



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 3

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1975

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

Handwritten notes or scribbles at the bottom of the page.

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of hon. members I would like to welcome to the gallery students from St. Martin's Central High School in Dunville, Placentia Bay. I understand there are forty-six of them and I do not immediately see them, so perhaps they have not gotten here as of yet. However if they come they shall certainly be made welcome.

I have been informed as well and wish to call to the attention of hon. members of the composition of the Internal Economy Commission, and the Commission is composed of the Speaker, the Chairman of Committees of the House of Assembly, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment and the hon. Minister without Portfolio.

PETITIONS:

MR. R. SIMMONS: I would like to present a petition on behalf of several hundred residents of Harbour Breton, which was in my former district of Hermitage. I am presenting it rather than the member who presently represents that community because it is addressed to me, and it came to me just after the close of the House last Spring.

The prayer of the petition is that the government provide without any further delay a dental facility at Harbour Breton. The petitioners say in part, "We are deeply concerned with the dental health of our children and the high cost of having to go to Grand Falls," the latter being a reference to the fact that if they want tooth extraction or any other dental attention they must travel well over one hundred miles to the nearest dentist at Grand Falls.

This situation, of course, has gone on for quite some time. It has been brought to the attention of the Department of Health on a number of occasions. Indeed when the present member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) was the Minister of Health I had occasion to write him on this matter, and he acknowledged the letter saying that they would be taking it under advisement and that kind of thing.

But I would like at this time to invite the present Minister of Health to bring us up to date, if he would, on what is being done to

provide dental facilities at Harbour Breton and at other points along the coast. It is kind of a circular argument which I will not go into now, a chicken and an egg type situation, where government keeps saying, "We will find the dentists if you will find the facilities," and sometimes says vice versa, "We will find the facilities if we could find the dentists."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the government to stop speaking with a forked tongue, as we say, and to say where it stands on this particular issue. The people along the Southwest coast are in desperate need of proper dental facilities, dental services, and are entitled to them. Much has been made about the dental clinic, the mobile clinic which was provided last Spring. It is a good idea if it were located in a part of the Province where it could be of most use, and I would submit that may well be the Southwest coast.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I heartedly endorse the prayer of this petition and present it to the House and request that it be referred to the appropriate department.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to also endorse the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) who presents this petition. The lack of dental services on the coast, as he points out, is certainly extreme. Kids have no chance, nor grownups either, for that matter, to get dental services regularly. A mobile clinic did appear once I think last year. I think it should be more often than this, certainly twice a year for the kids to get proper checkups. The whole Connaigre Peninsular is in the same area, of course, as Harbour Breton, and my own hometown of Gaultois - it is almost impossible for them to get dental services without travelling long distances. That mobile clinic

could very well come to Hermitage as well and be of great benefit to our children who certainly need the dental care. I heartily support the petition of the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

HON. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to comment on the petition just presented by the hon. member for - LaPoile? - and supported by the Burgeo - I have to get the districts straightened out. And supported by the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor).

HON. W. DOODY (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Can we not get a map or something?

MR. COLLINS: We will have to get a map, Mr. Speaker, somewhere because -

HON. A.J. MURPHY (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): And a uniform.

MR. COLLINS: - those fellows have been running around in so many districts it is difficult to keep track of them. But, in response to the petition with regard to dental services in Harbour Breton, I am not in a position at the moment to make any comment with regard to Harbour Breton. But I would want to go on record in saying that we just recently were successful in obtaining a dentist for Glovertown and for Holyrood. Those two gentlemen were in place this past week.

I would also like to inform the House that as a result of recruitment work which was done by my predecessor, six dentists were recruited from Great Britain and came to the Province this past Summer. Unfortunately only one of them stayed. We are having some difficulty in terms of getting dentists to agree to go to and practice in some of the rural parts of the Province. I agree with the need for the service and certainly we are leaving no stone unturned. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, is because they do not particularly like the outports of Newfoundland. Why that is I do not know because I love that section of the country, but the dentists do not seem to want to practice there. But we are doing our best to come up with the necessary people to perform the service.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as one of the members who represent a Southwest Coast district, Sir, I wholeheartedly endorse the prayer of this petition, Sir. I am very alarmed over the fact that this year only three Newfoundlanders will be accepted into Dalhousie Dental School. I do not know if the minister is aware of that. He probably is. And last year no Newfoundlanders were accepted. The reason given was because of lack of accommodations at the Dalhousie Dental School. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that they are trying to improve their situation by the four Atlantic Provinces getting together and each province contributing towards the financing of a new dental school which may or may not make more dentists available for Newfoundland.

But it is a very serious problem, Sir, and I do not think the problem will be solved unless and until this new dental school is built for the Atlantic Provinces so that more Newfoundland students can be turned out as dentists. I think this is the only way we are going to solve the medical doctor problem in Newfoundland and it is probably the only way we are going to solve the dental problem in the outports. You have to get Newfoundlanders who understand the local psychology, who are prepared to make the sacrifices and go into these rural areas and these isolated communities.

So, I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I do hope that the Minister of Health will do everything within his power to see that the prayer of this petition is answered, not only for Harbour Breton but for all the communities along the Southwest Coast that have been neglected for so long.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Before proceeding, once again I would like on behalf of hon. members to welcome to the galleries some forty-six students from St. Martin's School in Dunville. Actually at the beginning of proceedings I should inform the students I did in fact welcome them on behalf of all hon. members on all sides of the House but that was

done more quickly than entrance by the young people concerned. But certainly I know that all hon. members welcome them and hope that their visit here will be instructive and enjoyable.

MR. SPEAKER: I would also like to note and to welcome to the House Mr. Jack Marshall, the Member of Parliament for the District of Humber - St. George's - St. Barbe.

Are there any further petitions?

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. W. DOODY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have at this time the responsibility of tabling various special warrants which were necessary during the year. Under Legislative heading, a warrant of \$45,000 which comprises of salaries of \$35,000, which were mainly the Ombudsman's office, the setting up of the Ombudsman's office, \$35,000 of that \$45,000. Manpower and Industrial Relations, a total amount of \$170,000 was mostly involved in the extra funds that were required to cover the expenses of the Buchans Task Force. Under Education there is a \$12,200,000 warrant, \$10 million of which were for the salaries of teachers' and superintendents' salary increases, and the other \$2,200,000 was the extra operational grants to school boards which we discussed yesterday. Justice had a special warrant of \$400,000, which was required, Sir, for that very necessary and very important event which occurred in September, the election which returned this admirable group to office. Under Rehabilitation and Recreation, there is a \$250,000 special warrant which was required for trading supplies and produce for Labrador Services. A \$250,000 amount was due mainly for the cost of supplies and produce for depot operations, which have increased by fifteen per cent as all costs have increased during the year, and the volume of supplies has increased tremendously also. Under Health we have a warrant for \$13 million. Additional funds were required for two subdivisions within that Department of Health, or that department. We had an operating cost of hospitals not operated by government of \$10 million, and we had the extra costs involved in the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission of \$3 million, both of which, once again, Sir, were discussed yesterday in the Budget Speech. Under Fisheries there were three special warrants totalling \$3,729,000, part of which was for

special fish plant water systems; DREE, \$1.6 million. This is a ninety/ten arrangement most of which will be recovered. The ninety per cent will be recovered. There is an additional amount of \$1.4 million for fishing gear replacement for fishing gear lost by fishermen due to ice conditions in the Spring and Summer of 1974. These additional funds were needed for payment of residual claims within the Government of Canada for \$1,350,000. And there is an additional DREE water systems amount of \$639,000 once again, which is a special warrant, which is a ninety/ten agreement recoverable. Under Transportation and Communications we have a special warrant of \$2.5 million, \$1.5 million which was an extra amount needed for salaries in the Highways and Bridges Division of that department, and I think it showed admirable restraint, particularly in an election year. It is most unusual and most responsible. Summer maintenance costs are up \$500,000 and Winter maintenance \$500,000 for a total, Your Honour, of \$2.5 million.

These amounts I will table, Sir. I have got three sets of copies, which I will table in the hon. House. I am not quite sure how they will be distributed, because I am not quite sure about the make-up of the other side of the House right now. But as the situation resolves itself over the coming year, I am sure we will know exactly how many copies will be necessary to be tabled. And if I may, I will pass these three sets out now and if extra ones are necessary they can be provided. Thank you, Sir.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Would the hon. Premier tell the House what plans, if any, his government have or propose to try and increase productivity in this Province and cope with the almost 300,000 man-days lost through work stoppages outlined in the budget yesterday?

HON. F. D. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows that hopefully will be the purpose of this session whereby we will be talking about the various programmes that will be coming into effect, to talk about

our future, Also to talk about what anti-inflation positions we will be taking, together with the Federal Government, and also to draw up a blueprint which will be for the future of the Province. I suggest, Sir, that it

MR. MOORES: be debated at that time and is not the question of urgency at this particular moment.

MR. NEARY: I am dissatisfied with the answer, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to debate the matter on Thursday afternoon, five-thirty, during the late show.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister for Industrial Development. I wonder would he indicate to the House when a start might be made on the announced fish plant for Burgeo?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The people of Burgeo will be informed about government's attitude on that particular project within, I would say, a week.

MR. SIMMONS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, do I interpret from the minister's answer that there has been some change of plan by the government since it signed the agreement in September to proceed?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is certainly not my aim to determine how the hon. member interprets the answer I gave, that is his prerogative.

MR. SIMMONS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: would the minister indicate whether there has been a change in plans concerning the Burgeo fish plant since the government signed an agreement to go ahead with the plant last September?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Within the oral question period it is not permissible to continue asking in different forms the same question, or to seek the same information which a previous question would also tend to elicit and there is a certain discretion, obviously, which the Chair has in ruling on supplementary questions and I would suggest that the hon. member has come close, is getting close to eliminating his right with respect to continuing supplementary questions.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect I submit that I

was asking a different question. I would like to know whether government has changed its plan since the agreement to proceed with the Burgeo Fish Plant was signed in September. It just requires a simple yes or no answer, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think that is too much to ask the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman may ask his question but comments after are out of order and just as hon. members are required to comply with the rules so is the Speaker or any hon. member who is presiding required to enforce the rules and the obligation is the same in both instances, that of hon. members to comply with them and that of whatever hon. member is in the Chair to enforce them.

