

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I am sure hon. members would like to join me today in welcoming to the Speaker's Gallery a former Speaker of the Newfoundland Legislature, Mr. George Clarke, and with him a former Speaker of the Manitoba Legislature, Mr. Jim Bilton. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement.

MR. NEARY: Do you have a copy to send over here?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, we will have a copy momentarily, Mr. Speaker.

For the past several years this government has been insisting on the need for the federal government to enforce the constitutional power which it has to ensure that this Province can transport its hydro electric power to markets outside Quebec. As hon. members are well aware, the Province of Quebec has always insisted that we sell all the power to Hydro Quebec at the Newfoundland/Quebec border.

Simply put, our position has always been that hydro electricity is no different than oil or gas, wheat or minerals or any other goods and that the same rules should apply to all. If Alberta can ship its oil through other provinces without hindrance, if Saskatchewan can ship it potash without hindrance, and if Ontario and Quebec can ship their manufactured goods to markets without hindrance, then Newfoundland should be able to ship its products on the same basis.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It has always been our view that had the right of Newfoundland to be treated equally been recognized at the time of the negotiations for the Upper Churchill development, we would never have ended up with the current situation where Quebec obtains all the benefits and we obtain none. As hon. members know, we are taking every step possible to redress the inequities of that arrangement but none of this would be necessary if our rights in this regard had been recognized.

Mr. Speaker, over the past year or so, our efforts to get the federal government to act on this matter have intensified. I have spoken strongly on this issue at the First Ministers' Conferences and I have written the Prime Minister about it. My Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. Leo Barry, has had a number of meetings and exchanges of correspondence with his counterpart, the hon. Mark LaLonde. Officials from Intergovernmental Affairs, Justice, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and the Cabinet Secretariat have had meetings with their counterparts both here in St. John's on February 9, 1981,

PREMIER PECKFORD: and in Ottawa on March 10, 1981.  
The position which we adopted at these various meetings was that:  
(1) Newfoundland must have the same rights to transport hydro-electricity across other provinces to market as other provinces have with respect to their goods. (2) This right could best be granted by passing amendments to the National Energy Broad Act to effectively regulate interprovincial and international transmission of electric power. And, thirdly, that these amendments should cover both the concept of a dedicated power corridor and also the concept of wheeling power through the Quebec system. The dedicated line or power corridor approach would be adequate to cover off large blocks of power sold for a period long enough to cover the capital cost of the transmission lines constructed. The wheeling power option would cover off the sale of smaller blocks of power and short term sales, or short run surplus power.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to state that our concerted effort of the last several years has finally resulted in the Federal Government initiating some action. As hon. members know, the Federal Government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - yesterday tabled draft legislation which would, if enacted, give the National Energy Board some of the authority we believe it should have.

I would like to congratulate the Federal Government for the initial steps it has taken. They are welcome indeed and point out the validity of the position which we have always taken on this vital matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: However, while the announcement made yesterday is indeed encouraging, the following points

PREMIER PECKFORD: must be noted: (1) The draft legislation has been tabled primarily as a discussion document and no legislative action is contemplated until sometime this Autumn. There is no guarantee, therefore, that the proposed amendment will be legislated as proposed;

(2) The proposed amendment will only amend the existing legislation to the extent necessary to permit a dedicated line or power corridor

PREMIER PECKFORD: situation, will only cover the situation where a large block of power is sold for a long period of time. (3) The proposed amendment does not include granting the National Energy Board authority over the wheeling of short-term, surplus power on the existing system. We regret that this is not included since this provision would give us the flexibility to make short run surplus power sales and would not entail our having to commit large blocks of power for long periods of time like on the Upper Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, the federal proposal, if enacted into legislation, will be a very useful first step in granting Newfoundland equal rights. It recognizes the legitimacy of our position and will be of considerable assistance. It is certainly long overdue and a step in the right direction. It is only a first step, however, and other steps are necessary, particularly the need to add amendments covering the wheeling of short-term, surplus power.

My government welcomes this initial step but we will be maintaining our position that Newfoundland must have equal rights with other provinces. We have now attained some of the rights we believe we should automatically have as a Province. We will keep pressing until we have attained the proper level; namely, full equality. We are encouraged by this latest development. We sincerely hope that the present proposal will be enacted without delay and that we can prevail upon the federal government to take the final, necessary step to grant us the equality of treatment that we should have.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I ask for the support of this House in congratulating the federal government for the action it proposes to take on this vital issue and also for continuing our efforts to have the federal government make those additional changes necessary to ensure that our Province can at last attain equality with the other provinces regarding the transport of its products to markets.

Mr. Speaker, this action in the last couple of days proves that when we fight for our rights we can make substantial progress.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am proud today that we stood up -

MR. THOMS: All the trained seals are here today.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am proud today that we stood up strongly for Newfoundland on this issue, just as I am proud we are standing up for Newfoundland on many other vital issues that face us. This country can work as a true federation but only if each of the partners can speak out clearly and freely on important issues. Had we remained silent, we would never have even obtained this first vital step.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Significant changes can be achieved if we have the strength of our convictions and the courage to state our position in unequivocal terms. Progress has been made and further progress will be made as long as we continue to clearly state our position in issues such as this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has four and a half minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Now we will hear - the truth.

MR. HANCOCK: Listen now. Listen.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. PATTERSON: No more give away.

MR. STIRLING: How much time did you say,

Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Four and a half minutes.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, on this side we welcome the congratulations. I think that the record should show that the Premier has asked us to support him in his congratulations to the federal government. And we have now reached a milestone, I think a first and historic milestone, in which the federal government has been congratulated. Of course, he could not

MR. STIRLING: resist the last little bit of federal bashing at the end. Just in case the federal government felt inclined to co-operate and assist, the message has to go out that the only reason, the only reason that this happened today is that the Newfoundland Government stood firm, kicked Ottawa in the head continuously, and then finally Ottawa enjoyed the kicking so much that in fear of that great Newfoundland Government they rushed in and brought in the amendment.

MR. MORGAN: They had no choice but to bring it in.

MR. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make a confession. I must now confess to a failing as the Leader of the Opposition, as Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. MORGAN: You have failed. Are you resigning?

MR. HANCOCK: Just listen now. Just listen now.

MR. STIRLING: I have allowed this government, since I became Leader, to perpetrate the greatest fraud in Newfoundland that maybe Newfoundland has ever seen, and that is the con job of saying, "Equal rights, we do not have equal right. The only way that we can have equal rights.

MR. STIRLING:

is a transportation corridor across Quebec." Mr. Speaker, we now know - we just heard it; it was couched in the most careful language - but they are saying, "Ottawa, that is not really what we wanted." They have said to all of Newfoundland, "That is it, that is the answer; just give us the transportation corridor across Quebec," because they never expected to get it, Mr. Speaker. They never expected to get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, Shame!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: There is nobody any more disappointed than that side of the House today because the first meeting that I had when I became Leader, I went through Labrador and on to see the Prime Minister and said, "That is the number one priority with our party."

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: And have had, Mr. Speaker, continuous meetings that terminated this last week with Bill Rompkey and with those of our Liberal caucus saying-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - to the people in Ottawa, "Look, do not allow the confrontationalist attitude, do not allow that to be taken out on Newfoundland. Do not allow them to get people so upset!" And, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that this was brought in by the federal government as part of a total bill. And, Mr. Speaker, they could learn an example from Alberta. Alberta wanted to do the same thing and they have gone ahead, Mr. Speaker, and they have reached the stage where they have to expropriate some land and that is why the amendment is needed, for Alberta. They have gone ahead, we have wasted two years of threatening Ottawa. Why could this government have not gone ahead and anticipated that they were going

MR. STIRLING: to be treated fairly? They had a commitment from the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. They were treated fairly. They even had a change in the constitution to allow this to happen. The constitution was changed to allow it to happen. When the accord took place amongst the eight premiers, you will notice that this was not included in the eight premiers' accord. The Premier could not convince his colleagues to put this in. And, Mr. Speaker, so

MR. STIRLING: now the final evidence of good faith by the federal government is to give the authority to the National Energy Board to do exactly what has been asked for not only on that side - they cannot share one minute of the credit - asked for by that side and this side, Mr. Speaker, because we are working in the best interests of Newfoundland and Labrador - no politics, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Hon. members, I am sure, would like to join me in welcoming also to the Speaker's gallery today, the hon. Donald Orchard, who is the Minister of Highways and Transportation in the Province of Manitoba.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And with him is Mr. Albert Driedger, who is an M.L.A. for Emerson constituency, also in the Province of Manitoba. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Further statements.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: I must say, I did not understand the last point of the Leader of the Opposition's remark because the Constitution has not been amended yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Did they sneak the constitutional amendment through, Mr. Speaker, while we were away?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the minister has a new statement?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make all hon. members of this House aware at this time of the 1981 drilling programme of Petro-Canada Exploration Limited -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - which has today outlined its programme as operator for what is called the Labrador Group of Companies in Newfoundland waters. Companies included under the programme are AGIP Canada Limited, Amerada Minerals Corporation of Canada Limited, Aquitaine Company of Canada Limited, Gulf, Suncor, Eastcan and Total.

There will be three drilling vessels involved in this programme. For the past ten days or so one of these vessels, as many members have observed, the Ben Ocean Lancer, has been at dockside in St. John's loading and preparing for the Summer's programme and I am told the ship was due to sail about noon today.

In addition, the drill ships Pelerin and Pacnorse I will be involved. The Pelerin will start work in early July and the Pacnorse I a little later.

The 1981 programme calls for the completion of two previously spudded wells and the drilling of one new wildcat well. The first of these, Mr. Speaker, will be testing of the Bjarni 0-82 well which is located some 160 kilometers East of Hopedale, Labrador. This well was previously partially tested and produced natural gas and condensate. Members will recall the natural gas production was seven and one-half million cubic feet per day and the condensate at a rate of seventy-five barrels per day.

June 23, 1981

Tape 2699

EC - 3

MR. BARRY:                   The Ben Ocean Lancer will begin  
the work as soon as she arrives on station. This vessel  
will then move on to the previously spudded North Bjarni

MR. L. BARRY: F-06 well, which is about 8 kilometers North of Bjarni 0-82.

The Pellerin will start drilling at a previously spudded well, North Leif 1-05, and drill this well to its projected total depth of 3400 metres.

The Pacnorse 1 will start drilling in late July at another location, the Rut H-11 well. This well, Mr. Speaker, is about 65 kilometers Northeast of Saglek, Labrador.

I should like to add, Mr. Speaker, that depending on the results of the drilling I have outlined, and available drill time, an additional two wells could be spudded this season.

Also, in addition to this 1981 drilling programme, Petro-Canada will carry out a seismic programme covering approximately 3000 line kilometers on the Labrador Shelf, at a cost of approximately 3 million dollars. The company will also continue its Offshore Labrador Biological Studies Programme. This is an industry, government and community programme involving baseline environmental data-gathering to assist in the assessment of oil and gas developments off the coast of Labrador. Work this year will involve seabird, marine mammal and ice surveys, and ground fish studies and analysis of physical oceanographic data previously collected, as well as completion of an Initial Environmental Assessment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that Petro-Canada as operator for this group of companies has made a concerted effort to use goods and services available in Newfoundland and pursuant to our regulations.

MR. L. BARRY: It is interesting too, to know some of the employment effects Petro-Canada's 1981 drilling programme will have in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the company's operations base will be in St. John's at pier 14 and about one half of the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Pierre?

MR. L. BARRY: Yeah, I know. Pierre is at sea as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: - and about one half of the thirty people employed there will be Newfoundlanders. Also, bases will be operated in Labrador, at Goose Bay, Cartwright, Saglek, Hopedale and 90 per cent of the thirty or more employees will be Labradorians.

Also, Petro-Canada plans to have an environmental co-ordinator and a community relations officer employed as well as ice observers on ships and personnel carrying out aerial ice reconnaissance flights.

Petro-Canada will use nine supply ships, two fixed wing aircraft, and four helicopters.

This programme, Mr. Speaker, is expected to cost in the order of \$90 million. A substantial portion of this amount will be spent in Newfoundland and Labrador on employment, goods and services, mainly because of the fact that we are enforcing our local preference regulations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has about three minutes.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a great day in this House of Assembly when we have the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) being the public relations arm of Petro-Canada. A wonderful statement on behalf of Petro-Canada.

MR. BARRY: You are the P-R man for (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: One of the questions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh oh!

