

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, JULY 7, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like on behalf of government to extend sincere condolences to the families and friends of those who so tragically lost their lives in the recent disaster of the Arctic Explorer. Such an event obviously serves to remind us all of the frailty of life but at the same time somehow binds people closer together in common friendship.

It was in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that the staff of my office yesterday came to the aid of eight relatives of the deceased who were residing in Labrador City and were unable to avail of themselves of reservations to travel to the Island portion of the Province to be present with other members of those families in their hour of need. We were indeed most happy to have been of assistance to those people and we would certainly like to remind them once again that my office stands ready and willing to help in whatever manner may be deemed necessary to alleviate in some small way the sorrow caused by this disaster.

Mr. Speaker, this sad affair has once again brought to public attention the limited capability of search and rescue facilities in this Province. A small Search and Rescue squadron is currently stationed at Gander. This group of people and equipment have performed well when the need arises and I pay tribute to their skill and their efforts. However, they have limited long range search capability and need to be supported by fixed wing aircraft with the capability to

PREMIER PECKFORD: conduct a large scale search over open water. Currently the actual search for a vessel in trouble has to be carried out by fixed wing aircraft stationed in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

In this latest incident, I am informed it took the planes a number of hours to reach the search location after they had been notified. If the search planes had been stationed at Gander, the response time could have been cut drastically and the suffering endured by the survivors could have been correspondingly reduced.

This government, together with our MPs, Mr. Crosbie and Mr. McGrath, have consistently requested the federal authorities to upgrade their Search and Rescue capabilities in this Province. I have today renewed that request of the federal government and I fervently hope that the appropriate action will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak on behalf of all members of this House and when I say that once again, as in the past, marine disasters have played quite a part in the history in the development of this Province, and it is a sad day again today obviously to have to stand in my place to record our sorrow at this latest incident. We hope that our capabilities as a country and as a Province can be improved so that if it is possible to reduce some of these tragedies, then every effort should be made so to do.

I hereby table the statement.

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

MR.STIRLING: Has how many minutes?

MR.SPEAKER: About one and a half minutes.

MR.STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, of course we were all saddened on this side of the House as well as everybody have been in Newfoundland and Labrador, and in that respect let me join with the members on the government side in extending our sincere condolences. And I hope that the Premier will agree that the Speaker should write the families involved.

But dealing with the sad affair itself, Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied, as I am sure most members of this House of Assembly are not satisfied with the information that is available. One of the areas, for example, is why was there no communication? It seems that, for example, there are government planes, provincial government planes stationed, forestry planes stationed at Gander. I am sure that if they were aware of a problem they would have been pressed into service. I am sure that the ministers would have given up any use of the government plane and that itself could have been pressed into service. So I do not think we should get involved with the red herring of how long it takes to come from PEI. I would propose, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the Premier could join me in an unanimous resolution now, that we request of our federal partners, in the interest of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are Canadians living in this part of the Country, that we ask for a joint study by the provincial and federal government, funded, as is the normal thing, ninety/ten by the federal government, into the whole requirement for

MR. STIRLING: more effective communications, the need for air/sea rescue service in Newfoundland and Labrador based on the increased development in the offshore - and this particular vessel was chartered for the offshore. So, Mr. Speaker, in that context I propose that the Premier agree now and we take the time now because it is of an emergency nature and use the time of the House to have an immediate debate on the need for a joint study by the Province and the federal government, funded by the federal government with some contribution from the Province, of the total needs for air/sea rescue in this Province. Disregarding completely the needs for any other part of the Province but the whole offshore, the question for improved communication because it is the second tragedy where the problem appears to be communication.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave. Is there leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In response -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

-I do not agree with the

joint resolution, Mr. Speaker. There

is no need of an extra study. What is needed now is

PREMIER PECKFORD: action. As it relates to planes that the Province has, these planes are completely inadequate for this job, completely and totally inadequate; they do not do anything but serve to frustrate what is a highly technical matter. We have this morning wired Mr. Pepin and Mr. Lamontagne. We have consistently over the last several years demonstrated factually the kinds of requirements that we should have in this Province for Search and Rescue. A study is unnecessary and therefore I cannot go along with the resolution. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition, as I did in my statement, to support us in our request to the federal government to immediately put fixed-wing aircraft in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of by leave. I did give up the floor.

Mr. Speaker, putting a few fixed-wing aircraft in Newfoundland is not going to solve a problem in the middle of the fog or in the middle of the Winter or off the Coast of Labrador. What we really need is a fresh look by both the Province and the federal government at what is needed to do the entire job in Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) withdraw leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
I understand leave has now been withdrawn.

The motion was for the Speaker to express condolences, I believe, on behalf of all members of the House to the families of those who were lost in the tragedy. Those in Favour, signify by saying 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary, 'Nay'? Carried.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am extremely  
pleased to be able to advise the hon. House of the  
results of meetings held with the Anaconda Aluminum  
Company during a recent visit by the hon. the Premier  
and myself to Louisville, Kentucky.

The purpose of these meetings was  
to pursue Anaconda's interest in evaluating the establish-  
ment of an aluminum smelter in the Province using hydro-  
electric power from the Churchill River. These discussions  
formed part of government's overall strategy for Labrador  
hydro-electric development. It was a year ago that the  
Lower Churchill Development Corporation presented its  
report to the federal and provincial governments and it  
recommended that in the absence of markets for surplus  
Gull Island power a start should be made on the smaller  
project located at Muskrat Falls. However, both levels  
of government agreed that the Gull Island project was the  
preferred form of Lower Churchill development in view of  
the capacity of Gull to meet growing provincial energy  
demand at a per unit energy cost about 40 per cent lower  
than the Muskrat project in addition to giving the  
Province an opportunity to develop energy intensive  
industry.

Government has taken the position  
that a combination of export sales and industrial develop-  
ment would be the preferred disposition of surplus Gull  
power. Therefore government have been pursuing discussions  
with customers and export markets and have been holding  
discussions with a number of energy intensive industries

MR. WINDSOR: with a view to finding the most suitable industry from the standpoint of employment generation and environmental protection. Discussions with industry have been part of government's overall Labrador resource development strategy which will encourage the use of Labrador resources and would overcome the obstacles of isolation and transportation. With respect to Labrador development, government has been undertaking feasibility studies into year-round shipping through Lake Melville. This work has been undertaken in co-operation with the federal government and has



MR. WINDSOR:

involved the use of federal ice breakers and an ice reinforced bulk cargo carrier. The trial voyages of the cargo carrier MV Arctic and the ice breaker Franklin have proven to be highly successful. These tests will be continued this coming Winter with federal assistance and evidence accumulated to date suggests that year-round operation is both technically and economically feasible.

Discussions with Anaconda have been taking place over the past two years. During this time the company has made several visits to the Province. The main purpose of these visits has been to discuss the availability of power and the rates to be charged. The company has been looking at a number of potential sites for an aluminum smelter, including locations on the Island as well as in Labrador.

The Anaconda company is a subsidiary of Atlantic Richfield Company. Anaconda Aluminum employs approximately 6,600 people at seventeen plants around the world. Its operations are highly integrated ranging from bauxite mining and alumina refining to the manufacture of commercial end products. These end products include sheet aluminum foil extrusions, packaging and building materials.

MR. NEARY:

Never mind that.

What about this Province?

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, could I be protected from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

The company is one of the largest producers of aluminum in the United States. Its head office is located in Louisville, Kentucky, where it also operates a rolling mill and fabricating plants. The company has a relatively new plant located in Sebree, Kentucky, which is one of the most highly sophisticated aluminum reduction plants in the world. The Sebree plant is used as a model of high environmental standards in the United States. The level of

MR. WINDSOR: emissions from this plant is extremely low and tests have shown that the effects upon the environment are negligible.

Discussions with the President and other senior staff of Anaconda have reached the point where the company is prepared to participate in a joint feasibility study into a Newfoundland aluminum operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WINDSOR: It is intended that this study will evaluate both Island and Labrador sites and that it would be cost shared on an equal basis up to a maximum total cost of \$500,000. A joint management team from Anaconda and government have been established to conduct this study and it is intended that it be completed by the end of the present year.

Government is encouraged with the interest shown by Anaconda and confirmed by the company's agreement to invest money in a feasibility study. In addition to this investment, the company intends to devote a significant amount of senior management time to this project.

Mr. Speaker, this statement has been reviewed by Anaconda officials who concur with its contents. Both Anaconda and government look forward to the completion of a feasibility study and would hope that this would lead to the conclusion of a mutually satisfactory development.

MR. NEARY: You talk about a premature announcement.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR: The study, Mr. Speaker, is a result of a number of efforts undertaken by the Department of Development and other government departments over the past number of years, beginning, in fact, in the early 1970s with discussions with numerous companies and has intensified since early 1979. Approximately fifteen months ago Newfoundland Hydro and the Department of Development commissioned the

MR. WINDSOR: Power Marketing Study which identified the aluminum industry as the most likely customer for Labrador power. The subsequent industrial promotion campaign identified a number of companies which have been very interested in pursuing a development in our Province, and a number of these companies are still, I would like to emphasize, still interested in addition to Anaconda although Anaconda has now taken this step of joining with the Province to finance this study.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can understand why the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has to wait outside. He cannot come in here today because he was the one who reprimanded the Minister of Development for making this statement down in Kentucky and denied the press report, said there was nothing to it, no truth to it and we, as a government, never make these kinds of statements, we never make any premature statements. When we make a statement you will have the industries committed, signed and there will only be the money to be spent.' And now, Mr. Speaker,-

MR. NEARY: Only Joey used to do that. They do not make premature statements.

MR. STIRLING: - there just might be an election this Fall -

MR. DAWE: Grasping for straws.

MR. STIRLING: - there just might be an election this Fall. This is to try to prop up the situation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - in both Naskaupi and Corner Brook, because they have been very careful not to mention which area they are talking about for the smelter. And

MR. STIRLING: if people can live on hope, this is now extended to the end of the year, the hope.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes.

MR. STIRLING: Come by Chance was going to be operating in ninety days from the time that he became leader, and that was about two years and ninety days ago. Now we have a situation in which this was denied, no truth to it, no such thing as a statement in the press, all denied. And now it appears that a company has talked to government - this government who are so tough, who can tell industry what they do - this government is now committed to \$250 million, is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: For \$250,000.

MR. STIRLING: \$250,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: The minister has not told us how much they have committed themselves to this company to put in the plant, the construction of the plant. Will he deny that they have given any indication to the aluminum company that they will be spending any money or that they will guarantee a bond issue or that they will guarantee financing? What they have committed themselves to is \$250,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Anaconda will write that off as income tax.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, they have committed themselves -

MR. NEARY: The poor old taxpayers of Newfoundland will pay the government's share.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - to \$250,000 to do what? They have been meeting with them for two years -

MR. WARREN: Two years, right.

MR. STIRLING: -two years of meetings -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Two years of meetings, Mr. Speaker, and they are now ready to spend \$250,000 as their share to try to find out whether or not this aluminum smelter can go ahead at an acceptable rate. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is about the fourth time that this has been announced and now we have an announcement that an announcement is going to come after the government spends \$250,000 doing a study to find out if a company can set up in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, if this is the best effort after two years, God help us with everything else that this government has been doing for two years.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (H.Newhook). In view of the fact that two of the members, - Humber Valley (W. House) and Humber East (L.Verge)-have now publicly stated that as a result of their involvement that the memo of June 19th has been rescinded and that now Corner Brook and Deer Lake do not have to accept the dictate of Municipal Affairs, that they can use their own priorities, would the minister confirm that she has now written the town of Deer Lake and the town of Corner Brook-because, as she knows, they cannot accept the word of any politician; under the act they can only deal with the minister - has the minister now written the town of Deer Lake and the town of Corner Brook and told them that they can now use their own priorities for the spending of the money that was approved as a loan under the Municipal Grant this year?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, a telegram has gone out to the city council in Corner Brooke and we have asked them to establish their priorities under the approved funding and let us know exactly what they intend to do with that funding, what roads they intend to pave. And we have not received an answer from Corner Brook as yet.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Do I understand from the minister then that they have now changed the practice and that all that Corner Brook, the city of Corner Brook and the town of Deer Lake, all that they now have to do is advise the minister of their priorities and they will be automatically approved by the minister?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, we do ask them to notify us of their priorities. If it does not agree with the names of the streets that they have given us stating that this is what they wish to do, if this is not now a priority with the city or with the towns, then we ask them to come back and seek the minister's approval. And normally it is given.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, would the minister, in view of the comments being made publicly in Corner Brook by the minister and by the - by two ministers; one from Humber Valley and one from Humber East - that these two towns, Corner Brook and Deer Lake, could now use their own priorities - and the minister has now hedged their bets by saying that normally you would approve the priorities established by this city and this town - under what set of circumstances would you not have approved their priorities?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, this is our standard practice all across the Province. We have to make sure that they are not going to be paving somebody's back lane or somebody's driveway or something like that. There is usually no problem with them when they come back and establish their priorities. I do not know of any time we would say to them, 'I am sorry we do not agree with them.' But if the money is being spent wisely, well, then there is no problem with our approving when the towns come back with their requests. When they come back with their request there is no problem if these are reasonable.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. It is about time I think now that -

MR. POWER: Forests, Resources and Lands is the right title.