MR. SIMMONS: And the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! First, I do not know if the hon. minister intended or not to reply.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the question really is somewhat irrelevant because I did indicate to the hon. member, is he interested, Mr. Speaker, in the fish plant or in the debate. I indicated to the hon. member that the people of Burgeo will be informed about government attitude within the few days, perhaps even within a week. I am sure as a reasonable member representing these people that should be quite an adequate answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: I wish to direct a question, Sir, to the Minister of Industrial Development; would the minister care to give the House an updating on the serious situation involving layoffs at the Marystown Shipyard?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual question to be answered during the question period, but if the hon. House will permit I will certainly take the time to give a brief comment. The question period usually, of course, as I understand it, means that there has to be very brief questions and brief answers but there has been a layoff at the shipyard. We felt with the return of the present interim manager that we might as well face the facts that the work is not there

at the present moment to be able to accommodate the present work force. The present work force is 450, Your Honour. Three years ago when the shipyard was taken over by government the work force was just in excess of 200 people. In the last three years that work force has more than doubled and we have been able to attract quite a bit of work.

Previous to the government getting involved actively there I believe there were only two ships actually built but the shipyard and in the three years I am happy to say there have been fourteen ships that have been constructed and that have led to such an increase in the work force. I would not want hon. members to feel that because there has been a layoff, that there is a negative attitude on the part of government towards the shipyard. We are very hopeful that the layoff is a temporary one. We did not want to continue to have people involved there which were in some ways draining the resources of the shipyard, creating somewhat of a morale problem, as one can understand and consequently the layoffs. The contract has been finalized for the construction of a new tug. Discussions presently are being finalized for other work and we hope that that will be on stream early in the new year. There is no negative attitude and I would like to say to hon. gentlemen through you, Sir, that some of the public comment and controversy which sort of indicates there is something radically wrong at the shipyard certainly is not helping us in our efforts, with new management coming on stream in a month from now, to attract new business and to present for the international community that we do have a good shipyard, we are very proud of it. We do have a good work force and we feel that the long term prospects are very much in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I wish to make a point of order. Just as it is necessary for hon. members to keep their answers brief, exactly to the point without preambles, statements of opinions, arguments and giving only the information necessary to make a question clear, I think hon. members answering questions also are required to keep the answers as brief as possible in giving the information required.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Is it okay if I ask a supplementary question to the minister? I would like to ask the minister if the Board of Directors of the shipyards meet regularly to give the management of the shipyards proper direction?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all could I just say I agree with Your Honour's ruling a minute ago. Certainly if hon. members though are going to ask questions about the status of the shipyard you cannot answer that even in the House if one might be -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The hon. gentleman is directed to answer the question. Order!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir, I was going to say to the hon. gentleman who raised an important question that it has always been the practice of the Board of Directors to work in close co-operation with the management at the shipyards.

MR. NEARY: Does the board meet regularly?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Also - yes there have been regular meetings, Your Honour, and also I would like to say that our plans right now vary in mind a changing nature of the type of work that will be required to be done at the shipyards, to branch out and to attract new people to the Board of Directors to enable us to give more guidance and direction to the management at the shipyard.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Fogo.

CAPT. EARL WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries? In light of a statement which the minister made that he would be requesting an amount of a quarter of

a million dollars to be spent in improving fishing facilities at Musgrave Harbour, can he inform the House now whether this money has been approved and if so, for what intent?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the matter to which the member from Fogo referred, of course, has been under very active consideration by the department, and I am afraid that the hon. member and the fishermen concerned will have to wait a little while longer to ascertain if it is going to be possible to provide that money to provide that very badly needed facility.

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

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may address a question to the hon. the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and that is: could the Premier provide us with information detailing whenever possible the number of water and sewer projects that have been cancelled since September 16?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, you said to be brief. The answer is yes.

MR. NEARY: I have a question, Sir, for the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment. Would the minister inform the House if the matter of the municipal dump at Upper Island Cove has yet been settled and if not, why not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

HON. A. MURPHY (Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment): Mr. Speaker, if I may, with reference to the dump at Upper Island Cove it is settled as far as I am concerned because it is up to the council. I am not selecting sites for dumps. It is up to the council and the people concerned to settle it for themselves. The duties of my officials at Environment are to inspect sites and to approve or disapprove. It is a question of internal argument or dissension between groups in Upper Island Cove and as soon as they are settled

and get an alternate site we will inspect it and say if that is all right too. But I just want to impress on the House that my department or officials are not the ones to find sites for dumps. We are the ones to inspect the sites selected.

MR. NEARY: A question to the minister, Sir: Would the minister inform the House if it is correct that a permit was issued for a site and then at a later date cancelled?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Then, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister indicate to the House why the permit was cancelled?

MR. MURPHY: Because of depositions from other parties.

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

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Can the minister tell the House whether or not the extension to the Central Newfoundland Hospital at Grand Falls will go ahead this year and next year as originally proposed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

HON. H. COLLINS: (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member I am sure heard the Budget Speech yesterday and I can only reinforce what has been said there and what has been said previously and that is that there are no cancellations of hospital projects.

In many cases the work will continue at a reduced pace. But in any event, within the next few days we will be in touch with the Grand Falls people and be able to be more definitive in terms of what will be done.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister of Health, Sir. Will the minister tell the House what the status is now of the proposed Port aux Basques hospital?

MR. COLLINS: This falls in the same category, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, then. Has the minister been in touch with the board in Port aux Basques, to advise them that their hospital has been cancelled, or has the board been in touch with the minister?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we had a meeting with the Port aux Basques board about ten days ago and the hon. member was present. We have not been in contact with them since yesterday. I am not sure if he remembers he was present or not, but he was. But certainly the people of Port aux Basques will be given the same advice at about the same time as the other boards.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, correction. I was not present at any meeting with the hospital board, Sir, it was the town council.

Sir, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister inform the House if he or the government have made any representation to Newfoundland Steamship Company Limited and Clarke Steamship Company Limited objecting to proposed increases in freight rates to Newfoundland and Labrador?

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

HON. J.C.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is yes. My officials and myself met with Clarke Steamships' officials and discussed the proposed increase, and also I have wired the federal Anti-inflation Commission, the Chairman Mr. Pepin, asking him to indicate to us in my department, and this government, whether or not the Anti-inflation Commission does have any control or not over any proposed increases in freight rates. To date I have not received a reply.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister be prepared to table the correspondence in connection with Newfoundland Steamships and did the minister contact both Newfoundland Steamship and Clarke Steamship, and if so, would the minister undertake to table the correspondence?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to table the conversations I had in a meeting with the officials of the one steamship company. There is only one steamship company, I understand, that is proposing any increase in their freight rates. There is only one steamship company that has filed an official application for an increase in freight rates and that is Clarke Steamships.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, where is my old buddy the Minister of Tourism? I cannot find him around - oh! he is in front of me here. Sir, in view of the government's austerity, belt tightening, retrenchment, cutback programme, would the minister now tell us what will happen to the Norma and Gladys? Will she be brought back to her home port, will she continue her voyage, is she capable of continuing the voyage, just what is the position now concerning the Norma and Gladys?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, everyone aboard has their belt tightened. There is no suggestion that the vessel will be brought back, she will proceed on her voyage.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Would the minister indicate what steps his department is taking in relation to the dispute in the Conne River area over timberland. In particular I would be interested in knowing what action is being taken to provide the operators of the Conne River mill with suitable or adequate timber limits.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I held a meeting with the - I guess the whole group involved in the Conne River sawmill enterprise on Sunday and I put to them the following situation; that within the near term - and there is some dispute over the exact length - but anywhere from two, three up to

five years - they say two - by two years that there is a sufficient supply of timber down there to keep the sawmill operating. They have a permit from the department to cut up to 1 million board feet, so there is no problem in the immediate term.

I also indicated to them that by the end of March - possibly quite earlier - we will be in a position to sit down with not only the Conne River sawmill enterprises but indeed with all sawmill enterprises down in that area. And as well there may be others as inventories are completed across the Province, where we are prepared to sit down and talk with them about the supply of timber. At that time in Conne River, at subsequent times anywhere else in the Province, there may be a reallocation of resources where one company may give up an area and take another area which is closer to the mill and so on. This can be done in a sitdown with each of the operators in the area sometime by the end of March.

The situation as it stands now is they want a halt on the wood cutting in the area until such time as that discussion takes place and a mutual agreement is arrived at in respect to the continued long-term supply of timber for the Conne River sawmill enterprises. In the meantime, as I understand it, they do have the road blocks down and the Rallands Forest Products is taking out the wood that is cut. At this point in time they are not cutting any other wood. I was talking to Mr. Ralph of the Rallands Forest Products yesterday and I will be meeting with him on Thursday to discuss the situation with him.

So right now, after the meeting on Sunday, and this position which we have taken, it is holding now until I have the opportunity to talk with Mr. Ralph on Thursday.

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

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy I wish to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. What action has been taken to date by government to investigate industrial health hazards at Advocate Mines in Baie Verte?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that a great deal of action has been taken not just at Baie Verte but with regards to industrial accidents and various health hazards in the mining industry within the Province. This has been the subject of some study. The study will be made public in the very near future as will government action to correct it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, Sir, could inform the House just what is the position now of the land freeze, the agricultural land freeze in the greater St. John's area? Has the freeze been lifted? Partially lifted? Is it in the process of being lifted? Just what is the state now? Is the government buying the land? What is happening concerning this land?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. J. G. ROUSSEAU: That question I will have to take as notice. I have a full briefing coming up on the land freeze. There has been some adjustments made within the past year, some minor adjustments. As the position is at the moment with the land freeze on, government will have to make a decision in respect to the long term supply. We will be meeting with the farmers on Monday, before that time I anticipate having the meetings of the - I will take the question as notice and when I have my briefing I will give it in that part of the answer-question relating to it, the answer period.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Fogo.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Sir, another question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Can the Minister of Fisheries inform the House who has the responsibility now for community stages? You know, it is sort of half way with federal and half way with provincial. Is there any one particular government who has the whole responsibility for community stages?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the community stages, the future operation of them is now the subject of an agreement that is being worked out with the federal authorities. It has been agreed by Ottawa that we would convey to the Province the facilities. The Province has agreed to accept responsibility pending their upgrading, the cost of which will be borne, I believe, to seventy-five per cent by the federal authorities.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Transportation and Communications can inform the House, Sir, how near we are to reducing the speed limit on the Trans-Canada Highway in order to save lives and to prevent accidents?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, my department is giving now serious consideration to the possibility of reducing our speed limit. The plea is now being made by the federal Ministers of Mines and Energy and also of Transportation, and at this time it is under study. I am hoping to receive a report from the Highway Safety Advisory Board in the next two months, and shortly after that I will make a decision as to whether or not we will reduce the speed limit or not on our highways.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To save gas or to save life?

