment would be very, very high. You know, it really would not be something that would come specifically to my attention so for me to answer anything it would sort of be off the top of the head. It would not be a specific information that would come to my attention and that I would have readily available.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.
A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: I wonder if the minister could undertake to provide the House with that information. I can inform the minister that there is a local preference policy in effect on the Upper Salmon and I wonder if the minister can undertake to find out whether it is the government's policy to have this same vicious and insidious

MR. LUSH: policy in effect with respect to development of the Cat Arm? If this is the policy, then the government should announce it and the people from Terra Nova, for example, would not waste their money by going to the project to try and get the jobs-and from other districts. This is happening day in and day out so maybe the government could announce those areas and inform Newfoundlanders that mobility rights do not exist in those places -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

MR. LUSH: - and that equal opportunity for employment does not exist.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member referred to some insidious policy and I would not be in a position to provide him with details on any insidious policy because as every hon. member knows, both opposite and here, there would be no insidious policies being perpetrated by this government but only beneficial and enlightened and progressive ones.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: A final supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, since the government announced these regional policies, or whatever we might call them, for people in certain areas, since that time I would expect the employment situation certainly changed in some of these areas in so much as the government's grants to some of these areas, water and sewer projects and road works and this sort of thing whereas in the districts I am talking about

MR. LUSH: none of these things were granted, so in view of the circumstances where the preference was in effect in these areas and these people got capital works monies to do work, which is certainly going to further help the employment situation, would the minister undertake to look into that situation and, in view of the changing employment situation, change that policy to allow people from areas that did not get capital works projects to go to those areas and get work?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the practice now, and the practice always has been, and a number of hon. members on the opposite side as well as on this side are aware of that, that obviously there is general mobility throughout Newfoundland and Labrador and, obviously, the principle of access to employment opportunities is operative. I think all hon. members know that when in a specific area - and this is frequently in rural areas; I would not say exclusively, but frequently in rural areas - there is a particular project requiring employment, then there is an expectation at that local level where there is very high unemployment that a considerable amount of the employment be given to people in that general area. It is not a question of exclusivity, but there is an expectation. I think that is true of many areas, that there is an expectation and that people living in that area with such high unemployment will be given, if you wish, a kind of preference. That was true in many, many areas when I represented the area now represented by the hon. gentleman from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock). I became quite familiar with it but never took the aspect of nobody but somebody from St. Mary's, but that there would be a recognition that in that area there was

MR. OTTENHEIMER: high unemployment, that the work was being done one or five or six miles from their area and that people quite understandably expected that a certain preference would be given. And this, indeed, has been the practice, not as an exclusive thing but as an inclusive thing. So I think the general policy and practice is clear and would be accepted by most hon. members, I think, on both sides of the House as being the general practice. Now, with respect to an outline of various areas where the employment - and I think the question really relates more to questions of manpower and employment, and it is not that I do not want to get the information, but I am sure if the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) were asked, you know, something on the provincial course - he probably would not undertake to get it although it does not mean he could not get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But I would suggest that particularly with respect to manpower and employment that it does come more under the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, I think I have probably answered the gist of the question anyway, Sir.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor).

July 9, 1981

Tape 3185

EC - 3

MR. WARREN:

He was in his seat a few minutes

ago.

MR. WARREN: in the absence of the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), I would ask the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) in view of the fact that the Minister of Development announced a few days ago that the government was willing to cost share up to \$250,000 with Anaconda Aluminum Smelting Company to do a feasibility study into the aluminum industry in Newfoundland, could the President of the Council advise if there will be any ongoing talks with other aluminum smelting companies who are probably interested in setting up business in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, here comes the Minister of Development, so if the hon. member wants to repeat his question it would be much more appropriate if he gets it from the Minister of Development.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the question. My colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), tells me the question is: Will we be discussing with other companies -

MR. STIRLING: How can you be answering the question without hearing it?

MR. WINDSOR: Do hon. gentlemen want the answer to the question?

MR. STAGG: Obviously not.

MR. WINDSOR: I am assuming the question is that will we be having discussions with other companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Development if the government of the day is planning to cost share up to \$250,000 with Anaconda Aluminum Smelting Company to do a feasibility study in this Province. Where does this leave the other aluminum smelting companies who the

MR. WARREN: minister and the Premier have been talking with the past two or three years? Have those aluminum companies shown no interest at all in setting up in the Province?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, as I have told this hon. House on numerous occasions, we have been carrying on discussions with a number of companies. They have displayed various amounts of interest in establishing a plant in our Province. We have asked them, of course, to proceed with detailed feasibility studies, engineering studies and so forth, Obviously that is our objective. None have agreed to this point in time to put any financial commitment behind any kind of a study except Anaconda. And they have done this at our requests and we are prepared to cost share it with them. We think it is in the best interest of our Province to cost share in this particular study. It does not preclude the possibility that other companies may become involved in a smelter in our Province. We are simply doing a feasibility study. We have no commitment to Anaconda for any financing, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) tried to imply yesterday, of a plant or any deals of any nature. We do not make deals, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, is this a present that is being sent by the government - if there is any other company that wants to set up or is thinking about setting up an industry in Newfoundland or wants to do a feasibility study on a major product, is the minister saying that, if the company would come across and say, 'Yes, we will cost share a feasibility study,' would the minister say, 'Yes, okay, we will also cost share with you?' Is that the policy of this government at the present time?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is a policy of this government to try to encourage development in our Province and to do what is necessary so to do. If it appeared to government that another type of industry - and I think this is what the gentleman is getting at - other than aluminum, some other industry might be possible, if it required us to become involved on a financial basis in order to attract that, then we have done it before. We could probably do it again. Each issue would be assessed on its own merits.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary dealing with that same question. Do I understand from the minister that they could not find anybody who would come in to do this kind of feasibility study and, in fact, that they had to offer \$250,000 in order to develop any kind of interest? Do I understand from the minister that there has been no kind of an agreement signed, that there have been no guidelines set out, that there have no areas of the Province specified to be examined? What basis are we putting up our \$250,000 on?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it clear yesterday in my statement to the House that we have established a committee, a working committee, of officials from the Department of Development and officials from the company who will be sitting down and putting together a firm agreement, which has not yet been signed now. There is a firm understanding between the Premier and the president of that company - there were myself present, other officials of government and a number of senior people from that department - that a commitment is made on both parts to proceed with the study. The details have yet to be worked out but there is no

MR. WINDSOR: question in my mind at all that that study will indeed proceed and proceed with haste.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: I yield.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the hon. gentleman - and I am not quite sure - my colleague asked the question earlier and I am not quite sure if the hon. gentleman understood the question. Certainly I did not get the answer that - I did not comprehend the answer that he gave. I would like to ask the question more directly. Is the hon. gentleman saying that it was this government who approached the aluminum companies, Anaconda, and made them the offer of sharing the feasibility study to see if it was profitable for them to come into Newfoundland to make their fortune? Was it the government who approached them and made the offer or did they request a cost-shared project? Would the hon. gentleman tell the House that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, it takes two to tango and it takes two to make an agreement. As the hon. gentleman is aware, the Premier and I went to Kentucky, to Louisville, Kentucky, about a month ago to meet with senior officials of the company and, as a result of those discussions, there was an agreement made that we would cost-share a study on these sites.

MR. NEARY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans wishes to yield. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is being very evasive, Mr. Speaker, about his answer. It is just a simple yes or no answer. Did the government make the offer to Anaconda?

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3187

GS - 3

MR. NEARY:

And how many more companies - to
make the question a new question - how many more companies -
because the government is embarking upon a new policy unprecedented
in the whole of Canada. In any other province of Canada it

MR. NEARY:

is unprecedented where government would pay for a feasibility study to see if it is feasible for companies to come in and make their fortune in Newfoundland. All the smears they have made at Mr. Smallwood, that was something he never, ever did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, never did it, Mr. Speaker.

They can laugh all they like.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It is unheard of and unprecedented.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. NEARY: Now, a simple yes or no answer.

Did the government make the offer to Anaconda? How many more companies have been offered the same privilege? Was the same opportunity offered to Aluminum Company of Canada, for instance? Or was it the reverse, did Anaconda say, 'Well, if you want us to come in, tell us how much you are prepared to pay to show us it is profitable in there'? Yes or no. Did the government make the offer? Did Anaconda make the offer? And how many more companies have been offered the same privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is right on one thing, that they did not do this sort of a thing on many developments that were undertaken under their administration programmes. Those developments were undertaken without proper information, without proper study. There will not be any giveaways in this case, Mr. Speaker. We will know what the feasibility is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR: - and industry will proceed if it is feasible so to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. WINDSOR: So as I said, Mr. Speaker, the agreement was made as a result of negotiations. Who actually said first will you do it, or we will not do it if you do not do that, or we will do that if you will do this, I do not know, Mr. Speaker. It is a result of negotiations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR: The hon. gentleman obviously does not understand what negotiations mean.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question-if I can get the Minister of Finance's attention. I will wait for him - and it is with regard to the statement yesterday with the giving over of the refinery at Come by Chance to Petro-Canada. In the letter of intent - I presume we can refer to it - the letter of intent of Petro-Canada dated November 20, 1980, less than six months ago, Petro-Canada indicated - and they were very negative I think in that letter-as to their ability to ever rehabilitating the refinery. One paragraph - and it is the key paragraph, I think - is that, 'assuming we do not at the time of purchase have a commercially viable plan for the rehabilitation of the refinery, we will then mothball the refinery for a period of time.' Those are the key words, I think, they are prepared for not having a viable plan for the rehabilitation of the refinery, they will mothball the refinery for a period of time.'

Could the minister indicate to the House as a result of the sale yesterday, and obviously this would have had to be negotiated, would the minister indicate what period of time we are talking about? What period of time is Petro-Canada talking about inasfar as they are

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3188

IB-3

MR. FLIGHT: prepared to remothball the
plant?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite
sure of the import of the little preamble the hon. member
made there when he said, 'Giving over the refinery'. I
presume he did not mean the Province giving over the refinery
because the Province does not own the refinery. That is
owned by someone else. So the Province certainly did not
give it away.

MR. FLIGHT: It put \$50 million in it though.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

In regard to--

MR. LUSH:

Keep them working, boy.

DR. COLLINS:

In regard to mothballing, hon. members will recall that PetroCanada did some investigations. When those investigations were completed and they were satisfied therefore that it was technically feasible to rehabilitate, they re-mothballed at that stage and that was some time ago, perhaps six months ago, that sort of time ago. And the plant has remained mothballed since that time and it is still mothballed and the intention is that PetroCanada will continue their investigations, presumably and hopefully at an accelerated pace aimed at rehabilitating. How long that would take, I have no way-of knowing, and until they have reached a conclusion on their ability to rehabilitate and reactivate, the plant will remain mothballed, and remain mothballed at PetroCanada's total expense.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, either PetroCanada, has a viable plan to rehabilitate the plant or they do not. And one of their conditions, on November 20th, was that "assuming that we do not at the time of purchase. So the minister must know," at the time of purchase "was yesterday, "whether we do not at the time of purchase, have a commercially viable plan." Now, they either have a plan or they have not got a plan. They then go on to say that "if we do not have a viable plan, we will re-mothball the refinery from the date of purchase for a period of time." So, Mr. Speaker, it is simple. Two questions: Do they have a viable plan to

MR. FLIGHT: rehabilitate the plant and, if not, what period of time are they talking about that they are prepared to re-mothball the plant before they sell it to a third party as they go on to say they will do if they cannot rehabilitate the plant? Now, do they have a viable plan to rehabilitate and, if not, how long a period of time are they prepared to mothball?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Finance has twenty seconds in which to answer.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking a question that I cannot answer. That is a very technical question. They point about running a refinery is something that reaches into the highest aspects of business management. It relates to so many things, it relates to markets, it relates to availability of crude, it relates to price of crude, it relates to the cost of refining -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - it relates to the availability of material and so on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sorry, the time for Oral Questions has expired.