MR. NEARY:

Well, I do not know what it is. Whatever it is. They change them so often we cannot - they change the portfolios so often we cannot keep up to them. But it is time now, Mr. Speaker, we dealt with this matter of the land on the Gander River, land that has been taken over from the Newfoundland Telegraph Company and put in the hands of a company called Newfoundland Colonisation and Mining Company Limited. Now my first question to the minister in connection with this - and I have a number of questions I want to ask the minister - but my first question to the minister is did Newfoundland Colonisation and Mining Company Limited - which is registered in Mississauga, Ontario, represented by Mr. Gordon M. Stirling, Q.C., Royal Trust Building in St. John's, and the director of the company, Mr. Jolyon David Finch - did these people ask the Newfoundland Government or submit a plan to the minister's department for development on the Gander River, which I understand involves the whole area from First Pond to Fourth Pond involving about 6300 acres of prime Newfoundland territory?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):  
Resources and Lands.

The hon. Minister of Forest

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, in relationship to the question of lands owned by Newfoundland Colonisation and Mining along the Gander River part of the Province, let it be understood that they own about 6,000 acres of land which they have full title and ownership to along the Gander River or immediately adjoining it. Of course, there is a fifty foot reserve enforced very strongly by this government to make sure that nobody can control waterfront properties in Newfoundland, that that piece of land that they have is their own land, that they are in the process of, according to an act which we have in this legislature, an act forcing



MR. POWER: persons with more than 300 acres of land in this Province, forcing persons to use that land, that somebody in that company, either the local representatives or the representatives in Ontario, had made it known to our government that they intend to submit a plan to government for the development of that land in two areas, basically land for recreational cottages in one sense, and also to harvest the budworm damaged timber in another sense.

So as far as we understand it, we have been notified that a plan is forthcoming which then will be considered by government in due course.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a new twist. Is the hon. gentleman saying that Newfoundland Colonisation and Mining Company Limited— and I would suspect that the mining part of it is just a camouflage— have gone ahead with a major development, advertised building lots for sale in a mainland newspaper at \$30,000 a building lot, which can only appeal to millionaires and foreign owners, that they have gone ahead with this huge development of 6,300 acres of prime land on the banks of the Gander River without submitting a development plan to his department or to this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest, Resources, and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I explained in my answer to the first question, a plan is about to be submitted to government. No plan has been submitted to our knowledge, no advertising has taken place. I have received a great amount of information and input from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook),

MR. POWER: who has exerted great efforts on behalf of many constituents in the area who have some concerns about the development along Gander Lake. No development has been approved, no forestry projects have begun in the area, and no lots have been sold and no lots have been advertised for that given development. A plan is about to be submitted to government, so we understand. When it is submitted to government, it will be considered in due course. And I am sure that when we consider it as a Cabinet and as a government we will take into considerations all of the things that come in- to play with the ownership of that land. And certainly first and foremost will be the rights of Newfoundlanders to be protected.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just made a statement that the land has not been advertised for sale. I have the ad from the mainland paper only I cannot lay my finger on it right now - it may be down in the office, I meant to bring it with me this afternoon - I have the ad in the paper, where Mr. Finch and Newfoundland Colonisation have already advertised that land on the mainland for sale without submitting a development plan. And the hon. gentleman's department is building a road at taxpayer expense -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - to develop that property for Mr. Finch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman - I mean this is the Question Period - the hon. gentleman is obviously making a speech and a bad one at that.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

I was about to direct the hon. member to ask his supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon gentleman how come the taxpayers of this Province are building a road to develop that piece of property that 6,300 acres of property under the assumption that it is a road to forests in this Province that will benefit Mr. Jolyon David Finch and his company called Newfoundland Colonisation? You would not know but they are going to settle here for the first time, Mr. Speaker; the name he has on his company is an insult to Newfoundlanders. Why is that road being built? How much is it costing the taxpayers? Would the hon. gentleman give the House that information?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, again, as in many cases in the past, the facts that are quoted by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) are not, in fact, facts. What we have done is not built a road for the person who has proposed the development, a development, Mr. Speaker, that is, in the case of the forestry sense, to harvest some budworm damaged timber that is dead and dying along that part of the Province. We have given permission to cross 3,000 feet of Crown land in order to get access to some severely damaged budworm timber along that part of the Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, if someone opposite is suggesting that we should not give permission - which costs the government nothing - to get to a resource which has a great value and which, if not used in the next five years, will rot and decay anyway, Mr. Speaker, that is not the kind of logic we use in developing our management plans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, listen to them, 'Hear, hear!' It is a wonder they do not start pounding their little paws on the desk again, their little flippers. There they go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: What we need in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - we need four or five violins

MR. NEARY: so when we get answers like that the violins will start playing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, that was a very weak-kneed answer indeed.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: The question I put to the hon. gentleman was this, this road that is being built on Mr. Finch's - is he Lord Finch, by the way, is this a lord? He is not a lord, is he?

MR. POWER: He may be, I am not sure.

MR. NEARY: Well, the road that is being built on Mr. Finch's land - Newfoundland and Mining company - will benefit Mr. Finch more than anybody else because it is opening up over 6,300 acres of land for development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I want to ask the hon. gentleman, when they decided to build that road was it done in conjunction with Mr. Finch and his company? Was the government not aware at the time that Mr. Finch and company, Colonisation and Mining Company, were going to put that land up for sale, they were going to sell it anywhere they could in the world to foreign owners, That we would have the same problem as they have in Nova Scotia with foreign ownership in this Province? Was the hon. gentleman aware of this or did it take the Liberal Association in Gander to make the hon. gentleman aware of that development on the Gander River?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I am aware,

MR. POWER: no Liberal Association has made this Province aware of anything in the last ten or twelve years or so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: There are the flippers again.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the road, in getting access to timber resources which are there, one of the problems that we have in this Province is that many acres of Newfoundland property were given away in years past. We, under this government, brought in an act in 1974 that forces persons to use the resources that they have, that they have gotten either directly or indirectly, rightfully or wrongfully, from the public, the people of Newfoundland. By our act we

MR. POWER:

are forcing persons to use the resource to make sure it is for the benefit of Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Finch or someone else may benefit from us giving permission to build a 3,000 foot road. But what I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that if we go in there and we give permission for them to build a road at their own expense, that we will have many Newfoundlanders who are employed in cutting the wood, We will have many Newfoundlanders employed in transporting the wood and we will create some jobs badly needed in Newfoundland and we will a part of our resource that if not used in the next five years is going to rot and decay anyway.

Mr. Speaker, from our point of view, that is good management.

MR. WARREN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Does the hon. member for Torngat Mountains yield to the hon. member for LaPoile (S.Neary)?

MR. WARREN:

I yield.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains yields.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, now let us get back to the question of how Newfoundland Telegraph received this land in the first place, why they were granted this land. I understand they were granted large tracts of lands in various parts of Newfoundland and I believe part of it was in Come by Chance, where the oil refinery is located. And in return, payment was to be one peppercorn a year. Now, would the hon. gentleman tell us if Newfoundland Telegraph lived up to the terms and conditions of their grant? Before they sold this land to Mr. Finch, did they live up to the terms and conditions of their

MR. NEARY: grant? Or did they unload the land because the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan), when he was the Minister of Forestry, brought in a tax on unused land in this Province, was that what stirred them up? Now, has the hon. gentleman has his legal people do the research to see if the Newfoundland Telegraph have lived up to the terms and conditions of receiving that land in the first place and before they turned it over to Mr. Finch?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Forests Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, we intend that all land owners in the Province, whether they be over 300 acres or less will obey and abide by the laws of this Province, one of which relates to the development and use of the resource. In this case, Newfoundland Colonisation and Mining will be treated no differently than any other company that does business in Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the member for Torngat Mountains yield?

MR. WARREN: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I have a number of other questions but I will ask my final supplementary for the day to the hon. gentleman. Would the hon. gentleman tell us now what happens to all the cabins that Newfoundlanders have built on the banks of the Gander River? Will they be forced to remove these cabins? And would the hon. gentleman tell us the government's position on foreign ownership in this Province? If this land is to be advertised and sold to millionaires in various parts of the world who will come in and occupy the banks of the Gander, does the government go along with that? Does the government approve, condone this land being sold to foreign owners? That is two questions.



July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3101

EL - 3

MR. NEARY: What happens to the cabins that  
- are there already and what is the government's policy on foreign ownership in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Forests  
Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the cabin owners who now own cabins along the Gander River, as in any other parts of Newfoundland they will be dealt with, as I say, as it relates to the Crown Lands Act in Newfoundland. If they are in a legal possession of Crown land, either recently or for a long period of time, they will be dealt with according to the acts that are there. As it relates to foreign ownership in Newfoundland, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud to administer a Crown Lands Act which allows Canadians to apply for Crown land in Newfoundland, something which does not happen in very many other provinces, if any, in Canada, where in most cases you have to be a resident of that Province to apply for a Crown land grant. In the case of Newfoundland we, because of our Canadian attitude, because we believe in Canada, will allow any person in Canada to apply for Crown land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Torngat yields for a supplementary from the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Only just this morning - and I cannot resist this question - only just this morning on my desk I have a request from a constituent of mine whose family before him lived, developed, worked a piece of land for way in excess of twenty years, it could even be fifty years, and they cannot get a grant or a lease or cannot get anything in legal documentation. So I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, how a Mr. Finch can come into the Province and acquire 6300 acres of land while Austin Patey - I say this for the record because I shall send to him the documentation; hopefully, Mr. Speaker, I shall have the opportunity to consult with the minister - Austin Patey of River of Ponds

MR. BENNETT: cannot get three acres of land in River of Ponds, land that these people have used -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: - all down through the years and it is not available, Mr. Speaker. Number one, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has a question?

MR. BENNETT:

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, the cost involved to people like Mr. Finch to acquire such lands as 6300 acres as opposed to our people who find it so difficult even to acquire three acres and why it is being made so difficult for them to acquire lands, Mr. Speaker, that they have owned down through the years through squatter's rights and now they cannot get legal documentation to it. I am wondering what the minister's comments would be on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the member has a problem with one of his constituents who has a problem getting either access or title to land. In Newfoundland we have a procedure whereby if clear title cannot be given through the department or division of Crown lands of my department, then there is an act called the Quieting of Titles Act which anyone in this Province can apply to and go to the courts, and if they have rightful ownership of that piece of property then it will be given to them by the courts. And that is always an out which is there whenever they cannot get satisfaction from a division of a department of government. The courts are always there to arbitrate any kind of

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3102

IB-3

MR. POWER:                   dispute about ownership of  
land. As it relates to Mr. Finch's ownership of property,  
it is an entirely different issue. As it relates to  
the member's constituent district problem, I will be glad  
to sit down and talk to him. And I understand he has  
corresponded with me and is waiting for an answer and  
I am sure we will do the very best we can with that problem.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, My question is to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie). Mr. Speaker, as a part of the preamble, during the past Winter the minister's department shipped perishable supplies into the various communities in my district where his department operates depot stores. I am just wondering and could the minister answer why his department paid freight charges over 100 per cent more than the local businessman can get the same commodities into a community?

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

MR. GOUDIE: I am not sure if I understand that question - why we pay 100 per cent of the freight charges -

MR. WARREN: 100 per cent more.

AN HON. MEMBER: Over double.

MR. GOUDIE: The cost of freight, - is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR. GOUDIE: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker, but I will find out.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, My supplementary is here is an answer from the minister on June 19th, under the minister's signature, where the minister said that a bag of onions by a private businessman would cost - that is a fifty pound bag, Mr. Speaker - \$22.50, and in the government store the freight for a bag of onions, exactly the same weight, 50 pounds, would be \$47.50 freight. I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, why \$23.50 more for one bag of onions shipped into the coast?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, now we are becoming a little more specific, I know what the hon. gentleman is talking about. If he had been courteous enough to mention that particular piece of correspondence in the beginning then we would not have had to go through this process. In any event, we pay the regular going rates to Labrador Airways or to any other carrier which takes perishable foods into the Coast of Labrador, whether it is on an aircraft or on a coastal boat. The items to which the hon. gentleman was just referring; apparently a private businessman in Postville, I believe, brought in some perishables this Spring at sometime or other - I do not remember the date now - and sold them, as I indicated, and I think the gentleman has a copy of the price list which I provided to him as well, which indicated this particular businessman sold of the commodities with the exception of one, I believe, for - or two - what was it, one or two particular commodities of the items brought in at a loss and the man says he will never do it again. So I do not know where he lost the cost recovery on these various items, but obviously what we have done is paid the amount of freight that was charged to us and have sold the items for the regular market price.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3104

EL - 1

MR. WARREN: I think, Mr. Speaker, the minister is definitely misleading the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I will ask the hon. member to withdraw.

MR. WARREN: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to give you another example, Mr. Speaker, the minister spoke about this private company losing on some commodities. To quote, Mr. Speaker, a case of apples, 140 in a case, this private individual, the freight charges were \$18 and for the government store, the freight charges were \$38, Mr. Speaker, and neither the government store nor the businessman lost on that commodity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Does the hon. member have a question?