MR. STIRLING: -that the Minister of Mines and Energy does not seem to realize and he is very careful to try to create the impression that Petro-Canada has nothing to do with the Federal Government. Well, of course, if that PC Government, if the PC Government on the other side and the PE people that got turfed out at the first opportunity in Canada, if they had had their way-and their statements are on the record-if they had had their way, there would be no Petro-Canada, Mr. Speaker, no Petro-Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: And if you look at the content, Mr. Speaker- and this is a great public relations job- but if you look at the contents, not a nickle, not a single nickle in this is being spent by the Provincial Government. They are great at taking credit, great at standing up, great, Mr. Speaker, on making a statement, but there is not a nickle, not a nickle to be spent by the Provincial Government. All

MR. STIRLING: Federal dollars, all Liberal, good Liberal philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A good Liberal philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: The Premier is finally realizing he is a Liberal.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Done unilaterally, Mr. Speaker, unilaterally yes. They did not have the permission of all the Provinces, they kept it going unilaterally, Petro-Canada, now the prime mover in exploration off the coast of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. A great day for this House of Assembly, a great day for the Mines and Energy Minister (L. Barry) that he can get up and be the public relations arm for Petro-Canada. We whole-heartedly support it, Mr. Speaker. The only thing that we suggest is that the day come when they operate this Labrador operation from Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier that arises from his Ministerial Statement. Do I take it from the Premier that getting the power corridor across Quebec, which is what he wanted, is not enough and that there are now going to be delays while he attempts to get the right to wheel power by the Federal Government? Do I take it that what he has asked for, now that he has got it, he is saying that is still not enough and that the Churchill Falls Development will not start to take place until he gets wheeling right?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) has not been well informed about the statement from the federal government over the weekend. As I understand it, it is that they are not going to introduce legislation immediately, unfortunately. We would like for them to introduce that legislation in this session, this week or this month, before it closes down for the Summer.

We have now a commitment in principal from PASNY for delivering power to New York State, so we are prepared to get into final negotiations with a whole bunch of customers, including PASNY for that. But the federal government has now indicated an intent to introduce legislation. They have also said, and I had a telex from the Prime Minister to show this, that they are not going to introduce it until the Fall at the earliest. So when the Leader of the Opposition talks about this government delaying something, he should understand that the federal government themselves have no intention, as I understand it, of introducing this legislation until the Fall.

This is a very important first step and recognizes and acknowledges the fight and the argument that we have been making for the last two years that we should have the same right as other Canadians to transmit our energy products across neighbouring provinces. So we recognize it, as I said in my statement, as an important first step, but since last October we have been negotiating with the Prime Minister's office, with Mr. LaLonde's office, with the Department of Justice, with the Department of Finance and people in our own government for two things; that the existing Quebec system - we will pay our way, but if power from Labrador can be transmitted across the existing Quebec system, we will pay for whatever it costs us to transmit it across that system - we do not want anything free, we will pay our way - then that

PREMIER PECKFORD: should be used as well as a power corridor because that will allow for short term supplies to be provided to the United States market, or wherever the market happens to be.

If the corridor itself, whilst a significant step forward, still makes the Province of Newfoundland vulnerable to having to provide large blocks of power for a long period of time, in other words, it resembles the Upper Churchill contract in that context, and we do not want to have to be totally committed to just that avenue so we would like to see an addition- and we have said this since last October, I can table all the proposals that we have put forward which had to do with a corridor as well as the existing Quebec system which can take - and we will pay our way - certain amounts of power along their existing system which will make it more advantageous for Canada, more advantageous for Newfoundland in the sale of power to the United States without having to get into a long term, long block of power.

There has been movement and we are glad that the federal government has finally recognized what we have said for two years. And we have argued strongly, we have stood on our rights, I argued with the Prime Minister right up to the last day of the Constitutional Conference on that matter, and we are glad to see that they have acknowledged that - federal bureaucrats have right from the start, to give the bureaucrats credit, they really have.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Most of the people in the Prime Minister's Office, who advise the Prime Minister, most of the people in Mr. Lalonde's office, in the Intergovernmental Affairs office up there, as well as others, have recognized the rights that Newfoundland has here if we are going to be treated as other Canadians. But if we are going to make sure we maximize Canadian power out of Labrador, then we cannot be left suspect and vulnerable to large blocks of power for long periods of time, that if we are going to be treated as equal Canadians in that case, if we are going to be full-fledged Canadians then we should be able to provide power sales across the Quebec system that is available to us, paying our way as we get those sales West from Labrador. We do not want anything from Quebec, we will pay our way, but that existing system is very important for short term, small blocks of power. If that is done, as well as what has now been proposed to be done, then we will be equal, full-fledged in this Confederation and the congratulations today will be given again tomorrow as soon as those kinds of additional amendments are made to the National Energy Board Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I take it that we have a commitment from the Premier now to table all the documents, all the correspondence that he has had since that date that he mentioned last Fall, up until the present time. He said that he could table it, he said it in a speech last week that he would table it, but I have not seen the documents. Do I now understand that you will table those documents and the letters that you mentioned dealing with officials?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is very unusual of the Leader of the Opposition because the first question was answered so

PREMIER PECKFORD: comprehensively that he did not come back on any of the points that he asked in his initial question, but now diverts the attention of the House to whether am I going to table the documents or not. But given that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) has no grounds on which to ask a supplementary based upon the substance -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - then there is no question I will table, and I had so indicated already before the Leader of the Opposition even raised it. But let it be noted that the Leader of the Opposition's supplementary question on the original question, bears very scanty resemblance to the original question in its substance in the sense that we - he is, as well as I am, the Liberal Party and the Liberal Opposition are as convinced as I am, that if we are going to be equal Canadians we also need that wheeling right as well as the power corridor. But to answer him directly, no question, we will table the proposals that we have made to the federal authorities to allow for the wheeling as well as the corridor.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier gets carried away with his rhetoric he has from time to time made kinds of statements like this. Like last week, Mr. Speaker, he made a statement in which he had provided documentations for how much we are paying to Canada; he still has not documented, or tabled, that study. And that is why I wanted to be specific. Because, Mr. Speaker, my information is that he has not had any of these meetings and that it is a fabrication of somebody's mind. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, once it is documented then that will take away any of the argument.

June 23, 1981

Tape No. 2703

NM - 3

MR. STIRLING:

Now I understand - getting back to the main question since the Premier is so anxious to get on supplementary questions out of the main question - as I understand what he is saying now is that he did not start or make the assumption a year ago that he would be given this power corridor, and now what he

MR. STIRLING:

is talking about is a power corridor across Quebec, plus the right to use Quebec's own power system just the same way as we have a power system and Newfoundland Telephone and Newfoundland Light, what we are talking about is a right to use somebody else's system in addition to the power corridor. Is that what I understand the Premier to say?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Since the Leader of the Opposition was suppose to have pulled off this coup over the weekend,

I find it incredible that he asks such elementary questions on a very basic issue for Newfoundland rights and as it relates to hydro transmission. I find it absolutley incredible. Now, that is number one. Number two, on the question of my rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, it is not rhetoric, Newfoundlanders are not getting tired of it. If the hon.

member wants to see a number of polls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We will stand up for Newfoundland's rights, and that is what rhetoric is all about, Mr. Speaker, standing up for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let the non-Newfoundlanders and non-Labradorians opposite choose their own seats, Mr. Speaker. We are here to stand up for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in the Confederation, equal to other provinces, no more, no less.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now I can only take it that the Leader of the Opposition did not understand my answers up to now. I am saying to the Leader of the Opposition that if we are to have fullfledged equality within the Canadian Confederation as a Province of Canada-which we ask for, which we request- and for the Leader of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Opposition to say that he cannot believe that we had meetings. We initiated meetings through the Prime Minister's office, for the Leader of the Opposition's benefit -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: - Because the other members on the other side, I am sure, have already accepted the words that are written down in this Ministerial Statement. Now the Leader of the Opposition has not, but I am sure the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) has, I am sure the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has, I am sure the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) has, and other members on the opposite side have accepted that we last year initiated discussions with the Prime Minister's office and the first meeting after those discussions were initiated, and I mentioned this in the House last week, we had discussions in -

MR. STIRLING: You said you were going to table them.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will table them. We have had discussions in St. John's on February 9, 1981. That was the first fullfledged meeting. That was in my statement today. And then the next meetings were held on March 10, 1981 in Ottawa. So meetings have been held and our proposals have been put forward and I will table tomorrow, or make sure it is tabled if I am not here tomorrow, the relevant correspondence and the kind of proposals we put forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get to the nub of the issue, it is simply this, that if there is a surplus on the Quebec system - which there is and it has been identified - then we want -

MR. STIRLING: Did you table that too?

PREMIER PECKFORD: - through the Natural Energy Board - we will give the proposals.

MR. STIRLING: Will you table them?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I did not say a word when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) asked the question. I would ask him the same courtesy to me in answering the question. Can I answer the question, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, therefore, if we are to have the same kind of equality throughout Canada as other provinces now enjoy, we wish to pay our way and have an impartial body adjudicate it, not Newfoundland adjudicate it, but an agency of the federal government, the National Energy Board will decide; not an agency of the Province, an agency of the federal government decide upon the legitimacy, the price of wheeling that power across an existing Quebec system. We will pay our way on that score. We are not asking for something for nothing. We will pay our way on that system. That will allow us to get out of that historic and traditional way of dealing with other provinces and other countries whereby we have to sell large blocks of resources for a long period of time in order for us to be able to make it work and to capitalize our construction costs. We are asking for those two elements; a power corridor, which has been acknowledged and hopefully which will become federal legislation, and we are now asking, which we asked for last October, last February and March past, for the same thing as it relates to the existing system, so that we can get out of that historic role of being somehow subservient and having to give away everything over a long period of time. We want to have the same kind of manoeuvrability as we have always had. We have said that from the start, we are saying it now and we will continue to say it, but we do acknowledge that the federal government has agreed with us on what we have

PREMIER PECKFORD: advocated over the last two years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

Mr. Speaker, the National Sea operation in Piccadilly has locked out its employees and they have been shipping fish to other parts of the South-west coast of the Island and the plant is now down in the height of the fishing season and is causing great economic hardship in that particular area. I was wondering if the minister was aware of the situation and has he anybody that is monitoring this particular situation?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, yes, I am aware of it because yesterday evening the matter was brought to my attention by my colleague, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and again this morning by the hon. member for the area - Piccadilly is in his district - and upon the representations from the two members, the member for Stephenville, and the member who asked the question, we have been in contact with the company, National Sea Products and, of course, National Sea has been operating that Piccadilly facility under a lease from the Newfoundland government and they have been primarily involved in a salting operation, a saltfish operation. They tell us that the reason why they have been trucking out the smaller fish from the area is because it is not suitable

MR. MORGAN:

for salting and they are taking it out for processing into a fresh fish product in places like Triton, in particular, trucking it over across to the Northeastern coast of the Province. They have informed us this morning that they are willing to carry on their normal operations at Piccadilly; however, the employees of the plant, because they were opposed to the trucking of this fish to be processed in the fresh frozen state, the opposition was so great from the employees that they forced the close-down of the plant. I understand from the company that they are willing to go back and commence again the normal operations of salting fish; however, the fish that is not suitable for salting will be trucked out to be further processed in the fresh frozen plants in Triton and possibly in - I think it was mentioned, in Jackson's Arm, in particular, In other plants they have where there is a fresh filleting operation ongoing, they will take the smaller fish from Piccadilly and process it in these plants.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: I would point out to the minister that the smaller fish which the minister is talking about and which the company is talking about are fish under twenty-four inches, and I am told that this represents about 70 per cent of the catch that is coming out of Port au Port at the present time, from talking to the fishermen and the type of fish that is coming in. So basically what the company has asked the employees to do is to ship their jobs out of Port au Port. In other words, there will be nobody working in that plant. The plant is a fresh fish facility although they are an agent for the Salt Fish Corporation.

MR. HODDER: But at the height of the fishing season, National Sea has decided that they will ship fresh fish, when they have that capacity in Port au Port, away from the district. Now, we know that this district has one of the highest unemployment rates in Newfoundland and I would ask the minister if he would consider using the same tactics in this case as he talked about last year in the case of Nickerson's and National Sea, that if the company does not process to the satisfaction of the people and in the area in which they have been given their licence, that their licence be taken away.

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

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see that the Opposition members are now recognizing the importance of having a local preference policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Because, Mr. Speaker, although it may be a bit more parochial than the Province-wide preference policy with regard to hiring Newfoundlanders, the principle is indeed the very same whereby the member is asking that preference be given to employees from his own local area of Port au Port - Piccadilly

MR. MORGAN: and given preference over employees being hired in other parts of the Province to process the fish caught and landed in Piccadilly. It is the same principle, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to see he is now supporting our policy.