I would ask hon. members to joining me in welcoming some distinguished visitors to the Gallery today. First of all, we have Mayor Earl Cuff of the town of Musgrave Harbour in the district of Fogo who is seated in the Speaker's Gallery. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And also in the Gallery, we have Councillor Gus Kerwin, from the Deer Lake town council in the district of Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, in keeping with this government's tradition of providing information to the people of the Province and particularly to the hon. members of the House, I would like to table a number of annual reports. First of all, -

MR. STIRLING: You have no choice. You are required by legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: I point out that not all of these reports, Mr. Speaker, are -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR: - required by legislation. And, in fact this first one certainly is not. It is the first annual report - and probably the last because the department has changed, of the Department of Industrial Development, now, of course, the Department of Development for the year '79-'80.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen do not want information today. I table the report, the annual report for the year 1979-80 of NORDCO.

MR. STIRLING: Required by regulation.

MR. WINDSOR: I table the annual report of the year '79 - '80 for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

MR. STIRLING: It is required by law.

MR. WINDSOR: I table the report for the year 1979-1980 of the Labrador West Economic Development Association, which is doing a tremendous job in Labrador. . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: I table as well for the year 1979-1980 the report of the Gander Development Corporation, which is doing a magnificent job in Central Newfoundland. I table the report for the year 1979-1980 of the Board of Directors of Newfoundland Institute For Management, Advancement And Training.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: And I table the report for the year 1979-1980 of the Harmon Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: A great thing.

MR. WINDSOR: And there is one more; I also table, Mr. Speaker, the annual report for the 1979-1980 of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Talk about information, Mr. Speaker.

o o o

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, about seventy-odd written questions have been on the Order Paper now since February and March -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. NEARY: - and no answers have been provided yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could Your Honour tell us -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - whether or not ministers -

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the hon. member, being a veteran of this House, is fully aware of the rules and the rules say that the ministers may answer questions if they wish, or they may not whatever. But this certainly does not constitute - we have many, many precedents - this does not constitute a point of order.

MR. HISCOCK: A very open administration - no information.

MR. NEARY: How do we get the answers to these written questions?

MR. HISCOCK: No answers. We win the government, that is how.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 43, continuing debate.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act". (Bill No. 43).

The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for LaPoile, who had spoken for twelve minutes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are so fed up with everything being concentrated in St. John's that I am not going to delay the passage of this bill at all. I think in the interest of trying to get something done in the rural parts of this Province, we have heard enough chaw now about the city of St. John's. It is time to get -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. NEARY: - these bills through and do something for the outports, the rural parts of this Province.

July 9, 1981

Tape 3190

PK - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

Did the hon. President of
the Council introduce the Bill?

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. President of the
Council (Mr. Marshall) speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will agree
it is time to make progress, but the city of St. John's is important
and there were certain things that were said -

MR. STIRLING:

That is why you give them a token.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now there were certain things
that were said yesterday, including the allegation of lack of
consultation, that I want to deal with. And we will deal with
that first because that was mentioned by the Leader of the
Opposition. Now this time of the day, I do not think it is very
wise perhaps to get into a too spirited debate, but all I can
say about the Leader of the Opposition's comments yesterday, the
only way to describe them, really, Mr. Speaker, was shallow
and transparent because they had, Mr. Speaker, a transparency
about them that we could see as you can see with a lot of
statements the hon. gentleman has made.

MR. STIRLING:

You did not consult them.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now on consultation, Mr.
Speaker, there was - if we did not consult the City Council,
and if it was only yesterday that City Council were supposed to
have seen the bill, how come approximately a week or ten days
ago I got a call from a city councillor asking me when the
bills that were up before the House were going to get passed
by the House or when they were going to be dealt with because
the councillor, Mr. Speaker, was somewhat afraid that some
of the items that we had which could touch upon the next

MR. MARSHALL: election may not get through. But I assured that this government, as it always is, is prepared for these types of eventualities. So that is the first thing. The second thing -

MR. STIRLING: That has nothing to do with (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Because the hon. gentleman says we did not discuss it does not mean, you know, despite the fact that the -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - the morning paper this morning takes the hon. gentleman's word as gospel, the editor of the morning paper, or the publisher is about the only one in Newfoundland who does -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and it

MR. MARSHALL: does not make it , Mr. Speaker, because the hon. gentleman says that we did not consult, does not mean that we did not consult.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, at least two or three months ago, and going even further back, officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing were consulting with officials of the city of St. John's, with senior officials of the city of St. John's and if , if, if - and I say, if; I am not saying that it is a fact because, as I say, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition says something, it does not make it a fact - if a councillor had the impression, or more than one councillor had the impression that there had been no consultation with the city of St. John's, I would suggest that that is their problem and that they should consult the machinery within the city of St. John's itself, because each and every item in these bills, these bills that come before the House, that each and every item in all of these bills -

MR. STIRLING: Are you specifically saying that you consulted on.

MR. MARSHALL: - the two bills that passed yesterday, the one other consideration and the other two bills that will come before this House, Mr. Speaker, were matters that were discussed and discussed in detail between officials of the government and officials of the municipal council.

MR. STIRLING: They were agreed to yesterday.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, for example, to show the type of consultation, yesterday, while we were introducing this motion, there was a request made by the city council that we change the format with respect to the possible expansion of city councillors.

MR. MARSHALL: placed in the bill -
MR. STIRLING: That proves you had not consulted
before.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: What had been faced in the bill, Mr. Speaker, had been that the council would automatically expand from eight to ten members. Yesterday city council came in and requested that instead of it being mandatory that it be enabling in nature so that it may go from eight to ten members, and we in conformity with our policy of consulting with persons and groups that are affected by the legislation, are going to do just that and, as I say, we will be leading that in when the committee comes in. So that is the first thing, Mr. Speaker. And the other thing is with respect to the lands, the Crown lands being reserved; there is a very good reason for that as well. Maybe some people in council do not agree with it, that I do not know; some of them may and some of them may not, but the fact of the matter is that -

MR. STIRLING: Yesterday you said they agreed.

MR. MARSHALL: But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in connection with the extension of the boundaries, there are certain lands, particularly around the airport, which are Crown lands vested in the Province that the Province has to retain ownership and control of, and if you did not put that in then the city council would have the ownership and control. One or two other points that were made that require answering, and this is with respect to the Court of Revision. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), Mr. Speaker, when he was speaking asked why the right to exempt or reduce taxes owing by indigent persons was not given to the Court of Revision. I can answer that. The Court of Revision is not considered the appropriate body to hear this type of concern, and in all municipalities such appeals are heard by the council and it is much more

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3191

ah-3

MR. MARSHALL: fitting and appropriate that council should hear that type of representation and pass upon it than a non-elected group of appointees in the Court of Revision. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that answers most of the things. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked about the Powell Commission. I answered that when I introduced the bill, that as the universe will unfurl in time, in adequate time so the Powell Commission will be made public and the reaction of the government with respect to what is going to come out of it.

MR. THOMS: Could I ask just a brief question?

MR. MARSHALL: You want to ask a question?

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

MR. THOMS: When referring to the indigent clause that was repealed.

MR. THOMS: from the old act, I referred to the new one, the new Clause 5 in that particular act which gives council the authority to defer taxes. And my question at that time was whether or not council would now have the authority to forgive as well as defer taxes, because under the old clause they did have the authority to forgive rather than just defer.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, what it is there, Mr. Speaker, it is 'defer', but I think now - I stand subject to correction, as I am at all times. I do not mind being corrected, Mr. Speaker, if the person who is correcting me is repeating fact; if he is repeating fiction it is a different thing altogether. But it is my understanding that there are other provisions in the act that give this particular power, but if there are not those provisions, the point is very well taken by the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) and we will certainly look into it because it certainly should be done.

The whole point of the matter is that those considerations, we consider, are considerations for the council itself.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, not wishing to dwell - I could get up and I could rant and roar and I could tear into, particularly, the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to it, because I want to underscore this fact, that these bills that come up from the City Council, not just these bills but any bills pertaining to municipalities or any bills pertaining to public bodies are not passed without there having been consultation with the persons affected.

MR. STIRLING: Get an agreement?

MR. MARSHALL: Now the hon. gentleman says 'and agreement'. Now, without consultation with the people concerned - and we have had substantial agreement, as the hon. gentleman there knows, as with any group of people but particularly with the City Council here present now, it is not an everyday occurrence, let us put it that way, that there is unanimous agreement amongst all city councillors.

But we get a consensus, Mr. Speaker, we consult and we get a consensus and we make a decision. And the hon. gentleman says, you know, 'Do you get agreement?' No, you do not get agreement. You cannot get agreement from every single individual because that is part of the provision of governing the Province, Mr. Speaker, we have to take measures not just as pertain to the individual interest of one group but as are best for the overall interests of all of the Province.

Having said that, and having indicated very strongly that there has been full consultation and underlining that, I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is it the pleasure of the House that the bill be now read a second time? Those in favour 'Aye' -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order?

MR. STIRLING: Regardless of what the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order cannot be raised while a vote is being taken. We will have to conduct the vote and then I will hear the point of order.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 43).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 18, Bill No. 36.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Bill No. 36, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act".

The debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, who did not speak but just adjourned the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am grateful to my learned and hon. friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) for calling it at this time because that will enable me to carry on with some more of my district phone calls when we finish.

I would like to make one or two points in connection with this bill, Mr. Speaker, some

MR. ROBERTS:

of which has been touched upon by those of my colleagues who have spoken but which I would like to repeat, not for the sake of delay but simply because over the last three or four years since I have been doing some -

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) apparently is having an attack of some sort.

MR. NEARY: He is going out to check on the motorcycles.

MR. ROBERTS: And I would hope it works out well for him, whatever he is up to. The point I was making before my friend from Harbour Grace erupted himself in whatever way he did, was that the last three or four years I have had some experience from another aspect of the legislative process of working with some of the legislation, and without being dramatic I want to say one or two things to the minister. And when my colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) finishes with the minister I can carry on because I would like to get the minister's attention, and the minister, unlike most of us, cannot carry on two conversations at once. So when my friend from Grand Bank is ready to permit me to carry on, I shall.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister cannot walk and chew gum at the same time.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not the way the original phrase goes, Mr. Speaker, the original phrase, which President Johnson used to describe then Speaker Ford, then - whatever he was - Vice-President Ford, after President Ford, was most unparliamentary. The general gist of it, as my friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) says, was you could not do two things at once.

Now, if my friend from Grand Bank is ready to let me carry on, I will.

MR. THOMS: Go ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, thank you. I simply want to say to the minister -

MR. THOMS: I was just trying to talk about my district.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I appreciate that and I wish my friend from Grand Bank more success than I have had with the minister with respect to mine. I have no doubt he has, I have no doubt he has.

MR. THOMS: But I am nice.

MR. ROBERTS: And I will tell you, if that is the price then I will not pay it and I will be glad not to pay it. I have always felt the minister should approach his duties on the basis of what is right and proper as opposed to any personal likes or dislikes in which he may wish to indulge. Now the point I am making -

MR. THOMS: There is nobody safe from that biting tongue.