AN HON. MEMBER: Both.

MR. MORGAN: In our case, Sir, in Newfoundland there are two major points, one is the safety aspect and the other is a reduction in consumption of gasoline. But the federal government seems to be advocating the reduction of speed limits mainly for one reason, just the reduction and consumption of gasoline and not the safety aspect. Looking at our Trans-Canada and the standard of our Trans-Canada safety is a big reason for us to reduce our speed limit as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there have been announcements of retrenchments and cut-backs and so forth, would the Minister of Transportation and Communications inform the House what

priority, what the Trans-Labrador Highway now has on the list of government priorities? Is it still number one priority? Number two? How far up the list is the Trans-Labrador Highway? Has it been shelved? Are negotiations still going on with the Province of Quebec and the Government of Canada? Could the minister give the House an updating on the Trans-Labrador Highway?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, all major roads, trunk roads in this Province are priorities. But I can assure all hon. gentlemen that Labrador roads and the Trans-Labrador Highway is a priority. And in fact just this weekend coming up I will be going to Labrador myself and a meeting of the Task Force to look at the possibility of keeping one road we have now open in Labrador, which is also a priority. All roads are priorities. This government will be pursuing the matter of the Trans-Labrador Highway continuously in the future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health, Sir. Would the minister inform the House if the statements made recently by a member of the medical school, a doctor at the medical school, concerning the dispensing of drugs in this Province, if the matter has been dropped? Is it being investigated? Has the government had any official complaints? What is the status of these -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - these serious charges that were made?

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order! A question, an oral question relating to matters which passed outside the walls of the House is in my understanding not a permissible question and the question would be out of order.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Health inform the House if his department is conducting an investigation into charges made recently by a member of the staff of the medical school at Memorial University?

MR. COLLINS: It is being investigated, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate what form the investigation is taking?

MR. COLLINS: An investigative form.

MR. NEARY: By members of his staff or -

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Under the provisions of Standing Order 23, I ask leave

to move the adjournment of the House to debate a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the increasing seriousness of the situation which has arisen as a result of the labour-management disputes at the Alcan mines at St. Lawrence, the Price (Nfld) Pulp and Paper Mill at Grand Falls, the Labrador Linerboard Mill at Stephenville and the Bowaters Mill at Corner Brook. The situation in the paper industry today is undermining the economy of the whole Central Newfoundland, Western Newfoundland and Central Labrador areas and threatening our people with grave economic hardships. And the failure of the government to provide leadership in -

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

When the hon. gentleman is asking leave for such a motion, he may state, you know, what the actual matter is for which he is asking the adjournment and it is to discuss a specific matter of public urgency and it is the statement of the particular matter. Now any additional material would be, or certainly the additional material which I heard, would tend to presume that leave had been granted and the debate was going on, and right now the hon. gentleman is at the stage of asking leave and to the best of my knowledge has already stated this specific matter of alleged urgency for which he wishes the House to adjourn, the motion for adjournment.

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

HON. E. ROBERTS: With respect to Your Honour's ruling, we are all grateful for it, but I think Your Honour is being a little trigger happy. All that my colleague is doing is trying to state the very essence of the matter which in our view is the failure of the government to act. I think he should be allowed - he is certainly not allowed to debate it and I do not think he proposes to do so, but I believe he should be allowed to finish the few remarks he had.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the hon. gentleman had quite clearly and precisely and accurately stated the matter. He had stated the matter. And the additional material was in fact matter which would be very relevant in debate but certainly I understood that the matter, at least to my understanding, had been presented.

MR. ROBERTS: The failure of the government was very much a part of that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

HON. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, we would oppose the motion -

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

MR. WELLS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, yes.

We would oppose the motion moved by the hon. gentleman. All of these particular matters that he refers to are in their case urgent, yes, but the Department of Labour, which is a department of government, has the appropriate services for dealing with these and each of them are being dealt with in the proper way insofar as it is necessary or desirable for government to be involved. So that he is speaking of many matters not one matter of public urgency, Your Honour, and so that we would take the position that it is not an appropriate matter on which this House should be adjourned and specifically debated.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. There is no point of order. The rule, Standing Order 23, requires that Your Honour consider the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and if Your Honour thinks it in order and of urgent public importance you then read it out and Your Honour then asks the House whether any member objects. At that point I would suggest that the hon. gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) is certainly at liberty to say whether he objects or no, and we certainly take it from what he did say that he objects. But I submit there is no point of order. The Speaker may or may not find the matter to be of urgent public importance. We believe it is but it is the Speaker to decide.

MR. F. ROWE: And we have not heard it all yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The rules with respect to the asking of leave for the motion to adjourn are set forward in our Standing Orders and certain additional explanations indeed in Beauchesne. In Beauchesne, chapter 100, subsection 2 but it is at the very bottom of page 89: "There must be a prima facie case of urgency." The Speaker's obligation in this area is to rule on whether or not the matter is in order. And on page 90, subsection 3: "Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but it means urgency of debate, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (There is a distinction between the urgency of the matter and the urgency of debate.) - "When the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately."

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the matter is obviously urgent, obviously of public importance. I do not concur that there is the urgency of debate at this moment, and I would also refer to a speaking of Mr. Speaker Lamoureux given in the House of Commons, available in Hansard of July 9, 1969, and he stated: The motion is acceptable only if it concerns a matter that has unexpectedly become urgent and not if it concerns a situation that has prevailed for some time. If I understood correctly the hon. member's comments, the question is no doubt both important and urgent, but it has prevailed for some time. To that extent I do not believe that it would be in order to adjourn the business of the House to allow the hon. member to make known his views on the matter. With those two authorities, that of Beauchesne's commentary on the urgency of the debate as distinguished from the urgency of the matter and the ruling frequently referred to by Speaker Lamoureux as well as others and that is the matter must be something which unexpectedly became urgent but not something which has continued to be a situation for quite some time. I, therefore, rule it out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, could that maybe be tabled so that we can all take it home and read it?

MR. SPEAKER: It will be in Hansard, no doubt.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to the Orders of the Day, there were two matters, I believe, which were mentioned briefly on opening day and which, of course, could not be dealt with then nor could they be dealt with yesterday. One of them, I believe, the hon. Premier wished to deal with a resolution congratulating Archbishop Seaborn on his elevation to that position. But I wonder if it would be proper for me to move that the usual and appropriate message of condolences be sent to the family of the late Dr. James A. McGrath, a man who was no stranger

to many of the members of this House. He served in the House with a number of us, a man who was four times elected to represent the former District of St. Mary's, a district with which Your Honour is not totally unacquainted, and a man who served with great distinction for ten or eleven years as a member of the Cabinet, most of them as Minister of Health. Dr. McGrath's death, of course, occurred during the Summer, in the month of July in fact, but this is the first opportunity we have had. I would move, if it is in order, Sir, that the usual message be sent or if the Premier prefer perhaps the motion should stand in his name in which case I would be honoured to second it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, certainly I would be only too glad to propose the motion and I would also think it would be very wrong at this time that unless the Leader of the Liberal Reform Party was here as well, or the hon. member for Twillingate, who I am sure has more personal involvement with the hon. gentleman and has had than any other person in this hon. House, but as a Premier of a province talking about a man who is such a distinguished Newfoundlander, a man whose family I have known for many years, a man who in many cases, or most cases I think was beyond partisan politics, a person who was respected by not just his constituency but by people all around this province, I have great pleasure, Sir, in moving the official resolution to honour his memory in the form that this House normally does.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I join my voice with that of the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. the Premier in my expression of sorrow over the death of a very dear friend and a very great man, a great Newfoundlander, a great scholar, one of the most scholarly men I have ever known, a man of great wit, of great humour, a trencherman if ever there was one, a doctor, a magistrate, a medical specialist, one of the two greatest medical administrators, so it was said, in the whole of Canada when he and Dr. Leonard Miller formed a team in the Department of Health.

Dr. James McGrath was all man. He was all gentleman. He sat just behind me just about approximately where the hon. member for Harbour Grace sits now, I think it was, and again and again he in this House, quite oblivious to what was going on about him and about all of us, sat there translating into English some work of French that he wanted to translate, did a number of them for me. His loss to Newfoundland is one that is not going to be filled. He was a great man and a great Newfoundlander, a great father, a great husband, a great neighbour and a great minister, a great administrator and a great member of this House and his loss is irreparable.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved, seconded and agreed that an appropriate letter be drafted informing those concerned of the sentiments of the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3. It has been moved and seconded that I do now leave the Chair.

Order, please! When a question is being put if hon. gentlemen rise then the Chair has no way of knowing if they are rising on a point of order or to speak to the motion which is in the process of being put and can make it quite difficult so I would recommend that when a question is being put it in fact be put and then let hon. gentlemen who wish to speak would so indicate by arising.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, Sir, I want to offer sincere congratulations to Your Honour for being chosen as Speaker of this hon. House. I have known Your Honour for some considerable period of time. I think I was already occupying a seat in the House when Your Honour was first elected to the House of Assembly and then I saw Your Honour leave to go to law school and then return to the House of Assembly once again after being elected by the voters I think it was in the district of St. Mary's. I want to join with the other members of the House in offering my sincere congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, and I do wish you well, Sir, in your new job.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to pay a tribute to the former Speaker of this hon. House, the hon. James Russell.