But, Mr. Speaker, indeed we view it very seriously that any company that is buying fish from fishermen in our local areas, if they have the necessary facilities there, and we feel they do because we are leasing these facilities owned by the Newfoundland government on a lease arrangement with the company, that unless it is absolutely necessary for that fish to be taken away from Piccadilly to other plants, because the plant is there, because the facility is there in place and can be used for salting operations, we will be monitoring the situation closely over the next couple of days. We have asked our local field staff in the areas to go into the area and talk with the local company officials. We talked to the senior officials this morning from our office in St. John's and if the situation continues, they are going to have to give us a good explanation as to why fish is being taken from the area and not being processed in Piccadilly.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the minister that Piccadilly has a fish plant, Burgeo has a fish plant, Port aux Basques and every other community: Port au Port has a fish plant but unfortunately I see no preference policy when you ask that fish being caught in a particular area where there is a particular fish plant not be processed in that particular area.

MR. HODDER: But forgetting the politics of the situation, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister, in light of the fact that what we have been talking about here for the past few minutes is the plant, but National Sea has done something much more serious to the Port au Port Peninsula. They have a monopoly on the peninsula itself - T.J. Hardy is in the Fox Island River area - and they have now stopped buying fish from the fishermen. Now, at the present time the fish is being shipped off the peninsula down to the Southwest Coast down to King Fisheries. That is not a guaranteed supply. So not only do we have the only fish plant shut down, but we have fishermen who are not guaranteed a processor or a market for their fish, and it is a very tenuous situation. Would the minister look into this aspect of it as well because if Eric King Fisheries were suddenly to get a glut, then all of the fish on the Port au Port Peninsula, twenty-six communities, would not have a buyer for their fish. Would the minister look into that as well?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, indeed I will look into it. The fact is we recognize our responsibility for the processing end of the fishing industry in our Province and we are exercising it to the best of our ability. And fortunately, Mr. Speaker, we do have jurisdiction because if the federal minister has jurisdiction at the present time over the processing sector of the industry, he will be closing down fish plants around the Province. There are too many fish plants in the Province - I quote the Weekend he was here. That is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, he refused to give support to the St. Barbe fish plant, that multi-million dollar plant on the St. Barbe Coast. It is a shame. It is outright discrimination against the residents of the St. Barbe coast, outright discrimination, Mr. Speaker.

June 23, 1981

Tape No. 2707

EL - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

But, indeed, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member points out there is a plant in Piccadilly that

MR. MORGAN: can be utilized. There is no reason why it cannot be utilized. It was leased by the Newfoundland Government to that company, National Sea, for the very purpose of being utilized and to use local people in the area. At the same time, more importantly, in fact, it was to accommodate markets for the fishermen in the Piccadilly area, and the Port au Port area, generally. So as I can now assure the House and the hon. gentleman, we will monitor the situation very closely over the next twenty-four hours and have further consultation and talks with the company in the hope the matter can be resolved between the company and the local employees, and get that plant back in operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries as well, Mr. Speaker, and it pertains to the whales that are around the province. There seems to be a large number of whales this year, more than any other year, the fishermen tell me -

MR. NEARY: And there is the biggest whale of all over there, look, a beluga.

MR. HANCOCK: The fishermen are getting fed up with the treatment that they have been getting in the past and they told me over the weekend they are soon going to take their guns and shoot the whales. So we are going to have blood bath in the district that I represent. I would like to know what the minister is doing about it in his own department so that we will not have that kind of a scene this coming Summer?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have been reading copies of correspondence going back and forth from the hon. gentleman from St. Mary's - The Capes district (Mr. Hancock) to the federal Minister of Fisheries and I am somewhat disappointed to see that he has no influence with his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) in Ottawa, on behalf of his fishermen in St. Mary's - The Capes district. Because yesterday morning, in fact, listening to the local Open-Line show on the VOXM network, the numerous fishermen calling in complaining about the fact they are having their fishing gear destroyed or damaged again this year by whales, they were all wondering why, and what has happened to the programme announced last Fall by the federal minister when he came into the Province and addressed the fishermen at a Fishermen's Union convention here in St. John's and, indeed, announced a compensation programme for whales.

Now, if he is going to put the programme in place, all we are saying is get the programme in place now because the damage is occurring now. The fishermen are suffering the consequences again of the neglect of federal government policy which they should have put in place since they have jurisdiction over our fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Every time we run into a problem in this Province with the fishery, Mr. Speaker, it is blame it on Ottawa. I do not know why we need a local department of Fisheries to begin with. But I would ask the

MR. HANCOCK: minister at this time, does he support the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Andrews) when he is going to try to promote the whaling industry as a tourist attraction to the people of this Province? How does the minister feel about that problem, or this problem we are going to be faced with where we have the Minister of Tourism promoting it as a tourist attraction? Does he agree with it or not?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on the first part of the question the fact is that it seems whenever there is a problem of any magnitude with the fishing industry under federal jurisdiction, when they will not act in Ottawa, they automatically ask us to take over and spend money on their jurisdiction. That is what happens every time. The fact is that in 1972 the country of Canada imposed a ban on the killing and hunting of whales in our country, in our waters. It was Canada which took the initiative. So Canada should hold some responsibility with regard to either bringing back the hunting and killing

MR. MORGAN:

of whales, allowing a certain quota to be taken of these whales in our waters each year, or to compensate the fishermen who are suffering the consequences of having these whales in our inshore waters and having substantial damages caused to their fishing gear. For example, I talked to a fisherman this morning and he had a cod trap totally destroyed, it costs \$6,000 or \$7,000 to replace. It is not a very funny matter to these fishermen because they could very well lose their total inshore fishing season this Summer, right now. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is asking us what action we are taking. We have been taking action for the last number of months by having an Assistant Deputy Minister on a committee appointed by the federal minister who led the Newfoundland, who led the Newfoundland Fishermen's Food and Allied Workers Union, who led the fishermen of our Province to believe that there would be a compensation programme put in place by the beginning of the inshore fishing season this year. However, for some strange reason, unknown to us and unknown to the Newfoundland fishermen, Mr. LaBlanc has now backed off on that compensation programme.

MR. HANCOCK: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: I have never seen a man be so evasive in my life, Mr. Speaker. I asked him a straightforward question; did he agree with the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Andrews) when the Minister of Tourism wants to promote the whaling industry as a tourist attraction to the people of this Province? On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the minister inform - he may have better contacts in Ottawa than I have - I understand that the programme may be finalized this week-or it may not be, I hope it is; if not I will be taking a strip

MR. HANCOCK: off the federal Minister of Fisheries as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HANCOCK: You can mark that in your book, Mr. Speaker, But I told Ottawa I wanted an answer by the end of next week or I am going to come down on the side of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) here and I have to defend the people I was elected to defend, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HANCOCK: I would ask the minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HANCOCK: - the proposal that has been put up, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is a cost shared programme, is the Province going to get involved at all, or is it going to be strictly Ottawa? Would the minister inform us as to whether or not this is going to be a cost shared programme for compensation for fishermen affected by whales, or are you willing to participate in the programme?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly answer that question because I am pleased he asked that question, because there has been some criticism of us removing the half cent subsidy we had on fish prices back in 1979 which was used as a gear replacement subsidy. We took it off for one reason, Mr. Speaker, to have available to us funds which we could use and put in place with a federal government overall gear insurance programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), I get calls every day from his fishermen out there who are fed up with his representation. If he wants to listen carefully, he should, because his fishermen are very concerned over his lack of concerns on their behalf. And, Mr. Speaker

MR. MORGAN: we took off the half cent subsidy and we put in place, Mr. Speaker, a funding available for an overall fishing gear insurance programme. That programme was approved by the Fishermen's Union of our Province, the Fishermen's Union and ourselves put forward to Ottawa this programme, a proposal to the federal minister as long as twelve months ago; last June, in fact, it was put forward to

MR. J. MORGAN: Ottawa for an overall fishing gear insurance programme which would see the Newfoundland Government participate financially, the federal government take part financially, as well and we are looking forward to the guidance and leadership of the Fishermen's Union to do the administering of this kind of an insurance programme. For some strange reason again, Mr. Speaker, for some strange reason - maybe it is because he is going to move to a new portfolio, I do not know what it is in Ottawa-but for some strange reason, Mr. LeBlanc is again ignoring the wishes of the fishermen.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile.

We have about a minute remaining.

MR. S. NEARY: I will yield to my colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile

(Mr. Neary) yields. The hon. member for St. Mary's -  
The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, if the provincial government is going to promote the whaling industry as a tourist attraction to people outside this Province, does he not feel that they have a responsibility to live up to and look after the fishermen who have been affected by whale damage?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the question would be probably be better posed to my colleague, the minister responsible for tourism. But I am sure that if there are any means and ways of this government obtaining funds from any source at all, any source of revenue, they are going to take the initiative to get that means of revenue. And in this case if it would happen to be that whales were in the inshore waters and because they are under federal jurisdiction people

MR. J. MORGAN: from Ontario, from Alberta, from Winnipeg or from Manitoba want to see these whales, well, sure, why not! Why should not the Department of Tourism arrange for these people to see these whales?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: But the fact is, Mr. Speaker -

MR. L. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. J. MORGAN: The hon. gentlemen for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), his fishermen were in last week in my office and they said they have not seen the hon. gentlemen since he got elected two years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of Ways and Means on the Budget Debate. The last day we were debating the amendment proposed by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). The debate was then adjourned by the hon. the Premier. He is not here, so we will recognize now the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Premier decided not to come back and enter into the debate today? He got into the last fifteen minutes of the Budget debate, made some comments about secret meetings that he had been having with Ottawa, but he was very disappointed, did not think that he was going to get what he was looking for out of these secret meetings. He has now sort of

MR. L. STIRLING:           withered away and has given up his right to speak in the Budget debate.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost two years - out of courtesy to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would like to conclude his remarks on the Budget debate, I will yield if I do not lose my right to speak, if that is agreed?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Everytime the hon. gentleman, speaks there are the votes for us.

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

MR. L. STIRLING:           I take it that the Premier does not -

MR. L. BARRY:               (Inaudible) recognized (inaudible).

MR. L. STIRLING:           Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The very co-operative, courteous Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has somehow today got his nasty pills. A most unlikely candidate for being nasty.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost two years to the day - just a few days -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) see you go.

MR. STIRLING: You know more about losing leadership races than anybody on this side.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost two years to the day since this government was elected - two or three days ago. In those two years, Mr. Speaker, we should have seen Newfoundland and Labrador take full advantage of its position as a Province of Canada. What better could you hope for, Mr. Speaker? Two years ago, a brand new government, great advertising campaign, elected on the basis that they could cooperate with Ottawa, a P.C. Government in Ottawa and a P.C. Government in Newfoundland, we were in the land of milk and honey.

Mr. Speaker, the very first act of this government that could co-operate so fully with the P.C. Government in Ottawa was to call the P.C. Minister of Fisheries a traitor.

Mr. Speaker, we saw in the attitude of the government from that day forward a government that became the victim, the very first victim of our greed associated with offshore oil. Suddenly, Mr. Speaker, this government had to have all of the power, all of the benefits, all of the jurisdiction.

MR. PATTERSON: Shared powers. Do not get confused now.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the sharing was 100 per cent/ nothing; we own it, nothing further to be debated. And suddenly the Premier and the government became the arrogant confrontationalists and started to plant the first seeds of despair and confusion and insecurity. The attempt to cut himself loose from the Moores years - the first sign of disloyalty and betrayal was when the Premier left the Liberal Party at the invitation of John Crosbie and Frank Moores and was elected a Conservative in 1972. He became a parliamentary

MR. STIRLING: assistant, Mr. Speaker, and then served in the Moores Cabinet, served loyally during the difficult years, years when the Cabinet was torn by the revelations that concluded with the statement in the Mahoney Royal Commission that the government ignored the Public Tendering Act. The Premier, Mr. Peckford, had many occasions when he could have resigned over information contained in the Minutes of the Cabinet meetings; however, he remained loyal to Premier Moores, did not disclose what was happening in the Cabinet and did not resign from the Cabinet.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, most parliamentarians who can handle debate in the House normally speak without reading a speech. The hon. gentleman is now reading a speech someone wrote for him. May I ask he table that same speech in the House, please?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the fact that it is a rule of the House that you are not permitted to read a speech, but on most occasions when a speech is being read, especially by a new member, the Speaker and the members of the House turn a -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: A new leader! ar.

MR. NEARY: No, turn a blind eye to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: But I just wanted to draw to the attention of the Chair that only today we saw a

June 23, 1981

Tape 2711

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:  
by the Premier.

Ministerial Statement being read

MR. MORGAN:  
but this is a speech.