MR. ROBERTS: The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, has to do with this question of compulsory insurance. And we have compulsory insurance in this Province by virtue of legislative fist. But the minister I am sure realizes that we do not have compulsory insurance in this Province. And I want to say to him today that I think this not only a very serious omission in the laws of this Province, but I think it is a completely unnecessary one. And I will tell the minister - I cannot reveal details of any particular matter I may have worked on - but my friend from Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) is in his seat and he may remember recently there was a very serious accident before Christmas out on the Southern Shore road. He may or may not be familiar with it. Just so the minister knows how the compulsory insurance works, one of the persons involved in that accident -

MR. ROBERTS: and the minister is very studiously ignoring me , which may or may not be discourteous of him but I am perfectly serious - there was an accident, a very serious one on the Southern Shore road, not far from St. John's, in which one person lost her life, in which another one was grievously injured. Some criminal charges have been laid. All that is a matter of public record. What is also a matter of public record is that one of the drivers involved in that accident had no insurance at all. Ah ha! I am told, but he has to have insurance before he can get his license.' And sure enough if the minister takes the time to go to the Motor Registry or to send for his official, the registrar, a most competent official, Mr. Haire, and ask him the name of this person, which I will give to the minister outside the House if he wishes, he will discover that when that gentleman applied for his annual motor vehicle license he did in fact fill in the space on the blank which says, "Provide the name of your insurance company" and "Provide the number of your policy"

MR. ROBERTS: 'Provide the name or the number of your policy.' Now, whether the applicant knew it or not, there is no check made on that and in this particular case he had filled in the name of an entirely different person. Furthermore, if any check at all was made, as one has subsequently been made, it would have been discovered that this particular gentleman, in the course of the nine months, since the 1st. day of April 1981 - I am sorry, the 1st. day of April 1980. The accident was around Christmastime so it was about nine months - had held no less than three different public liability insurance policies and had cancelled each and every one of them. Had cancelled each and every one of the.

Now, I have never been able to understand why the government does not require the insurance companies to take the very simple step that would obviate the problem; the very simple step is to require the insurance companies to notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles whenever an insurance policy is cancelled.

MR. STIRLING: That is what they had to do under the original legislation. But there were so many cancellations that the Registrar said he could not handle it and they changed it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, my friend from Bonavista North, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), who, before he became Opposition Leader was very prominently involved with the insurance industry, tells me that that originally was required, but there were so many cancellations that the Registrar could not keep up with it.

MR. STIRLING: And they changed the legislation.

MR. ROBERTS: And the legislation was changed and the companies are no longer required.

Well, I know the Registrar's division is a very busy one, I also know it is a very efficient and a very effective division. And I cannot think of any valid reason, given the immense number of bodies we have on the public payroll, why we cannot find enough, or, if need be, add one or two or three more, to keep up with this. You see, I will tell you what happens, Mr. Speaker: We have driving around this Province today - if the proportion is, 'Len', 5 per cent of drivers; again, if I can get the attention of my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), is it 5 per cent of drivers who are uninsured, as a guesstimate?

MR. STIRLING: There is a great deal of them.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, let us take it at 1 per cent, and we have in the Province about 250,000 licenced drivers -

MR. STIRLING: The government estimates 10 per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: The government says 10 per cent. Well, let me split it down the middle, between 1 and 10 and the middle is 5.5, we will call it 5 per cent. We have, at 250,000 drivers in this Province today, 12,500 who are not insured. And if anyone of us tonight should have the ill-fortune to be run into by one of these ladies or gentlemen, not only have we got the pain and the suffering and the trauma and whatever may occur from the accident we have the additional satisfaction of knowing that the financial recompense is limited to \$75,000 which, of course, is the limit that the judgement recovery process, the unsatisfied judgement process provides.

MR. ROBERTS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that may sound like a lot of money, \$75,000. The hospital bills in this case to which I refer come to over \$45,000, which the government will collect back. So in effect, then, there is available, in the set of circumstances that I have outlined, less than \$30,000 to compensate the people who have been injured through an accident in which they had no fault at all.

And I say that as an opinion, I cannot say it as a conclusion of law, but I think it is a good opinion. So the result is that in this one case, because the government are so slack, and because they neglect to hire the extra staff that would be necessary to enable a very simple administrative

MR. ROBERTS:

step to be take, namely, to enter an notification that John Jones had cancelled his public liability insurance and then to pass that to the authorities to follow up on it, because of that we have a situation where every year in this Province hundreds of people, who are involved in accidents to which they are not at fault or are only in part at fault, are denied the compensation which the law gives them.

Now I want to say to the minister that I do not think that is good enough. I realize the minister is a prisoner - what is that noise, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CARTER: The hon. member has a scratch in his throat.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I would rather have a scratch in my throat then be scratching where the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) usually scratches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is the intercom.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I wonder if perhaps we can arrange to have the intercoms checked.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will arrange the tape and sound operator check into that. Is it okay now? It is okay.

MR. ROBERTS: Are we okay now? Have we overcome the technical difficulties?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Good, because I want the priceless words-

MR. BARRETT: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot overcome the difficulties of the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) but they are genetic and not technical. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belabour the point, but I do want to be sure it is clearly made, because what obtains is this, because of this failure by the government to take what is a very simple administrative step, hundreds of people are being denied the compensation which

MR. ROBERTS: they are entitled by the law. Compensation cannot replace the pain and the suffering, money cannot replace the lady who was killed in the accident to which I refer.

MR. CARTER: Would the hon. member permit a serious question?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I most certainly would be glad to.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has said that this problem of reporting cancelled insurances can be overcome by a very simple administrative step. I am given to understand that it a very difficult administrative step and I would like him to comment on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I do not claim to be an expert in the administration of the Motor Vehicle Division, MVD, whatever it is called, but it is, I suggest to the member from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) a very simple administrative step which consists of this: There is a computerized file over there in the registry, or there is a terminal that gives access to a computerized file, that has on it information about every licenced driver in this Province - correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: That is correct. I mean, all you do is look at your - I do not have mine on me at this moment - but look at your driver's licence and equally there is one for every vehicle, and it is a very simple matter if a form comes in from an insurance company, let us call it the Carter and Roberts Insurance Company Limited - there is a name that would inspire confidence in the average homeowner - Carter and Roberts Insurance Company sends a notification -

Extraneous Noise

MR. NEARY:

There, you have done it again.

MR. ROBERTS:

Done it again. I did not mention the name of the gentleman from St. John's North (J.Carter) and he insists on doing it again.

The Carter and Roberts Insurance Company sends a notice into the Registrar of Motor Vehicles which says, 'Please be advised that Jack Smith has cancelled his insurance policy, number 678523.'

MR. NEARY:

So they cancel his licence?

MR. ROBERTS:

No, no that is step one. Step two is that must then be entered on the computer. Right? It is fairly simple. Step three, somebody has to pick up the phone and call Jack Jones and say, "Where is your insurance policy? And that to me is not difficult. Now, it requires, in due course, a policeman to go or somebody to go and take his plates. But, by heavens, if a man is driving around without insurance, surely we should take his plates. It is a condition of driving. And I think that is a fairly simple administrative procedure. And I think anybody the least bit involved in the insurance industry, and my friend from St. John's North has had a distinguished career in the insurance industry, will agree that this problem is a huge one. The drivers who cancel as often as not are exactly the kind who want to be carrying insurance because I would think their accident record is well beyond that.

And this particular gentleman to whom I refer, who put in somebody else's name and then had three other policies and cancellations in the year, has a driving record, you know, a record of violations as long as my arm.

MR. CARTER:

It is because their insurance is high that they cancel out.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, because they - yes, they may

MR. ROBERTS: do it just to save their money and they may do it because they do not think the rules apply to them.

MR. CARTER: Or it may be beyond their means because they -

MR. ROBERTS: If it is beyond their means, then I question whether they should be driving because their insurance rate is high -

MR. CARTER: They have put themselves -

MR. ROBERTS: - because they are in a category that does that. And they are time-bombs.

MR. CARTER: Yes, sure they are.

MR. ROBERTS: And, you know, I know an individual case does not in itself make a law, but I have just given one example and I can find many more from my own knowledge and my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) before he became an executive and was doing insurance work, day by day, sure has hundreds and hundreds of them.

MR. STIRLING: St. John's West.

MR. ROBERTS: St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), I am sorry. I have done a disservice to both St. John's North and St. John's West. I apologize humbly to both constituencies.

But the fact remains it is a very simple step. This bill touches on it. We are now going to make available under the Section 192, we are going to make available the name and address of the insurance. That is fine, but that is not enough. We should put into place a procedure to ensure that - either that or forget the compulsory insurance. Why have it if we are going to make it stick? Why have speeding laws if we do not

MR. ROBERTS:

try to make them stick? Why have laws prohibiting driving while drunk if we do not try to make them stick? Yet we have a law that says you must have insurance and that law is being broken continuously and continually and often and a day, and is being broken, furthermore, by the very people from whom the average driver ought to be protected, because I would wager that if we could get the numbers and study them out, the people who cancel their insurance are by far and away far more likely to be involved in a serious accident than the people who buy their insurance and who carry it on.

Let me make another point growing out of that. The \$75,000 limit, I would say to the minister - and I know it is not specifically in this bill, but it falls within the Highway Traffic Act - that limit is too low. It may have been high enough - it was originally \$35,000; it was \$35,000 for a number of years - and when the present Chief Justice of the Trial Division, Mr. Hickman, was the Minister of Justice two or three or four years ago, it was raised to \$75,000. It is not nearly enough.

The hospital bills in this Province today are averaging about \$325 a day for general care, so if you are in the hospital for 200 days, you have used up near enough to the \$75,000 which is either the minimum that is required - and a lot of people are carrying the minimum - or it is what is available from the judgement recovery process, the so-called unsatisfied judgement fund.

MR. BARRETT:

If I may interrupt you there -

MR. ROBERTS:

My friend from St. John's West.

MR. BARRETT:

If I could make an observation
as to why (inaudible) \$75,000 (inaudible)

MR. BARRETT: highest limits of any jurisdiction in Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: One of the highest?

MR. BARRETT: Yes, one of the highest.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that just shows they are all wrong. I mean, \$75,000 is not very much.

MR. BARRETT: I agree.

MR. ROBERTS: And furthermore, my friend from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) will confirm that the cost in a premium between \$75,000 and \$150,000 is very little.

MR. BARRETT: Very little,

MR. ROBERTS: You know, if it costs \$300 to insure a given driver for \$75,000, it might only cost \$320 to insure him for \$150,000. But I will tell you, it is cheap on that end.

MR. HOLLETT: Seven dollars for (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Burin - Placentia West says that the cost, maybe in his case of a careful student driver, is \$7 for an extra \$300,000 in public liability coverage.

I would say to the minister that it is cheap from that end, and it does not cost the government anything anyway; in fact, the government gets eleven cents on the dollar because we tax insurance premiums in this Province, the only province in which we tax them. So the minister could say he is raising money and thereby he can afford not only to pave Mount Scio House but to pave the roads that the people in my district must use every day to get back and forth to work and to school and to hospital.