Now, Sir, on Opening Day I think it was the member for Twillingate expressed an

opinion that Your Honour would probably be the best Speaker that we have ever had in this hon. House. Well, Sir, with all due respect to Your Honour who presently occupies the Chair, in my opinion, Sir, Your Honour will have to go some to beat the gentleman who occupied the Chair for the last three-and-a-half years. He was a thorough gentleman, Sir, impartial and did, in my opinion, an outstanding job, an absolutely magnificent job in chairing the debates that took place in this House, Sir, under most difficult circumstances.

I also, Sir, want to extend my congratulations to the - Sir, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition worried about my speaking it is about time they learned that there is more than one party in this hon. House.

MR. DOODY: How many are there?

MR. NEARY: Well there is the old guard Liberal Party, there is the Liberal Reform Party and there is the Independent Liberal Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So, Sir, it is about time their Whips, their House leaders or their Whips just did not ignore the other members on this side of the House. They do not own the House, Sir. There are other members and other parties in this hon. House. So if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would just not be so rude and take his seat and stop interrupting me when I am trying to address his Honour, the Speaker, I would appreciate it very much, Sir.

Sir, I want to also congratulate the Deputy Speaker of the House who has been chosen, the hon. member for St. John's South (Dr. John Collins). I think this is a very good choice indeed, Sir, and I do wish the Deputy Speaker well in his new duties. He is a newcomer to the House of Assembly, but I am sure, Sir, that if I know the hon. gentleman at all that he will do his homework and try to do a good job when occupying the Chair of this House or when occupying the Chair in the centre of the House as Chairman of Committees.

And also, Sir, I want to extend my best wishes and congratulations to the member for Bonavista North (George Cross) who has been chosen the Deputy Chairman, the Chairman of Committee of the Whole. This

gentleman is also a newcomer to the House of Assembly, Sir. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am not at all familiar with the gentleman, but I have heard some good things about him. I have, as a matter of fact, talked to some people who were former students of the hon. member, and I believe that he will make a good Chairman of Committees.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duties if I did not extend my sincere congratulations to all those members who were re-elected for the second and third time and to all those members who were elected for the first time. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that we have had fifty-one members in this hon. House. And that brings me, Sir, to my first point in the budget debate. During the time, Sir, that we debated the Royal Commission report on the Redistribution of Provincial Boundaries in this Province, I was one of the members, Sir, who stood in his place in this hon. House and strongly objected to increasing the number of members to the House of Assembly. And my main objection, Sir, was on the grounds that this Province could not afford fifty-one members, that instead of increasing the number of members in the House, Sir, instead of increasing the number of members we should have been reducing the number of members from say forty-two downward to about thirty-five. But, Mr. Speaker, the Royal Commission had no choice, they were bound by legislation, by an Act that we passed in this hon. House to bring in a recommendation that the number of districts in Newfoundland be increased to fifty-one. They did not have any elbow room at all, Sir. It was laid down

by this honourable House and they had no choice but to recommend fifty-one districts because it was spelled out in legislation. They did the best they could, Sir, to set out the boundaries. But the administration at that time saw fit to gerrymander the districts. You know, Mr. Speaker, it was humorous on election night to hear the Minister of Finance, the Member for Harbour Main-Bell Island coming out and saying he would have loved to have a fight with the former Member for Bell Island. Well, Sir, I would have loved to have a fight with him too. But, Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman think that I am a fool or that I am stupid? When I go into a fight, Sir, I like to go into a fair fight, not a fight where the dice are loaded or the cards are stacked against you. Anytime, Sir, anytime the hon. member wants to have a fair fight all he has to do is let me know. Come down to LaPoile and I guarantee you he will get a fair fight, or anywhere in Newfoundland for that matter, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, they gerrymandered the districts and it backfired, Sir. It backfired on them. The government now have less members, a lesser number of seats, less seats in the House than it had before the last provincial election. And they also, Sir, have a much lesser percentage of the popular vote. So the whole thing backfired on them, Sir. They thought they were being smart. They were going to gerrymander themselves back into the House of Assembly with a large majority. Instead, Sir, their majority has been cut and the percentage of the popular vote has been cut drastically, substantially and they are now sitting in this hon. House with a smaller percentage of the popular vote than all of the members on this side of the House put together.

Another significant point, Sir, about the outcome of that election is the makeup of the new House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, as far as I can ascertain, out of thirty seats on the government side of the House, and, of course, this is a matter of opinion of what your

definition of urban or semi-urban, but out of thirty seats, Sir, twenty-two on the government side of the House are represented by urban or semi-urban districts. In other words, the members, twenty-two of the members on the government benches at the present time - yes. I would consider the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island to be representing a semi-urban district, semi-urban - so, Sir, twenty-two out of the thirty seats the government have at the present time in the House the members represent urban or semi-urban districts, a matter, Mr. Speaker, that is of grave concern to a lot of the members of this hon. House and something that has to be watched, Sir, very, very carefully.

MR. DOODY: Why?

MR. NEARY: Why? I will tell the minister why and the House why. So that all the programmes that will be put forward, not only in this session of the House but in sessions of the House to come, that all the programmes will not be urban community oriented. Well, Sir, first of all we have to see the programmes and then we will be able to tell the minister. I am sure that St. John's Centre has done fairly well with the representation that it has down through the years or I presume the hon. member would not be returned to this House of Assembly five times in a row, five times. The minister and I have the same amount of seniority in this honourable House. We both came in in 1962.

MR. MURPHY: What else do we have in common?

MR. NEARY: That is about all we have in common, Sir. That is about all we have in common. But it is something, Mr. Speaker, that has to be watched very, very carefully and I will be standing here in my place in this hon. House as a member

who represents a rural district. Three of the communities in my district are isolated. You have to get there by boat. Petites, Grand Bruit and LaPoile are all isolated communities. This time in the year, Sir, the only service they have is by the conventional type of CN coastal boat. My hon. former colleague, the member for Fogo (Capt. E. Winsor) operates a ferry in the area but I am afraid this time in the year, Sir, his little boat that he brought down from Louisiana is unable to cope with the Newfoundland weather conditions. And in November she had to be taken out of service and tied up for the Winter. I will have more to say about that later on, Sir, about that bugaboo.

Mr. Speaker, so here we are, a kind of a mixed up crowd now in the House of Assembly. But one thing, Sir, that we all have in common is that we were all sent to this House by secret ballot. We were all sent here by the majority of the voters in our various districts. That, Sir, we have in common. We were all sent here, Sir, by the people of this Province in these most difficult times to try to do the best we can to improve the standard of living of the people of this Province.

Prior to this House opening, Sir, I am afraid that some members at least thought they were sent to this House just to have a ball, to play games, one-upmanship, to make legalistic mountains out of molehills, to clown around, to attack other members' characters, to attack the Speaker and to waste the time of the House. We saw what happened, Sir, in the last three and a half years in this hon. House, Sir. You cannot really point your finger at any one significant or outstanding accomplishment of this administration or you cannot really point your finger at anything worthwhile that was done in the hon. House. The whole thing, Sir, was a sham.

Some of the members who sat in that hon. House paid the price. Some, their constituents were prepared to forgive them and send them back again hoping that they would reform, change their ways, take off their coats, roll up their sleeves and get down to brass tacks and try and do something for a change for the ordinary

people of this Province.

I know, Sir, I know I have often fallen into the trap myself of getting down and rolling into the mud with some of the hon. members. God only knows I was provoked often enough. Well, Sir, I stand before you in this hon. House today not purified or not cleansed - no, that is my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). I stand here, Sir, openly and say to Your Honour that I will not tolerate or put up with any clowning around by any members or by any personal attacks on members' characters in this hon. session of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: We have been sent here, Sir, by the people of this Province to do a job. It is going to be a difficult task, Sir, as we heard yesterday from the Minister of Finance when he outlined the various measures for dealing with inflation in his

MR. NEARY: mini budget, the first time that we have had a mini budget in this province. It is going to be rough. It is going to be tough, Sir. Newfoundlanders, I believe, have never backed away from a fight and I do not think they will now. But certainly the leadership has to be provided if we are going to work our way out of this most difficult situation that we are in at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the way that I would sum up the average Newfoundlander's opinion of yesterday's budget is that it is much to-do about nothing. After a couple of weeks, Sir, of predictions by the hon. the Premier, by the hon. the Premier taking to the radio and the television and the newspapers, telling us that there would be harsh belt tightening measures in this session of the House of Assembly aimed at giving the Government of Canada full co-operation in its battle against inflation, after about two or three weeks of this, Sir, why yesterday members were almost frightened to death, almost scared to come into the House. They were expecting to come in, Sir, and the people would come down in droves and smash the windows out of the place, that the measures would be so severe. The Minister of Finance would bring in such harsh measures as we were led to believe by the hon. the Premier. Harsh, severe measures he told us. And what did we find ourselves with yesterday, Mr. Speaker? Just a mild slap on the wrist, a little love tap to the consumers who we are led to believe, whose wild purchasing could be one of the main causes of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Finance yesterday in his mini budget, his Fall budget, talked out of both corners of his mouth, Sir, at the same time and I could not come to the conclusion whether he was trying to be a good guy or a bad guy. First he told us about some of the bad news and then he used to slip in the odd little goodie and then the minister told us that the exemption of clothing from the ten per cent sales tax was going to be a great boom to the poor people, to the ordinary people of this province. It is going to be a great boom, how are you, Sir! It is going to impose a severe hardship on the ordinary people of this province. Oh sure, Sir, the rich, the wealthy, the high mucky-mucks

can now go out and buy their wives a fur coat and they do not have to pay the ten per cent. That is clothing. So they are getting a bit of a break too. When the House is opening, anybody who can afford it, the rich want to buy a cocktail dress so their wives can attend the cocktail parties or an evening gown or an expensive nightgown. They do not have to pay the ten per cent sales tax.

So who is getting the break?

AN HON. MEMBER: Five per cent on nightgowns.

MR. NEARY: Five per cent on nightgowns? Well, Sir, it is going up and up, not the nightgown but the - So, Mr. Speaker, who is getting the break? What about all the ordinary people who have to buy knives and forks and pans and paper to paper their houses and putty and broken glasses in their windows and nails and cooking utensils and refrigerators and stoves and washing machines. The minister made no reference to all these items at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will be exempt.