Ministerial Statements, yes,

MR. NEARY: No, it is not different,  
Mr. Speaker. That is the same thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was tabled, too.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe it was tabled, but  
the hon. gentleman could have tabled it before he read it for  
that matter. But, Mr. Speaker, this is tradition in the  
House: the hon. gentleman is not reading a speech, nobody  
wrote a speech for the hon. gentleman; the hon. gentleman  
is merely using notes as reference, Mr. Speaker, and copious  
notes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - at that and as far as I know  
that is in order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I certainly do  
not believe that there is a valid point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it is most amusing,  
really amusing, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)  
gets concerned that I am reading from -

MR. MORGAN: Table it (inaudible) hon. member.

MR. STIRLING: - some notes. Now, Mr. Speaker,  
the reason that I have a few notes prepared is that I want to  
make sure that I am being correct, that I am being so  
concerned that I am giving the members full credit and that  
they are accurate. And I was talking about the loyalty,  
Mr. Speaker, of the Premier and I can understand that the  
Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would be very concerned  
about the fact that he would like to disassociate himself  
from the Moores' years, from the years when he was a member  
of that Cabinet, and concerned that - that minister had the  
unique distinction from those Moores' years of being the

MR. STIRLING: minister, Mr. Speaker, that had to appear before the Public Accounts Committee and was judged by four -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) hon. gentleman (inaudible) Deputy Mayor (inaudible) had to insure all buildings in St. John's. Account for that, now, as Deputy Mayor.

MR. STIRLING: - members on their side and four members on this side of finding that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. HODDER: Smear! Smear!

MR. MORGAN: Buying a condominium down in Florida with Mr. Johnson.

MR. HODDER: Smear, smear. You always were.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) Deputy Mayor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - has been found to have contravened the Public Tendering Act.

MR. MORGAN: Tell us the facts.

MR. STIRLING: Probably one of the things that if a man had any decency, Mr. Speaker, if there was an item of decency, a man who has a reputation for breaking the Public Tendering Act was found to be -

MR. MORGAN: Who (inaudible)?

MR. THOMS: Knowingly.

MR. STIRLING: - knowingly broke the Public Tendering Act.

MR. TULK: A smear artist.

MR. MORGAN: St. John's insurance (inaudible) a fine place (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are jealous, that is all.

MR. HODDER:

Do not let them get you. Do not  
let them get you.

MR. MORGAN:

If he would do that as Deputy  
Mayor, what would he do as Premier?

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, in those past two  
years the Premier remained loyal to the twelve members of the  
former Cabinet and, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries  
(Mr. Morgan) who was a member of the twelve members, the only  
person who could have taken action -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Say that outside the House!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order!

Order, please! Order, please!

I will have to ask the Minister  
of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to restrain himself.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Name him!

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, just recently it was revealed in this House of Assembly that the unanimous opinion of the Labour Relations Board, a board having the same jurisdiction as a court under the Labour Relations Act, found that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) had attempted to intercede and influence the board.

Mr. Speaker, members of the IBEW, the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers, the Construction Trades Council, NAPE, all said that they had no confidence, and the Premier continued to remain loyal to his former colleague in the Moores' Government and did not ask for his resignation. Premier Moores must have wondered why the sudden change of attitude when Premier Peckford severed all connections with him.

The next person to become a victim was Jim McGrath when he was the Minister of Fisheries in the PC Government of Joe Clark. He was named a traitor. And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier set out to tie his wagon to three motherhood issues; offshore gas and oil, the fishery and energy. Mr. Speaker, when he realized he had gone too far with his anti-Canada separatist view, he denied press reports, Mr. Speaker, in which twelve reporters, including Canadian Press, reported that he would conduct a referendum to see if Newfoundland wished to separate.

In the past two years, Mr. Speaker, and again in this budget, regardless of all the public relations statements, and all the news media comment, the actions or the lack of action, scream loudly that this government, if this government had its way, we would never have joined Confederation in 1949. As a matter of fact, it would be interesting to speculate who would be the leader of the Anti-Confederates if that vote was taken today. Who would be the one saying

MR. STIRLING: Newfoundland has its rights, Newfoundland to be restored to responsible government, Newfoundland to have its fishery, Newfoundland to have its offshore, and Newfoundland to be the independent dominion of Newfoundland? Who would be leading that Anti-Confederate fight? Despite all of the pretence, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is by the government's own Five Year Plan and a report from APEC, this Province will be standing still until 1984 or until this -

MR. J. CARTER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I am quite interested in what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is saying, but if he is reading his speech I must insist that it be tabled at some point after he is finished speaking. Because there is a rule in this House; you may read whatever you like, even if it is unparliamentary, I suppose, but it must be tabled at some point or as soon as possible after it has been read. And he is obviously reading something.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That is the same point of order that arose before and the Chair ruled that there was no point of order. As I understand it, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is referring to some notes that he has made and therefore it is not a verbatim report from a speech on the table and would not require tabling.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. THOMS: You are not allowed to use a lectern in the House either, so why do you not mention that to little Alfie the next time he does that?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the documents, Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to table in just a minute. Mr. Speaker, one of the documents I will be pleased to table is this one that I quote from, Mr. Speaker, and I am very pleased to table the documents. "Dear Voter, How many time have you heard the Opposition member say he can do nothing? There will not be a general election for another eighteen to twenty-four months. The by-election is on Friday. You can vote for an Opposition candidate, who can do nothing, or you can vote for Jim Peddle, who can work with me to improve Bellevue district and Newfoundland. If you do not like Jim Peddle's performance or mine before the next general election, you can vote him out and me with him. The choice is yours. Vote for a chance or vote for little or nothing. I challenge you to give Jim Peddle and me a chance. Are you up to the challenge? Sincerely yours, Brian Peckford, Premier" - on the Premier's letterhead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in tabling this because when we tried to bring it up at a time before, it was not the proper place in which to do it, and Mr. Speaker did not accept that we should table it. But now that my colleagues are so concerned that anything that is quoted be tabled, let it be shown that we have tabled now, it is now in the record, the letter which the Premier wrote, which he successfully stopped us from tabling right after the Bellevue by-election, a position that shows a new low.

MR. STIRLING: There has never been - we talk about comparing with Premiers in Canada, challenges us to compare him with any other province.

Mr. Speaker, there has never been a Premier in Canada on the eve of a by-election who ever wrote such a blatant blackmail letter, an indication of the attitude of the government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: What has this got to do with the Budget Speech?

MR. STIRLING: You wanted me to table the letter, I tabled it for you.

MR. CARTER: What has this got to do with the Budget Speech?

MR. STIRLING: Well, the Budget Speech has to do with the attitude of the government. Mr. Speaker, we have to deal with in the Budget what is the attitude of the government? What is the attitude of the people on that side? We have seen myth number one destroyed here today, Mr. Speaker, myth number one, which was put out in all kinds of material, Mr. Speaker, put out here in one case paid for by the member Harbour Main-Bell Island (N. Doyle).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) that.

MR. STIRLING: No. This one, though, Mr. Speaker, put out in all of the liquor stores, I presume paid for by the government.

MR. \_\_\_\_\_: Yes, it was.

MR. STIRLING: Another one sent out to the household called The Challenge - Developing the 80's, The Constitution Act, Hang Tough, Our Christmas Stocking, sharing among equals, all pieces of propaganda and every one of them referring to this government wanting the right to have a power corridor across Quebec; that that was going to be the solution. Our

MR. STIRLING: last chance, a government that brings on, time and time again, the belief that they there is only one chance, that this government is the only chance.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that the people of Newfoundland will have seen the government caught in their own propaganda machine. They have convinced every Newfoundlander, every Labradorian that the only answer to our problem was if only we could get a power corridor across Quebec. And now, Mr. Speaker, we do not want a power corridor across Quebec anymore, that is not what we really wanted. That was simple. Everybody could understand that in

MR. STIRLING:

Newfoundland we had the right to have a power corridor across Quebec. That was something that everybody could understand.

MR. TULK:

Now he wants Quebec's power corridor.

MR. STIRLING:

And the Prime Minister said, 'Yes, we can understand it, we agree with it'. When we came into the constitutional debate, things that were important to Newfoundland, the federal government brought up a Constitution, set up a series of meetings to deal with amendments to the Constitution. This government took the attitude, we will ignore those committees, we will ignore the federal government and in collusion with eight others, they put forward their proposals for constitutional reform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the issues that are important to Newfoundland? And what happened to them under the federal government's constitutional proposals and the provincial government's proposals under the accord? Under the federal government proposals this power corridor across Quebec was settled once and for all, it was clearly said that you could transport services, goods, people across provincial boundaries. What did the accord say? Nothing, Mr. Speaker, it did not deal with the issue. They abandoned Newfoundland on Quebec's corridors.

What did it have to do in the accord with the offshore? Mr. Speaker, as much as the government would dislike the idea, on both sides of this House we are in favour of ownership of the offshore. They do not like it. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is there. They do not like that idea, they want it to be only theirs but it has always been the provincial government's position.

Mr. Speaker, where did it come up in the accord, the eight provincial Premiers? Where did the Premier get that in? He did not put it in, Mr. Speaker, no mention of the offshore, no mention of the fisheries, no

MR. STIRLING: mention of shared jurisdiction. So, Mr. Speaker, this Premier had an opportunity with his eight other provincial Premiers, to do something in that accord for Newfoundland and there was nothing in it, Mr. Speaker. He abandoned Newfoundland in the accord.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us come back and talk about the budget.

MR. HANCOCK: Tell them about Come by Chance. We will soon have that over. One more trip to Ottawa and you will have that over.

MR. STIRLING: No, that is a surprise. Do not let them know that yet.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) did not hear me so they are safe.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the government's own five year plan tells the truth about their views about Quebec power. They do not really want a power corridor across Quebec, Mr. Speaker. That is not what they wanted, that is what they put out to the people of Newfoundland because, yes, that sounds like something that everybody can relate to. What they really want with Quebec is they want somebody else to force Quebec to allow us to use their power system to transport Newfoundland power just in the same way as this government would be very excited about allowing Quebec to use our transmission system. Can you imagine it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, in this budget we have seen the government take the gasoline tax, which in this Province is already high enough, and change it to a percentage tax. Mr. Speaker, we have an 11 per cent retail sales tax but on gasoline we now have a 22 per cent retail sales tax. Everytime gasoline and oil goes up, Mr. Speaker, the tax will go up and this government benefits from the increase.

The government's own plan says that the Province simply does not have the fiscal capacity to deliver the desired level of public services and will not within the five year period. For any substantial improvement

MR. STIRLING:

we will have to look beyond 1984.

Mr. Speaker, what are the things that are important in this Province that we should be paying attention to? We should be working with Ottawa in so many areas, Mr. Speaker. This business of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) getting up and attacking Nova Scotia, attacking Ottawa, attacking the Fishermen's Union, attacking anyone who comes in sight, simply because everyone has lost confidence in his ability as a Fisheries' Minister. And, Mr. Speaker, we need a lot more of joint development in this Province. Our whole forestry programme,

MR. L. STIRLING:

the Labrador roads programme, all of the fisheries programme, this whole area, Mr. Speaker, needs two governments. We are acting in a vacuum here in Newfoundland. We are acting as though everything had to come through the provincial government when, by their own admission, their own Five Year Plan says they do not have the ability, they do not have the money to be able to bring up the level of services in the next five years. The only way that we are going to be able to develop, Mr. Speaker, is jointly in co-operation with Ottawa. And I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, in forestry look at the co-operation; 90 per cent of the money being spent in forestry is being spent by the federal government. The whole area of the fisheries; all of the money being spent is federal government money. The offshore development; there is not a nickel except on the staff of the Petroleum Directorate. That is the only contribution by the provincial government to the offshore, the staff of the Petroleum Directorate.

Mr. Speaker, there is no money being spent anywhere in the offshore development. It is federal money. Mr. Speaker, we have to work together. We saw in the statement today, again a repeat by this government, that they just could not resist the temptation to have to kick Ottawa in the head on a day in which Ottawa made a tremendous concession, a tremendous concession by giving the rights to Newfoundland to transmit power across Quebec. In every area the Liberal government, the federal Liberal government has shown their willingness to work with the provincial government. But this government, Mr. Speaker, cannot work with anyone. They could not work with NAPE, NAPE had to go on a hunger strike to get the

MR. L. STIRLING: money that they needed. The educators, the teachers - the educators actually had to take a strike vote, they actually had to tell the Province they were prepared to go on strike, they had to bring that strike vote in in order to get any kind of negotiations from the Treasury Board.