MR. WARREN: I would like to ask the minister a question. Has the minister called tenders, has the minister's department called tenders for freight charges into the various communities along the coast as pertaining to perishable goods that are shipped in during the Winter months? Has he called tenders?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Not that I recall, Mr. Speaker. We do not normally call tenders on freight charges, but we do call tenders for the supply of materials, perishable items and non-perishable items, all items sold in the five depot stores on the coast of Labrador. As a matter of fact, we can, I suppose technically have as many as 500 different suppliers of items to coastal communities-or the depot stores in coastal communities

MR. GOUDIE: of Labrador on the North Coast. The freight costs, I would have to double check and find out exactly what the process is, but as that hon. gentleman, and I guess all other hon. gentlemen of the House know, there is only one or two air carriers operating in Labrador which would carry these items to the coast of Labrador after or during the freezeup period.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In view of the fact that the Terra Nova district along with several other rural districts in the Province was severely and disgracefully discriminated against by the government by being denied and rejected any capital works money for installation of water and sewer systems and road improvements, and in view of the fact that there is rampant unemployment in these areas, can the Premier ensure the workers of these areas, workers from the Terra Nova district and these other rural areas, that they will be guaranteed equal employment opportunity in this Province this Summer? In other words, can the Premier assure all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that they are free to seek employment anywhere in the Province, that they are allowed mobility rights within their own Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would ask the hon. member to ask that question to the hon. member for St. Barbe (T. Bennett) behind him, who wished to have local preference on a job in the Great Northern Peninsula. So that therefore there might be some possibilities that if his colleague, the member for St. Barbe, keeps insisting on that kind of local preference, that people from Terra Nova might not get jobs in the Great Northern Peninsula.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.



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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier then saying that the policy of his government is to deny the people of this Province equal employment opportunities throughout the Province, to deny them mobility rights? Is that what the Premier is saying?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to restate what has been a position by a number of member of the Opposition in debates in this House over the last couple of weeks and to inform the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) of what some of his own colleagues are saying. That is all I am trying to do, Mr. Speaker, to see whether in fact there is some consistency on the other side of the House when it comes to some of these issues which are facing the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Leader of the Opposition is against local preference as it relates to the offshore, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) is in favour of local preference when it comes to his own district, so that shows some inconsistency and I am just at a loss to know how I am supposed to respond when I get these inconsistent questions coming from the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: As it relates to the hon. member and unemployment and employment in the Province, I can only reiterate, as I have said -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, may I be protected?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I listen without any comment to questions that come from the other side of the House and I would appreciate the same courtesy in response.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, as it relates to employment and unemployment in the Province, the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is the critic for Labour and Manpower, I think, and he should know - if anybody on the other side of the House should know, it is the hon. member - that the unemployment rate in this Province has gone down almost 5 per cent in the last two years. We have created 20,000 new jobs, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are very, very proud. And if we can get on with building the hospital in the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) district, and on with building the hospital in the member for Burin - Placentia West's (Mr. Hollett) district, and on with building the hospital in Trinity North, and the hospital in Grand Falls, and the hospital in Forteau, another great Liberal district, we will even reduce the unemployment rate further.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: In the name of humanity, Mr. Speaker, I am calling on the Premier to assure the people of the Terra Nova district, who have been severely discriminated against, as I pointed out, with no monies for employment in the area this year, in the name of humanity, will the Premier tell those people that they have equal employment

MR. LUSH: opportunities in this Province, that they are allowed to move around this Province to get jobs, for example, on the Upper Salmon project and at Cat Arm and other government projects?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The question is out of order because it is a question that already has been asked and has been answered or not answered, and Beauchesne says you cannot repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer has been refused.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts that I quoted, is the Premier willing to announce this day that his government will rescind the local preference policy presently in effect on the Upper Salmon, which is discriminatory against the people of Terra Nova district and other rural districts throughout this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have seen in various parts of this Province, in Happy Valley/Goose Bay, in the Roddickton area, in the Bay d'Espoir area, and in other areas of the Province from time to time, severe unemployment problems, extremely severe, very depressed conditions -

MR. LUSH: No wonder he does not like the mobility' rights across Canada.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - to the extent that in the Bay d'Espoir area, in the last couple of years before the Upper Salmon project, there was unemployment at 50 per cent, 60 per cent and as high as 70 per cent. We have reduced that now, I dare say, Mr. Speaker, it is down to 10 per cent -

MR. LUSH: Nonsense, hogwash.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and we are very proud of that. So there has to be on some of those major projects, which are now in a depressed area, certain preference given to the local people who have worked on other hydro projects like, for example, the original Bay d'Espoir project itself. So there has been some of that and we have tried to be fair and yet seeing that people from other parts of the Province get a good crack at these jobs as well. So we are trying to be as fair as we can given the depressed conditions in certain particular areas around the Province. But I can

PREMIER PECKFORD: assure the hon. member that I am sure there are workers in Musgravetown and there are workers in Glovertown and there are workers throughout the Terra Nova district who are great workers -

MR. LUSH: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - some of the best workers in the Province and that they will be able to obtain employment around the Province just the same as workers from other districts who are obtaining employment right now.

MR. LUSH: Upper Salmon.

MR. SPEAKER: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Denturists", (Bill No. 49).

The last day of debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), who is not here.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

If the hon. minister speaks know he will close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there are a few things I want to respond to that were raised yesterday. A couple of the speakers made some general remarks about dental care. The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) was equating, of course, denturism with dental care and he was talking about what was going to happen in St. Barbe, and I told him I would check it out and find out. What we do have in St. Barbe, of course, for the first time we have a dentist stationed in the Western part, and in September we will have one on the other part of the district and, of course, they will be very well served there. He is not in the House, but I thank him for giving me the opportunity to point that out.

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3106

SD - 3

MR. HOUSE:

The other thing I want to say, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. HOUSE:

- in relation to that is the fact

that there is in

MR. HOUSE:

the last ten years, I believe, about ten years - and I am not equating that with any regime or any reason - the fact is we have doubled the number of dentists in the Province. And, of course, most of that doubling has gone into the remote parts of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: There are still problems, that is correct. But I am saying that what we have done, we have doubled the number. And I think it is something like 80 per cent of school pupils have access to, are getting access to dentists in the school programme. Unfortunately in a few places -

MR. STIRLING: This is a Liberal programme.

MR. HOUSE: Oh, this is a programme that has been in place ten years and improved on and expanded.

MR. STIRLING: Tell us about one improvement, one expansion.

MR. HOUSE: Ten to twelve, including twelve. But that is the facts, Mr. Speaker, and what has happened in that respect is the fact that, you know, 70 per cent to 80 per cent of the people are getting service through that programme.

Now there are two or three things I want to mention. First of all, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) led off on the debate yesterday after I had finished. I want to point out two or three things. First of all, that we are following very closely the recommendations of the select committee of the House of Assembly on the denture problem and the denturists' bill. They recommended that it be a committee composed - the only thing that we are not following closely is we do not want

MR. HOUSE: to overload the committee with other professional people other than denturists. We are putting a dentist on because of the fact that, of course, he is the expert in making dentures and in all matters pertaining to dentistry.

There is nothing that has changed in the Province to change what the select committee said that we should do. The only thing that has changed is the fact that there are more dentists and perhaps the need for denturists is not so acute as it was when the select committee had met. I just stated that we have doubled the number of dentists in the last ten years and most of these, as I said, have gone into the remote parts. So it points out that there is no greater need for any improvement on what the select committee said about denturists now as was then, there is no greater need for denturists now than was then and they should not have a bigger mandate.

Now, the argument came up about partial dentures, and I want to point out that we could possibly have deviously gone about a way of putting in a mechanism for dealing with partial dentures. We could have done that like they did in Saskatchewan and like they did in Ontario. But you want to bear in mind what Saskatchewan has done: They gave legislation that a denturist supply partial dentures but only with a written referral from a dentist. Now, Mr. Speaker, all information I have that I have been able to garner is that there is no desire on the part of the denturists and the dentists to work together in this regard, and you just cannot impose that kind of thing. So I do not think it would have done anybody any good to put that kind of legislation in here.



MR. HOUSE: Ontario, for instance, they talk about Ontario's legislation, In Ontario a denturist or a dental therapist-or a denture therapist rather, may only carry out inter-oral procedures in the office of a dental surgeon and under that particular person's supervision.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition I am referring to because he mentioned this, he said that the fabrication of teeth is done, the manufacture, by technicians. It is true that dentists themselves hire hygienists and

MR. HOUSE:

technicians. That is a fact. But the impressions are taken by dentists, the fittings are done and perfected by dentists, and they have, of course, sufficient education in reading X-rays and in oral pathology to determine what has to be done. I do not think the present training of the people who are classing themselves right now at this point in time as denturists are equipped with that kind of knowledge, and I would have a lot of difficulty in allowing people without these qualifications to be making legally partial dentures.

Now this leads me, of course, to the other word that they talked about yesterday, the word 'professionalism' and they say this group is a professional group like the Law Society or like the optometrists or like the dentists or the doctors or any other group. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty with that particular statement too because it is a good philosophical argument; I do not know how you would define a full-fledged professional. Certainly I do not think, you know, in most of these it is the highly skilled people who have several years of training. I do not think that the people who are denturists are under that particularly category. The best I can say is that they are para-professional, or perhaps it is a trade, that the trade is to manufacture of a prosthesis.

Now I do not know what the word is when you say it is adequate. So part of the process in this particular act, Mr. Speaker, part of the process is to define what the education of denturists will be, to train and define what it will be. Then, of course, I do not know what can happen; there is always a mechanism to put in place a training programme or put in an amendment relating to partial dentures.

Now the other thing there is the board. And I want to say why we determined that the board

MR. HOUSE: should be three, three, and one, and it is the fact that the board is not a board like, for instance, the Opticians Board, who work under another group.

Now these people who are denturists are doing their work, they are doing the impressions, and they are also doing the dispensing; they are doing a total health service. And that is why I think at this point in time that they should not have a majority of members on that board. But I do believe, of course, as time progresses and as they prove themselves and get the proper organization and training that perhaps that particular thing shall change.

So these were the two main arguments, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to rebutt. And, of course, I am very pleased that we have gotten this far with this act. I think it has been a long time coming but, as I said at the beginning, it is following closely the recommendation of the select committee of the House of Assembly and nothing has changed in that time for us to change that particular recommendation.

And it gives me great pleasure to move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Denturists", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 49).

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 10, Bill No. 37.

Motion, second reading, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Embalmers And Funeral Directors Act, 1975". (Bill No. 37).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on that. It is an amendment to this particular act.

MR. HOUSE: We have under the Department of Health Act and the regulations under this Act, the mechanism whereby we can inspect the properties of any funeral director and, of course, for the purposes of seeing that it is sanitary and that sort of thing. But we do not have any capability within the department to ensure that the building is adapted for what it is meant to be, a funeral parlor. This particular section is being added to give an inspection section and that will allow, of course, members of the board the privilege to go in and inspect the premises, and that is all this particular amendment is doing.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Embalmers And Funeral Directors Act, 1975," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 37)

MR. MARSHALL: Order 11 Bill No. 14.  
Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Medical Act, 1974," (Bill No. 14).

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this is as a result of a request coming in from the Newfoundland Medical Association. As it stands now, in order to change a by-law the Newfoundland Medical Association, under the Medical Act have to get the consent of sixty-six and two thirds per cent of all the members. Of course, that was very good a few years ago when every one of them may have turned up to a meeting but, of course, there are a large number of medical people now, doctors in the Province in the Medical Association and, of course, it is impossible to get two thirds

MR. HOUSE: of them voting together, and it is impossible to get it done by proxy. So what they are asking, and it is at their request, is that this act be changed to two-thirds of those voting either at a meeting and on the same issue by proxy. And that will be the new amendment to the act.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Medical Act, 1974," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 14).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 12 Bill No. 13.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospitals Act, 1971." (Bill No. 13).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides that a hospital board would be able to manage two or more hospitals. Also the Act now reads that any naming of the hospital board is that it shall be known as the---Hospital Board---the Lady Northcliffe Hospital Board or the General Hospital Corporation Hospital Board. Today we have hospital boards doing something more, they are doing other branches of health care delivery other than , of course, operating hospitals, so we want to arrange now so that the bill would give the Lieutenant-Governor in Council greater flexibility in naming hospital boards under Section 5. That is that they could name it something other than hospital board. For instance, the Grenfell board want to be known as the Health Services Board. That is a very minor amendment, that it is just a matter of, really, giving permission for a name change.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that seems to me to be an oversimplification of what this bill is all about. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House

- and perhaps he can tell us now when he stands to close the debate-whether or not hospital boards are operating one or more hospitals now. If they are doing it now, which ones are doing it and why it was necessary to bring in this bill. Does the government anticipate that in future they are going to put more hospitals under a single board? Because some boards may operate better than others, and because there may be some difficulty in getting manpower or womanpower to serve on these boards, are these the reason why this bill is necessary at this time, Mr. Speaker?

I wish the hon. gentleman, when he was introducing this legislation - this is the third bill now that he has introduced - and he has given us very little information to go on, very little to argue about, very little to debate. Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that this bill is more significant and more important than the hon. gentleman is telling the House. So perhaps the hon. gentleman would care now, if nobody else wants to say anything about it, to elaborate on some of the points that I have raised.

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

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought I mentioned that it would allow, under the act, to operate two or more hospitals, and I believe we put the word 'sheduled' in there because all hospitals operate under a schedule. That is to differentiate it

MR. HOUSE:

from a hospital like, for instance, the cottage hospitals or the - those are not scheduled hospitals until they come under a board - one in Argentinia, for instance. That would not be able to come under one of our boards.