MR. NEARY: They will not be exempt!

They will be exempt from the ten per cent on clothing. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, if the situation is anything like when I was growing up, and I believe it is today in a lot of parts of Newfoundland, most of the kids are wearing hand-me-downs because they cannot afford to go out and buy clothes, and so the savings there, Sir, will be very insignificant indeed. It will benefit the rich more than it will the poor, Sir. What the minister should have done if he had to have any sense, he should have wiped out the ten per cent on clothing and then put a luxury tax on the rich and the wealthy and the high mucky-mucks and make them pay. But no he did not do that, Sir, he gave them a big break.

Mr. Speaker, I think the biggest error in judgement, Sir, in the Budget Speech was the fact that there was not a single indication that the government itself, on its record over the past three years - which has been one of extravagance and waste, probably the most wasteful and the most extravagant in our history - not one single indication, Sir, that the government itself is going to engage in any of the belt tightening that we heard so much about for the last few months. Are the government going to get rid of any of these platoons of high paid executive assistants that they have? And they are increasing now, Sir, we are told. In the last couple of weeks since the election - and there is a surplus of defeated candidates around - that a few of them have found jobs as executive assistants. What happened to the old ones? The government has not changed, the administration has not changed, are they now put on the unemployment rolls or have they found other jobs? No, Sir, not a single indication that the government itself was going to retrench and cut back and cut out this extravagance and profligate spending of the last three and-a-half years.

And, Sir, what about my favourite pet peeve, the government aircraft? Is that going to be put in mothballs along with the other money-wasting aircraft that is being misused and abused? And, Sir, did we hear anything, did we hear a peek out of the hon. the Minister of Finance about the empire building that is going on in the public service and by the university bureaucrats who have become a major monkey on the backs of the taxpayers of this Province? Planning and Priorities Committees, Cabinet Secretariat - three quarters of a million, \$1 million, \$1.5 million - and all these

fellows that are flying around the Province and flying around Canada and flying around the world at public expense, when they should be in their classrooms teaching over at the university. Where do they get the time, Sir, that is what I would like to know to go off on these commissions and enquiries and seminars and visiting lecturers? Where do they get the time? They are getting paid full-time to lecture over here at the university and if you get aboard an aircraft, Sir, you are bound to bump into a whole flock of them. That is if you can get into the first-class. They go first-class. The poor old neasants like ourselves have to go second-class. This is a major problem, Sir.

And we did not hear a word, Sir, about any reduction in future handouts by the Rural Development Authority for such dubious projects as funeral homes and beauty parlours, and not even notice of intent to cut back, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated a few moments ago, on the inter-provincial travel and the international travel at the expense of the provincial treasury, of the huge numbers of - cabinet ministers themselves are the biggest culprits in this, followed very

closely, I would say, by the Memorial University staff and officials of the government, Crown corporations, advisory boards, committees of all kinds, not a peep from the minister of whether or not they were going to cut back in this area as we watch all these people go on their little jaunts about the globe on all these unnecessary conferences at public expense. You know, Mr. Speaker, I would say that on any given day, Sir, on any given day, and Your Honour can pick whatever day he wants, that you will find anywhere from 500 to 1,000 well-heeled, well-to-do residents of this Province, Sir, either in the air, en route to far flung corners of the world, far destinations or lounging in a luxurious hotel room somewhere in North America, or in Europe or wine and dining, Sir, in some of the posh eateries of the world and all at the expense, Sir, of the provincial taxpayer who himself is huddled in his little modest home in Newfoundland putting on two or three sweaters so that he will not freeze to death, turning down his thermostat if he has one because he cannot afford to buy the heating fuel that he needs to keep his poor, old modest home heated. Did the minister throw out the challenge to these people, give them something they could get ahold of, a hand on, say, well, the minister is sincere in what he says. He is going to clean out this crowd of monkeys on the taxpayers back who are travelling all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was told a story recently by somebody who knows. Not only do they go off to their posh hotel rooms and their posh eating places but you know they arrange it so they can attend the hockey game in Montreal and sometimes they exchange tickets.

MR. DOODY: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: Ah! It is true, Sir. I got it right from the horse's mouth. And I am not talking about ministers. I am talking about some of that crowd over there on the campus of Memorial University who will not disclose their budget to the people of this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They disclose it partially.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they will not disclose it. I beg to differ with my hon. and former boss, the hon. member for Twillingate. We, Sir, when I was a member of Cabinet, and I am not divulging Cabinet secrets, we tried to put the boots to them but they put the boots to us instead. Yes, I beg your pardon, Sir. All they will give you, all they will give you, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins): Order! Order! I remind the hon. member he is addressing the Chair.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. I remind Your Honour, Sir, that all the university does is give us a little sheet of paper with headings on it - salaries, \$5 million; maintenance of buildings, \$10 million and so forth and so on. You get this list. We do not even know if the places are insured over there or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are.

MR. NEARY: They are. They are not. Well, Sir, that is something worth looking into. But, Mr. Speaker, I will talk about the university disclosing its budget when I get into the Throne Speech. I am only just getting warmed up now, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, that budget yesterday, that mini budget that was presented by the hon. Minister of Finance and the President of Treasury Board, Sir, is just a bit of gim-crackery -

MR. DOODY: Can you spell it?

MR. NEARY: Gim-crackery, g-i-m-c-r-a-c-k-e-r-y, gim-crackery.

MR. DOODY: Is it hyphenated?

MR. NEARY: Hyphenated. Just a bit of gim-crackery with a buildup carefully managed in advance by the hon. the Premier and the members of his Cabinet so that it would appear that things are not as bad as they had been predicted. Mr. Speaker, the only congratulations that I can offer to the hon. the Minister of Finance are due him, Sir, not for the wisdom, not for the common sense, not for the usefulness of his budget

in providing this Province with a genuine inflation fighting tool
but Mr. Speaker, for the wonderful job that the minister did of
stage managing its presentation in the House of Assembly yesterday
and

his excellence of pulling the wool over the eyes of our provincial taxpayers. It was almost as effective, Mr. Speaker, as the pre-election budget of last Spring when so many goodies were promised to so many without any real regard for the beleaguered governments ability or intention for that matter to produce them.

Mr. Speaker, if this House foolishly accepts the present budget without a thoroughgoing reconstruction to fashion it, Mr. Speaker, into a real inflation fighting tool, then I predict, Sir, as do some of my colleagues that I have talked to in this hon. House, that next March and next April and next May the government will be forced to recognize the extent to which it itself is contributing to inflation and bring in a budget that will really come to grips with the problems of inflation especially with the problems that are created by the government itself.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would maintain, Sir, that it is the duty of every member of this House, it is the duty of this present House to refer the entire matter of the budget back to the Minister of Finance, not waste any more time and give him instructions to bring measures into this House that will really have a chance, Sir, of showing that the government of which he is a member really intends to support the federal government. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier on numerous occasions at public functions has said, we are going to support the Government of Canada, and then when the Tories held their convention at the Holiday Inn he said, well, we do not like their measures. We do not like what they are doing but we are going to support it anyway. That, in my opinion, Sir, is hypocritical and all it does is confuse the people. You either support it or you do not. You are either going to fight it or you are not going to fight it.

Other provincial governments, Sir, have taken the bull by the horns. Out in British Columbia the NDP Government brought in a ninety day wage and price freeze. I would have liked to see our government do something similar in this Province, Sir. Mr. Speaker, our dollar is eroding day by day and somehow everybody seems to throw up their arms in defeat and say, there is nothing we can do about it.

We depend on the buck, Sir, whether we like it or not. My God, I tell you this, just imagine a hockey team going out on the ice that did not have the determination to win. Well, they might as well stay in the penalty box. Well, Sir, that is like the government. They do not seem to have that determination to be able to beat this inflation.

Newfoundlanders are out there and Canadians waiting, eating their hearts out for something to happen, for somebody to show them the way, to show them the light. Well certainly, Sir, they could not take any inspiration from yesterday's budget. And, Mr. Speaker, over and above limiting measures, negative measures, let us in this House also engage on a positive programme to try, Sir, and link up the minds of our people to the real relationship between the standard of living and productivity.

You know, Mr. Speaker, somehow or other I would say the majority of our people, not only in Newfoundland, in Canada, in North America, do not relate in any way, shape or form what they get in their pay envelopes to what they produce and nothing is being done about it. Sir, I have for three years put a resolution on the Order Paper suggesting to this government that they set up a productivity council comprising of labour management and other section or factions in society to try and come to grips with work stoppages, legal and illegal. Set up a productivity council. Do it by peaceful means. You will never accomplish it the way that Mr. Mercer is going about it, by taking on everybody or taking on the labour movement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that I will have more to say about later on. But let the budget, Sir, also contain and bring forth proposals, Mr. Speaker, for educating management and labour in the importance of productivity as the only real long-term way, Sir, to fight inflation. Mr. Speaker, it must be as plain as the nose on your face, Sir! And people cannot see it, members of the House cannot see it! And I must say, I think in the last session I almost had the Premier convinced that my idea of a productivity council was a good thing. We spoke privately about it, and he said, it is good, I like the concept. But, Sir, why he did not go ahead and set up this productivity council I will never know. No where else, Sir, in Canada is it so necessary as in Newfoundland. We are almost as bad now here as Italy was a year ago and the whole place was in turmoil. The economy was wrecked through strikes, whether they were legal, illegal, work stoppages of one kind and another, lockouts. Canada, Sir, has the next worst reputation to Italy, and Newfoundland is the worst in Canada. My God! and we sit back and do nothing about it. I do not mean that we should go out and clobber anybody, Sir. We have to show people the light. And what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is start right back in our educational system, start right at kindergarten and work right up through, Sir, and tell our students, our young people, our graduates of tomorrow, what productivity is all about, what trade unions are all about, what management is all about, what capitalism is all about. As of right this moment, Sir, they do not know.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that will have the biggest bearing on people's lives when they finish vocational schools and the university and the College of Trades and the College of Fisheries and high schools, is the union, and they will learn nothing about it. I was president of my own local union for fourteen years, and I am pro-union. I am a union man, and I am a Liberal, too. And, Sir, I went right from kindergarten right on up through high school and did not learn one thing about the trade union movement. It is something that would have a bigger bearing on people's lives than anything else in society, and yet we turn a blind eye. When I was an executive office of the Federation of Labour,

we tried to get it into the curriculum in the schools, and we were laughed at. They still do not have it there. I think at the College of Trades or at the university now they are making minor stabs at industrial relations but not far enough, Sir, in my opinion. We are going to have to change people's attitudes, and the only way you can do that is go right back when they start going to school all the way up through, and teach people, Sir, that they can only own, they only deserve what they earn, they can only enjoy what they earn.