But the fact remains that when you are on the other end of it, it makes a big difference, and if the minister tonight had the misfortune, which

July 9, 1981

Tape 3197

EC - 3

MR. ROBERTS: I devoutly pray he does not have,
to run into one of these drunken fools driving these
time bombs around this Province,

MR. ROBERTS:

and it turns out that he is grievously injured, and it is no trouble to run up a claim, a valid claim of a couple of hundred thousand dollars and the minister, or his widown, if that be the case, if forced to settle for \$75,000, then, you know, we begin to see the other side of it. And, yet, that happens every day; it happens every day in this Province and it happens unnecessarily.

So all I want to say with respect to these aspects of this bill is that I can conceive of no valid reason why we should not raise the level, and insurance rates are regulated, you know if anyone thinks the insurance companies are going to rip off, they all lost money last year. In fact, in Ontario they are going up 30 per cent and 40 per cent. And the regulatory authorities have approved it because they lost so much money last year - there is no valid reason why we should not raise the level to at least \$100,000 or \$150,000, and, secondly, there is no valid reason why we should not require the insurance companies to notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles whenever a public liability policy is cancelled.

MR. BARRETT:

They are quite prepared to do that.

MR. ROBERTS:

My friend from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) says they are quite prepared to do that and I understand the same.

MR. YOUNG:

Some insurance companies will not sell less than \$100,000.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, my friend from Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) says some companies do not sell less than \$100,000, and, I mean, I do not find that offensive. I see no reason at all why we should not require even more, because given \$300 a day for hospital

MR. ROBERTS: bills - now I know the Health Department occasionally will back off and not press its claim to allow something, you know, for the other legitimate claims within the package, but that means we, the taxpayers, absorb all the costs then because the hospital bills have to be paid.

It is not uncommon, Mr. Speaker, I assure you and hon. members, to see hospital and medical accounts now \$25,000 and \$30,000. You do not have to be all that grievously injured before the tab runs up to that kind of money. The most recent one I saw, I think it was for the Health Science Centre, \$318 a day is the rate at which the hospital care is being charged out and that, presumably, is a true cost of providing that service.

So I would say to the minister that these are two things for which there are compelling reasons to do them and no valid reason against them. The administrative difficulties, I do not think, are even difficult let alone insuperable, and when weighed against what it means to people - we all use the roads, we all use them constantly, we must all use them constantly, and that means there are going to be accidents. and the accident that concerns me is not the one that I cause to myself, because I am responsible for that, what I am worried about is driving out the road some evening - and in every accident there is at least one person at fault, sometimes more than one but at least one, and I simply come back to the example with which I began, the man and his wife who were coming home from a Christmas party and driving out the Southern Shore road before Christmas - well, the gentleman is charged criminally - and he is not the gentleman who cancelled the policy so

MR. ROBERTS: I am not talking of his - but another young gentleman came up the road at some speed - so as not to prejudice the case before the courts, or not to deal with it in any way, it is no business of this House, it is before the courts now - there was an accident and a man was in hospital for months, a lady is killed and all that comes from that. And that can happen to anyone. It happens every day in this Province. We cannot prevent it, I fear - although the drunk driving legislation and other things have helped - but we can surely alleviate it.

Other than that, Sir, the bill is relatively unexceptional. We can talk about - and my friends and colleagues on this side have made some very, very good points. I have my own views and, you know, I think we should, as we are here, require stopping - with school buses that is one of the most sensible rules we have, that when a school bus is stopped, Mr. Speaker, the children coming out of it explode and go in all directions at once and provisions

MR. ROBERTS: the very least we should require is drivers to stop until that bus moves off. And, you know, there are other points but they have all been well dealt with by members on this side so I will not repeat them. But I do want to say as strong as I can that (a) we should require insurance companies to notify the registrar when a policy is cancelled. I can think of no argument against it and compelling arguments in favour of it. And, secondly, I think we should raise the limit for the minimum amount of insurance, the compulsory amount, I would say to at least \$150,000 and if there is a feeling that the insurance companies are profiting, then there are methods to take care of that. I do not think they are profiting based on what we know publicly of their results and their records, but if there is that feeling that there are other ways to solve that problem. What concerns me is the situation which crops up time and time again - these are not isolated examples - in which people are injured and have no economic recourse. They can get a judgement at law but the judgement is of no value to them because it cannot be enforced and this happens time and time again. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I shall sit down having said what I wanted to say on this bill and other hon. gentlemen can speak or if not the minister can close debate and we will carry on with it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation. If the hon. minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. DAWE: I wish to thank all hon. members who have spoken on this particular bill and I duly note a number of hon. members mentioned, I think first brought up by my colleague, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), as it relates to the insurance situation which was brought again by the member for the Strait. I have already had, my colleague the Minister of Justice (Mr.

MR. DAWE: Ottenheimer) and myself have had some preliminary meetings on this particular topic and we will be continuing that over the next month or so with our officials to try and develop a firm policy in this direction. One thing that may aid in this is the proposed new system of licensing which will occur on more of a staggered basis over the period of a year which will relieve that pressure situation at one point in time in the year.

MR. ROBERTS: For vehicles.

MR. DAWE: But it will also relieve the staff pressure over a more significant period of time.

MR. ROBERTS: They are now (inaudible).

MR. DAWE: Yes. This will be for the car renewal licenses and so on.

Mr. Speaker, we have duly noted the concerns of a number of members and, of course, like this government has been doing all along, we will take note of it and implement new programmes and policies as they become necessary. And I would like at this time to move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 36).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 19 Bill No. 25.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act." (Bill No. 25).

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 25 will bring the operators, the private operators of ambulances

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3199

ah-3

MR. DAWE: and cars and vehicles that carry injured people under the same standard and guidelines as now applies to commercial operators.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Ambulances operated by municipalities, which are now exempt, will be coming under the board and so they should.

MR. DAWE: That is correct.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.
(Bill No. 25)

MR. MARSHALL: Order 20 Bill No. 45

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act To Provide For The Compulsory Use Of Seat Belts". (Bill No. 45).

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be the minister responsible for the Department of Transportation at a time when this bill is introduced. I think all hon. members will be pleased and happy to support this particular piece of legislation. If statistics speak for themselves, over the twelve months after this particular piece of legislation becomes law, we will have been collectively responsible for saving some ten to fifteen lives on the Newfoundland highroads in any given twelve month period.

There are a number of people who have expressed some concern, there are a number of myths which have been created about the use of seat belts. There are those who say that they fear being trapped in their vehicle. Mr. Speaker, the first use and the extensive use of seat belts was by race car drivers who were involved in high speed activities and these drivers were the first to use and successfully use seat belts. because by using seat belts, if they do become involved in an accident, they have a greater opportunity to remain conscious and in control of their activities as opposed to being unconscious, without the use of a seat belt, and run the risk of being burned and in some cases on the high road, of being, where this rare occasion happens, involved in an accident where your car runs into a river or a lake, trapped in the car and not being able to get out.

The seat belt, contrary to the belief that it will trap you, will, in fact, allow you the opportunity to be able to get yourself out of those dangerous situations.

MR. DAWE: It is important to realize that in any collision there are two types of accidents. One involves the car itself and the collision of metal against metal or metal against some other object, and the second collision occurs within the car itself, that is, the human collision, the passengers, the driver of the car becoming tossed around inside a very hard-framed vehicle, hard-framed designed, by the way, Mr. Speaker, to protect the passengers and the driver who are in a specific part of the automobile. Without the use of seat belts, once a car is involved in an accident, people are dashed around inside the car and not only are hurt by the car itself, but are sometimes hurt by actually two people coming together and doing damage to themselves.

Statistically we are told that some 48 per cent of all the fatalities and car accidents are head injuries, those injuries caused by a passenger or the driver hitting his head against the windshield, against the door frame, or some other object in front of him in the car. About 37 per cent of all fatalities are caused by chest and abdomen injuries, caused in most cases by the steering wheel or some other protruding object in the car.

The steering wheel itself, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for some 30 per cent, in total, of fatalities; the side of the car some 22 per cent of all fatalities, all because people do not use seat belts. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that parents, in their desire to protect and cuddle their young ones,

MR. DAWE: are really the major cause, in a lot of cases, of babies being crushed between their parent and the dash of the car. In simulated incidents it has been shown that babies weighing some seventeen pounds cannot be held by the average size woman in car crashes of fifteen to thirty miles an hour, even when they know that the accident is about to happen or the car is about to come to a sudden stop. A child of ten pounds, in a collision of thirty miles an hour, transmits a body weight into the crash of some 300 pounds. It is the equivalent of dropping the baby off a three story building onto the pavement.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we can all be proud of the fact that over the next period of time we will be emphasizing and re-emphasizing the responsibilities that we have as drivers and as parents, remembering the fact that the use of an automobile on our road systems in this country is not a right, it is a privilege. And that privilege carries with it a number of requirements, the passing of a driver's test, certain physical abilities, a certain age, it requires you to drive at certain speeds and to be not under the influence of alcohol and so on.

This act is very specific and very simple in its application. First of all, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it is government's intention to carry out a twelve month educational campaign that will involve a great number of agencies and school systems and so on throughout the Province.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. DAWE: Before it will be enacted as being compulsory, yes. That process will involve, as I said, a number of agencies. And it is interesting to point out, Mr. Speaker, that already there has been public support from a number of organizations that have felt

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3201

IB-2

MR. DAWE: obliged either to write in or to make public their support for this proposed piece of legislation. The Newfoundland Medical Association have voiced their support on a number of occasions. The Newfoundland Safety Council, the Janeway Hospital, the NTA have expressed, at their convention and in other forms, their desire to see this particular piece of legislation put forward.

I had a teacher and his family into my office just yesterday morning and the wife of the - the man said to me, 'I would like for you to say in the House of Assembly, when you introduce this bill, that it was because we used seat belts that the lives of five Newfoundlanders, namely their family, was saved just last year in a very serious car accident'. Young Drivers of Canada have put forward their support for this particular piece of legislation. The Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, in a recent submission to the Cabinet in this Province, voiced their support. There have been numerous editorials from individuals and from other groups throughout the Province.

There will be some exemptions, possible exemptions for medical reasons. And the Medical Association have discussed this and said that it will be very reluctant to just pass out medical exemptions for anything other than very serious reasons. The police in urban centers, some taxi drivers and so on who are getting in and out of their vehicles, may be exempt under certain regulations.

And before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the former Minister of Transportation who was instrumental in bringing this particular piece of legislation forward to

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3201

IB-3

MR. DAWE: Cabinet and who did most of the spade work. I am privileged to be able to present this but in reality the former Minister of Transportation, the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), is to be complimented for his particular efforts in bringing forward this piece of legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. the Leader of the Opp-

osition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for

this piece of legislation. On this side of the House we have no problem supporting anything that is brought in of a forward-thinking or a progressive nature or will help the people in Newfoundland and Labrador. There has not been a single instance, where this government has brought in a piece of progressive legislation, that we have voted against it. But we have voted against bad legislation and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that

I personally can support this piece of legislation is the same reason that the Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe) can, he has seen all of the good films that have been produced, he has seen all of the statistics that have been produced and he has become convinced. Well, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the fears that people have are real, as the minister said, there are some myths. If you fear something, then that is very real to the person who has that fear. And I want to tell the minister that I believe that all of the information which he has and all the films which he has, should be made available. The minister has a habit of ignoring -

MR. DAWE:

I am listening to you.

MR. STIRLING:

Yes, but give me the courtesy of

looking as if you are listening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

The success of this legislation will largely depend on the minister's ability to get the information out to the public, to get the education across to the public. And he

MR. STIRLING: should use television and he should use whatever other means, and people on this side of the House will be quite happy to take our share of engagements -

MR. LUSH: Get the Premier on television.