The fact is yes, we do have a number. We are getting some of the bigger hospital boards taking over cottage hospitals. A case in point: The Gander Hospital, for instance, operates the Fogo Island cottage hospital - that is taken over under that board - and it operates the one in Brookfield. I believe we are trying to make an arrangement so that Grand Falls will be operating the hospital, say, in Harbour Breton.

The Grenfell Board is a new board, took over in April of this year. It was operated by the Grenfell Mission. The board, of course, is a local board now with representation from the Grenfell, but they operate a large number of hospitals. They operate Churchill Falls, they operate one in Goose Bay, and the one in St. Anthony, and then, of course, a number of nursing stations along the coast.

Also, in addition to that, they are doing the public health service as well as a lot of dental programmes. So you are correct. There are some of them doing it, but the legislation is not exactly there to do it. We want to change it for that.

The other thing is, of course, the name is significant.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE:

Yes, we are hoping to. For instance, there are some places we would not amalgamate with others, but as a general, common

MR. HOUSE: agreement with the area, yes,  
because, for instance, Grand Falls is the major hospital  
for a particular centre.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: They have not as yet.  
There has not been any move that way as yet, but it is  
not the same because Botwood uses the Grand Falls  
hospital anyway. But they are referred from Harbour  
Breton to Grand Falls. So I can use this as a case.

Now, Port aux Basques  
Hospital, the one in your district, was a cottage hospital  
but that has its own board. And, of course, Burgeo, I  
think. Burgeo is another one that may be coming up.



MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) is it a good board.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, it is an excellent board, no question about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: Yes, all boards are good but most of the members of that board, by the way, just about have their time up, that time served, yes.

I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospitals Act, 1971.", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow, (Bill No. 13)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting Dispensing Opticians", (Bill No. 21).

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this is a new act and it is an act respecting dispensing opticians and of course, by definition dispensing opticians are those who dispense optical appliances and of course it defines in -

MR. STIRLING: Very similar to the one for denturists.

MR. HOUSE: No, not exactly, not exactly. I will tell you the difference in these and the denturists. These are to an optometrist what a druggist is to a doctor. They dispense what the optometrist usually prescribes. A dentist prescribes and dispenses and the denturists prescribe and dispense.

MR. STIRLING: That is not what they are asking for.

MR. HOUSE: Oh, yes. That is what they are asking for. Oh, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) what the doctor (inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: No, Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. HOUSE: But this has never been under an act, the opticians have never been under an act, but there is a Dispensing Opticians Guild who agreed with us that we should, of course, put in place an act to govern the people who are presently dispensing and, of course, they would have a grandfather clause in this particular case because they have been dispensing for a large number of years. And also it does determine two or three ways for education programmes which are outlined in this particular act.

We have had a long service with most of these people. There is nothing controversial in it. We are setting up a board and again the board is going to consist of four opticians, in this case, and two people, I believe it is, two others - three others; one which may -

MR. STIRLING: Do they not do the same thing as the denturists?

MR. HOUSE: No, I explained the reason, the difference for that. I am explaining that these people are operating under, basically under the guidance of other professional groups. They are dispensing for a particular prescription, that is right. There are other parts here that they will have to specify who will be able to dispense contact lenses. That is the other.

MR. STIRLING: You know there is a monopoly in Newfoundland.

MR. HOUSE: A monopoly on what?

MR. STIRLING: Opticians.

MR. HOUSE: Possibly there is, yes.

What we are putting in place is legislation, not to control the industry as much as it is to register the people who are involved in dispensing and to set up standards of education. The other point, as I said, I want to point out, one of the things it will not allow, this particular act,

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3111

EL - 3

MR. HOUSE: will not allow an optician to dispense. It will not allow an optician to dispense contact lenses unless it is specified by an optometrist or a doctor.

Sometimes, I think now they can go in and change the prescription from an ordinary glass to a contact lense, but now, they are not permitted to do that under this particular act.

MR. HOUSE: There are three conditions there - I think we should outline that - for training. They must have successfully completed a course in optical dispensing recognized by the board, and have received practical training and optical dispensing from a dispensing optician or optometrist for the period of a year, or have completed at least three years of training in optical dispensing under the direct supervision of a dispensing optician, and have completed a home study course. That is the other one.

The third one is a combination of any of these.

I mentioned that we are going to allow the grandfather clause to be operative here if somebody has been operating for a year.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very straightforward act, it is not controversial by any stretch of the imagination, and I will try to answer any questions from any member.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was not here when the minister explained the difference between a denturist and a dispensing optician. I know they are in different fields of endeavour, but in their mode of operation I do not see too much difference. I mean, we could, I assume, require that denturists would prepare dentures through a dentist. I am not aware of any situation that exists now - the minister refers to the act in that now an optician cannot dispense contact lenses without first having those prescribed by a regular eye doctor. I was not aware that that was the practice by any of our dispensing opticians prior to this act being debated here.

MR. THOMS:

I have worn contact lenses now, I think, for something like twenty-five or twenty-six years. When they first came on the market, I was one of the ones who first had the hard contact lenses and I have been wearing them ever since. I had them changed once in the last twenty-four or twenty-five years. That is one of the advantages over the type of glasses that the minister is wearing. They do, as I understand it - and they have certainly done in my case - stabilize the eyesight of a person and you find that you do not need to change them as often as you do the ordinary glasses. If a person can wear them, I would certainly recommend that they get them.

MR. THOMS: Originally I obtained them and then a few years ago when I had the prescription changed, it was done on the advice of a optometrist who did it. I know one of the opticians in this city, a Mr. John Power, who I consider one of the best men at the job that you could find. He gives excellent service and I certainly had no complaints with him and I have been going to him now since I have been about eighteen or nineteen years of age, which was not yesterday, Mr. Speaker. But there is another difference in this particular piece of legislation than in the piece of legislation passed earlier this afternoon called "An Act Respecting Denturists" and that is that in this particular case we do not have the majority on the board represented by people outside the profession.

In this particular case there are seven members appointed by the minister, four of whom shall be dispensing opticians; the other three need not be, but I can assume that they could all be dispensing opticians but there are four of whom must be dispensing opticians. So in all likelihood you are going to get four opticians and three laymen on the board. But there is one question in connection with this bill I would like the minister to, if he might, give me the rationale behind it. In most professions, and certainly in the profession that I am associated with, the Law Society of this Province, the board - in the Law Society's case it is call the Benchers - elect their own Benchers to run their own organization and they are governed under the Law Society Act. They are not appointed by the minister, they are elected by the members at large of the Law Society, and if you are in practice, I think it is for ten years or something, five year, whatever the case might be, you are eligible to become a Bencher. But they are governed by the Law Society Act, but the members of the Law Society themselves elect their members to their board which they call

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3113

SD - 2

MR. THOMS:                   the Benchers or they elect their members to the board and I believe they have a rotation where some are elected for one year, some for two years, some for three years and they rotate in that manner. But

July 7 1981

Tape No. 3114

IB-1

MR. THOMS:

I am wondering why, in these cases that we have coming before the House now, that it is the minister who is appointing the board. I mean, the Optician's Guild and the opticians in this Province enjoy a good, good reputation. I am wondering why we could not give them the same privilege as we give the Law Society, of letting them elect their own board rather than having the board appointed by the minister. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that an effort should be made on the part of government to have less to do with the everyday lives of people in the professions and people generally. I think you have seen

this wave of sentiment in the Reagan administration, in the Government of the United States, where Reagan says the government should get off the backs of the people. And this is another example. It seems to me that we should - I do not understand why the minister would want to, in all these cases, appoint boards. Why not let the professions, themselves, govern themselves and elect their own boards and carry on their own business under an act of this Legislature, the same as the Law Society of the Province?

You know, I have argued in this House time and time again, I think there is probably almost total agreement within the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, that there should be a Police Commission. And the reason for it is to get politics out of the Newfoundland Constabulary. As long as you have that link between the Department of Justice and the administration, you are going to have problems. Well, it is the same thing here. It makes no difference how straightforward or how honest or how much integrity the minister shows in appointing the members to these boards, the accusation is



MR. THOMS: always going to be there that he is putting a bunch of Tories on as members of the board. I mean, no matter how much integrity you show, if you threw every practicing optician's name in a hat and pulled them out, if you were that democratic, Mr. Speaker, if the minister were that democratic, there are still those, and a majority of them, who will say that you are appointing Tory, for the want of a better word - I do not like the word, but for want of a better word, you are appointing Tory hacks to these boards, so that you are always giving it that political connotation, that political connotation.

So to me it is something, I believe, that we should be trying to get away from rather than having that little hold on these professional organizations that we have by the minister having the authority to appoint the boards. Let them appoint their own boards. If they are not capable, if they are not qualified of running their own affairs and electing their own boards, then we should not be talking about them in the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: Carried.

MR. THOMS: Is my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) anxious to get out of the House? I thought you were going to be here until Christmas?

MR. NEARY: I thought you were finished.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: I thought you were going to be here until Christmas. Now he wants me to hurry up. What a myth, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Hurry up. Hurry up.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a -

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3114

IB-3

MR. NEARY:

Carried.

MR. THOMS:

That is difficult. That is  
difficult. Is he attracted to -

MR. SPEAKER

Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Yes, okay. Because that could probably keep me on my feet all afternoon, if he did not retract that particular statement, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, it is just a point that I wanted to make, that if we are going to set up these organizations, if we are going to set up these boards, well, then, let us give them the responsibility, let us take the political connotation out of it. It is like I said, if the minister will throw all the names of every lay person in the Province in a large drum, and put in all the names of all the dispensing opticians, when he makes the appointment to the board, Mr. Speaker, he is going to be accused of appointing Tories to the board.

It would be the same thing if we were over there, and if my hon. friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) were Minister of Health and he did the same thing, it makes no difference who is in power, who forms the government; as long as these boards are appointed by the minister, then you are going to have these accusations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): If the hon. Minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The Hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: If the member for Torngat Mountains were Minister of Health, there would not be much change on top.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: There would be a lot from there down, I would suggest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the main points the member talked about there was the appointment of the Denturist Board as compared to this one. And again I have to say that this board is a dispensing board which works under direction, dispensing under the direction of optometrists or medical doctors. That is a little different.

Now, the other one, as I said, is offering a complete health service - partial health service, complete. And that is why we think that the board should have the makeup that it has. Of course, I did say that I think that as time goes on that that board could - you know, certainly there could be amendments to it.

With regard to the dispensing of contact lenses, it is quite clear that before there was no regulation governing it. Now I have stated that the regulation is there.

With regard to the appointment of boards, usually in these kinds of cases we go to the particular organization and ask them for a list of names. We get that list of names and, of course, that is the professional appointee. We do go and select the other members.

For the information - and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) should listen to this - of the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), we never always appoint Tories to boards. You will want to know that the Chairman of the Board of Funeral Embalmers and Directors is one Julia Briffett from Corner Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER:

She was a Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE:

I move second reading,

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please! Order, please!

On motion, a bill, "An Act

Respecting Dispensing Opticians", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

(Bill No. 21).

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 14, Bill No. 12.

Motion, second reading of a

bill, "An Act To Amend The Timber Scalers Act". (Bill No.12).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of

Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:

In introducing an Act To Amend The Timber Scalers Act, I will not take a great deal of time other than to say it is typical legislation brought in by this government in the sense that we move quietly and diplomatically to improve the lot of the ordinary workers of this Province. In the case of timber scaling in this Province, timber scalers who are licenced by the Province often do not work for the companies.

In the case of where a dispute arises between a wage earner of one of the companies and the timber scaler, in the old days it was just put out to an appeal system and an arbitrator came in, the official timber scaler of the Province came in. But the decision of the official scaler was not binding. As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, the only recourse for a wage earner, who did not agree with the official scaler's report, was to take the matter to court, oftentimes necessitating great amounts of money and great amounts of time.

MR. POWER: In order to make that fair to the loggers of this Province, to the ordinary wage earners, we are now proposing an amendment to the decision of the official scaler, in the case of a dispute, binding up on all parties, allowing for an appeal mechanism, but making sure that it is binding on all parties, thus allowing any ordinary workers who do have a dispute with the timber scalers, who are employed by the companies, to avoid the costly time and finances of going to the court system and having it binding on both parties. And again, Mr. Speaker, it is a type of an amendment which again protects the ordinary workers of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Who appoints the official scaler?  
Where does he come from?

MR. THOMS: Carried.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it will be carried.  
I will not delay the House like the hon. gentleman did. You know, will there be official scalers in various parts of the Province or will there be just one provincial official scaler or two? How many will there be? And how do they get appointed? I mean, what are there qualifications?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the one official scaler will be a senior civil servant who obviously has earned that position over a period of time, and he will be the official scaler for the Province. There will be a Timber Scalers Board, which will be made up of senior timber scalers both of the companies and of the government itself, and those are the persons to whom an appeal can be made. So the official scalers employed by the Province, and there will be a Timber Scalers Board made up of timber scalers throughout the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Timber Scalers Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 12).

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 16, Bill No. 36.

Motion, second reading of a bill,

"An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." (Bill No. 36).

MR. SPEAKER(Baird):

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. R. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, this is really some housekeeping amendments to The Highway Traffic Act. The first one, Clause (1), deals with the definition of a school bus and it merely allows the same protection to school buses transporting children to activities outside regularly going from home to the school. It will take care of situations where school children are transported to baseball games or to stadiums and to swimming pools or school picnics and this sort of a thing. It will require the drivers of vehicles coming up to school buses that have their flashing lights on will be required to stop as per now, during regular school hours.