The fishermen, Mr. Speaker, last Summer were on strike for the whole Summer simply because this government refused to face up to the facts of life and set up a royal commission. The Summer was over before they did it. All over this Province people are looking for some evidence that the government is concerned about them, concerned about people, concerned about people in senior citizens homes, concerned about people who do not have jobs, who cannot get jobs, people who are living on dirt roads who cannot get even calcium chloride to be used to keep the dust down, a government that has abandoned any kind of an expansion of the provincial parks system. Everywhere where people are involved they have been cut back and cut off, Mr. Speaker. And there is a general feeling around this Province that the only thing this government is concerned about is what happens here in St. John's and dealing with the offshore oil. A government, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave, by leave!

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this Budget is a Budget that abandons the management of the Province. The government - it is just like the order of business in this House. Mr. Speaker, the Budget was late coming in, The Budget was an Interim Supply Bill, unheard of, a three-month Interim Supply Bill. There is business in this House, Mr. Speaker, that has not even been brought in, that we still have to pass. In Nova Scotia, Mr.

June 23, 1981

Tape No. 2716

DW - 3

MR. L. STIRLING:

Speaker, they are meeting morning,  
noon and night in order to pass the business of the House.  
This government will not meet at night, they are gentlemen  
and gentlemen

MR. STIRLING: do not have to work at night. They do not work at night, Mr. Speaker, they will not have night sittings of this House. They have decided that they want to pass the legislation without debate. Well, Mr. Speaker, that cannot happen. We are meeting only three hours a day and they want forty pieces of legislation passed, some of which they have not even brought into the House.

MR. MARSHALL: Not so. That is not so.

MR. HODDER: Forty-seven.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: Oh, is that right? Well, Mr. Speaker, in that case, if we are only going to debate the ones that have been brought into the House, then we have the Order Paper changed considerably because the last check we had we were missing some twenty bills from the Order Paper. But that may change. And if we are not going to bring that in then fine, we will not bring it in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. Leader has one minute left.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) gladly give him another thirty seconds by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I said once before, and I will say that history will record, that when they

MR. STIRLING: record the overall impression of this government, it will be one of deception, Mr. Speaker, a government of deception.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question on the amendment? Those in favour of the amendment signify by saying 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary, 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

Is the House ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the main motion; however, Mr. Speaker, there were a couple of comments made this afternoon I would like to take the opportunity in the - and, you know, if people really insist, I will speak for thirty minutes if you really want me to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) this afternoon made a statement concerning me and the amount of time that I spent in the district. I would like to correct it.

MR. CARTER: Which was not time.

MR. THOMS: There is the same type of comment again.

He also said that he had a group of fishermen in his office who told him that I had not visited the district of Grand Bank since the election back in 1979.

MR. MORGAN: No, you have not been seen in the riding.

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is one of the greatest when it comes to slinging mud and dirt across the House of Assembly. I suggest, before he starts making some of those statements, that he check with some of his colleagues and, if necessary, Mr. Speaker, I will ask Your Honour for an affidavit. Your Honour knows, because Your Honour was in the district with me since the election in 1979.

MR. NEARY: I was there too, by the way.

MR. THOMS: I will just name you the people on the other side of the House - the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) was in the district with me since the election in 1979. And, Mr. Speaker, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) has been in the district with me since the election in 1979. I do not know, there may have been others on the other side of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to sit in this House and hear statements and accusations made by the Minister of Fisheries as to when or if not, I visited the district of Grand Bank. And neither do I like to hear that these statements are coming allegedly from fishermen in

MR. THOMS: the district when I know they are not. And if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) thinks that the district of Grand Bank is not in good shape, if they happen to believe that it is not in good shape from a Liberal Party point of view, then let this administration call an election and see what happens in the district of Grand Bank. The Minister of Fisheries is looking for another district. He is finished in Bonavista South. I do not mind. If he wants to run in the district of Grand Bank, let him run in the district of Grand Bank. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand here, and sit here in this House of Assembly and hear accusations made by the Minister of Fisheries, thrown across the House, without challenging them. Because they do not happen to be correct. And I do not want to hear it unless he is prepared to back it up.

I am prepared to back it up, I am prepared to back it up with statements from his own colleagues in the House. So, Mr. - Mr. Speaker, I mean, what is this? I have not spoken in the Budget debate. I am entitled to speak for thirty minutes. But I will resist the temptation, Mr. Speaker. I understand that we have agreed to let the amendment and the main motion go through. I simply wanted to state that what the Minister of Fisheries alleges in this House, says in this House 99 per cent of the time, is absolute garbage and incorrect.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is the House ready for the main motion? The main motion is that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and means.

All those in favour of the motion, signify by saying "Aye."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Contrary, "Nay."

MR. NEARY:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare that the 'Ayes' have it and therefore the motion is carried:

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have considered the matters to them referred, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, presently, by leave.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I wish to advise that I have received a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: Please rise for a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

The following message is addressed to the Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending 31st. day of March 1982, by way of further supply and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(sgd)-----

Lieutenant-Governor."

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor be referred to the Committee of Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the message of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the total of the estimates contained in the message of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor be carried.

Motion, that the total of the estimates contained in the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be carried, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the amount of \$1,029,485,800 contained in the estimates of supply, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, presently, by leave.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the Committee of Supply with respect to the estimates of 1981-82, together with a resolution and a bill consequent thereto, be referred to a Committee of Ways and

MR. MARSHALL: that you, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair for the purpose of consideration of same.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

RESOLUTION: That is is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1982, the some of one billion twenty-nine million four hundred and eighty-five thousand eight hundred dollars (\$1,029,485,800).

On motion, resolution carried.

On motion, clauses 1 through 3, carried.

On motion, Schedule carried.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Two And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service". (Bill No. 81).

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and report having passed a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to same.

On motion, report received and adopted.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Two And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service" (Bill No. 81), read a first, second and third time, by leave, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion 2, Bill No. 85. I will just take a moment to get it.

Order, please! Bill No. 85.

The first to be considered, the resolution.

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who is presently out of the Province on important public business, I have the duty to introduce the bill that is before the Committee at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a bill for the purpose of raising the tax on tobacco, and is in accordance with the rates that were set down by the Minister of Finance when he delivered his Budget Speech. It is, Mr. Chairman, in concert and in conformity with the Budget Speech, was fully explained in the Budget Speech, so I do not propose to go into a detailed analysis of the bill

MR. MARSHALL:

itself. Instead, Mr. Chairman, it is indicated, for instance, the price of cigars, the new rate will be nine cents and the old rate was seven cents, for instance. And I do not think that this is of any great - well, it is of information if the committee wishes it. So I just introduce the bill on behalf of the Minister of Finance and I will be quite happy, ready, willing and able to answer any questions that hon. members may have with respect to same. However, I will indicate that it is part of the Budget Speech. I assume that it was a matter that was fully discussed, both in the committees of the House and in the Budget Speech itself.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point. I would just like to quote the President of the Council (W. Marshall) when he just spoke in connection with this particular bill. And he says, 'this is not to raise the tax on tobacco, to raise the tax on tobacco.' We have another bill before this House to raise the tax on gasoline. Now, I would also like to quote the Premier of this Province during the June, 1979 election. And at that time it was stated that taxes would not be raised in this Province within the first three years of the term of the present Premier and the present administration.

But here we have the President of the Council stand up and say that this is an act to raise the tax on tobacco. I presume that when the gasoline tax comes in, he will stand up and say that this is a bill to raise the tax on gasoline; that when the amendments to the Companies Act come in, where the registration fees are raised for the people who want to register title to property within this

MR. THOMS: Province, he will stand up and he will say that this is an act to raise the taxes on the registration of deeds and mortgages and conveyances, etc. in this Province. And this is in spite of a commitment by this government, by this administration made in June of 1979, a commitment which was accepted in good faith by the people of this Province, a commitment that said that taxes would not be raised in the first three years of the term of this administration.

Now, what a shock, Mr. Chairman, it must be. And I am not talking here about the tax on tobacco. I mean, if you are going to raise the taxes on anything, tobacco is as good a thing as anything to raise the taxes on. I would like to see the taxes so high that nobody would want to smoke. I have never been convinced of the ill-effects of tobacco on anybody, but there is one thing I know and that it does not do you any good. Therefore, it is a complete wast of money and it is a habit that most people have which is very difficult to break. So, if you are going to put taxes on, then you might as well put it on tobacco.

Gasoline is another matter. Deeds, conveyances, title documents, that is another matter. To put it on the necessities is quite different from putting it on alcohol or from putting it on tobacco. So, I cannot let this opportunity go past, Mr. Chairman, without reminding the people of this Province, without reminding the thirty-two districts, or thirty-three districts that voted for this Tory administration, voted for them in good faith, that ever since they have been elected we see promise after promise gone

MR. THOMS: by the wayside. I happen to believe, Mr. Chairman, that promises that are made during elections are promises that politicians, that governments, that administrations should keep. If they cannot keep them, Mr. Chairman, then they should not be made. And that is why I hold Mr. Trudeau to the statement that he made at the university about the benefits of offshore oil and gas in this Province, about the principle control being in the hands of this Province. It was a commitment that was made prior to and during the 1980 federal election in this country and any watering down of that position I take exception to. I also take exception to the Premier of this Province, to this administration. And believe it or not, although sometimes you wonder,

there is a collective responsibility. Does not the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook), does she not feel for all the people who were fooled during the 1979 election when the Premier promised that there would be no raise in taxes? How about the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Health (Mr. House), the Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands (Mr. Power)? How about the President of the Council himself? Nobody ever doubts, nobody would ever doubt, would dare to doubt the integrity or the intellectual honesty of the President of the Council. Nobody would dare doubt the integrity or the intellectual honesty of the Premier of this Province. So what happens? A promise is made, maybe more than any other promise, that got the Tories elected in this Province on June 18, 1979, and that promise was that there would be no raise in taxes during the first three years. But that promise, Mr. Chairman, as we can see, is gone by the board, it is gone by the board. And apart from this we have had other

MR. THOMS: raises in taxes. Every time the budget is brought in we have raises in taxes. In June of 1979, the Premier of this Province promised the people of this Province that the Come By Chance oil refinery would be open within 90 days. The people of this Province are still waiting for that promise to be kept. The people of this Province - every time a tax bill comes before this House, the people of this Province should feel let down. I am sure it is not the first time it has happened. It may not be the last time it will happen. But promises should not be made by people seeking office unless there is a reasonable chance and they reasonably believe that those promises can be kept. Now, there has never been one more flagrantly voided than this particular promise that was made in June of 1979. And instead of sitting there smiling, laughing at the people of this Province, sneering at the people of this Province, the Premier should be hanging his head in shame.

Mr. Chairman, it is just not tobacco, it is just not alcohol, it just not title documents that the people have to register, but the cost of living in this Province is getting to the point now where people cannot exist any longer. I understand that across Canada, on an average, there are 1000 homes being lost every month - with payments are doubling. Those who were paying less than \$200 on a mortgage payment the interest rates on mortgages today - mortgages becoming mature, they are being remortgaged, renegotiated at a higher price, higher interest rates - they are doubling, and a mortgage payment of \$150 has now gone up to \$400 and people are finding that they cannot

MR. L. THOMS: make the payments. There are an awful lot of average Newfoundlanders right throughout this Province, Mr. Chairman, who are paying mortgage payments of \$600 or \$700 a month. Once the term on these mortgages become due, then in order to save their homes, they are going to have to pay in excess of \$1,000 a month, \$12,000 a year. There are very few, Mr. Chairman, there are very few Newfoundlanders who can afford that kind of a payment together with the payment for food and clothing, telephone, and light. How anybody in this Province can afford to smoke today is beyond me anyway. And, as I said, I sincerely hope that the day will come when there is so much taxes on tobacco that we will be forced to give up smoking all together. But in the meantime, it does not excuse the Premier of this Province making these election promises in June of 1979 and then, without any apologies, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) introduces a bill on behalf of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying that this is an Act - and these are his words - 'This is an Act to raise the tax on tobacco'. Now, I, along with everybody else in Newfoundland, thought that this was a phrase that we were not going to here during the first three years of the present administration's term. That no longer for that three years would the Minister of Finance be getting up and saying that we are going to raise the taxes on this or we are going to raise the taxes on that. I would have assumed that the Premier and this administration would have come in here and would have said that, 'We are going to honour our commitment made in June and we are not going to raise taxes'. But we have, I do not know how many tax bills on the Order Paper.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote against these tax bills. I will vote against these tax bills because I consider them a betrayal of the faith of the

MR. L. THOMS: Newfoundland people in this administration. They have been betrayed by the Premier and by this administration.- the promises made and the promises not kept.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the people of Newfoundland deserve better than this. They deserve much better than this. They do not deserve to be betrayed by this administration and this is exactly what these tax bills are doing and I will not support any tax bills on that basis. Now, there are some I will not support as a matter of principle. I will not support the one amending the Conveyancing Act to raise the fees on

registering title documents. Because there only a certain section, really, of society is being hit, the people who can ill-afford it, the people are paying \$65,000 for a three bedroom bungalow. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) knows how much that same house cost - what? - fifteen or sixteen years ago. When I articulated with the learned gentlemen, you could buy that house for \$18,000 or \$20,000. Today, fifteen years later, that same house costs \$65,000. Young people in this Province can no longer afford a home. The dream home for a young couple in Newfoundland is out of the question. It is gone! It is finished! They are relegated -

MR. J. MORGAN: It is because of high interest rates.