MR. STIRLING: - because, Mr. Speaker, passing the legislation is not going to be enough. As the minister knows, where there is no legislation in force, about 8 per cent of the people use seat belts. Where there is legislation in force, about 40 per cent use seat belts. But the danger lies in that other 60 per cent. Mr. Speaker, it is because they do not know the difference. Every case that has been brought to the minister's attention, like this young couple that were in his office this morning, and we could all personally cite dozens and dozens of cases where they have had the same experience now, it requires discipline. I now use a seat belt but I must confess it is only when I go on out of town driving because of the nuisance. And eventually, the legislation that is going to make it worthwhile will be legislation requiring car manufacturers to have some kind of thing which is automatic, some kind of an enclosure system which is automatic, that you do not have to go through the nuisance of buckling up. That is going to be the end result. The engineering technology is there, it just requires the will to bring in some kind of automatic system.

So, Mr. Speaker, the thing I would like to emphasize is that there are some very real fears. There are people out there who are very much concerned about getting trapped. There are people who have fears, no matter how misinformed they are, and really the challenge to the minister is for

MR. STIRLING:

him to get the information across so that people will buckle up because they want to be safe. Now, the legislation is going to be the prod that will get people into the habit. And, Mr. Speaker, it does require with it a full education programme and you may have to give some of those frightening kinds of statistics that you just gave. The effect of dropping a child out of a three storey window is something that people will rebel against, they will accuse you of fear tactics, but, Mr. Speaker, it is important, for the lives that can be saved, for the minister to persevere and bring that information to the attention of the public until people develop the habit of buckling up. And so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, the points that I would like to bring out is that there are some real doubts. Some of the members on our side have some doubts. I do not because I have seen these statistics and I have seen the information, and the minister has seen it, and I would like for the minister to show the same information to colleagues on my side as he has shown to his colleagues, and that he make that same information available to the public. And, Mr. Speaker, when that is done you will not have the resentment. The immediate resentment, when this legislation is passed, is saying one more thing that you are forcing people to do. There will be people who will resent it, and there will be people who will have serious objections against it and there are people who have some fears against it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the real challenge to this minister. If he will provide them with the information, he will find that he will not have any real problems getting people to buckle up. If he provides them with the information. And I urge him not to introduce the programme until he has an education programme to go with it.

I am not suggesting delay the

MR. STIRLING: implementation of the programme, what I am suggesting is over the Summer get all of this good material which is readily available so -

MR. DAWE: Starting immediately.

MR. STIRLING: Starting immediately. When are you planning to proclaim it?

MR. DAWE: Well, we are looking at it
(inaudible) so I would say the 1st of August of next year.

MR. STIRLING: Well, you may, in fact, be able to speed that up. I would suggest that if you are serious, and I believe you are, that in the next twelve months you could save ten or twelve lives by buckling up, that with an intensive educational programme I believe that you could speed up that deadline and that you could maybe aim for the 1st of January rather than the 1st of August next year. And I, personally, would support it. There may be some who feel that they have to vote against it, and I would urge you to put the legislation now and we will see what happens.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: There are a few points that I think should be made in this debate. I feel quite strongly about seat belt legislation myself, and I would like to make the following points.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: We are hearing from the resident anthropologist. The best thing he can do if he wants to serve this House is to go out and make away with himself.

MR. NEARY: Buckling up (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: There are a number of ways - out the window is one of the best, the quickest.

MR. CARTER: As I was saying, I think that seat belts are good. The use of a seat belt or the impact that a car going thirty or thirty-five miles an hour, well within the legal limit, on impact that would be the same as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) leaping out this window and landing on the pavement below and we can imagine what the result would -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: Oh, oh! Foolish cuff.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: - the end result would be about the same. In the hon. member's case, I think

MR. CARTER:

it would perhaps be a happy result but, nevertheless, we deplore the unnecessary loss of life that that can occur. But I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation requiring seat belts is not the ultimate solution. In the first place, I think it is a bad law. It is just a generally bad law because I do not think it can be easily enforced. It is not obvious to a policeman whether a person -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have the right to be heard in silence and I think I can insist upon it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!
The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. THOMS: He does not have the right to be heard at all.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, what kind of vitamins is the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Every hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. CARTER: I wonder what kind of vitamins they are taking, Mr. Speaker. Too much meat I think probably, too high a protein diet. Anyway, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that a person is or is not wearing his seat belt is not readily apparent to a policeman or to a member of the general public or to someone outside that vehicle. Therefore, it leads the guilty party very easily to say, if a policeman stops him, "Look, you are not wearing your seat belt", "Oh yes, I was. I just removed it. Once the car came to a stop I am not required to wear it. So I just removed the seat belt".

MR. CARTER: So I think, in my opinion, it is bad law. And in jurisdictions that I have been in, where the seat belt legislation was in force and was compulsory, and where the fines and the sentences for noncompliance were very heavy, I had not seen any evidence of greater use of seat belts than in jurisdictions where it is not compulsory. And, therefore, I suggest that although there are people who believe that the seat belt legislation is what encourages the increased use of seat belts, I would suggest that what increases the use of seat belts is the concurrent advertising campaign that goes along with it. Now, I do not think any jurisdiction wants to appear to be overly heavy-handed. So at the same time as presenting this legislation, they present a very heavy comprehensive educational programme. And I would suggest that that is the programme that does the good. That is what gets people to buckle up.

Now some cars, the Broncos for instance, some of these four-wheel drive cars, have what is called a roll bar in them and I can speak with some personal knowledge, that the anti roll bar is just as effective if not more effective in saving lives. So I would like to say to the minister that whatever he is putting in this act, whatever he wants to make compulsory, it is probably more important - two things should be compulsory, one that cars should have functional

MR. CARTER:

seat belts because they are useful. They are good. I am not suggesting they are not good but I am suggesting that making them - trying to enforce them by law is the wrong way to go about it.

The second thing is roll bars should be enforced. All vehicles should be equipped with roll bars because many times a car, when it goes out of control, will roll and flatten and, of course, the members can imagine the damage that is done.

Some years ago, there was a team of acrobatic drivers here and they put off a show that was quite impressive. They had safety harnesses and crash helmets and these roll bars, in old cars specially fixed up, the glass had been removed, and they collided with each other and they rolled over and over and they did impossible things and they emerged without a scratch. And if ever there was an example of safety equipment being able to prevent personal injury, that certainly was enough to -

MR. LUSH: What does the hon. member mean by functional?

MR. CARTER: Safety harness, functioning seat belts.

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: Yes, well now of course, the harness that these drivers were wearing were rather more cumbersome and they had safety helmets, shoulder straps, safety belt and, of course, these roll bars..

MR. LUSH: - be able to (inaudible)

MR. CARTER: The hon. gentleman should be silenced permanently. I would gladly undertake the job -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: - but it is not parliamentary.

So, that is the - the point too, that should be made, Mr. Speaker, is that although we try our best

MR. CARTER: to pass a fair bit of legislation here, we may get carried away with the efficacy of legislation. Not everything is amenable to legislation. And I am reminded of the jurisdiction in the United States, some years ago where the members were carried away in a state of moral fervor and passed a law requiring people to be good. So, I do not think that you can make people wear seat belts just by passing the legislation. I was tempted to vote against it. I think it is bad legislation. I am certainly speaking against it but on reflection I do not think it matters whether we vote for it or do not vote for it, because in jurisdictions where it is in force, where the law is in place, people do not observe it. It becomes a dead letter. What they do observe, what does happen is you get a heightened use of seat belts but it is the educational programme that is concurrent.

So, with those few observations, I will let it go but I would suggest to the minister that the use of anti-roll bars is more effective and that I would suggest that he wait a good long time before proclaiming this law. Meanwhile, concentrating upon the educational programme and the dissemination of the statistics which are, although to my view, somewhat biased, still very impressive and very useful.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): If the hon. the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. DAWE: I am glad that the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) made his comments. It just shows again what a democratic party is on this side of the House.

MR. BARRETT: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: There is one statistic that I really wanted to put forward and it is a booklet that came forward from Transport Canada which did a survey across Canada, and it interviewed people in various situations and various walks of life,

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3205

EL - 3

MR. DAWE: about the same number of people in each province. It indicates that the people of a province, or the residents of a province most in favour of mandatory seat belt legislation was Newfoundland, some 91 per cent, the highest in Canada.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act To Provide For The Compulsory Use Of Seat Belts", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 45)

MR. MARSHALL: Order 21, Bill No. 34.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1972". (Bill No.34).

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) I have pleasure in introducing this bill. This is a forward step in the child welfare law of this Province. It changes the definition of a child in need from a neglected child to a child in need of protection. We feel it much more accurately describes the situation. It also, Mr. Speaker, sets forth in Clause (3) more clearly, the principles of what are in the best interest of a child in need of protection. Clause (4) extends, as well, the right of the Director of Welfare to empower the director to delegate responsibility for medical attention to a child in need of protection, to a person whom the director feels it appropriate to do so. At the present state it is rather narrow and it is only the director and a social worker who may have medical attention for such a child, and, of course, this is too narrow and we want to expand that.

Generally speaking then, Mr. Speaker, that is the essence and the principle of the bill. And we feel it is a forward piece and a progressive piece of legislation, and we urge it for the consideration of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to have a few comments on this piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is a very broad bill. In my opinion, it is good. But there is no reason at all to bring it in because most of this could be,

MR. BENNETT: in effect, in effect before this was ever introduced to the House of Assembly.

My exposure to a district of people who support the government, taxpayers, and the government who profess to protect people and provide for children, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there are some terrible discrepancies. Just a few days ago-when we look at Clause 2 (ii) "a child who is without necessary food, clothing or shelter, as may be available with the level of financial assistance given in relation to that child under the laws of the province," now, Mr. Speaker, we do not need to bring in new legislation or amend existing legislation to provide sufficiently for children. When you realize the subsistence existence of some of the children we have in our care today, some of these children, most of them, Mr. Speaker, subsist, if they are on social assistance, a dollar a day, very little more than a dollar a day. Now, Mr. Speaker, an apple will cost fifty cents, a can of Coke will cost fifty cents, so what is left for the child to have boots provided or schooling or books or whatever is necessary for the welfare of that child? "A child who is living in circumstances that are unfit or improper for the child". The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House) is not in his seat at the moment, I was hoping he would stay there, the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is not in his seat and I was hoping he would be there to hear my comments, because for two years I have been trying to get assistance for people who live in the most deplorable conditions, and the hon. Minister of Health might very well know of whom

MR. BENNETT:

I speak. I will certainly tell him that for two years I have been trying to get decent accommodation for families who have children. And I have notified the Department of Health and the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, if you were keeping animals in such deplorable conditions and the SPCA were notified, they would not allow animals, pets, to be kept in such deplorable conditions as those in which we find our children, human beings, being kept. Housing in the district - there have been substantial dollars spent in my district, Mr. Speaker, on a federal programme that is known as RRAP. Houses that are beyond repair are referred to Social Services. Quite a few of them in my district have been written off, and undoubtedly, a lot of them in the Province have been written off as unrepairable, beyond repair, and they are referred to the Department of Social Services or some other department in government. But because they are beyond repair, people still have to suffer and raise their children in those most deplorable conditions, in houses that are beyond repair, cannot be salvaged by a RRAP programme. And people are living in subsistence conditions in which it is impossible for them to raise their children with any decent standard at all, just to raise them, apart from the education that they need to face a very hostile world, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not tarry very long. There is another comment I would like to make seeing we are speaking of children and the welfare of children. Again, I must relate to my own district, because I am familiar with a case that I brought to the attention of the Department of Social Services where a man lost his wife. His wife passed away and left him

MR. BENNETT: with six small children. That man is not able to get housekeeping financial help for any more than, I think, something in the order of \$60 a month but, Mr. Speaker, if the children were taken away from the parent who now is a single parent - if the children were taken away and placed in foster homes with strangers and not raised in a family atmosphere, the government would find many hundreds of dollars, something in the order of \$150 per child, I am told, to raise those children in foster homes, away from the family unit.