Clauses (2) through (8)

refer to the issuing of dealer plates to people who are in the automotive sales business, and it removes providing two plates and restricts them to one. This is to reduce some abuse that has been detected with some operators using the same plate number on two different vehicles at the same time. So it will restrict the issuance of plates to one.

Clause (9) refers to the trainee or a beginner getting a motorcycle licence. Prior to this amendment an operator who was learning to use a motorcycle, the only time he was permitted to be on the highroad was during the testing, when he was making application or being tested for his licence. This will allow a motorcycle operator, under restricted road conditions, or reduced speed limits, on secondary roads and so on, to operate on that road provided he is accompanied by a licenced driver, either beside him on a

MR. DAWE: either beside him in a motorcycle or behind him in some other vehicle, a motor car. Clause 10: This will increase the fee of searching for motor vehicle records from \$2.00 to \$5.00, very straightforward. Clause 11 refers to the Judgement Recovery Act and it provides the - as a matter of fact, Clause 11, 12, 13 and 14 refer to the Judgement Recovery (Nfld.) Limited and it refines some of the requirements that go into seeking judgement, things like increasing the limit on minor claims from \$500 to \$1000, keeping in tune with inflation and so on. Clause 15 requires the operators of motor vehicles when approaching a crosswalk where someone leaves the sidewalk and begins to walk across, to stop going in both directions. Right now the law only says that you have to stop if the pedestrian is in your particular right of way. This new amendment will cause the vehicle operators to stop, going in both directions. Clause 16 is an amendment requested by the city of Corner Brook. Prior to this the city of Corner Brook and St. John's were exempt from the school bus regulations which provided for operators of other motor vehicles stopping for flashing lights, picking up and letting out children. Corner Brook have asked to have this included in their by-laws and so this amendment will acknowledge their request. Clause 17 requires an operator of a motor vehicle who is involved in an accident to provide to a person at the scene of the accident, either a person involved or an observer, a witness who might consider some of the information might be valuable later in some other action that may or may not be taken, either to provide proof of insurance, registration and so on. Clause 18 just increases the amount required to report an accident from \$200 to \$500, again keeping in line with some of the



MR. DAWE: inflationary problems we have upon us. Clause 19 will allow the Motor Registration Division to release information to selected individuals requiring information about the records of drivers and their operating records over a period of time. These would be solicitors or representatives of the individuals involved in an accident and so on. Clause 20 puts some more clarity into the situation as it relates to municipalities setting some speed limits and regulations within the municipalities, and outlining, more specifically, procedures to follow in setting fees or fines for violations of these particular offences.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would gather from browsing through this Act that there is more than just some housekeeping amendments in this particular Act. One thing it does is it increases the amount - now I think, you have to report an accident - Was it \$200?

MR. DAWE: Over \$200.

MR. NEARY: Over \$200. Now they are increasing that to \$500. That is a major amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE: Raised it from \$200.

MR. NEARY: Is that because of inflation?

MR. DAWE: The cost of everything.

MR. NEARY: The cost of everything. The cost of repairs are going up so they lift the ceiling. Now, Mr. Speaker, this act contains a number of amendments, some of them are housekeeping and some of them are substantial. But what I want to talk about are a couple of things that this Act does not contain. I am referring mainly to tractor trailers using the Trans-Canada Highway

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3117

ah-3

MR. NEARY: and our public roads on weekends and holidays and on Sundays. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that should stop and it should stop immediately.

MR. THOMS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I will bet, and I do not have the figures in front of me, I do not have the statistics, but I will bet more accidents are caused by tractors and tractor trailers in this Province than any other source of accidents on the Trans-Canada Highway. Last weekend, which was a long weekend,

MR. NEARY:                      weekend, I left St. John's myself to drive down to Freshwater, Placentia, on a Sunday, on the Canada Day weekend. And just as I got outside the overpass I was overtaken by an Irving Oil tanker loaded with flammable products, stamped right across it, 'flammable'. Now, that tanker, Mr. Speaker, you would not know but what the driver was in the Grand Prix the way he passed the traffic going down the Trans-Canada. And I was expecting to drive a few miles down the highway and see him piled up in the side of the cliff or over an embankment somewhere on the Trans-Canada Highway. An Irving Oil tanker on a Sunday, terrifying people who were out with their families driving down the Trans-Canada Highway! I think it is shameful! The worst stretch of road is between Stephenville and Port aux Basques, one that I have become very familiar with in recent years, since 1975. I have been over that road - the next time I go down will be fifteen times since the first of the year, between Stephenville and Port aux Basques. I have made fourteen trips and next week I will be making my fifteenth trip. You are taking your life in your own hands, Mr. Speaker, driving down that stretch of road where you have a large concentration of tractor trailers.

  This matter was raised in the House before. Obviously, the government have turned a deaf ear to it. Only the other evening there was an accident over on the Thorburn Road that was caused by a tractor. I do not know whose fault it was. But practically every accident that is reported, there is a tractor trailer or a tractor involved.

  I think, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the minister to take the bull by the horns and bar tractor trailers and commercial vehicles off

MR. NEARY: our highways and by-roads on weekends and on Sundays. Now, highways and by-roads were put there for the convenience and for the pleasure of Newfoundland drivers, Newfoundlanders who want to take their families out. You are risking your life taking your family on the Trans-Canada highway on a weekend and it is time to stop, Mr. Speaker, this slaughter on the Trans-Canada Highway. That fellow who went off in the Irving Oil tanker - well, you should have seen him zig-zagging in and out of traffic, a line of traffic, I suppose, a mile and a half long, with this huge tanker. It was not just an ordinary delivery truck that I am talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Eighteen wheeler.

MR. NEARY: Eighteen wheels, Mr. Speaker, zigzagging and sauntering down the highway. You would not know, as I say, that the driver was over in Monte Carlo in the Grand Prix, and everybody frightened to death. I know I was scared, I was frightened. I was expecting to see a pile-up any minute. That was on a Sunday when people were out for a Sunday drive, and it is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. We have had enough slaughter now on our highways as a result of accidents involving these tractor trailers and it is time to put a stop to it and bar them off the highways, bar them from midnight Friday night until midnight Sunday Night. Do not allow any commercial vehicles of any kind. Unless they are carrying perishable products and they get a special permit to do that from the minister, then they should not be allowed on the highways. Mr. Speaker, that is one point I wanted to raise on this matter.

The other point has to do with school buses. I notice now that - and this is a major amenement too - that the new act, these amendments will compel school buses to pull in on the side of the road

MR. NEARY: rather than hold up up traffic.

I often wondered, Mr. Speaker, what sense it made. You have a school bus, say, going from here to Portugal Cove, making about fifteen or twenty stops on the way to Portugal Cove and holding up the traffic all the way from St. John's to Portugal Cove. I am sure hon. gentlemen must have experienced that. I think they would be better off if they were to stop at selected positions along the road, pull in on the side of the road and have crosswalks for the children who have to cross the road. Is that not more sensible, Mr. Speaker, than having

MR. NEARY: lines of traffic, sometimes miles and miles of traffic tied up because under this law that we have cars have to stop when the red lights are flashing? So I would like for the minister to elaborate on that. Because it seems to me that is what this bill will do, and it is going to mean, if that is what it means then, there will have to be some education into the new system. The school safety programmes will have to be geared up and the bus drivers will have zero in on the new rules and regulations. Because in this act as amended, as I understand it, if the bus pulls into the side of the road, well, then, the traffic will just pass by, both ways, coming and going, if that is what it means.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything else I have to say about this bill. There is an awful lot of stuff in here for amendments. There is reference again to the judgement recovery, Mr. Speaker, and that raises the matter that I raised in this hon. House before about vehicle owners beating the compulsory insurance. And I am told how they do it; when they apply for their licences they have to give the policy number. So they make arrangements with the insurance companies to get their policy number and then, after they get their licence, they either do not pay the insurance or they let it run out. As a result, we have too many drivers on our highways and by-roads driving without insurance.

I know a number of people who have come to me who have been involved in accidents that were not their fault, and the culprit did not have insurance. I do not know how they can get away with it, Mr. Speaker. I have to get my insurance, and hon. members have to get their insurance, and everybody else is supposed to get their insurance, but you would be surprised at the number of drivers who are using our highways and by-roads who do not have public liability insurance. I do not know what happened to

MR. NEARY: the old fashioned road checks that we saw carried out a few years ago, I have not seen one in recent years. There was a time when the police would check you for your driver's licence. Why I will bet you, Mr. Speaker - let me see, the last time and the only time in recent years that I was stopped and asked if I had a driver's licence, was in Port aux Basques. And Port aux Basques, a year or so ago, was like a police state, every car, after eleven o'clock in the night, was stopped and I was no exception. I was stopped and I was asked for my licence, only once, but that is the only time, I would say, in twenty years. I could have been driving back and forth, driving for the last twenty years without a licence. How many hon. members have been stopped in the last twenty years and asked to produce their licence and asked to produce proof that they have public liability insurance? How often? Not very often, Mr. Speaker. But in the old days - there was a time when you were stopped every year, at the expiration date. When the licences became due, for the next several weeks, there were spot checks here and there to find out how many people were driving without a licence. And I will bet you that is another thing that you would be surprised to know, how many people in this Province are driving without a qualified driver's licence.

MR. DAWE: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you prove it?

MR. NEARY: No, I cannot prove it. But I am amazed, reading the court reports, at the number of people who are hauled before court for this and that, and for traffic violations, who do not have a driver's licence, or he does not have public liability insurance. Now, that is not good enough. If we have a law, then the law must be enforced. I would like for the minister to comment on that. There should be no need at all for a judgement recovery

MR. NEARY:

fund in this Province. There should be no need of it. I mean, if we have compulsory insurance, we have compulsory insurance. Nobody should get away, be allowed to break the law. Why should we have a judgement recovery fund? The judgement recovery fund is to take care of those people who do not have insurance, who are involved in accidents. But the law says you have to have insurance.

Mr. Speaker, that is a contradiction. And the other thing I wanted to talk about before I take my seat, and I will be brief about this because this is something that disturbs me to no end, that gets my dander up, it gets me riled up everytime I go to St. John's Airport or everytime I go over to Memorial University, when I see the regalia and the rigs and the electronic devices and the electronic eyes that they have for swindling the public. The taxpayers put that parking lot down at St. John's Airport and the taxpayers put the parking lot over there at Memorial University.

MR. TULK:

And the Health Sciences.

MR. NEARY:

And the Health Sciences. And why should- when everytime you go down to St. John's Airport, you have to get in and pull out a slip and up goes the rail and in you go and you pay \$2.50 a day for the privilege and pleasure of parking at St. John's Airport. And a guardhouse on this end with a little machine there with a tag hanging out; you push a button, a tag comes out, you pull it out, up goes the rail, you get inside the rail.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is the federal government.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. HOLLETT:

They do not control the parking lots.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the rules and regulations for parking are made in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, they are not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Ah,



MR. NEARY: they certainly are. We have a full-time man, just listen to this- I am not finished with St. John's Airport yet. I am going to have a severe dart at that and I do not care who is responsible for it. It is not good enough. The regimentation, the devious ways they have for socking it to the poor old vehicle operator, a person who goes down to the airport. You talk about a police state. Why you would not see the likes of that in Moscow, what is happening at St. John's Airport.

MR. CARTER: That is Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not care who it is. Whoever is responsible for it should be ashamed of themselves. So, up goes the rail, you drive inside, you park your car and if you overnight there, it costs you \$2.50. At the other end they have a man sitting down in a uniform with a big badge on like a sherrif, and he sits there very stern-faced and when you are driving out, if you were there overnight, \$2.50.

MR. WARREN: If you are there a week, \$10.

MR. NEARY: If you are there a week, \$10.

Now, I went down there recently and I thought I would beat that machine. I parked way up on the back and when I came back, I was gone one night, and when I got back it cost me - I have not paid it yet- it cost me \$5 for a ticket. So, there was no choice. If I had gone inside, it would have cost me \$2.50. I parked outside and it cost me \$5.

MR. L. THOMS: That was not very smart, was it?

MR. NEARY: No, it was not very smart. I went out another time, I came back. I went in, I pulled out the little slip of paper, and when I was driving out-I was gone from one o'clock in the day until four thirty the next afternoon, from one o'clock Saturday to four thirty on Sunday, a part of

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3120

EL - 3

MR. NEARY:

a day.

Do you know how much I had to pay,

Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Five bucks.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman is right, five bucks, for a part of a day. Not \$2.50 plus -

MR. HOUSE:

We cannot change that over here.

We do not make the rules out there.

MR. NEARY:

Well, if every hon.member in this House, if every hon. member stood in this House and racked up the perpetrators of that conspiracy down at St. John's Airport, turning it into a police state, they might be shamed into doing something about it. I think it is shameful. You pull up to a parking meter down there, you go in to pick up bags belonging to sick people or an invalid, and when you get back to the car, with the trunk open, probably the engine running, a ticket slapped on the windshield.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough.

It is not fair treatment of our Newfoundland people. Somebody should go down with a bulldozer and bulldoze these sentry

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3121

IB-1

MR. NEARY: boxes out of it. You would not know but -

AN HON. MEMBER: Civil disorder.