MR. L. THOMS: It is not because of high interest rates. It is not because of high interest rates. But they are relegated to apartment living for the rest of their lives. And what is even worse, Mr. Chairman, is that the majority of those people are relegated not just - they cannot afford the apartments on Lakeview Avenue, they cannot afford the apartments in on Kennedy Road or Logy Bay Road or Prince Philip apartments, they cannot afford the Regency Towers, Mr. Chairman, they are relegated to second-class living accommodations, they are

MR. THOMS: relegated to basement apartments because that is all that they can afford. And here we now, one of the few pleasures that many of us have left, having that being taxed. Registration of title documents being taxed, gasoline being taxed and, you know, where does it end, Mr. Chairman? Where does it end? I mean, how far do we go? How far do we drive the people? I am afraid that we are just on the brink of driving them too far. And there is going to be, there has got to be a re-thinking. We have to re-think our whole position. We have to re-think about where we are taxing and who we are taxing. Because with most of the tax bills that come before this House, who is being hit? Who is being hit? It is the low-income and the middle-income earner in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I realize my ten minutes are up. I am sure there will be somebody else speaking and I will be able to carry on.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the tax on tobacco, when we find taxes going up in this Province all the time, in each Budget it is always - whether it is the Federal or Provincial government, they always put tax on tobacco. I, myself being a non-smoker, do not particularly mind as it does not hit me. But what I am concerned about is the attitude where we keep raising the cost of tobacco because it is considered a luxury. But what I would like to see this government - there is no question that tobacco is being linked to lung cancer, even though people in our Province say that an old gentleman or an old lady ended up smoking all their lives and do not die of cancer so it is

MR. HISCOCK: all foolishness so therefore it is not linked with cancer.

What I would like to see this Provincial Government in taking the tax on tobacco, introduce it to an education programme. The Minister of Education (L.Verge) spoke in this House that she is rather concerned about the number of young girls in our schools now who are smoking for the first time. It is almost becoming of epidemic proportion of our younger students, younger girls in this Province who are taking to smoking.

There is another question, also, Mr. Chairman, that tobacco smoking is an addictive, it is a drug and therefore we need a programme developed by the Department of Health to address this problem. We cannot look at tobacco and alcohol as a means of raising revenue for this Province of ours if we do not get into the preventative aspect of it. And I find, Mr. Chairman, that we only compound the issue even more, that we have to pay more in the long run for health costs because of cancer and other related lung problems. We also have to pay more with regard to our habit and lifestyles. I would like to see, as I said, the government take so much of this tax, put it on to education in the schools, put it on to health, the preventative aspects, getting into jogging, getting into the right nutrition food and that, Mr. Chairman.

Or I would like to see the Provincial Government take some of this money from the tobacco tax and alcohol and create a job programme for students of this Province, that the majority of the students in this Province cannot get jobs as a result of the economy. And because of this, Mr. Chairman, if it was not for the Federal Government youth job programme creation, most of the students in this Province, Mr. Chairman, would not be working and as a result they would find it rather hard to go on with post-secondary education.

MR. HISCOCK:

I have said it in this House, and I said it even before I was elected to this House, that this government has to come up with a student job programme for our younger people. That the price of our tuition is going up all the time. The price of housing is going up all the time with regard to students. It is almost impossible now for students to afford an apartment in this city of ours, which not only is the capital but is also the major educational centre for this Province. And I would like to see so much of this tax go towards - I do not think that the people in this Province mind paying extra sales tax even though it is eleven cents, or tax on tobacco, tax on alcohol, but we would like to know where it goes.

We do not particularly like the idea that it goes in general revenue and that it goes to pay for

MR. HISCOCK: revenue and then it goes to pay for the house on Mount Scio. We do not particularly like to see that raise on taxes go to pay for The Rounder. Basically it is almost as bad as a political machine that the Conservatives accuse the Liberals of in The Newfoundland Herald in -

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland Bulletin cost \$100,000 -

MR. HISCOCK: - with regard to that, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: - and the Rounder cost \$200,000.

MR. HISCOCK: - I think, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the tax, we are having taxes, There is no question that when the Conservative government took over this administration back in the early '70s, the country was going to go bankrupt under Mr. Smallwood, according to Mr. Moores and Mr. Crosbie. We had \$750 million and we built the Province and what we have now is a result of that. Now in ten years, Mr. Chairman, we see the debt going to \$3.5 billion.

MR. NEARY: \$700 million and we were bankrupt.

MR. HISCOCK: This is why we are penny pinching, this is why we need an extra two cents on cigars, this is why we need to raise the licences, this is why we need to raise the rabbit and moose hunting licences, this is why we need to put - and I think it is the worse one of all, and this administration said it would never bring in taxes within three years, to index a tax on gasoline. It is unbelievable! And the people in my district are now - and we know that the National Energy Board and the Premier want to go to world prices sooner than we are now. If we are going to be doing that, we know what the price of gasoline is going to be in four years from now, it is going to double - \$2.00 now down on the coast, it is going to be \$4.00 in the future and here this government is going to get more revenue as a result of indexing the gasoline tax. But I am saying that we are penny pinching, We are trying to get two cents here, we are trying to get two cents there and, basically, whether

MR. HISCOCK: the country is on the verge of bankruptcy, which I firmly believe—and that is why we see all the construction companies going bankrupt and all the private businesses in this Province going bankrupt this year. And if it was not for some coastal Labrador DREE agreements and forestry agreements and other DREE related programmes, this country itself, the Province, would not necessarily go bankrupt but I can tell you this, the construction companies and various other related industries would go and are going belly up. But I would like to see this Province take a more aggressive attitude and, if we are going to pay two cents on tobacco here and so much on gasoline, that we have to get into a better quality of looking after our money. We cannot spend \$150 million on the drilling of a tunnel down in the Straits of Labrador, in the Straits on the Northern Peninsula, to spend \$150 million and to waste it. We cannot convert - the linerboard mill was supposed to go for chips but the Province here decided on bringing logs down from Goose Bay, the former Minister of Finance for the federal government, Mr. Crosbie, as well as the Province here. We cannot see the continued mismanagement of the resources and this is what we have seen for the past ten years. We have not only seen an increase on gasoline each time, we have not only seen an increase on liquor and various other related so-called luxuries. But, Mr. Chairman, it is done from the point of view that the country is being mismanaged financially and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) cannot in any way question that. If the Liberals were in for the past ten years and spent the same amount of money, then I am sure that the President of the Council would be getting up and saying that it is mismanagement. And there is no question, Mr. Chairman, that this is related. So, I would like to see this Province get into Summer job creation. I would like to see the Minister of Health (Mr. House) spend more on preventative measures

MR. HISCOCK:

I would like to see the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) spend more. And here we see a waste of money that was done by the Department of Education. This is the mismanagement, the mismanagement of spending money on public opinion polls, the mismanagement of calling contracts - letting contracts without tenders. The

MR. HISCOCK: past ten years is total mismanagement and we are continuing to have mismanagement. And again, if it were not for our part as equal Canadians in the Canadian family and the amounts of money that we are receiving from Ottawa as equal Canadians, not as a handout but as Canada wanting to see each area of Canada from sea to sea built up in this nation of ours and continue to make the progress that we are making in the world of showing other countries the idea of pulling together, of co-operating and the idea of using the tax base, if we are going to have a tax base to make sure that we have a certain amount of revenue to go to the low incomes. That is why Medicare was brought in by the Liberal Government, that is why unemployment insurance was brought in by the Liberal Government, that is why old age pension and youth allowance and Canada Pension was set up and that is why Petro-Canada and various other great Liberal reform programmes were set up. I always like to stress this because every time I say that whether it is in my district - where there is very little criticism in that way - but in other parts of the Island they always say, 'Oh, those benefits would come anyway: unemployment insurance would come anyway, old age pension would have come anyway, Medicare would have come anyway. It is not true. They would not have come. They were Liberal reforms, they were Liberal philosophy, and it would have taken a Liberal Government to bring them in. And we only saw briefly when Mr. Clark and Mr. Crosbie had the Conservative Government that they were going to do away with Petrocan and also that they were going to allow the doctors to opt out of Medicare and destroy Medicare. They were also going to do away with the Canada employment project for the work.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is really not being relevant. I mean, not only is he not talking about tobacco taxes, but he is talking about Medicare and matters within the purview of the federal government.

MR. HISCOCK: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite relevant that taxes on tobacco relate to health and as a result of health problems we have to pay more Medicare costs. If we, as a Province, are allowed to opt out of Medicare, and doctors, then we not only need to see an increase in Medicare but we need to see an increase in extra tobacco costs to pay for that Medicare.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the point of order, the Chair has allowed a fair degree of flexibility to the hon. member speaking, but I would like to point out, for the sake of making some progress, that we are discussing the Resolution to Bill No. 85, which is An Act To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act, and I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to that.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, in concluding, I would like to see a more discriminative way of spending our money. If we are going to tax our people, then I do not think we as a Province can stand for mismanagement, that we should have a health programme related to the negative effects of smoking and we have to get this into the schools as well as into the communities. And for this, Mr. Chairman, I will vote against this increase because

MR. HISCOCK: the government is not doing this, the government is putting it into general revenue and paying for other mismanagements in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1978," (Bill No. 85).

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

Motion 3, Bill No. 86, 'An Act To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act, 1978.'

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Once again, Mr. Chairman, this is a bill in conformity with the decision that was made in the budget, regrettably, as it turned out, to have to raise the gasoline tax. The gasoline tax, Mr. Chairman, has been raised and placed on an ad valorem basis the same way as in all provinces except Alberta and Nova Scotia. As we all know, Alberta has been lucky enough to have neither gasoline nor sales tax.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, it works on a percentage of the price. The percentage rates of gasoline will be 22 per cent of the average retail price less the tax. This is the way it works. This is the way it is set up.

MR. BARRY: Twenty-two percent?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: And, Mr. Chairman, this is now, you know, the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) in the previous debate indicated, and I just want to say this because the point has to be made again, and I know he will probably get up again and talk about the government not keeping with its promises that it made during the election. But the fact of the matter is that this government did not say, never said, at no time said there would be no increases in taxes. What the hon. the Premier said during the election, that election that the hon. members there opposite will remember so well and so, you know, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - as the people of Newfoundland will remember so well, he said and I quote, "The new Progressive Government under my leadership will not introduce any increases in provincial sales tax." This is not, Mr. Chairman, an increase in provincial sales tax. The provincial sales tax is levied under The Retail Sales Tax Act, number one.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Or personal income tax or corporation taxes, that is not levied under this Act, Mr. Chairman. It was not levied under this Act at the time on small businesses during the term of its mandate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, this government has kept its commitment to the people of this Province. It has kept, and it will continue to keep, its commitment to the people of this Province not just for the ensuing term but for the next three or four

MR. MARSHALL: terms, when it is re-elected and its  
back in government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.  
What a cop out.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, what a cop out.

MR. THOMS: What a cop out.

MR. HANCOCK: That is a good one that is.

MR. MARSHALL: No wonder he is leaving the Chamber.

MR. HANCOCK: I can figure that one out.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, what we have is  
the man saying that the commitment was made that the retail  
sales tax -

MR. HANCOCK: Is not going to go up.

MR. THOMS: - in the Province of Newfoundland  
would not go up.

MR. HANCOCK: That is right.

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Chairman, that is inaccurate.  
That is misleading the people of this Province.

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Because, Mr. Chairman, as the  
price of goods go up in this Province so does the retail  
sales tax, so does - not the percentage but the amount that  
is collected and goes into the Provincial Treasury of this  
Province, it goes up and up and up -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) with that one.  
'Brian'.

MR. THOMS: - and up according to the increase  
in the cost of living, according to the increase - every time  
a pound of bologna goes up the people in this Province, instead  
of paying 11 per cent of 40 cents a pound -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: - they are now paying 11 per cent  
of \$1.80 a pound. So the retail sales tax does, in fact, go up

MR. THOMS: and it is incorrect, and it is inaccurate, and it is misleading, and it is a Tory lie for anybody on that side of the House to stand in this House to say that the retail sales tax in this Province is not increasing. Of course, it is increasing. Just look at what the retail sales tax meant to the government of this Province four years ago or three years ago, and look at the amount they are collecting in retail sales tax today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Because, as I said, every time the price of an article goes up then the cost goes up. Correspondingly there is 11 per cent, and 11 per cent of \$1.00 is less than 11 per cent of \$2.00. Now, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) might have difficulty -

MR. HANCOCK: Oh, yes.