Now, in my opinion, these children, Mr. Speaker, would be better raised in the family atmosphere, with their parent.

So these are some of the things that I would hope the various ministers in their wisdom would in future make sure get enforced, and as I said earlier in my talk, Mr. Speaker, we do not need legislation of this nature, what we need to do is respect and enforce and carry on existing legislation to take care of children, give sufficient financial assistance where it is necessary. And I am honestly of the opinion that the government would benefit in its Treasury and the children would be raised in a much better manner.

Thank you, Sir.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1972," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 34).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975," (Bill No. 11).

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

July 9, 1981

Tape 3207

EC - 3

MR. MORGAN:

A brief comment, Mr. Speaker.

This is to give authority to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board to gather information from

MR. MORGAN: the sector of the industry dealing with the construction of fishing vessels and the acquisition of equipment for these vessels which was not, prior to now, included in the Fishing Board Advisory Board authority.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. speaker.

I would like to make some brief comments in relation to the amendment and the Board itself. Mr. Speaker, I think the minister well knows, and most of us are aware of the fact, that since this Board was conceived and put in operation it has been somewhat of a lame-duck board not because of the members there but because of the very strict limitations placed upon it.

I think it is fair to say on behalf of the Board that they have endeavoured to do their best, but because of the lack of complete legislation that would give them access to the complete fishing industry, in the past they were unable to perform this task. And certainly this amendment, as I know some of the larger fish companies do not agree with it, in relation to the total disclosure of everything, if we are going to know on a regular basis the state of the industry, then certainly the Advisory Board would have to have access to this type of information, it would be very incomplete otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing I would like to mention, and I think that the minister would basically agree with me, and I will be quite honest, I did not ask him in advance at all, but it has come to my attention that certain members of this hon. House, on occasion, have asked the Advisory Board

MR. HOLLETT: for some pertinent information but were refused because basically their rule is to advise the minister and the Department of Fisheries. I can appreciate the fact that in some cases information has to be classified very sensitive, and rightfully so, and this should not be dispensed, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that any hon. member of this House who asks for basic information that the Advisory Board has compiled, then certainly I think it should be made available to them.

I would like to ask on behalf of myself and other members, in particular, ask the minister if he could agree to this request and also notify members of the Board that some of us will be asking for information from time to time and we would like to get it. Thank you very much.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to close the debate on this amendment I will say that the request is a very genuine one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. HISCOCK: You are closing the debate before -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Another member wishes to speak. I am sorry.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Just very, very briefly, and I will be very brief, with regard to the boat bounties for boats over twenty-five feet in his district -

MR. MORGAN: Wrong bill. Wrong bill.

MR. HISCOCK: I know it is the wrong bill, but with regard to the fishermen being on the Advisory Board, can the minister inform me whether it is in this bill or some other bill whether they will be obtaining them this year?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries. If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the question regarding the bounties I would prefer to answer on the bill dealing with the change in the Bounties Act. I will be glad to answer the question then. But I will say, in the comment made by the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), that I agree that information gathered by that Board should be available to all members of the House of Assembly, especially those who have fishermen in their ridings. But the procedure, of course, will have to be that requests come through the minister because they report to the minister. I agree the information should be available and, in fact, I will arrange to make same available in the future.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 11).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 23, Bill No. 30.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act". (Bill No. 30)

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, with this bill we want to make two or three changes. Number one, the first clause would just delete the redundant reference to Section 29. But clause 2 would allow the minister, or give the minister power to allow co-operatives to issue credit to their members in excess of limits which are generally imposed under the act. Presently credit is allowed up to 75 per cent of the paid up shares of any member of any co-operative. But this is not very satisfactory, for instance, in the case of some fishermen who may want to buy a number of hundreds of dollars or even thousands of dollars of gear and who may have only a hundred dollar membership in the union. This clause would allow the minister the power to allow co-operatives to extend that credit beyond the 75 per cent of the paid up shared capital.

The other clause, clause 3 would allow the minister the power to provide for the creation and the stabilization of a mutual aid fund. And this is a fund which has been requested for several years now by various co-operatives throughout the Province, and would provide some protection to members in the case of bankruptcy or some such nature.

And the final clause, clause 4 would change the name of the Newfoundland Co-operative Services to the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Co-operatives, to more accurately reflect the role they play in today's society.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, we have no problem in supporting this bill and, in actual fact, find that it is long overdue. But we are quite pleased that we are setting up stabilization of a mutual aid fund for the various co-ops in this Province. I strongly believe that where we have the Fisheries Loan Board, where we have the Rural Development, where we have the Agricultural Development and various other co-ops in this Province, that it is has more often been redundant in administration work and we lose more in renting office space, etc. instead of providing these funds to them.

As for section (4), changing it to Newfoundland and Labrador, again I feel very strongly that most things in this Province should be referred to as Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Co-ops or federation of whatever and using it. With extending the credit, as I said, we are finding great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the high interest rates in the country at this time and also the problems of getting loans from a bank, that we do need to strengthen our co-ops even more in our Province, particularly with regard to our rural areas. If we are going to develop an economic base in our outlying areas of this Province, then we need to have a greater availability of money. And we can only have that available if we have loan boards, etc. set up and co-ops.

So for the Opposition, we support the bill and, as I said before, we find that it is long overdue.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 30)

Motion, second reading of a
bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural,
Agricultural And Northern Development Act". (Bill No. 33)

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Rural,
Agricultural And Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, this bill would
give our department authority to make regulations for the
granting of loans to various interested groups and individuals
throughout the Province as opposed to using guidelines
which are presently in place.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Again, Mr. Speaker, the bill is
quite straightforward. But one of the things that we
brought up in the Estimates of the Department of Rural

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Development as well as brought up in the House: this House, or the opposition goes on record of standing that if we are going to loan out money to individuals and companies in this Province, then we should find out who they are. The Department of Rural Development, more so than any other department of government, refuses to give the names of individuals in the Province who are getting money, much of it is often grants as well as loans, getting it from the taxpayers of this Province and when the public knowledge - when people ask for it and ask who these people are getting this money, we are told that it is confidential and we cannot get it. Yet with regard to DREE or with regard to any other departments, the Fisheries Loan Board, for example, and other groups in this Province, when we find out who got the loan, how much, what did they get it for, there is no problem. And I am rather reluctant to say that the Department of Rural Development, with regard to giving loans, is often used like the Fisheries Loan Board, for political patronage, and that is how the loan board, the Fisheries Loan Board, found itself in the trouble, as they did in the last election. Before the last election, the former Minister of Fisheries went around giving out loans and grants and that until finally, when all the bills came in etcetera, what ended up happening was that they found out that the Loan Board was bankrupt. The fishermen got rid of the Fisheries Advisory Board and set up another one. And I feel that the same thing is happening with the Department of Rural Development loans. I wonder why the government -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. E. HISCOCK: - is not permitting the names to be told, when we are giving them loans and giving them grants.

MR. E. HISCOCK: I, as a member of this House -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3210

RA - 2

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - and the taxpayers, feel that we have a right, we have a right to find out who these loans are made to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order.

MR. HISCOCK: -who these loans are made to, Mr. Speaker, and if we are not told who these loans are made to, then I think, that tabling the list - as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had done, and he got it - I do not believe that is the way it should be done.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right.

MR. HISCOCK: It should be common knowledge to this Province and I feel, that unless we find out who applied for NIP - because why should there be any cover up, why should there be any need to not tell the persons names? Surely it is not competing. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this bill I believe very strongly that the Department of Rural Development, and the minister here and this government, when you are talking about an open government, and Freedom of Information Bill, I myself feel that it is repugnant for this House and the taxpayers of this Province to not find out who these loans are being made to. I hope that when the minister gets up he will address this and tell us why is it that we do not have the list of people who end up getting loans. Because, again, the taxpayer is paying it and with regard to the taxpayer paying it, I feel that we should find out. And, as I said, hopefully the minister will let us know why, and that we do not want any -

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not know (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. HISCOCK: Well, the list, as I said, I can get the list, and we can get the list again next year, but what is the sense of getting that? It should be over and above-

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3210

RA - 3

MR. HISCOCK: board, and it should not be open to political patronage -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: -in times of election and giving them out, There are people in this Province who accuse the Rural Development Department which, by the way, is something like \$14 million and \$8 million-

MR. HOLLETT: 90 per cent of it is federal anyway.

MR. HISCOCK: - \$8 million or \$11 million comes from the federal government, that the Department of Rural Development has used, more so than the Fisheries Loan Board has ever used, for blatant political patronage and our people are beginning to question that. This is the

MR. HISCOCK: reason why we are not given the names of the people on the Loan Board because it is outright political patronage to supporters.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural, Agricultural And Northern Development Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 33).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Before proceeding with the next order, although it is a couple of minutes past 5:00 P.M. -

I did not want to interrupt the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) while he was speaking - I can inform the House that I have received notice of no motions for debate at 5:30 P.M. and that is basically because three members of the Opposition who had questions on the Late Show decided to forego that for another purpose of which all members are aware and we will get to that at 5:30 P.M.

The next order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 25, Bill No. 32.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Public Works And Services Act, 1973 With Respect To Government Printing," (Bill No. 32).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to have the office of the Queen's Printer within the public service. Up until the appointment of Mr. David Dawe, we were the only Province that had the Queen's Printer outside the civil service. This will enable official documents to be printed by the Government Printing Service or by

MR. YOUNG: public tender.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this is another one of the routine housekeeping bills that we have been going through all afternoon and we do not wish to delay the debate any.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Public Works And Services Act, 1973 With Respect To Government Printing," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 32).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 26, Bill No. 5.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act," (Bill No. 5).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to accomplish two things. It is quite straightforward. Number one, it will permit the Fire Commissioner to deem certain areas as fire lanes; what one has in mind there is malls and complexes like that, and that for this purpose they will come under the provision of the Highway Traffic Act so that when the Fire Commissioner determines that there should not be parking here or leaving of other material, as a safety measure so that fire engines could get there in case of a fire, that that will have the legal effect and could be backed up with the teeth of the Highway Prevention Act. And the other will permit the Fire Commissioner to designate detection devices like smoke detectors - I think they are the basic kind - in certain areas, and here we are thinking of public buildings of various kinds. They are the two things that are covered by these amendments.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are pleased to support this particular amendment, especially inasfar as it relates to the fire lanes. We think it is an absolute necessity to have the act amended to provide for this and we are pleased to support the bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 5).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 27, Bill No. 62.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Provide Certain Rights For Blind Persons," (Bill No. 62).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, this bill also is quite straightforward and is a matter of, I think, some importance, considerable importance, especially bearing in mind that this is the International Year Of The Disabled, and this will deal with the rights of blind people.