MR. NEARY: Yes, civil disorder. You know I am really tempted -

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - really tempted to go down there with a bulldozer and bulldoze down these guardhouses they have down there. You know, the last time we saw them was in the Second World War, sentry boxes, guardhouses, down here at the airport.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman over there should not interrupt, because in this building, now, we have a full-time man, and that is not Mr. Trudeau or the Ministry of Transport, we have a full-time man in this building going around issuing tickets, a full-time man, a fellow dressed up in a uniform, going around this building, going around the parking lots of this building issuing tickets, full-time.

MR. TULK: They do not want visitors.

MR. NEARY: No, they do not want visitors. Mr. Speaker, the same thing over at Memorial, the campus over at Memorial. You cannot blame that on Ottawa. The same thing, they have the sentry boxes over there. You go in, you have to put your coin in, sentry, put your coin in, up goes the rail, you drive out the other end, you go through the magic eye up goes the rail. I think it is absolutely disgraceful, Mr. Speaker. And the only thing that I can say is that Newfoundlanders must be awfully soft to let the authorities get away with it. That huge big parking lot down at St. John's airport, quarter-full and half-full.

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3121

IB-2

MR. HOUSE: A true Canadian.  
MR. NEARY: Pardon.  
MR. HOUSE: A true Canadian setting a bad example.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well, they should not be down here.

Maybe we could start the reform in this part of the country.

MR. YOUNG: You would be the first one to bawl if someone had your parking spot.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. YOUNG: You would be the first one to yell if someone had your parking spot.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have never complained about my parking spot.

MR. YOUNG: No, you have not.

MR. NEARY: No, I have not. And I would assume that if the name plate is put there, that people would obey the law. But I think it is disgraceful for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) to second a full-time man, going around with a book of tickets in his back pocket, and a pen, writing tickets all day long. That is his full-time job, sneaking around and hiding and using all kinds of dirty tricks to increase the revenue for the Public Treasury. That is the real reason, Mr. Speaker, the real reason. If that is the only way they can get a dollar when they need it, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have really stooped to a very low level in this Province.

But I would like to hear other members comment on that St. John's airport thing. That one really irritates me. A classic example of a police state down there at that airport, at St. John's airport.

MR. MORGAN: It is no worse than at Memorial University.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the airport,

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3121

IB-3

MR. NEARY: St. John's airport. I am talking about the parking regulations down there.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, yes. I am inclined to agree.

AN HON. MEMBER: We agree.

MR. NEARY: Well, certainly, and any sane person would agree. The same thing around this building, around this building, around Memorial University, around the Health Science Complex. They are too stiff and they are too militant with people, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: And around Confederation Building.

MR. NEARY: I said around Confederation Building where we now -

MR. HOLLETT: Tourists are even given tickets here.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HOLLETT: Tourists are even given tickets.

MR. NEARY: Tourists, of course. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is generally acknowledged in other parts of the world, if you are driving down through Maine or New Hampshire or the State of New York or California or on the Mainland of Canada and you have a Newfoundland license plate and you happen to be in a restricted area or a no parking area, the police or the security people will be most courteous, they will come along and they will thank you for visiting their province and they will say, 'Of course, you realize you were in a no parking area, but we do not issue tickets to tourists. So we hope you will enjoy your stay here, hope you have a good trip, and if there is anything we can do for you, well, drop in and we will be glad to help you'. But is that the way it is done in Newfoundland?

MR. WARREN: No way.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they have the Gestapo down at St. John's airport. They have the Gestapo in Confederation Building, at the Health Sciences Complex and at Memorial University. They have their

MR. NEARY: storm troopers going around issuing tickets right, left, and centre. And it does not make any difference. If you are a tourist, if you are an official, if you are a cripple or an invalid or a sick person, that does not make any difference, stick a ticket on the windshield.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Do they get a commission, Mr. Speaker? Do they get a commission for issuing these tickets?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, they get a bonus.

MR. NEARY: They get a bonus at the end of the year. Do they get a bonus for the number of tickets they issue?

MR. DAWE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: They are awful snarky and snappy. And I will guarantee you, for public servants they are awfully rude, some of them, too, awfully rude for public servants. They should take a Dale Carnegie course. They come out like storm troopers and whack the ticket on the windshield of your car, and then, if you draw it to their attention, they lip you up, they will sauce you up, public servants, their salary is being paid by the taxpayers of this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not apologizing at all for the length of time that I have taken on this matter. I realize we have to have rules and regulations, I understand that, but I think we have gone too far and we have turned the public parking lots around federal and provincial buildings into a virtual police state, and if we do not fight against that, and if we do not try to stop it, the next thing there will be other restrictions placed on individuals going into these airports and into public buildings. I think it is shameful. I do not think there is anything severe enough for me to say about it. I think it is cruel and criminal, the way they treat our Newfoundland people, in a discourteous

MR. NEARY: manner, people who cannot afford tickets, who can barely keep body and soul together, going off with tickets that cost \$5 and \$10, taking the bite out of children's mouths, issuing these tickets. And they do it in such a high-handed way that is what irritates me, they do it in such a high-handed way, Mr. Speaker, they do it just like the storm troopers, like Hitler's storm troopers. They would grind you down and put the heel of their boot down in your face, if they thought they would get away with it. It is not good enough treatment of our people.

And I am glad to have the opportunity under this bill to have my say, to make a few remarks about the way that both governments, both levels of government, the Ministry of Transport, the Minister of Public Works in this Province, have turned the public parking lots into a police state, aided and abetted by rules and regulations brought in by this administration. I remember, a few years ago, this administration brought in an amendment to an act -

MR. CARTER: I would like to have a few minutes too.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, you can have it now as soon as I am finished. I have five minutes left. - rules and regulations to give the security - to amend the act to give the security officers at Memorial University practically the same authority as the Newfoundland Constabulary, to arrest people, to search. Untrained people, Mr. Speaker, untrained!

We just passed a bill in this House regulating security companies in this Province. Has anybody looked at the security people going around this Province lately? Just take a look at them. I met one over at the Holiday Inn. The surveyors were having a convention over there, and they had a lot of valuable equipment downstairs in a room, so they had twenty-four hour security. They hired a local security company to provide the security for the equipment. Well, I am telling you,

MR. NEARY: when I went in seven o'clock in the morning for breakfast, I thought I was at the United Nations. You should have seen the uniforms. I tell you, the uniform that this fellow had on was more impressive than the one that is being worn by the gentleman who is sitting in the Sergeant-at-Arms seat, more impressive. Not more impressive than the hon. gentleman, but the uniform. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to wonder if these private security people had more authority than the Newfoundland Constabulary or the RCMP. But there they were. They are going around now dressed like policemen. They even had the badges and the numbers. They have everything now. They have the night sticks. They have everything but the gun. The only ones that have these are the RCMP, I suppose. I do not know. I believe the CN police, the CN security in this Province carry guns.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know where it is all going to end. I really do not. But I will tell you this, that there an awful lot of people pretty sore, an awful lot of people who have grievances, who have been walked on by these security people, by the rules and regulations passed by this administration, that have virtually turned our public parking lots and the areas around public buildings in this Province into a police state.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CARTER: I just wanted to say a few words in this debate, on the amendments to the Highway Traffic Act, concerning the compulsory insurance provision. Now, the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) is partly right. It is true that a lot of people are driving around in Newfoundland without



MR. CARTER: proper insurance. And yet the laws of this land require you to have liability insurance. I am not sure of the amount, somewhere between \$50,000 and \$100,000. It is not all that expensive for someone who has a good driving record, but if you are under twenty-five and unmarried and have had even a couple of minor accidents, the amount, the cost of insurance - and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition, with his background in insurance business, can certainly contribute a little bit to this debate. He can probably quote me the actual figures. But there is no doubt about it, that the cost for someone who is not the best risk in the world - by this I do not mean someone who is a danger on the highway but someone who has had a couple of mishaps and is not in the A-1 category - the cost can be very great for adequate public liability insurance. And I think I am correct when I say that it can be more than a thousand dollars a year. The Leader of the Opposition is nodding assent, so I do acknowledge that this is an area of his expertise, although I would not acknowledge that politics is such an area. But certainly the insurance -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: - the insurance area is one of his areas of expertise. Now, then, what happens - not everyone can fork out a thousand dollars or something greater than a thousand dollars at the beginning of the year to pay his insurance so they agree, quite properly, to pay it monthly, and that is perfectly acceptable and they make the first monthly payment. Perhaps the first payment is a little more than subsequent payments and they get their red or pink card which certifies that they are properly insured. Now the next month comes along and perhaps they make the payment, perhaps they do not. Supposing they do not; their insurance obviously must lapse, but the insurance companies, I do not believe, are

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3123

GS - 3

MR. CARTER: required to report that fact to the Motor Registration. And if they do report that fact to the Motor Registration, I do not think there is the mechanism at Motor Registration to deal with it. In other words, they would need -

MR. STIRLING: They were required. When they started off they were so flooded at Motor Registration that Motor Registration changed the act so that they are not permitted to report. You are on the right track.

MR. CARTER: I thank the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) for his input because I think this is a very important point.

The insurance companies certainly, I know, were willing to report any lapses

MR. CARTER: or any insurance policies that had lapsed. But Motor Registration, I believe, felt that they could not handle the flood of information. And this, by the way, makes an added point; if there was a flood of information there must have been a lot of lapsed insurances. So there must be a lot of people driving without proper insurance.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. CARTER: Now I suggest, although I am not one to suggest any government spend extra money, I do think here that the minister would be well advised to make some provision for a division in Motor Registration to be set up just to handle reports of lapsed insurances and then upon receipt of such a report, and once they are sure that that report is a valid report, that the insurance has indeed lapsed, they should call for the plates. Never mind cancelling the fellow's insurance, get the plates, get the car off the road. Let us not have any cars driving around in this Province unless they are adequately insured. And I think if the minister, if the administration does that, they will achieve far more than if they bring in compulsory seat belt legislation or compulsory this or compulsory that.

I would suggest, from what I hear, that something of the order of 25 per cent, or greater, of all cars driving in this Province are not insured for public liability.

MR. STIRLING: Let us get his plates. Let us (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Alright, but I think there are far more problems associated with having uninsured drivers going around. You are an innocent properly insured driver, you get injured in an accident, it does not take much of an impact for your car to be written off. I have seen in body shops a car, to my way of thinking, which was not really seriously damaged and, yet, I was assured that it would cost more to repair that car than the car was worth. The driver - although a lot of drivers now only have public liability insurance, that

MR. CARTER: is all they are able to afford, they cannot afford the collision and the comprehensive that would reimburse them if some uninsured person collides with them, they can only afford the public liability and, therefore, although they are not a danger to others insofar as you know, anyone whom they struck would be not recompensed yet they do not have any means of getting any compensation for themselves. If they should strike a pole, or if they should go into a ditch they are completely out of luck, they are not covered for that. So I think that I would urge the administration and the minister to do something, to set up a division in Motor Registration to handle lapsed insurance policies. I really think it is worth doing. And having made that point, and I think I have said enough about it, I think members on both sides of this House agree with my main points I will sit down and ask the minister to respond.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) that one of the rules that I imposed on myself when I first got involved with politics, including municipal politics, is that I would not take part in any discussion or debate relating to insurance. I followed that at City Council and I will follow that here because of any possible suggestion of a conflict of interest or a vested interest. Let me say though, that in dealing with the Highway Traffic Act, I am very disappointed that the government chooses late in the season, late in the sitting of this House - business of the House definitely has been mismanaged and there are a number of things in this bill that should be looked at much more carefully than there is enough time to look at them in the remaining time. We have about another 30 bills on the order paper, the government insists that they are all going to go through and they are very important. We have picked out two or three that are essential, that cannot be postponed until the Fall,

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3124

RA - 3

MR. STIRLING: and we have said to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) we are prepared to give up Private Members Day to discuss these tomorrow. These relate to municipal affairs and the development having to do with setting up a ward system and things of that nature. And in dealing with this specific act , the Highway Traffic Act, Mr. Speaker, I just

MR. STIRLING: asked the minister when he proposes to make this Highway Traffic Act amendment effective and he said, 'As soon as it is proclaimed', an indication, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that the government, for the last two years, has been handling things in the most sloppy manner. They still insist that we will not meet in the morning. They still insist that we will not meet in the evening. They can only deal with legislation for the two or three hours a day. There is buried in this clause, Mr. Speaker, Bill (36), Clause (10), an amendment which would increase the fee from two dollars to five dollars for the searching of records and the issuance of a certified abstract of a driver's operating record. One of the things that insurance companies do, that will give benefit to the people who have good driving records, is give them discounts based on the driver providing a certified abstract. The cost of that in most provinces, Mr. Speaker, unless it has changed in the last twelve months, varies from fifty cents to a dollar. We always did have a charge of two dollars, handled manually on a system that should be handled by computers. We are now going to charge five dollars for somebody to go and get their own driving record.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that, without authority, this government has been charging five dollars since August of 1979. Two years ago they implemented the change, two years ago.

MR. WARREN: Then the bill has not been (inaudible)?

MR. STIRLING: The bill had not been brought in until this sitting of the House. Two years ago, without authority, the government started collecting five dollars per abstract.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3125

IB-2

MR. STIRLING: Not very important?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, there is nothing wrong with this.