MR. THOMS: - recognizing that or understanding that, because we saw an ample display of the minister's trying to reason mathematics sometime ago in this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what do we have, what does Bill No. 86 do?

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: What does Bill No. 86 do? No longer are the people of this Province paying nineteen cents on a gallon of gasoline, or twenty cents on a gallon of gasoline, but the people of this Province are now paying 22 per cent on the price of gasoline. Now, Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that the Premier of

MR. THOMS: this Province is in Alberta hobnobbing with the oil shieks of Alberta and advocating that the price of gasoline go to 75 per cent or 85 per cent of the world prices or the Chicago prices.

MR. HANCOCK: Shame, shame, shame!

MR. THOMS: Is it any wonder?

MR. NEARY: Poor old Newfoundland!

MR. THOMS: Because we now have a situation where, as the price of gasoline increases, so does the amount that goes into the provincial Treasury. And it is no longer nineteen cents added to a gallon of gasoline, whether a gallon of gasoline is a dollar or two dollars, but it is 22 per cent. Now, Mr. Chairman, that 22 per cent is a retail sales tax on gasoline. The Premier - the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) read his statement - the Premier says that there will be no increase in the retail sales tax in this Province during the first three years of his administration. So how does he get around it? That is a sales tax, that is a retail sales tax. How does he get around it? He takes the twenty cents that is on a gallon of gasoline and says no longer are you charged nineteen cents or twenty cents per gallon provincial taxes, we are now going to charge you 22 per cent. That is a retail sales tax. That was a breach. Even if you took the Premier's announcement prior to the 1979 election, even if you took that and confined it only to the retail sales tax, it has gone up. Now most people did not take it to mean only retail sales tax, it meant no raises in taxes.

And I am sure the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) did not go into every little nook and cranny, he did not go into Rencontre East or Harbour Breton or Belleoram or Coomb's Cove or Red Cove or any of those places, St. Bernard's, Bay L'Argent, Terranceville, English

MR. THOMS: Harbour West, English Harbour East, he did not go into any of those explaining to them, no, the Premier said that it was only retail sales tax that was not going to go up. I would venture to say that the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Steward), in all the places that I mentioned, left the impression, or did not bother to correct the impression created, that there would be no -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the member (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: I will tell you this much, I will tell the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) this much, if I decided to go to Fortune-Hermitage in the next election he might as well step aside, he might as well go back into his rural development job, he might as well go back to the Tory organization, the Rural Development Association and look for his job back. Or my friend from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock). If either one of us decide, you are gone, you are finished, you have had it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Chairman, to get back to the 22 per cent bill we have in front of us. Now, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) says that we are the only Province in Canada. That may be so, Mr. Chairman, that may be so but do not try to fool the people of this Province, do not try to fool them. They are now being charged a retail sales tax on gasoline of 22 per cent.

MR. HISCOCK: Unbelievable! Unbelievable!

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Chairman, it is getting to the point again, as I say - the 22 per cent to the oil barons who are going to come into this

MR. THOMS:

Province, the 22 per cent does not mean very much to the big financial magnates who are going to be into St. John's and doing business, who are going to suck the people of this Province on the offshore oil and gas. Twenty-two per cent is not going to make much difference to them but, Mr. Chairman, again to the lower-income and to the middle-income people of this Province, then, 22 per cent on a gallon of gasoline means something. It means that it is going to come to a point where, Mr. Chairman, you are not going to be able to afford to drive from your district in to ten sittings of the House of Assembly. I am not going to be able to afford to drive to the district of Grand Bank.

MR. HODDER: The House Leader rides -

MR. THOMS: The member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) will have to bicycle from one end of the district to the other if he expects to get there, and here we have -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMS: - here we have the Premier of the Province out in Alberta hanging on to the coattails of Lougheed, agreeing with him and conniving with him and planning with him to get the price of gasoline to world prices. It is just so that they can get 22 per cent on every gallon of gasoline that is sold in this Province.

MR. HANCOCK: And why would he not look for world prices?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. MORGAN: Tell us about Petrofina.

MR. HANCOCK: Tell us about the whale damage.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Seriously, it is coming to the point where you will not be able to afford to drive a car.

MR. THOMS: I find now and I have one of the more medium sized cars that you can drive, a six-cylinder, and it costs me about \$22 every time I fill it up, \$22. Now, it is not true that I do not visit my district, Mr. Chairman, but certainly the price of gasoline would be a good reason for me not to go to the district and now we have the Premier of the Province travelling across this country saying to everybody who will listen, 'Get the price of oil up, get the price of oil up'. Now we may have a billion barrels of oil off the shores of Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman. By the time this Province finishes paying for the paper that the Premier - the statements that are being made by the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy - we are going to need a billion barrels to pay for that oil, to pay for the amount of paper that is used. Here again we find that it is the low-income person and the middle-aged person who are being hit the hardest. He cannot afford now to own a home, he cannot afford to own a home, now he will not be able to afford to own a car, aided and abetted by this administration. Now, how many - the President of Council referred to a statement made by the Premier prior to the election - how many on the other side of the House, Mr. Chairman, are going to go out into their districts prior to the next election and explain this bill to them? How are they going to explain that they are now charging a - after making a promise that there would be no increase in retail sales taxes, how are they now going to go out and explain to the people that the retail sales tax on gasoline is 22 per cent on a gallon of gasoline and that this administration and this government is 100 per cent behind the price of gasoline going as high as they can get it, as high as they can get it? Now, how are you going to explain that?

June 23, 1981

Tape No. 2729

GS - 3

MR. THOMS:

How is the member for Fortune-  
Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) going to explain that to his home  
town of Harbour Breton when they have to drive all the way  
up to Grand Falls to get into

MR. L. THOMS: St. John's in their cars? How is he going to explain it? I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, how he is going to explain it. He is not going to explain it, he is not going to explain it. He is going to pretend -

MR. NEARY: Cop out.

MR. L. THOMS: - he is going to pretend that it did not happen. Either that or he will try to blame it on Frank Moores.

MR. TULK: Or on the federal government.

MR. L. THOMS: Or the federal government. But most likely in the first instance, this administration would try to blame it on Frank Moores.

MR. TULK: No, it is too good.

MR. L. THOMS: But they will try to find somebody to put the blame on. They will not accept the responsibility-

MR. TULK: I had a call from down in your district (inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: - they will not accept responsibility for Bill No. 86. They do not have the audacity, they do not have the intestinal fortitude.

MR. J. MORGAN: Are you opposing the bill?

MR. L. THOMS: Of course I am opposing the bill, Yes, I am opposing the bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: And you are happy.

MR. L. THOMS: And I am very happy.

MR. MORGAN: Do you not want paved roads? Do you not want water for your district?

MR. L. THOMS: For what the district of Grand Bank got in the budget, I could have voted against the budget I can inform the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. HISCOCK: I thought you were against company tax.

MR. L. THOMS: The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) will tell you how much the district of Grand Bank got.

MR. L. THOMS: The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs H. Newhook) can tell you how much the district of Grand Bank got. Nothing.

MR. HISCOCK: I thought you were against property tax.

MR. L. THOMS: Absolutely nothing, Nothing! So when I vote - if I voted against the budget I would be voting against nothing, absolutely nothing. And the member for Fortune- Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) just sits there with a laugh on his face. And then they try to tell me that they are not practicing, you know, putting all the dollars into Tory districts, into trying to save Tory districts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: If you have got a million and a half dollars for your roads, you have got a million and a half dollars. Well, you are going to need more than a million and a half dollars to save your skin, let me tell you that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: Maybe that is it, maybe that is it, maybe the Premier is still peeved because I voted against the flag. Maybe that is it, maybe he is that small.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK: The Premier is a natural peeve.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make and impress upon the people of this Province once again that they have been hoodwinked, they have been hoodwinked by this administration as far as the promise made by this administration in the raising of the retail sales tax, or any taxes for that matter. In fact, they have been raised -

MR. HISCOCK: Are you going to go down.

MR. L. THOMS: I want the people of this Province to know. I want it to go out loud and clear to the people of this Province that this administration is raising the retail

MR. L. THOMS: sales tax and they are putting in effect a retail sales tax, that was not there before, in this particular bill. That is there is 22 per cent, 22 per cent they are now charging. And the Premier of this Province is saying that the price of gasoline should go to three dollars, four dollars a gallon, five dollars a gallon because 22 per cent of five dollars is more than 22 per cent of four dollars, it is more than 22 per cent of three dollars, it is more than 22 per cent of two dollars. So the higher the price of gasoline goes the more money that this administration is going to have to pour into Tory districts in this Province to try and attempt to get re-elected in the next election. And, Mr. Chairman, I can inform this House, I can inform the Premier, and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and everybody opposite it is not going to work. It is not going to work because the people of this Province are more intelligent than that. They realize what is going on, they realize that they are being made fools of, they realize that they are being hoodwinked. And it is bills like this

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, it is bills such as this that are going to kill this administration. It is going to lead them to their defeat at the polls in the next election, as soon as the Premier gets the nerve up to call one. I wish he would call an election. I wish he would call it today and let the people of this Province decide whether or not they agree with the direction in which this Province is going, let the people of this Province decide whether or not they are keeping their promises.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is Fortune - Hermitage -

MR. THOMS: If we only get two seats, one is going to be yours.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the question, How long can the people be deceived, how long can the people be hoodwinked before they realize what is going on? And there is no doubt in my mind that this is one of the biggest perpetrations of fraud that I have ever seen pulled and I am only too happy to vote against this particular bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Shall the Resolution carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this motion. I am not going to vote for it because I think that out of all the taxes that have been increased that this increase is the most savage of all. This increase hits the ordinary Newfoundlander. This increase in the provincial sales tax affects people who have to use their vehicles for transportation back and forth to work.

MR. HISCOCK: Harbour Grace people coming to St. John's.

MR. NEARY: Yes, people who drive around the bay, people who drive long distances. And it affects the cost of living in this Province because, as hon. members know, every time you increase the price of gasoline or increase the price of diesel fuel in this Province, you drive up the cost of living automatically. Because most of the goods that are moved around this Province are moved by road.

So the impact of this tax, Mr. Chairman, is tremendous, and I would say that the average Newfoundlander - up to the time that the tax was changed when the budget was read in this House, the average Newfoundlander was not aware that so much that he paid for a gallon of gasoline went into the Provincial Treasury. The average Newfoundlander did not realize that over thirty cents, I believe thirty-five cents a gallon on gas, went into the Provincial Treasury.

MR. TULK: I think that must be forty cents, somewhere around forty cents.

MR. NEARY: I do not know what it is now, the 22 per cent - but let me make this point, Mr. Chairman, that our provincial tax on gasoline before it was converted into a percentage tax, when it was a straight across the board tax, our tax on gasoline was the highest in the nation, was the highest in Canada and higher than any State in the United States. I believe that point has to be made, Mr. Chairman, that we are paying in this Province the highest gasoline tax probably on the North American continent. Now, that is something to be proud of. That is a reputation that I would not want to boast too much about. Instead of a straight across the board tax, it is now going to be a percentage tax, which means that every time the price of gasoline goes up the provincial tax increases. So why would not this government fan the fire

MR. NEARY: of inflation, Mr. Chairman?  
Why would they not hope that inflation will drive up the cost of living in this Province? As the cost of living goes up they collect more revenue on the 11 per cent sales tax. As the cost of living goes up, the cost of gasoline goes up, they collect more revenue on gasoline. And these are the two taxes above all other taxes that hit the ordinary people in this Province. I could not get upset over increases in the tobacco tax; I could not get upset over increases in the tax on booze or beer in this Province. But I believe we all should be upset over the way that the government is now playing with the gasoline tax. And they are doing it in such a sneaky way, Mr. Chairman, that you would almost say it was being done in a deceitful manner.

MR. NEARY: They are doing it now in a way that they will not have to come back to the House of Assembly for approval, again, to increase the gasoline tax, that is unless the price of gasoline in North America goes down. Then they may be back looking for an increase in the percentage. If the price of gasoline went down and reduced the amount of revenue going into the public Treasury well, then, they would be back looking for 25 per cent or 28 per cent or 30 per cent. But as long as the price of gasoline per gallon is on the upswing, is increasing, then you need not have any fear about the government being back looking for further increases in the gasoline tax. They have now made it 22 per cent which means they do not now have to come to the House of Assembly every year and ask for an increase in the tax. The increase is going to be built in, built into the new formula. The increase in revenue will be built into the 22 per cent, because they anticipate that the price of gasoline will be going up just about every month.