With respect to accommodation it deals with a couple of things. One thing it does is it will make illegal any discrimination against a blind person in terms of accommodation and in terms of commercial properties as well, not only residential accommodation but commercial accommodation, and it will make it illegal for a person to discriminate or deny use of these facilities to a blind person on the reason that

MR. OTTENHEIMER: such a person is blind and/or is accompanied by a guide dog, so it establishes the right of accommodation in commercial or residential premises to a blind person and also a blind person accompanied by a guide dog. It will also establish that in any lease a prohibition, which might be against the keeping of animals, will not apply to a guide dog owned or used by a blind person. So, any contractual terms saying a person may not keep a dog, that will not apply to a blind person who has the use of a guide dog. It also says that nobody may charge a fee to a blind person for his guide dog in terms of admission to any place. If there is admission fee - okay - if it is \$2.00, a blind person obviously pays it, but there can be no fee for the dog. And it also says that no person other than a blind person may carry a white cane. It makes it an offence for anybody else to carry a white cane. This bill will become operative upon Royal Assent; there is no future date, not upon proclamation, and it will replace the White Cane Act. It will replace that because it goes further than that, and it is also binding on the Crown, it specifically states that it is binding on Her Majesty. So I think it is certainly a very worthwhile piece of legislation for our blind citizens.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I speak for everyone on this side of the House and every blind person in the Province and I had been affiliated with blind people for the first fifteen years of my life. And I welcome this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a positive step in the right direction and sometimes I think that this being the year of the disabled that we should do less talking and more action to help not only the blind people

MR. HANCOCK: but all the disabled people in this Province, Mr. Speaker. It is welcome news and I am sure I speak for every blind person, and I congratulate the government for bringing in such legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide Certain Rights For Blind Persons", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 62).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 29, Bill No. 69.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Amending Agreement Entered Into Between Government And Lower Churchill Development Corporation Limited" (Bill No. 69).

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I introduce this in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). The purpose of this bill is to extend the option agreement in the Lower Churchill Development Option Agreement. As everyone knows, the Option Agreement as contained in the principal bill, granted an option to the Lower Churchill Development Corporation to acquire all the assets then held by the Gull Island Power Corporation. And then, Mr. Speaker, also, the manner for the purchase of these assets was determined and, of course, also included in the option was the option of the Corporation to enter into a water lease relating to the Lower Churchill River basin. Now, Mr. Speaker, that expired or was due to expire in March of this year, and this is a matter of extension of the bill for forty-eight months, and also it provides that it can be further extended if necessary by consent between the parties. This matter was a matter of some debate earlier in the session, Mr. Speaker, when it

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3212

GS - 3

MR. MARSHALL: was indicated - the question was asked the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) as to whether the option had expired, and, of course, the option had not expired. He had an agreement at the time with the Hon. Marc Lalonde for the extension of the option. This is the agreement, and we now seek to have legislative sanction to the agreement in the same manner, because the principle agreement itself is sanctioned by legislation.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say from the start that we are going to support this legislation. Again this is good legislation in the sense, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side will do anything, we will support anything that expedites the development of the Churchill Falls Power, the Lower Churchill. The legislation, Mr. Speaker, raises unbelievable questions. In spite of what the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said, the agreement has expired, it indicates sloppiness, incredible sloppiness and irresponsibility on the part of the government to allow that agreement to expire. We are now three months past the expiry date and we are finally bringing in legislation to renew the option or to legalize the agreement, the continuing agreement between LCD, between the federal government and the Newfoundland Government.

Now let us look at what LCD was put together for the in the first place, Mr. Speaker. After ten years of fooling the people, of playing politics with the Lower Churchill Development, this government recognized that they could not develop the Lower Churchill without the participation of Ottawa. And, of course, they went and Ottawa agreed and we had the LCDC set up for the sole purpose of developing Labrador power.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Lower Churchill is ever developed will depend on two or three things; our ability to attract industry, that we use the electricity or our ability to export the power. And it is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, this government's reaction to the new legislation, federal legislation, that would allow this Province, that would allow the National Energy Board to expropriate land for a right of way of Churchill Falls Power, it is very interesting that after

MR. FLIGHT: ten years bashing the federal government, after ten years using the excuse that the only reason we have not developed the Lower Churchill is because we cannot get the federal government to use their constitutional authority to give us a right of way across Quebec, after ten years of that, the federal government brings in the necessary legislation and what do we hear from the Premier and from the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry)? The first remark was, 'A half a loaf is better than none'. They rejected it in the first instance. And then, of course, the Premier saw there was no politics in that so he jumped on the bandwagon and attempted to take credit for that legislation. Well, the fact is that legislation came, that new federal legislation that now makes it possible for Newfoundland to develop the Lower Churchill and have a designated corridor that he has been asking for. That legislation makes that possible. And the fact is, it came in in spite of this government, it came in spite of the attitude that this government has taken with the federal government re Labrador power.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting also that the only person in Canada who is seriously objecting to this legislation is Mr. Levesque. Mr. Levesque is the only Premier in Canada who is seriously-and possibly the federal P.C. Party. But it is very interesting that Mr. Levesque was the Premier that our own Premier, during the constitutional conference, said publicly that I would rather support Mr. Levesque's view of Canada than Prime Minister Trudeau's. Mr. Levesque was the man a few days ago who pulled out of the conference, the Eastern Premiers Conference, because of his opposition. So when it is in Quebec's interest-the Premier saw very quickly what a bedfellow Mr. Levesque would be when it was in Mr. Levesque's interest to oppose something. So the Premier should be ruing the day now, should want to eat his words, when he said nationally 'I would accept Premier Levesque's view of Canada as opposed

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3213

IB-3

MR. FLIGHT:

to Prime Minister Trudeau's!

Now, Mr. Speaker, this new legislation has done something else. It has taken the argument that we have not got the right to designate a corridor through Quebec. But the Premier knows now, knew when he was Minister of Mines and Energy, the present Minister of Mines and Energy knows that the one option available, the one alternative to what we want, and maybe the only thing will work, is an agreement with Quebec to wheel that power out. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) announced a few days ago that he is hoping that a major aluminum company will build a smelter that would take one-third of the power of the Lower Churchill.

Mr. Speaker,

MR. FLIGHT: if we cannot negotiate an agreement to wheel that power out I cannot see -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Because we want - the Premier is demanding, and properly rightly so, he is demanding the right for Newfoundland to sell that electricity to the consumer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MR. FLIGHT: To the consumer not to a third party, to the consumer. I cannot see any consumer, PASNY, New Hampshire or anybody else, regardless of how that power is delivered to them, whether it is delivered through a designated corridor or whether it is delivered under wheeling rights in the present Hydro system, I cannot see them accepting 1,000 megawatts or 1,500 megawatts of power on a short-term deal. LCDC is going to have an awful challenge here, Mr. Speaker, they are into one terrible situation. I cannot see and maybe the Premier will say a word on this bill - a company, PASNY or anybody else, agreeing to purchase a block of power from Newfoundland on which their industry or their cities will be dependent, and purchase that on the basis that it is recallable by Newfoundland the minute that we can identify an industry to use it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we may have great difficulty, whether or not we decide to export Labrador power by a designated corridor or by wheeling rights out of Quebec. And I think, Mr. Speaker, the crunch is coming. This government is going to have to come clean on exactly what we can do with the Labrador power, and exactly what they are prepared to do with it. Because I do not think, at this point in time, there is anything in the works that will guarantee the development and the export of power under any mode of transportation out of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, it will be carried when we are ready to carry it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

I will tell the member we will carry it, when we are ready to carry it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order!

Order! Order!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, there are another couple of points I want to make. The Liberal Party, the position of this Opposition, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Carried.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- enunciated by the Leader of the party six months ago, was that we should make an immediate start on the transmission lines out of Labrador to bring hydro power from Labrador into Newfoundland. And under any scenario, under any set of circumstances we need those transmission lines, whether it is the development of Gull by itself, the development of Muskrat by itself, or winning our case on the recall, it takes five years to build the transmission lines, we should start now.

Now, the Leader of the

Opposition enunciated that, that is the Liberal position, Mr. Speaker, that is the Opposition's position. Again the Premier might indicate why it is, knowing that we have to have Labrador power, knowing that under any scenario any power development in Labrador, whether it is Gull Island, the Lower Churchill, or winning recall rights on the Upper Churchill, we have to have the line, why it is, Mr. Speaker, that this government have not started putting those lines in place. I will never know. And every month they refuse to start to get the transmission lines in place is putting Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders in the position where to have to pay higher and higher electricity charges, Mr. Speaker. It will take five years to put it in place. It

MR. FLIGHT: is no good to wait until the Lower Churchill is developed and then start to build the hydro line, it is no good to wait, we do not need to wait until we win the case. Under any set of circumstances we have to have in place a transmission line for that power. So why are we not putting the transmission - if the Government of Newfoundland, if they believe, if they have confidence in the fact that they can under any set of circumstances deliver power to Newfoundland from Labrador, then they owe it to this Province now to start that transmission facility. And as long as they do not start that transmission facility, it is proof that they are not sure they will ever develop or deliver a kilowatt of power to this Province.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to wind this debate up - one could go on for a week, a week, Mr. Speaker, this bill would justify a week of debate, and it is going to get more debate over the long haul than it is going to get this day, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let us talk - for a second, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the situation we saw in this Province this past couple of days with the sale of Petro Canada.

MR. WARREN: Fifty million dollars.

MR. FLIGHT: The sale of the oil refinery at Come By Chance to Petro Canada.

MR. WARREN: They are giving it away. They are giving it away.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let it be known that this government for ten years have hung their hats - they have accused the Liberal Party of a give-a-way with regards to Labrador. That is

MR. FLIGHT: you know, the kind of mentality they have, that is the only thing they could do for years and years, for ten years.

The member can look at his watch. He is going to get into the debate now in a minute. I will stir him up and he will get into the debate.

For ten years that has been the cry, to give away. But remember, there were conditions on that if there was a giveaway. There never was a giveaway. Ten years from now, Mr. Speaker - let us get on to this - ten years from now if that refinery is going, if it is a profitable operation, if there is a petrochemical plant in place as a result of it - very profitable for Petro-Canada. The giveaway on the Upper Churchill, which was not a giveaway in the first place, is a giveaway with no conditions. That giveaway, Mr. Speaker, will be in the shade. We have just witnessed the giveaway of the century in this refinery, Mr. Speaker. We have done nothing to protect Newfoundland's interest. No sane man would believe that if we have Hibernia out there, when that oil comes ashore that we could not reactivate that refinery and have an industry that would take care of the economy of the East Coast. We have given it away, \$50 million plus accrued interest. No clause there protecting our investment, a clause saying that we have a right to buy into the refinery. Mr. Speaker, that will be - let the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) remember - all the speeches that he has made these past ten years about the giveaway with regard to Newfoundland power will be nothing to the speeches that will be made in this Province with regard to the giveaway of the refinery.

I want to wind up on that. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker. We will get plenty of time to continue

MR. FLIGHT: to debate this government's attitude and this government's performance with regard to the development of Labrador power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the final word, I do not see why LCDC would be jumping for joy today because their mandate has been renewed. This government, the one that now seeks to renew the mandate, turned down, totally rejected the recommendations that LCDC made to the government with regard to Labrador power. Why they should be concerned about whether the mandate is renewed or not, I do not know. The professionals, the people who know more about energy development in this country than all the ministry put together, presented a report that said, 'Let us do Muskrat now. For the benefit of Newfoundland let us do it now.' This government totally rejected it. Why they would get excited about a mandate renewed, I do not know.