MR. STIRLING: Oh, the government by retroactive laws, two years late in the middle of the Summer, bringing in a statute which, Mr. Speaker, will directly affect the cost. Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WARREN: So they are collecting money from the people -

MR. STIRLING: They have been collecting money from people.

MR. WARREN: - illegally.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, either paid by the individuals or their insurance companies, illegally for the last two years. And they are now bringing in a piece of legislation which the minister said was going to be effective immediately. They are going to have to bring in another amendment or they are going to have to make it retroactive to August of 1979.

MR. WARREN: Sock it to them, eh?

MR. STIRLING: And it ties in with this whole business. They had an oil directorate set up two years ago, operating without authority. It is an example that the government has absolutely no respect for the House of Assembly, no consideration whatsoever. And that is why we are sitting through the long hot Summer, while somebody has brought to their attention all of the authority of the House of Assembly which they have ignored and, as my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) says, they have been collecting five dollars for abstracts at Motor Registration and if this was required in Clause (10) of this act, then they have been doing it illegally for two years.

MR. WARREN: Boy, oh boy, oh boy, what a government, eh?

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I think

another very serious mistake that the government is making and it is in the simplistic idea that because - the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) touched on it - if we cannot handle the problem, let us close our eyes to it and let us hope it goes away. Clause (18), Mr. Speaker - and my colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) referred to it earlier - clause (18) looks like a very innocent little clause increasing from \$200 to \$500 the amount of damage that has to be done before you are required to report an accident to the police. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is that going to do in the Province? I think that you are making a very serious mistake in increasing that limit from \$200 to \$500 because it means that anyone who has an accident now, does not have to report that accident unless, in his view or in an estimate, the amount of damage is \$500 or more. And that means, Mr. Speaker, that Motor Registration loses the opportunity to develop a track record on a driver who should not be on the road. It also requires people to report an accident within twenty-four hours.



MR. STIRLING: This is now saying that up to \$500 damage you can run off the road, you can have any kind of an accident, as long as the damage is not \$500 you do not have to report it. Mr. Speaker, it is not for the amount of damage the report is supposed to be made, the report is supposed to be made so that Motor Registration can keep track of drivers who should not be on the road. People with a series of small accidents, Mr. Speaker, statistics will show, are headed for a major accident, and not requiring people to report accidents under \$500 is setting it up so that there will be a temptation now for nobody to be reporting accidents. Mr. Speaker, it comes into the same category as allowing people to swim in the water supply areas; once people start abusing those things you will never get it back under control. Right now, most people feel they have to report an accident to the police and because \$200 is an amount of damage that can be done very quickly, essentially you get all accidents reported to the police. When you change it to \$500 you are saying to - all of the people who have these minor rear end collisions, collisions involving drinking, collisions involving one car accidents that slide off the road, it is the indication of the fact that the person has very bad driving habits that Motor Registration should be looking for, a pattern in a series of accidents that says here is a driver who should not be on the road.

In other provinces they brought in a point system. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we have some of the highest accident records in Canada is because of this problem of enforcement and the lack of a point system. And now we are going, instead of in a direction of controlling it - because your accident rate eventually sets the insurance premiums and it is

MR. STIRLING: checked into here and under the control of a board. Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason for accidents has more to do with driver records and driver patterns, and increasing this from \$200 to \$500, in my view, Mr. Speaker, is a mistake. Now, the amendments will go through, no question about it, because the government has the majority and they have determined to push it through, but I think they are taking a backward step. They have taken a step which is going to encourage people not to be reporting accidents, not to be concerned about accidents and not to be concerned about what will happen when the police investigate an accident that they had. Many of the convictions that come for impaired driving, one way or the other, is as a result of the requirement to have to report an accident, and as a result of the investigation this kind of thing is found out.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I think will also happen, is that you are not going to have police anxious to go to the scene of an accident, you are going to have RCMP not anxious to go to the scene of an accident, because the first question that they are going to be asking when a call is made reporting an accident will be, 'Is it under \$500?' 'Yes.' 'Well, we do not have to go.' So I think you are going to have a situation, if you put through this amendment. And I would seriously suggest that the minister take a look at it before we get to the Committee stage and go back and see if there are not many more problems related to this question than just the simplified idea, 'well, inflation has caused us to increase all the fees and inflation is now such that we should look for \$500 before an accident has to be reported.' True, it will cut down on the amount of police work, it will cut down

MR. STIRLING: on the amount of work by the RCMP.  
Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that is going in the wrong direction. Getting people in a safe condition on the road is one of the reasons that I presume this government is bringing in the many amendments to the Highway Traffic Act requiring compulsory seat belts. In my view, that is a step in the right direction. It is requiring people to protect themselves, as you buckle into a seat belt. There are all kinds of statistics.

But this is one step which the government is

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3127

GS - 1

MR. STIRLING:

doing which is inconsistent, and it is also typical of many other things that the government has done. One step forward and three steps back, it is getting to be known as the PC disco number, one step forward, two steps back. I would seriously suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the minister have a look at that and talk to some people who have some experience and some expertise in this field to find out. And I believe that what he is suggesting in this amendment is a step in the wrong direction and one that he will regret later, when he tries to get this problem under control.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. member from St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly

I wish to have a few words and shall be as brief as possible, Mr. Speaker. It is a very important bill, Bill 36.

Undoubtedly we could speak a long time on this. I would most certainly, myself, Mr. Speaker, like to see added to safety on highways - I would most certainly like to see highways made safer to assure the safety of people on the highways. The district that I represent, Mr. Speaker, has several roads that are not even fit to drive over, and still we are worrying and we need to worry about Bill 36. We need to worry about Bill 36, while at the same time we have areas of the Province that if you drive over, and if you are thinking of driver safety, you will barbarize your equipment, your trucks or your cars in the potholes, and you eat the dust, you destroy your desire to travel over some of our roads, you destroy the quality of your produce, your fish, your lobster or whatever you might wish to haul over the roads. While this may not sound relevant to Bill 36, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have these few comments while I have the opportunity.

MR. STAGG: I do not (inaudible), Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) will have his opportunity to pass his remarks and I shall wait patiently to hear them.

We touch on the insurance aspect, and when we look at the bottom of page - it is mentioned here in this bill that Judgement Recovery (Nfld.) Limited shall, within a reasonable period of time but not to exceed sixty days from the date of such application - when government apparently have their own insurance in place and they become involved, the government equipment, vehicles, become involved in an accident, people in the Province have to wait months on end for settlement. I have had people call from my district - judgement against government vehicles - and people from my district have called and said, 'I have been six months waiting for a settlement from government to have my vehicle repaired. So, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to recommend that the government should employ an insurance company that could afford to meet its obligations when the government cannot afford to meet its obligations in living up to reimbursing people who get involved in motor car accidents.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most hazardous methods, and one that I feel we should certainly take a look at and really consider, is the school bus system across the Province. So many times we hear tell of a child who gets knocked down and killed because some careless driver passed an unloading or a loading school bus. I would certainly like to see side roads or parking off main thoroughfares -

MR. HOLLETT: Pull-offs.

MR. BENNETT: - pull-offs of some sort, and it would take very few dollars to make this possible so that children could offload or unload school buses. Even if a

MR. BENNETT: vehicle did pass at high speeds, the child would not be on the highroad and hidden by the bus. The child would have a chance to see anything coming before he walked into the traffic flow. There have been many children killed just for the sake of having a pull-off for a school bus. In the district that I represent, Mr. Speaker, we do have a lot of school bus activity. We have a main thoroughfare, a good highway built, a ribbon of asphalt right up the Northern Peninsula, but our children have to be taken from side roads, brought in sometimes and loaded onto these on the main ribbon of highway and carried to schools that might be ten or fifteen miles away.

MR. BENNETT: So, there is certainly room for improvement, in having conditions appropriate to assure the safety of our children when they have to get to the schools.

At this time I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have sufficient tax in place to support some of the things that we would like to see done, to assure the safety of our children. And when we speak of tax, and the 11 per cent vehicle tax especially, especially the vehicle tax because it is, such a repetitive thing; you buy a vehicle and you pay 11 per cent and every time that vehicle is moved from one person to the other, every time that vehicle is sold the government reaps 11 per cent sales tax, and that vehicle could be sold a dozen times over, Mr. Speaker.

So some of the things that are mentioned here most certainly -

MR. STAGG: Is that relevant?

MR. BENNETT: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is relevant.

When it comes to the policing of our highways, I find it most unfortunate myself - because I do respect the RCMP in their role, I do respect them, they have a responsibility. Some of our people are uptight at this time because of the methods being used by the RCMP. I am being told, over in my area now, that they are being referred to as 'half ton cops' because they are driving around in half tons and parking with - now I am not sure if this is correct or not. I am being told that this is the way it is being done, the RCMP are using half ton trucks to operate radar from. Ghost cars apparently have become too conspicuous, too readily identified by a would-be offender.

So to me it does not enhance the image or the respect that one would like to see the RCMP enjoy. I would most certainly, Mr. Speaker, wish that our people would respect our RCMP, the officers of law here in this country and in this Province. But as we lose respect for them violations will mount, violations will increase in numbers. So this kind of thing I would certainly like to see soft-peddled, downgraded,

MR. BENNETT: certainly not enriched. I am not very anxious to see RCMP officers using half ton trucks rather than using their own police cars.

My hon. colleague touched on the inconvenience and the expense involved when it comes to parking at St. John's Airport. And I must agree it certainly is an inconvenience and certainly an expense. They come in here and sometimes bring their cars and fly to other parts of the country, the mainland, and they wish to leave their cars, even members of the House of Assembly here- I used to leave my motor vehicle at the airport, I find I cannot afford to do it any more, I have to leave it back in the driveway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: You may not believe that I can ill-afford to leave my car, but I am reluctant to leave it there if I am gone into my district for a week at a time, which I choose to do. I go into my district for a week at a time, Mr. Speaker, and it costs a lot of money when you come back and find out that you have to pay as much as \$15 and \$20 to have your car parked which, in my opinion, should be a lot less money or even free. We enjoyed that freedom at one time.

Mr. Speaker, when we say 'freedom', you know, we have lost so much freedom. We have lost so much freedom in every respect. We have lost the freedom of being able to park at the airports. We certainly lost a lot of freedom in other areas. We have reached the stage now, Mr. Speaker, even in that regard, when it comes to parking, it is the wealthy who can afford to own and operate a motor car. You know, the high cost of licence plates, the high cost of registration or transfers, the high cost of gasoline tax, already being the highest taxed province in the country, all this is getting to be unbearable. And the



July 7, 1981

Tape 3128

PK - 3

MR. BENNETT: more rural' and the further away you live  
from St. John's the more costly it gets to be to get the  
services that you have to come into St. John's to enjoy.

People who come into St. John's

MR. BENNETT: to meet with the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or the Department of Health, these people have an exorbitant expense. They fly in, probably, or they might motor in, and when they do they have to find a place to park their cars. They have to pay 22 per cent, not twenty-seven cents on a gallon but 22 per cent, twenty-two cents on a dollar, gasoline tax. And all of this is taking away the freedom of mobility. People can so ill-afford to travel anymore. You certainly cannot afford to travel in comfort. People have to reduce the size of their motor cars. They have to reduce the size of their vehicles that they do their work with adding an extra load, an extra burden, overloading their half ton trucks because they cannot afford to operate a one ton because of the government's tax. They cannot afford to buy it in the first place. They cannot afford to operate it in the second place.

So, Mr. Speaker, to me I cannot see where the government is doing anything to enrich or to enhance or to encourage people to develop and employ others. Free enterprise is the lifeblood of any country. But we are being stimied all the time, we are being set back by government taxation and government regulations. There is no freedom anymore.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want the government (inaudible)?

MR. BENNETT: No, I want the government not to increase taxes anymore. I feel they have already done enough tax. You have already taken enough taxation off the backs of the people of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, seeing the hon. gentleman is liking to hear from me, I would like to remind him that I represent a district that is not totally complete with roads construction. But it is among the hardest working people in the Province

MR. BENNETT: and they are good contributors to tax coffers, to the tax to the Treasury and we do have a good ribbon of highway up the Northern Peninsula.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOLLETT: Too bad they did not elect one to the House.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yes, it is unusual for a member, probably, who has no roads to make some comments concerning the Highway Traffic Act. However, Mr. Speaker, there is a concern that I have concerning the Trans-Canada Highway that I wish to bring to the minister's attention. And I am sure that it has been discussed time and time again. And that is, Mr. Speaker, I think about two years ago the Department of Transportation changed the merge sign or the merge lane, that is the two-lane highway on the Trans-Canada, and had a yield coming up through the center. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: It is not a bad idea.

MR. WARREN: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) might call it a good idea but, Mr. Speaker, there is a danger of having a yield sign, especially on a busy weekend when there is someone trying to overtake someone else going probably fifty kilometers an hour and all of the sudden he is just about ready to pass and he has to yield and there could be other traffic coming up behind and you are causing a traffic jam. And I have seen this happen time and time again, Mr. Speaker. I have seen this happen time and time again that, as my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said earlier, when a tractor trailer, the big eighteen wheelers are on the road and they try to pass you in a fast lane and by the

MR. WARREN: time they get to the top of that lane, when the inside driver has the right of way, this tractor trailer cannot stop, Mr. Speaker, and very often it happens that a collision takes place.