I remember, I think, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), I believe, in his peril and glory, outlined the problem in our Canadian North American society. I think the hon. former Premier, Mr. Speaker, came to the conclusion, when he did put together that little booklet, that we were living too high off the hog. And it is only now that the chickens are coming home to roost.

So, Sir, if we are going to win this battle, if we are going to convince the people who sent us to this House of Assembly, Sir, that we are sincere and genuine in our thinking, and the government first of all has to show the leadership by eliminating all these cocktail parties. Look, Mr. Speaker, I was going to refer to the public accounts. You know, I do not make this stuff up. In the Throne Speech I will be dealing with it. In the Auditor General's report we have reference to air services, to booze parties, the liquor being put aboard the government aircraft (look!) without any vouchers, liquor being spread around, nobody signing for it. I could read it. It is there in the Auditor General's report, Sir. And then we have all this, office entertainment it is called. Look, Sir, a whole page of it. One hundred and fifty-eight dollars

to somebody to pass out to go see Stomping Tom Connors, the Merry Widow, all kinds of waste and extravagance, \$4,000, \$4,626 - miscellaneous. They must have been ashamed to show that altogether. You know any member can take this, this public accounts or the Auditor General's Report, go through it and the Auditor General has shown us where we can save millions of dollars every year and we have ignored it. And we ourselves, Sir, if we were men enough, could show the people of this province that we mean business. The government is going to ground its jet and have an auction down here at Torbay and get rid of it. Only then, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, will the people of this province, Sir, take the measures that we heard about yesterday seriously.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker - is it any wonder that we have so many strikes in Newfoundland at the present time. The poor old worker is frustrated, confused, bewildered, does not believe that we have problems of the magnitude that we have. All he knows is that he is faced with personal problems he is unable to cope. The \$600 yesterday that was announced in the housing programme by the minister - who will benefit by that? Is it the ordinary people of this province, the low income people that the minister was so concerned about? No, Sir, because they cannot afford to buy homes. It will be the fellow up in the \$10,000, \$12,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 a year bracket who will benefit by that, not the person on social assistance, unemployment insurance, low income as the minister was trying to lead us to believe yesterday. It will go to the fellows that can afford it, the high mucky-mucks again that I refer to. I am not talking about the millionaires, and I could have a few words about them too, Sir, but the \$600, Sir, the minister tells us is going to be of such tremendous benefit to the ordinary people of this province will only go to a certain group, to a certain category of people.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me see what else is here in the, oh yes, yes, Sir, the minister just brushed over the motor vehicles and driver licences increases. He did not tell us, Sir, he said, oh just a matter of \$2 a year, nothing, pin money. That amount, Sir, over a three year period is sixty-six and two thirds per cent increase and that will

be taken out of the hides of the ordinary people and the increase, Sir, for motor vehicle registration going up from \$22 to \$29 a year, that amounts to thirty-two per cent of an increase that will be wacked right out of the backs of the ordinary people of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Plus the scrap cars.

MR. NEARY: Well the scrap cars I will deal with in the Throne Speech, that is a different matter. So, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot to think about in this hon. House. We have to examine our conscience and if, and I cannot help but repeating this, Sir, because people are just not taking the matter seriously. They are not convinced that the Government of Canada can enforce its price controls. I am not convinced. Labour is not convinced. Probably the minister is not convinced. But does that mean, Sir, that we have to give up on inflation, that there is nothing we can do about it. We have to do, what is it the minister is saying we have to do?

MR. DOODY: We are discussing whether you are on the Budget Speech -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am on the Budget Speech and, Sir, I could go through the Fall Budget 1975 book presented yesterday in the House of Assembly. Is that Bell Island on the cover, by the way?

MR. DOODY: Yes. The district that you ran away from.

MR. NEARY: Is that so? Is that so? Well it does not look like Bell Island. You could go through this, Mr. Speaker, with a fine tooth comb and you could find, Sir, all kinds of examples of extravagance and waste and Sir, I just opened up a page there and this put it in my mind about the linerboard mill. I argued, Sir,

Sir, in the last session of this hon. House that one of the greatest mistakes that this administration made - apart from forcing out one of the best companies that we ever had, Churchill Falls Corporation was taking over the Linerboard Mill and letting John C. Doyle off the hook. The Minister of Finance at the time was so full of hatred and bigotry and despised Mr. Doyle so much that he felt the thing to do was to take it over, and I fought against it. I think I was the only one in this hon. House. I broke party rank to fight against it. And I fought. And people were confused because they felt Mr. Doyle had been called a crook and a gangster and a scoundrel and a rogue so often that the thing to do was to get rid of him. That is what they were conned into believing. But, Sir, it was a grave mistake to let that company-whomever owned it, I do not care who owned it, whether the Minister of Finance owned it, or whether his predecessor owned it, or whoever owned it, Sir, it was a sorry day for this Province. It was a mistake to take over that mill and let the owners off the hook. They are laughing all of the way to the bank. And what is happening today? We are pouring into the Linerboard Mill, Sir, about \$28 million or \$30 million. This year it will probably be \$35 million or \$40 million coming right out of the public treasury going into that mill, and it would have operated, it would have gotten there, it would have operated. They would have found a way. But no, we had to bring in a salesman from Stateside and pay him \$75,000 a year plus fringe benefits to operate that mill for us, and let the owners get away scott free. And not only that, they paid him \$4 million, \$5 million or \$6 million for their mill. And you can go down, Sir, to the University, an old pet peeve of mine - this year, I think, they are spending \$32 million, I believe it is, A blank cheque, Sir, we are passing over to them, \$32 million - and they do not have to tell us what they are spending it on. I heard a story the other day, Sir, I was - last year I was telling about George Fifth down at the Marine Science Laboratory where they were teaching him how to ring a bell so he could feed himself. Well I was talking to one of the doctors recently on staff at the University who was telling me, Mr. Speaker, it would be

worth your while to go down to the Marine Science Complex sometime when they are performing surgery down there, and here they are, Sir, all doctors from all over the world, their expenses paid to Newfoundland, dressed up in their gowns with their caps and masks ready to perform surgery on some poor little old herring that they just hauled out of the water. But if some poor little child wants a pair of crutches or a set of glasses or a set of dentures, or some old person wants a wheelchair, you cannot get it! And go down there and there they are locked up, cloaked in their little room - my hon. friend knows how they dress, I cannot describe them - their stethoscope around their necks, ready with their scalpel to make an incision into the brain of a herring.

And here we are, Sir, talking about retrenchment and cut-backs and belt tightening. What is going to be done about that? And what is going to be done, Sir, about all these outsiders that are hauled into this Province with their families, and I am not bigotted or prejudiced against Come-From-Aways getting jobs here. My hon. friend from - the Minister of Transportation and Communications brought it up recently and I said to him downstairs one day he should take a look at his own administration. Why only recently, Sir, the assistant deputy minister of Health is a Come-From-Away. Nobody in Newfoundland can do that job? The minister's own deputy minister is a Come-From-Away. Down in Finance she is full of Come-From-Aways, and it is increasing all of the time. And down in the Minister of Justice's Department the assistant is a Come-From-Away or the deputy is a Come-From-Away. And you can go through every government department. And I am not talking about appointments, Sir, that have been made for some considerable time, I am talking about recent appointments in the Fisheries Department. Who was appointed there recently? The gentleman from Ottawa, a Come-From-Away. What does the Minister of Transportation and Communications have to say about that? And they may be all good men, Sir. I am not condemning them. And I am not against Come-From-Aways God only knows there are enough Newfoundlanders in Ontario and Boston and all the other provinces and states.

I am not against it, Sir. But certainly we should - I agree with one thing the minister said, that we should give preference to Newfoundlanders whenever possible. And I am sure that we could have gotten an assistant deputy minister of Health without going outside the Province. But, Mr. Speaker, I am wandering a little bit.

I started off by zeroing in on the university, \$32 million a year. I can get the odd person in this House to agree with me, and I remember the day, Sir, when it was unpatriotic in this Province to criticize Memorial University. How dare you! They would immediately go on the defensive and say, "Oh! you are attacking the academic training at the university." No such thing, Sir. They can go ahead and teach their bridge over there if they want to and their folklore and the Extension Service can go out and form the fourth Newfoundland Party if they want to. They can stir up trouble in every community in Newfoundland if they want to. They can do all sorts of these things. I am not interfering with that. I am saying that, Sir, point blank. And God only knows the majority of people in this Province agree with me, although I may not get agreement in this House because, Mr. Speaker - I remember when I was in the old guard Liberal caucus, any time I zeroed in on the university -

MR. DOODY: How many meetings did you have there?

MR. NEARY: - that night for sure, Sir, that night there were phone calls back and forth between the president and one of my colleagues in the caucus saying, "What is wrong with that Neary? What is he criticizing us for?" Now, Sir, I am out from under the thumb of that sort of thing, and I can let her go, and they can make all the calls they want. And my former colleague would say, "Well, oh yes, Mr. Neary. He is only speaking for himself. He is not speaking for the caucus. I speak for education in the Liberal caucus." I have no job to protect, Sir. And I guarantee you this, I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that I speak for a lot of people in this Province when I suggested to this House, Sir, that it is about time that the university was forced to disclose its budget to the people of this Province. The government should refuse to let them have one more red cent. That is not an attack on academic freedom. That is an attack

on how they are spending our money. Sir, I am not saying - Mr. Speaker, I would be the last person in this world to say - that all the staff, all the administrators and all the people over at Memorial University are careless with our money. I am not saying that, Sir, no more than I am saying that all the lawyers are crooks in this Province or that all the consulting engineers are rogues. I am not saying that, Sir.