That is my contribution, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: There will be more said on the LCDC concept before this session is over.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Amending Agreement Entered Into Between Government And Lower Churchill Development Corporation Limited," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 69).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 30, Bill No. 74.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Act, 1975," (Bill No. 74).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to empower Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to borrow -

MR. MARSHALL: their borrowing powers not to exceed the sum of \$250 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro from time to time is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: If I could, Mr. Speaker, just to give a little bit of history. In November, 1978 there was an amendment to the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - 1975, to place a limit of \$200 million on the net increase in Hydro's debt. I might say that at the time this type of legislation, which is what we have now, is one that is one of the cardinal principles of this party in that there should be no borrowing of Crown corporations or government without that borrowing being referred, insofar as it possibly can be, to the House first, and that is the reason why this bill now appears.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Another clime and another time that I will not get into, borrowings of this nature could be done simply by Order-in-Council, by authorizing them, but in this particular instance we have to get the legislative sanction as we should have.

Now, since 1978 the net

MR. MARSHALL: increase in Hydro's debt has been approximately \$163 million, leaving a balance of \$37 million.

The economic size of Hydro's bond issues in Canada and the U.S. is now in the order of \$75 million. And, therefore, the amount remaining on current limit is inadequate. What really we are saying here is that, you know, you have to borrow in certain amounts, \$50 million, \$75 million, \$25 million and what have you. So we need it, so that Hydro may finance its capital projects during the next fifteen to eighteen months. And these projects, Mr. Speaker, are well known to the House and well known to the public.

The completion of the Upper Salmon project will require large sums of money, the Cat Arm project, as it gets underway, you know, that very large construction project in the district of the member of Humber Valley (Mr. House) has to get underway. So we need this power to borrow. It is important that we bring it before the House but I would indicate to members of the House, even though I know some members will want to debate it, that the purposes for the borrowing of this money is well known and it has been debated to large extent certainly it has been brought to the attention of this House in times before.

So I lead in this bill, Mr. Speaker, and if there are any questions I would be quite happy to answer them on closing the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have been promised in this House, I think from the days when a similar bill was discussed by the Leader of the Opposition of the time, that the Premier agreed to table all capital expenditures of Crown corporations or quasi Crown

MR. STIRLING: Crown corporations, all the developments having to do with the offshore, the Petroleum Directorate and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, the explanatory notes are different from what the bill appears to be saying. The explanatory notes say, 'would provide the authority to increase borrowings and guarantees to a further \$250 million'. In introducing the legislation, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said increasing it up to \$250 million, and I think he was correct, and maybe he can confirm for us now that it is not the intention to increase it to a further \$250 million, it is to increase it up to \$250 million from \$200 million. I presume that is correct. I ask the President of the Council to indicate.

MR. MARSHALL: No it is to give \$250 million borrowing to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

MR. STIRLING: In addition to what they now have?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, what they now have is 'The aggregate of all loans to the corporation to be guaranteed after the coming into force of this section by or on behalf of Her Majesty shall not exceed \$200 million'. That is what the present act says. The new act, as I understand it says, 'The aggregate of monies to be raised by way of loan shall not exceed \$250 million'. Now, does that mean that we are splitting that out and saying -

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. STIRLING: \$250 million, in total.

MR. MARSHALL: From \$200 million.

MR. HANCOCK: I cannot get a few dollars to get a bit of a road paved.

MR. STIRLING:

See, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things - the explanatory notes are in error in that it is not more than doubling the authority to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, it is only increasing it from \$200 million to \$250 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am not satisfied that the government has the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and all its related subsidiaries under control and operating for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. For example, Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Board, in setting the rates,

July 9, 1981

Tape No. 3217

RA - 1

MR. STIRLING:

are not allowed to take into consideration the profit that might be made, for example, in sales to the New England States. Mr. Speaker, I see that the time has just about run up and I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Debate has been adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. It being 5:30 a motion to adjourn has deemed to be before the House. However, before putting that motion, there is a matter which we would like to deal with and I wonder if we could get the Sergeant-at-arms back in his seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I believe there is agreement that we would defer for a few moments before putting the motion to adjourn. And I, first of all, want to thank the members for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) once again for giving up their time during this Late Show to allow this particular matter to be raised. And the matter which I wish to bring to the attention of all hon. members and indeed those others who frequent our Assembly, is that although he will be with us until the House recesses for the Summer whenever that may be, in the next day or two or whatever, today we do face the unwelcome task of bidding farewell officially, if I may, to an outstanding servant of this House and I refer, of course, to Mr. Hemmens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Hemmens is a gentleman who for 19 long years has carried out the duties of Sergeant-at-Arms in this House of Assembly in an exemplary manner. He

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): is only the third person to hold the office since confederation, having been preceded in it by Sergeant Thomas Christopher in 1949, and Captain George Hicks in 1960. But his 19 years in office is by far the longest tenure to date. As a matter of fact, as far as I can determine, he has served as Sergeant-at-Arms longer than anyone else since Newfoundland gained Representative Government in 1832. Appropriately enough, when one considers the tactics and strategems employed in this House from time to time, the experiences which most aptly had fitted him for his role of Sergeant-at-Arms were gained in the Second World War. A member of the 166th Newfoundland Field Regiment, Royal Artillery from 1939 to 1945, Mr. Hemmens, following training in the United Kingdom, saw action with the regiment in North Africa, the invasion of Sicily and the invasion of Italy. When asked how things went for him during those terrible years of war, he answers, I came out with a whole skin; an echo of a reply given by a member of the French aristocracy who, when asked what he did during the revolution and reign of terror, answered, I survived, as though that covered everything of importance and, I guess, in a way it did. But Mr. Hemmens was a Sergeant in those days of war, a position which often sees one's enemies distributed equally throughout the contending armies, so he must have showed a great deal of mental and physical agility to come out of it all with a whole skin. Since his appointment as Sergeant-at-Arms, and he took up his duties March 20, 1963, Mr. Hemmens has done much more than merely survive. He has established an outstanding record of service to this House, which sets standards of excellence for all those who come after him. He has been a devoted servant of this House, a discreet advisor when his opinion was sought, and a friend to all. And, now, at the age of 72 years he takes his retirement

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

retirement and no one, of course, could deserve it more.

Perhaps his war years in Africa gave him a taste for the warmer climate, for he and his wife, Joan, who incidentally is seated in the gallery with us here today -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Because of this taste for a warmer climate, we understand that he and his wife plan to spend most of their time from now on in Spain. I can only admonish him to take the stand of a former, former Premier of this Province who insists there is nothing wrong with Newfoundland's climate, it is just the blasted weather.

But sun or no sun, all his friends here and throughout Newfoundland hope we will see a great deal more of Bert Hemmens. I am sure I speak for all hon. members in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Hemmens the long and happy retirement that they so richly deserve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to associate myself with the very appropriate remarks that you have made today regarding the outstanding service of Mr. Hemmens to this hon. House of Assembly.

The presence of this very distinguished gentleman in the Legislature of our Province has, in my opinion, been most instrumental over the years in adding to the decorum of this Assembly. That major contribution in itself, Sir, is one that is worthy of note and should be publicly recognized.

It is often a very sad event indeed, Mr. Speaker, when we see those with whom we have associated

PREMIER PECKFORD: for a long time go their separate ways, but on this occasion it is especially sad to see Mr. Hemmens, a man for whom we all have such admiration and respect, leave us to begin a well-deserved retirement at the age of seventy-two.

In the ten years, Your Honour, that I have served in this hon. House, I have always been impressed by the efficient manner in which Mr. Hemmens has executed his responsibilities, and I say in all sincerity, Sir, that you will be sadly missed indeed, as I feel that your very presence on the floor of this Chamber exemplifies the dignity and tradition of the House.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not think any hon. members will ever forget the military manner of this gentleman as he issues his command to all present to "Stand in the gallery, please."

It is in this spirit, Sir, that I take great pleasure on this occasion in presenting to you the first Newfoundland service medal, as a token of the high esteem that we hold for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to be standing - and I believe I should probably stand smartly at attention for at least a moment - to pay tribute to our Sergeant-at-Arms.

I have only been in the House a couple of years, but Sergeant-at-Arms Hemmens has a reputation that goes much beyond this place and I have enjoyed some of the stories about some of the ongoings in the House where the Sergeant-at-Arms was brought to attention and might have had to escort a gentleman

July 9, 1981

Tape 3218

EC - 3

MR. STIRLING:

or two outside the House.

And I do not think that there is any doubt today - and some of them, I believe, may be present - there is no doubt today that he could still do it. There is no question that he could still escort anybody out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: I want to pay tribute as well to his wife, Mr. Speaker, who put the fear of God into me many years ago when she ran her nursery school over on Elizabeth Avenue. I was working at Johnson's across the way, and she ruled that parking lot on Elizabeth Avenue with the same kind of iron fist that her husband ruled the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Sergeant-at-Arms Hemmens has another honour, he came into this House at the same time, the same year as the senior member of the House, the member on this side of the House, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who also contributes, I believe, to keeping this House in order from time to time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: So it is a great day, Mr. Speaker. It is a great day, and we are reminded by Sergeant-at-Arms Hemmens of the way that you can carry out your duty with dignity and without making enemies on either side of the House. He is a man that we all admire, we all look up to. He will be a hard act to follow but I believe he has trained his successor well, and we wish him well. As my colleague just said, if he decides to become a writer, he will probably have a bestseller if he tells some of the stories that he has overheard in the confines of this building.

Mr. Speaker, we too join with the Premier in congratulating him on being the first recipient of the Volunteer's Medal, it is something that everybody can be proud of in Newfoundland and Labrador. On this side of the House we certainly want to wish him and Mrs. Hemmens the best in their retirement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I remind hon. members, and others as well, that there will be a reception in the Collective Bargaining Room on the Third Floor and the reception will be in honour of Mr. and Mrs. Hemmens. I trust that all members will make a special effort to come and wish them well.

Before we proceed with that - incidentally, at that reception there will be a further presentation made to Mr. Hemmens - but before we proceed to that reception, I do have a memento here that I wish to present to the Sergeant-at-Arms, if he will come forward and accept this memento on behalf of the members of this Assembly, in particular, and all those who have preceded us. And while it is a small token, hopefully it will serve as a memento of this particular occasion and you will be able to look back upon it in the years to come and remember this particular day.

It is a photograph of the Sergeant-at-Arms himself which we have had blown up and suitably framed, and on the rear of the photograph he will find the names of all the members of this particular General Assembly. We hope that you will take the time to read the names and remember us every once in a while.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion now then -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Speech. Speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

Speech.

Does the House wish to waive the rules and allow the Sergeant-at-Arms an opportunity to say a few words?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

to say a few words?

Is the Sergeant-at-Arms prepared

MR. HEMMENS:

Yes Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SEARGEANT AT ARMS (Mr. Hemmens): Many, many times in the past eighteen or nineteen years I have wanted to do this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEMMENS: Now I cannot say what I had in mind then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HEMMENS: That would never do.

We all know irrelevancy is frowned upon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HEMMENS: I do wish to thank, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and all hon. members for this very splendid thing which has happened to me. You have been most kind in your remarks and I am quite sure you all agreed with the presentations that have been made to me and the references made to my good wife. My wife and I, we will discuss the (inaudible), of course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HEMMENS: All I can say is thank you very much, and thank you, Sir, for the unique opportunity for an unelected person to speak from the floor of this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: There might be a district available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 10, 1981, at 10:00 A.M.