And so, Mr. Chairman, this is a cruel tax. It is cruel because it is going to affect every man, woman and child in this Province. It is going to affect the school bus operators who are just barely, now, able to keep their heads above water. It is going to affect the taxi operators. It is going to affect people who have to use buses. It is going to affect people who have to use their vehicles to transport themselves back and forth to their employment. And some of these, Mr. Chairman, have to travel long distances. You would be surprised at the number of people who have to come from all the way around Conception Bay every day, and from Your Honour's own district, to earn a living. And it is going to affect the rent-a-car business, Mr. Chairman.

As a matter of fact, talking about renting cars, I am told that the government has now adopted a new policy as far as the public servants are concerned. And I heard about this in the Department of Social Services, where

MR. NEARY: the social workers, the field staff in the Department of Social Services have now stopped using their own vehicles, have now stopped putting in their expense account on a mileage basis. They feel that they are going into the hole, even on a mileage basis. So they have stopped using their own vehicles and are now renting vehicles. Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, the cost to the public Treasury? The government have now gone into the business of allowing the public servants, the field staff of various government departments, instead of using their own vehicles and charging on a mileage basis, they find they cannot make ends meet that way so they are now allowed to rent vehicles. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to imagine the drain, the cost, the effect that that is having on the public Treasury.

I would like for the minister to tell us whether this is a policy that exists now throughout the public service or does it only just apply to the Department of Social Services' field staff? If you apply it to the public service as a whole, Mr. Chairman, the cost will be horrendous.

MR. CALLAN: Astronomical.

MR. NEARY: It will be astronomical as my hon. friend says. So I would like to get an explanation or a clarification of that policy, that new policy, Mr. Chairman, that seems to be adopted by - at least by the social workers, by the field staff in the Department of Social Services. And I understand it applies to other departments of government also.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think the whole House should vote against this converting the straight across the board tax on gasoline, converting it to a percentage basis.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Oh, the freeloader over there is not worried about this kind of an increase. The freeloader does not worry

June 23, 1981

Tape No. 2732

IB-3

MR. NEARY: about his constituents having to travel  
all the way around the bay to find employment in the  
construction industry and with the federal and provincial  
civil service. The freeloader,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could not care less.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, that is right, but the freeloader will find out. The freeloader will find out in the next provincial election whether they care or not, Mr. Chairman.

You know, Mr. Chairman, when this tax first came in, in case hon. members are not aware of it, when the Gasoline Tax was first implemented in this Province it was not a sales tax at all. It was a road tax, it was a tax put on gasoline to collect revenue to build roads, to construct roads, to reconstruct roads and to pave roads in this Province. That was the purpose of the tax - and superports. The tax, Mr. Chairman - Freddie the freeloader is on his way out again, Haig the Freeloader - Mr. Chairman, the tax was a road tax in the beginning. Initially that is why a tax was put on gasoline. Somehow or other we seem to have gotten away from that. Now the tax on gasoline is not being used at all for the purpose for which it was intended. If you look at the capital expenditure on roads in this Province this year, you will discover that the amount of revenue collected under the new formula of 22 per cent on gasoline will not equal the amount to be spent on roads in this Province in this fiscal year. As a matter of fact, it is much less and out of the total amount of money that is to be spent on roads in Newfoundland this year most of it is to pay for road work that was done last year, commitments that have already been made. In actual fact, the amount of money to be spent on roads in this Province in this fiscal year amounts to only \$11 million or \$12 million. So, Mr. Chairman, we have gotten away from the purpose, the original idea of the Gasoline Tax which was, as I indicated, to construct roads, to reconstruct

MR. NEARY: roads, to take Newfoundland communities out of isolation and to pave roads in this Province. Now the tax on gasoline goes into General Revenue and is used for all sorts of things. It is used for the Norma and Gladys, \$115,000 this year. It is a pity she did not go to the bottom the other day, Mr. Chairman, it is a pity she did not go to the bottom. I would not want to see any loss of life, I am glad that all the crew survived, but it is a pity she did not go to the bottom. We could have taken that \$115,000 that is going to be wasted and squandered this year and the hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars that have been squandered on that tub in the last several years. I would estimate that somewhere between four and five million dollars have been spent in the last ten years on the Norma and Gladys, between four and five million dollars. And that is absolutely outrageous, Mr. Chairman, it is scandalous. If she had gone to the bottom, maybe we could have saved some money to keep some hospital beds in this Province open that are being closed down at the present time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this motion because I feel that if there is a tax that has a more detrimental effect on the people of this Province than the one we are debating now, then I cannot think of it unless it is the income tax, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the government should be strongly condemned for changing this formula, by increasing the tax on gasoline the way they are doing it and if we cannot get any other message out to the people of this Province in this late session of the House - it is a job to get psyched

MR. NEARY:

up these days, Mr. Chairman, but I can tell hon. gentlemen that if they think they are going to get out of the House of Assembly by Friday coming, well they better start thinking again. There is no way, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) here all Summer.

MR. NEARY:

- there is no way, Mr. Chairman,

with forty-seven bills on the Order Paper, with six more money bills to debate, there is no way that we can get out of this House outside of three weeks, or around the latter part of July. There is no way it can be done unless the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is willing to be flexible and is willing to talk to the House Leader (Mr. Hodder) on this side, behind the curtain, and they can come to some kind of an agreement or some kind of an arrangement on leaving some of these bills on the Order Paper for the Fall session of the House. That is the way it is always done, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that I have to tell members of this House the way that deals are made in this House. They are not talked about.

MR. CARTER: Stay open and you will find yourself the boss.

MR. NEARY:

I beg your pardon?

MR. CARTER:

You be the boss and we will

stay open.

MR. NEARY:

No, I am not the boss. But you will stay open as long as the government mismanages the House like they mismanage everything else in this Province when, because of lack of planning, they hope that they can ram through forty-seven important pieces of legislation at the last minute. They have managed to do it on previous occasions, but there is no way that my colleagues are going to allow this to happen this year. As far as I am concerned, the House could

MR. NEARY: have been closed the end of May, and should have been closed the end of May for what good it has done, For what important legislation that we have passed in this House, that would put no bread and butter on the tables of the ordinary people of this Province, we could have been out by the end of May. As a matter of fact, my colleagues will tell you that I suggested -

MR. STIRLING: You cannot tell caucus secrets.

MR. NEARY: No, that is not a caucus secret that is my secret. But I suggested to my colleagues that we wind up the present session of the House the end of May, but we could not get the co-operation of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). The Government House Leader is unco-operative, is nasty and rude, and will not plan the business of the House in a proper way. And, Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference to us -

MR. MARSHALL: Well, (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - we will say here - and he likes to boast about it. And I can say right now, Mr. Chairman, in my experience in this House, that there is no way that forty-seven bills can be rammed through this Legislature, six or seven money bills be passed, including The Loan And Guarantee Act, Supplementary Supply, there is no way it can be done. It has to be done in a sane and reasonable and sensible manner between now and the end of July.

MR. YOUNG: . (Inaudible) longer.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. YOUNG: You can always stay longer.

MR. NEARY: Stay at it - well, I am satisfied to stay until Regetta Day. There is no problem with me, Mr. Chairman. I hope the hon. Government House Leader and the press will not go out and say oh, it is the fault of the Opposition. They are talking too much. The Opposition does not plan this House. The Opposition does not call the

MR. NEARY: Order of Business in this House . The Opposition does not bring legislation into this House. It is the government who organize the House and plan the House not the Opposition. I hope that message will filter through.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBFR: We might have to stay open.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the House stay open all Summer because it would be one of the biggest tourist attractions that we would have in this Province. And it is free. No charge, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMS: Why go to St. Mary's to see the whales?

MR. NEARY: That is right. Why go out, why encourage people to go down and look at the whales and look at the bird sanctuary or go aboard the scuttle -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - go aboard Lukey's boat -

MR. BARRY: You are out-numbered, there are only three of them there.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Chairman, or travel off to foreign countries? Why do that when you can come in and sit in the public gallery and see the best entertainment, live entertainment, the best entertainment in the Province and it is free. And I would say that one of the best things that we could do is keep the House open as a tourist attraction, Mr. Chairman. You do not have to go to the museums, you do not have to go down looking at historic objects or historic monuments, all you have to do is come into this House and you will see all the historic objects and monuments that you want to see, and I do not mean, Mr. Chairman, they are hanging on the walls of the House.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Chairman, if it takes two or three or four or five days to get the message through on this particular motion, that the government are, in a cruel and callous manner, converting straight across

MR. NEARY:

the board tax on gasoline to a percentage, 22 per cent, which will increase the amount of revenue taken out of the pockets of the consumers of this Province, taking out of the operators of motor vehicles in this Province every time they go to the tank to fill up as the price of gasoline increases - I can see the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) wringing his hands with joy, I can see his eyeballs clicking dollars and cents just like a cash register rolling over, crick, crack, tic-tac-toe - the Minister of Finance's eyeballs just like a slot machine, tic-tac-toe, he has hit the jackpot again; the price of gasoline has gone up and he is down like Scrooge, wringing his hands. He managed to pick a few more cents out of the pockets of the consumers of gasoline in this Province.

Just take the last increase in gasoline, Mr. Chairman, nine cents a gallon.

MR. HISCOCK: They are going to have a tollgate on that new overpass by the mall.

MR. NEARY: A tollgate on the new overpass at the mall, I would not be at all surprised.

The last increase on gasoline was nine cents. Add 22 per cent provincial tax on to that and the increase in the price of gasoline did not increase by nine cents, Mr. Chairman, it increased by eleven cents, two cents went into the pockets of the provincial Minister of Finance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who got the other nine?

MR. NEARY: Who got the other nine? The other nine was used to subsidize oil in Eastern Canada. The other nine cents, which went into the federal Treasury, was used to help to pay the subsidy of oil which keeps the price of gasoline and heating fuel down in

MR. NEARY: Eastern Canada. The federal government is trying to hold the lid on the price of diesel fuel and heating fuel.

MR. HISCOCK: Over \$3 billion subsidy.

MR. NEARY: Over what?

MR. HISCOCK: Three billion.

MR. NEARY: Three billion. My hon. colleague just reminded me that the federal subsidy on trying to hold down the price of gasoline and heating fuel in Eastern Canada is over \$3 billion. I would not mind, Mr. Chairman, if this government took the money and used it for the purpose for which it was intended, or subsidized homeowners in this Province to heat their homes, or subsidized the price of gasoline in this Province in essential services. But no, Mr. Chairman, it goes into the general revenue, into the Public Treasury, to be used by the government as they see fit. And that is wrong, Mr. Chairman. That is morally wrong. I consider this to be an immoral tax.

MR. THOMS: Brought in by an immoral (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, I presume that if Mr. Trudeau can call people in the House of Commons immoral jerks then that would be parliamentary in this House to call them immoral jerks. I do not know how you would call a lady a jerk, or two ladies jerks. They are female jerks.

MS VERGE: What is the difference between a male and a female jerk?

MR. NEARY: There is a big difference between a male jerk and a female jerk and if the hon. minister wants to find out, I will demonstrate for her sometime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this is the most cruel form of taxation there is and I think that every member of this House should vote against this motion. And as I started to say a few moments ago, when I got sidetracked by the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), if it takes us three or four or five days for our message to filter through to the table over my left shoulder here, then I think we should spend four or five days at it and let the people of this Province know that they are paying higher gasoline taxes than any other province in Canada or any other State in the United States. The highest tax of all is the gasoline tax and I think that is shameful, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to vote against this bill. Let us see what coverage it gets tomorrow and if it does not get proper coverage, we will have another go at it. We may have to use more colourful language. We may have to get out in the middle of the floor and stand on our heads to get the message through, but I hope that the message will filter through tonight and tomorrow morning, and in the papers tomorrow, that Newfoundlanders now are paying the highest gasoline tax in North America, and I dare the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), when he gets on his feet, to contradict that.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Shall the resolution carry?

MR. HISCOCK: No, it will not carry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: I move, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee rise and report progress.

MR. NEARY: Report no progress.

MR. HISCOCK: Report no progress.

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and report some progress and ask leave to sit again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, could we read the bills now. The bills have to be read three times, or one bill has to be read, the Tobacco Tax Act, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and report having considered a certain resolution and recommends that a bill consequent thereto be introduced to give effect to same.

On motion report received and adopted, bill ordered read now, by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1978", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 85).

June 23, 1981

Tape No. 2736

IB-2

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

MR. MARSHALL: I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.