I remember a story came to me prior to the recent election. Somebody said, "Oh, look! one of your friends," (And I said, "huh, I better watch this," one of my friends) said, "oh, Neary has attacked the lawyers, he has attacked the doctors, he has attacked the consulting engineers, he has attacked the automobile dealers, and now he is attacking Memorial University. Just look," he said, "at all these people and all their friends and all their relatives, just look at how many people he is turning against him." Well, Sir, if you put them altogether they would not fill up a pork barrel. They amount to about zero-point-one per cent of the people of this Province and that is why I have no hesitation in zeroing in on the car salesmen or the lawyers or the staff at Memorial University or the professional engineers or the real estate agents or the second mortgage holders. Put them altogether and what have you got, Sir? Have you got one per cent of the population of this Province? I like to be the watchdog, Sir, for ninety-nine point nine per cent of the people of this Province, and that is why I am standing in this seat that I am in today, because the people wanted me back in this House to carry on the fight, the great fight, the great struggle that I have had down through the years, my fourteen years in this House, on behalf of the ordinary people of this Province. Ninety-nine point nine per cent of the people are poor people like myself, struggling for survival. Now I have lost my \$3,500 whip's fee that I used to get.

MR. DOODY: We will have a bingo game for you.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend can have it. He is welcome to it. I can think of no person better suited to get it - large family, struggling, and so forth. I am not accusing my hon. friend of taking the bite out of my childrens' mouths. But, Sir -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - I will tell you I was highly amused. Before this House opened they were talking about increases. "Get the House open so we can get paid! Get the House open so we can get our big increases." This was the talk all over Newfoundland. Members have quit and come back from Ottawa, given up their free passes on Air Canada, given up their luxurious offices up in Wellington Street or wherever it is in Ottawa, and their telephones and their secretaries and coming down here to slug it out in a poor old province. Gave up \$35,000, I think, a year.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$38,000.

MR. NEARY: \$38,000 a year. And then you have others who quit their jobs, \$22,000 a year, \$20,000 a year, \$25,000 a year. Then you have the lawyers who are coming up once in a while, dropping in to the House, punching in an hour or so, and all saying: "Oh! we have to get a big increase in pay. To hell!" they were saying, "with the federal government's wage and price guidelines." Well, Sir, I give them a fair warning now, and I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied to approve, to agree with an increase in this hon. House within the guidelines, and I am satisfied, Sir, to see members of the House paid their expenses the same as civil servants - present your bill for your hotel and your travelling, your rent-a-car or whatever expenses you have, pay for that over and above what members are getting now. But, Sir, I give fair warning that I will not stand in this hon. House and agree with any increase outside of the guidelines that have been laid down by the Government of Canada.

I feel sorry for these fellows who quite their \$18,000 and \$20,000 and \$22,000 a year jobs but they knew what they were getting into. Maybe some of them thought they would be in the cabinet by now, Sir. Maybe they had delusions of grandeur. Maybe they put blind faith in the wrong people and they are sitting here now for their little old \$14,500 the

same as I have had to struggle along with except that I have lost my Whip's pay for the last - not only that, Sir, it was \$3,500, I think, when I first came into this hon. House. And I have managed to get there and they are going to have to manage to get there because if it means my vote I can tell the House right now that I will vote for increases in member's pay within the guidelines, eight and two.

MR. DOODY: Paid for productivity?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. I will tell you, if we were getting paid for what we produce in this hon. House, I am afraid there would be a lot of members down to the welfare officer before a week is out.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against members getting paid for what they do. You know, I hear this argument so often; well, look! a janitor, a plumber, a miner down in Labrador City is earning more than a member of the House of Assembly. Well, Sir, maybe members are getting paid enough for what they are doing. I know in the last sitting - I am not going to refer to this sitting of the house because the first thing the Minister of Finance will say, "name them" - members dropped into this House once in a while, they would come in and pick up their pay cheque and they would go off downtown and sit in their law offices and they would spend all day long in court and they spend about four or five, give them at the outside ten hours for the whole sitting of the House, and then they expect people to sympathize with them and say; "Well, why does not the poor old member get paid the same as a janitor or a watchman or a miner or a truck driver or an electrician?" Why, Sir? Because they do not deserve it, that is why!

Now there are members who deserve to get paid well because they work hard for their districts, for their members and for their constituents. I think, Sir, the income of members should be related to the total income of a member and what he does and how much he produces in this hon. House.

Now, Sir, getting back to Memorial University for a moment or two,

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance, members of this hon. House would have sufficient courage, Sir, to say to the University, "You are not getting another penny, another cent until you agree to disclose your budget." And I remember what started me off on that kick now was the fact that I will be accused now of attacking another group. But, Sir, I want to make it abundantly clear that I am not attacking everybody at Memorial University, and when I talk about lawyers I am not attacking all lawyers. There are some honest, decent people in all the professions, Sir. There are some decent politicians. There are some scoundrels and rogues too as we saw up in Quebec recently and in Ottawa. I do not think we have them in Newfoundland. Fortunately, I think most of the members, at least, Sir, maybe I am naive, but I would hope, Sir, that most of the members of this House are sincere and want to do a job for their constituents, for the people who sent them in here.

Mr. Speaker, we did not hear one reference from the Minister of Finance, Sir, when he had the opportunity, when he was bringing in this Fall budget to tell us about the alleged, the so-called scandal in the Fishery Department involving, so we are, told \$3 million or \$4 million. You know, Mr. Speaker, when I heard that, when I heard that, honest to God, I said to myself, the scalding and the crucifying that I took in the hon. House from the former Minister of Fisheries, now the Minister of Mines and Energy, telling me and my family and the people of this Province that a minister is responsible for what goes on in his department whether he knew it or not. Well, Sir, I say now that that Minister of Fisheries who is now Minister of Mines and Energy is also responsible for what went on in that department and the minister before him.

MR. DOODY: He is not in the House.

MR. NEARY: He is not in the House. I wish he were, Sir, because I would shove his words, I would throw them right back at him.

MR. DOODY: Wait until he comes into the House.

MR. NEARY: I am going to have a go at him. Do not worry about that. I am going to have a go at him. I thought it was only in the Welfare Department, Social Services that this sort of thing could happen.

MR. DOODY: Maybe you can get Fisheries next time.

MR. NEARY: Maybe. I will certainly have to stand in line. There are a lot of people on the other side more qualified than I. I will just wait until he gets back. But, Sir, the minister should have dealt with that matter in the budget. It does involve, Sir, some \$3 million or \$4 million of the taxpayers money. I would like to know why the minister shyed away from it. It is not before the courts. The Minister of Justice need not get his feathers ruffled over there. So we are perfectly free to talk about it in this hon. House. That is what we are here for.

MR. HICKMAN: More hogwash!

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am talking about the scandal over in the Department of Fisheries. And we have had one, two, two ministers on that side and both of these ministers, Sir, should answer for this alleged scandal. They should be compelled to answer. They should be suspended from their duties for being negligent and careless in the administration of public funds. When I was told, Sir, in this hon. House I remember Mr. Wick Collins, who loves me, had a little editorial in The Evening Telegram. I should even be put out of the shadow Cabinet, he said, the shadow Cabinet, That and fifty cents will get you across on the boat to Bell Island. You know, he was so sanctimonious! I should not even be allowed in the shadow Cabinet. Well, what about the Minister of Fisheries, two of them sitting on that hon. side of the House, what about them, Sir? Are they going to resign? Are they going to be tossed out? Are they just going to sit there? And nobody says a word! Mr. Wick Collins is silent now. Where is his pen now? And all the other news media that are so quick to go after your jugular let the ministers get away scott free. They are

responsible, Sir, for everything that goes on in that department and they should be the ones to answer and pay the price and pay the penalty for any wrongdoing - not that they were involved themselves, Sir. That is not the point. They have to answer to this House and to the people of this Province for their wrongdoing, not their wrongdoing, for any wrongdoing that may have taken place during the

time that they were minister of that department. No, Sir, the present Minister of Health and the present Minister of Mines and Energy should, Sir, for their own sake, for the sake of justice and decency in this Province, truth and justice, come out and tell the people, tell the House what happened in the Department of Fisheries. The Minister of Mines and Energy may not be here, but the Minister of Health is here. I do not know but part of it may have taken place when my former colleague the minister - no, the minister shakes his head and says, no. So the onus of responsibility then is on the shoulders, rests on the shoulders in the government to come out in the interest of truth and justice and tell us what is going on and what happened in the Department of Fisheries. I do not think for one moment, Sir, and I saw this twisted the other night, twisted on a television programme, twisted around by a cute and sly little interviewer, getting a poor little old lonely fisherman to say that a lot of the fishermen in this Province were liars. I do not think that for one moment, Sir. You know, Mr. Speaker, if there are those amongst us who were tempted then, Sir, I would say that it is only because they have been shown a bad example by the people of this Province whom they look up to, No, I am not talking about legislators, I am talking about other things that have been disclosed recently and confirmed by Mr. Mercer when he spoke down at Rotary the other day, and confirmed by a lawyer down in the Minister of Justice's Department, a Crown prosecutor who came out and said that fraudulent practices are widespread in the business world and in the transfer of properties in this Province - A statement made by a Crown attorney, a Crown prosecutor! I do not know if he was silenced or reprimanded by the Minister of Justice. I hope he was not, Sir. This is refreshing and this is the kind of thing that I like to see, but it merely confirms what some of us have suspected all along, and it demoralizes the whole population, the ordinary people, Sir, and it undermines the administration of justice in this Province. And that brings me to my next point that I would like to see: A thorough on-going investigation into second mortgage companies, real estate transactions, legal fees involved in certain transfers of property in this Province.