Mr. Speaker, on the judgement recovery fund, I honestly believe that if a person has to pay to the judgement recovery fund - I know a person, for example, who has been paying now for the last eighteen years. The man, the individual has reached, has gone past the age of sixty-five, and he is compelled to pay to the judgement recovery fund until his dying day. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is unfair. I believe this is totally unfair and I think the government should, at this time, bring in an amendment saying that after the person reaches sixty-five years of age that we will not attach his earnings.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I noticed, and I noticed it in some provinces, that vehicles are not required to have two licence plates, one on the rear and one on the front. Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the Minister of Transportation -

MR. WARREN: or is there an act today in this Province saying that you can just use one licence plate on your vehicle? I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) only has one licence plate on his vehicle. He has a flag on the front. Is it standard, Mr. Speaker, for any car driver in this Province to have just one licence plate on his vehicle?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the Highway Traffic Act.

MR. WARREN: And the Highway Traffic Act says it too. And the Minister of Public Works has one at the rear and the flag of Newfoundland in place of the licence plate on the front. Now, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, a minister of the Crown - if it is not law why should a minister of the Crown be allowed to carry on like this? Mr. Speaker, if it does become law, then let all citizens avail of the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about amendments to this act stating that school buses do not have to stop in the middle of the road but will pull up to the side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: This is just terrible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You cannot be heard.

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. WARREN: I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, about this new amendment saying that school buses can pull up to the side of the road and let the rest of the traffic pass. I have to disagree with my hon. colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I believe the safest way, as is happening today, is that the drivers are compelled to stop when the light is flashing and the bus is loading

MR. WARREN: and unloading school children.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that if the school bus does pull off, parking on the side of the road and instead of going back and forth we are going to probably see small kids going across the road unaware of this action. I think there will have to be education for the children involved, for the bus drivers and for the general public. This may have a serious effect, Mr. Speaker. The school bus could be pulled off to the side of the road but even so, Mr. Speaker, it is unloading school children, and school children, knowing that they did it last year and knowing that in September they cannot do it, it could cause serious accidents.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up any more time. I think I have brought out two or three points that I would like to see included in this bill. I hope that when the minister does bring in this bill that he will see that first and foremost he must take into consideration the safety of all people using the Newfoundland highways.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I would just like to have a few words. I would like the minister's attention if I could get it while making these few remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the necessity for judgement recovery in this Province. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we are always going to need judgement recovery because you would never be able to get the situation, Mr. Speaker, where everybody is insured and we know that everybody is insured. So judgement recovery will be necessary. And I am not so sure but that judgement recovery is not cheaper in the long run

MR. THOMS: than taking the suggestion that was made by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), that we set up another bureaucracy in Motor Registration and have a full crew of people there to whom insurance companies would report.

But judgement recovery will always be necessary. Neither do I agree with the suggestion that has been made that the police forces in this Province start to stop vehicles as a matter of course. I believe that you would get a hue and cry in this Province if every Friday or every Tuesday or every Wednesday the RCMP or the City Police set up a road block on Kenmount Road and stopped everybody as they were

MR. L. THOMS:

trying to get out over the road for the weekend. I think they would be asking for trouble and that is not the answer. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Torngat Mountains mentioned the passing lane on the Trans-Canada highway, and it also struck me as kind of funny and dangerous, Mr. Speaker, that it is passing lane, the fast cars that have to yield the right of way. As I understand it, it is different in the other provinces in that the fast lane has the right of way. And when you are driving out over the Trans-Canada, on any number of occasions you find yourself passing traffic in the slow lane and then almost having to come to an abrupt halt when you get to that section of the highway with the yield sign marked across it. And it would appear to me to make sense that the traffic that should have the yield would be the traffic in the slow lane. They are the people who should be able to come to a slow-down, or come to a stop easier than somebody who has speeded up to pass the car in the slow lane. These are just a few things in the debate, that were discussed here this afternoon. And Mr. Speaker, this is a type of bill that one could speak all afternoon on. But, I would like to throw one suggestion to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Dawe) and maybe he can address himself to it, and ask why and answer why we have not got a regulation such as this. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I find the seat-belt legislation so difficult is that it is un-enforceable. That is one of the problems with seat-belt legislation, that it is un-enforceable.

MR. MARSHALL: Is that relevant?

MR. L. THOMS: You will see the relevancy of the connection I am making if the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) would just listen a moment.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Oh, yes, I realize it. One of the problems is the un-enforceability of the seat belt legislation.



MR. L. THOMS: Now, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that if there was a requirement that drivers drive on the highway with their headlights on, that it would reduce the accident rate on our highways by six per cent. That is my understanding, that is the understanding that I have. I cannot even tell the minister now where I got that information, but I must have read it somewhere.

MR. STIRLING: The same place the minister got it.

MR. L. THOMS: Now, if that is the case and I further understand that that requirement would cost a car owner an additional twenty-five dollars a year, which is not really very much when you consider that you are preventing six per cent of the accidents. It is a pretty good trade-off. It is a pretty good trade-off, you are preventing six per cent of the accidents that occur each year by requiring that people drive on the highway with their lights on, and it would cost only twenty-five dollars a year to the individual to drive with - now, I happen to be one of those who drive when I am on the highway, which I am practically every weekend this time of the year now driving to Grand Bank -

MR. STIRLING: With your seat belt on.

MR. L. THOMS: No, I have to admit, very rarely do I wear my seat belt.

MR. ROBERTS: You should be driven (inaudible).

MR. L. THOMS: But that is the point that I am making, that very rarely, probably will I wear my seat belt after the legislation is passed in this House, okay?

MR. ROBERTS: Contributory negligence.  
Contributory negligence.

MR. L. THOMS: Oh, sure, there is a question of contributory negligence that is one of the problems with the act if you have read the brief from the law society.

MR. ROBERTS: The act does not (inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: But the point I am making is that if I want to drive out over the highway without my seat belt there is very little that can be done to prevent me from breaking that particular law. So we have another statute on the books that is difficult to enforce. But the point is this, that for me to drive out over the highway with my lights on, which I happen to do anyway now as a matter of course, it is easy to enforce, because any policeman travelling on the Trans-Canada can see whether or not somebody has got their headlights on, and if they do not have their headlights on they can

MR. THOMS: stop them and they can ticket that person. But I would like the minister, when he closes the debate, to tell this House whether or not he or his department has given any consideration to amending the Highway Traffic Act so that drivers are required to drive with their lights on.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Is that a requirement, a legal requirement anywhere? I do not know, I am just asking.

MR. THOMS: I do not know, I do not know. I was just talking about -

MR. ROBERTS: It should be. It is not, but it should be.

MR. THOMS: But it should be. It is a simple thing, it is a simple thing. It is easy to enforce. There are no problems with the enforcement.

MR. ROBERTS: Motorcycles now, the headlight comes on automatically on a motorcycle.

MR. THOMS: Yes, on a motorcycle.

And it would reduce the accidents on our highways by 6 per cent. It seems to me that it is a simple requirement, one that we could not grumble about too much. It is enforceable and, as I said, it cuts down on accidents by 6 per cent and that is good value for your money. It is going to cost the driver, it is going to cost to drive his car an extra \$25 a year which is not much, Mr. Speaker, when we consider that there is going to be 6 per cent less accidents because of this very simple requirement. Now, I would like the minister to tell me whether or not, and tell this House whether or not he has considered, his department has considered making that a requirement. Because I would like to see it and I would only be too happy to support anything that would reduce the number of accidents on the Trans-Canada.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: I will just take a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, and, specifically, I want to reinforce to the minister what has already been said with regards to compulsory insurance in this Province, and I would very quickly tell the minister, Mr. Speaker, that I am aware of whereof I speak. The insurance companies have indicated to me - I have contacted them personally - they have indicated to me that they are quite willing to co-operate. They are prepared to send a memo to the minister's department, to the Motor Registration Division, the day or the hour that a motorist cancels his public liability. The problem is with the minister's department. The problem is with the Motor Registration Division, Mr. Speaker. There is no telling how many people are travelling our highroads with no insurance. It was coincidental, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, that I talked to two motorists from Manitoba, and I am told that in Manitoba within minutes, within an hour after a person cancels an insurance policy, the insurance companies automatically - it is understood and it is quite possibly under legislation - they notify the motor registration division or the people responsible in Manitoba, and within a day or however long it takes, the licence is removed from that car.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is computerized.

MR. FLIGHT: It may be computerized.

MR. STIRLING: And PEI.

MR. FLIGHT: And PEI. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that if it can be done in Manitoba, it can be done in Newfoundland. It is unbelievable the number of accidents, Mr. Speaker - the number of drivers who are driving in this Province today without public liability insurance. It is a

MR. FLIGHT:                    crime against the law-abiding people in this Province who take the act seriously, who go out and buy insurance, not to protect themselves, to protect the general public but they are afforded no protection, Mr. Speaker, no protection at all. Any hon. member of this House or any person in Newfoundland who carries public liability insurance and goes on our highroads and gets run into by somebody not carrying public liability insurance, where is the fairness? Where is the decency in that kind of treatment, Mr. Speaker? Now, another thing I would want to mention, the clause in the act that increases from \$250 to \$500, the limit that must be reported, I can personally attest here, Mr. Speaker, to two or three accidents that I am aware of where the drivers had no liability insurance. The damage to the car was between \$250 and \$500. In the event that

MR. FLIGHT: that clause had been in effect then, that would have meant that the Motor Registration or the RCMP would never have known that that individual had no liability insurance. If there was no need to report the accident, and the injured person decided not to take action on his own, that driver could have continued to drive forever. I am aware of a specific case where this happened. Because the accident was in excess of \$250 and had to be reported, the RCMP moved in and removed the guys licence plates, not because the injured person reported it, or not because he wanted to cause any trouble for the guy who was driving the car, but under the law that accident had to be reported. Now they are going to go to \$500. What about the guy tomorrow with no public liability insurance who does \$400 worth of damage to somebody's car? That accident does not have to be reported. That is stupid, it is insane to bring an amendment into the Highway Traffic Act that would require an accident to be in excess of \$500 to have to be reported. It is nonsense, it is utterly stupid and insane and the minister should have to - I do not know if the minister is listening - but the minister should have to stand in this House and give this House of Assembly a detailed explanation as to why he is increasing - why he is bringing that amendment in that would exempt an accident up to \$500. People have been killed in traffic accidents with less than \$500 damage to the vehicles. People have been maimed in traffic accidents with less than \$500 damage to the vehicles.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the minister in telling us, in justifying this clause, this amendment, should have to give a detailed explanation to this House how he justifies that amendment. And I think, Mr. Speaker, the minister should take the compulsory automobile insurance legislation in this Province seriously.

MR. FLIGHT: I think he should instruct the Motor Registration Division to require notice from the insurance companies the moment that an insurance claim is cancelled and that the licence plates of that insured motorist should be cancelled herewith. And it is the only way. There is no other way to guarantee that all of the drivers on the Trans-Canada, on our highroads will be carrying public liability insurance. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, minister after minister has sloughed off that responsibility, I am amazed that they have sloughed it off. This issue cannot - the day that we read into this House a bill that made public liability insurance compulsory, from that day on this issue has arisen and incident after incident has been brought to the attention of the minister and the government. And yet they will not move to enforce the law that we have in this Province, to enforce that people driving on our highroads are covered with public liability insurance. And it is as simple as the nose on your face, require the insurance companies to report cancellations and the Motor Registration Division therewith cancel the driver's licence or the registration of the vehicle. There is no other way. And until the minister is prepared to take that responsibility seriously, we will have hundreds and thousands of motorists continuing to drive with no liability insurance, buying their insurance for the purpose of getting their licence, cancelling it within days after they get their licences. The insurance people have informed the minister that it is indeed a fact. The general public who are having accidents every day, who are running into people, with no insurance, are telling the government every day. Yet for five years now, since we have had compulsory insurance, the minister has not seen fit or the government have not seen fit to put some teeth into that legislation. And as a result every person who goes on the highway in this Province today, is running the risk of being wiped out financially.

July 7, 1981

Tape No. 3133

IB-3

MR. FLIGHT:

So, Mr. Speaker, if the minister is not prepared to take his responsibilities in that area seriously, it is hard to believe that he will take them in any area seriously.

MR. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.



MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister is not in a hurry to debate me anywhere else.

MR. STIRLING: I think he is afraid of you.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I can tell him the debate will be going ahead. The only question is whether he will be there or not? And that is not for me to decide.

MR. DAWE: The hon. member is probably used to talking to himself.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I find that makes more sense than talking to the hon. minister, considerably more. Unlike the hon. minister, when I talk to myself I do not get an answer as he does.

MR. STAGG: It is nice to see you around.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, who said, it is nice to see me around. It is the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) just visiting the House again is it?

MR. STAGG: He is getting personal now. He is (inaudible) of the Liberals.

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

MR. ROBERTS: It is five to six.

MR. STIRLING: Would you send him back to Stephenville?

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to say a few things on this bill. We could either call it six o'clock or I will carry it until six and we can meet again the next day, whichever the Government House Leader wishes. I would prefer, obviously, to be connected as opposed to discombulated and I would suggest it would make it go a little more quickly. So I wonder if the Government House Leader is prepared to let us go home?

MR. MARSHALL: Adjourn the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I will move this debate adjourn, Mr. Speaker, we will carry on from there.

July 7, 1981

Tape 3134

PK - 2

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle adjourns the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that 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.