Now, Sir, a few moments ago I made reference to the heading in the estimates, Rural Development Authority. In our rush, Sir, to deal with the Rural Development Authority in the estimates we somehow or other just - and have, and I suppose I have been guilty of this although last year I asked for a list of all the loans that were made by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation -

AN HON. MEMBER: That was supplied.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not supplied, Sir. It was not supplied. The list that I asked the minister for was a list of all those who had defaulted in their payments, a list of all of the loans that were uncollectable, and the minister refused to give it to me - the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation - and I think the excuse that the minister gave at the time was the fact that it would be not in the best interest of the public or these firms or these individuals to make it known that their debts were outstanding. Now I am refreshing the minister's memory and he remembers it. It is coming back to him. And, Sir, I am not too bad. I am like the elephant in this hon. House, Sir. The only place in the world that I feel at home is right here in this hon. House. I am like my

my former boss, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). I love it. I could stay here night and day and bring my bed in. But, Sir, there is very little known about the activities of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

MR. DOODY: You got it on the Order Paper now.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I have a question on the Order Paper. That does not stop me from dealing with it when I am running through the Fall budget, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, maybe I am over suspicious, Sir. But I have a feeling that all is not well with the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation. Well, when I say all is not well, first of all let me say to clarify that, to say that they are not doing the job in my opinion, which they were set up to do. And, in the second place, Sir, I would like to find out from the minister, if he elects to speak later in this debate, how many loans have been made by the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation, what the loans have been made for, whom they have been made to and how many of these loans are uncollectible, if any. I hear rumors that some of them are uncollectible.

Last year we had an example of where the director of Air Services and the president of the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation went out to the seal fishery to get their winter supply of flippers to put in their deep-freezes. And when I asked for a justification in this hon. House, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, who was then Minister of Transportation and Communications, kindly gave me the full information and in his reply to my questioning and cross-examining told me that the president of the corporation went out because they had loaned the owners of one of the ships a substantial amount of money from the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation to put a cannery on a sealing ship to can what would remain on the ice of the carcasses of the seals. Is that basically correct, basically what the hon. minister told me?

I swallowed that, Sir. I took it down hook, line and sinker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was the outcome of the experiment?

MR. NEARY: Ah, that is what I am leading up to, Sir. I do not know.

I do not know if the money has been lost, what the outcome is. I want the minister to tell me.

MR. DOODY: Sent you flippers, too.

MP. NEARY: Ah, Sir, I got a flipper alright. It was a frozen one from the year before.

And so we have confirmation that there was a loan made to this particular company. I believe it was in the vicinity of \$300,000, \$400,000 or \$500,000, to carry out an experiment for canning seal meat. And now, Green Peace Foundation are down there telling us they are going to squirt dye on the seals now and try to do away with the seal fishery altogether. That was followed closely by Mr. LeBlanc, the Federal Minister of Fisheries who says, well, they may have to take a decision shortly whether or not they are going to allow the seal fishery to continue or whether they have to have a few years of conservation.

But the president of the Development Loan Corporation has great faith in the seal fishery, enough faith to the extent where he loaned the owners of that ship a substantial amount of the taxpayers money. What I would like to know is if the experiment paid off, if the loan is collectible, if any of it has been paid back and if not, will it be paid back? I would like to know about all the other loans, what they have been given out for. We have been able only, Sir, to get a minimum of information under this heading. I think that it is time now for the minister to loosen up, open up the books and let us have a look and see who is getting these loans. Are they going to legitimate cases? Is the Development Loan Corporation just becoming another form of welfare, industrial welfare as we saw happen to the Rural Development Authority when they were providing handouts for defeated P.C. candidates.

I know one, Sir. He is over on Bell Island, God bless him! He only got about, oh I think so far he only got his hooks into the government for about \$30,000 or \$35,000, not all from Rural Development, \$15,000 of it, I think, from Rural Development and the rest of it from the Newfoundland Farm Products.

How much of this has gone on in the Newfoundland Development

Corporation, if any? Maybe none. But we should know. Ah, the Minister of Tourism is there smiling. I remember when he was over here he used to put these rhetorical questions so well and drive everybody up the wall. And, we used to say, "Oh McCarthyism," you know I heard it flung at me from the other side. But, Sir, I am quite sincere.

AN HON. MEMBER: It did not come from this side.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. Then when the crowd, when the faces changed on the other side, then it would come right back across the House again. But, I am quite sincere, Mr. Speaker. If we are going to have belt tightening, retrenchments and cutbacks, then for God's sake, let us level with one another. We are all mature, grown people. Let us find out what is happening in this Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation. Any sweetheart

deals, buddy-buddy agreements, just loans made to those who are turned down by the banks and the finance companies and the Industrial Development banks and any other source of loans? Have they taken any initiative themselves to start up industries in Newfoundland? If they have not, in my opinion, they are like DREE, they have failed.

So, Sir, when the minister speaks in the debate, let us have a few words, open up his heart and open up his books to the people of this Province on the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. We own it, Sir. It does not - they are not like -

MR. DOODY: We do not own it.

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not own the corporation.

MR. DOODY: The federal boys own it.

MR. NEARY: - they are not like God up on their -

MR. DOODY: The federal government owns most of it.

MR. NEARY: The federal government owns most of it.

Well, why is it in the minister's budget?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Because we got to pay fifty per cent of it.

MR. NEARY: And you got to pay fifty per cent, and you have to administer it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We do -

MR. NEARY: Well that is what I am asking you to do; produce, produce the documentation, produce the evidence.

Now, Sir, let me see where - oh! air services. Here we are, air services. I already dealt with it, Sir, briefly, but I want to come back to it again. The Auditor General dealt with it at some length in his report. Let me see this year what we are going to spend on air services, \$851,500 - no, I am sorry, Sir, that is not correct. Aircraft operation alone is \$1,954,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: That includes the water bomber.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that includes the water bombers.

Well, Sir, I have no objection to the water bombers, none whatsoever. They are doing a good job, a good concept brought in by the former administration.

But what I am getting at, Sir, is the misuse and the abuse of the government aircraft for the last three and one-half years. I have asked, Mr. Speaker, to have the logs back as far as January, I think, 1974, tabled in this hon. House. I doubt if I will get it. When the hon. the other crowd were over on this side of the House they asked for the logs. They did not get them.

MR. DOODY: I showed you one log.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DOODY: I showed you one log.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the minister showed me one log.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time, Sir, that we put aside our petty thinking and our partisan politics. Sir, I wonder if the people of this Province are aware that I, as a member, as one of their elected representatives, comes into this hon. House, asked the government for certain public information involving the spending of public money, and I am refused that information? Are the public aware of that, Sir? Does it sink in at all? Year after year after year they refused to give us information on the government operated lodge on the Gander River.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not so.

MR. NEARY: That is so. We asked for the list of guests at the government operated lodge, year after year, Sir. They have refused to give it to us. The use of the government aircraft, who uses it, how many ministers have been aloft in the last year or so, who were they accompanied by?

MR. DOODY: For security reasons.

MR. NEARY: For security reasons. Well the Auditor General asked a few questions here that may be more in the line of security. In my opinion -

MR. HICKEY: You know one name.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You know who one was. You know who it was.

MR. NEARY: I was not aboard.

AN HON. MEMBER: Someone was at -

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir,

AN HON. MEMBER: I was -

MR. NEARY: Fortunately, the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: Had a safe trip.

MR. NEARY: - had a safe landing and a safe return, and I was glad to hear it. But just listen to this, Mr. Speaker, as an example of the extravagance and waste in the misuse and abuse of the government aircraft. Page 31, the report of the Auditor General; "in my opinion the Department of Transportation and Communications should have taken steps to allocate expenditures for aircraft operations to user departments on the basis of actual usage rather than on the original estimates. My audit

disclosed that subdivision 1713-03, air services, aircraft operations, included payments totalling \$1,650 made to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission for supplies delivered to the government aircraft, additional amounts costing \$482 were delivered during 1973-74 but were not paid until 1974-75. During the fiscal year 1973-74 it was directed that entertainment expenditures were to be charged to the Department of Finance, entertainment division. Also a minute of council issued the 12th of July, 1972 required the minister's signature on all payment vouchers for entertainment expenses under \$250 and the prior approval of Treasury Board for all charges over \$250. Neither the minister's signature nor Treasury Board's approval was obtained to authorize the payments noted above. In my opinion, the above payments were not properly authorized and were made contrary to the relevant Order in Council.

Well, Sir, if the Auditor General is correct, Sir, ministers should be sent bills for these amounts. Why should the taxpayers be called upon?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a normal situation.

MR. NEARY: That is not a normal - that is a normal situation, the minister says. The Auditor General says it is an abnormal situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not ministers.

MR. NEARY: That is not ministers. Needless expenditure of public funds. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, just listen to this, Sir. "Air services aircraft operations during the year, Treasury Board, minute 17674, authorized as a charge against subdivision 1715-03, a payment of \$4,355 to an airplane charter company deemed the charge for a charter flight from Toronto to St. John's for six passengers. From a review of related documents it appears that a sales company anxious to sell its aircraft to the Government of Newfoundland undertook to arrange a demonstration flight from Toronto to St. John's. The sales company, however, apparently did not have its demonstration aircraft available at the time and as a result it arranged to have the official party

flown to St. John's by the charter company." Just imagine! It was contended by this company that the group had been informed in advance that there would be a charge for the flight. A responsible member of the official party has denied this, denied it, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who paid it?

MR. NEARY: Who paid it? The Province, the taxpayers, the public treasury paid it because the chartering company was considered to have been in good faith and misunderstandings were indicated. The charge was eventually paid by the government. The flight actually terminated in Moncton, New Brunswick. They did not even make it to St. John's. As soon as they saw the lights of Moncton they were dazzled and they set her down over there and did not even come on to St. John's, and for that we have to pay \$4,355. Mr. Speaker, just imagine how far that amount would go, Sir, to help some poor, little crippled child in this Province or to help some poor person whose house is leaky, whose house is neither windproof nor watertight. And then we talk about retrenchment and cutbacks and belt tightening! You have to practice what you preach. People are not going to believe it. I cannot wait for the Auditor General's report this year, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, how can the ordinary people of this Province, who make up 99.9 per cent of the population, how can they believe, how can the administration, how can we as politicians have any credibility at all left in the eyes of the ordinary people when the government is not prepared to make the sacrifices? They are not prepared to give up the aircraft for a couple of years and get aboard of EPA that is struggling, that has been in the red for the first half of this year who will probably be back to the government with their hand out pretty soon. Why do they not just travel on the conventional airlines and not first class either because I do not agree with that. EPA does not have first class.

MR. T. HICKEY: EPA is all first class.

MR. NEARY: EPA is all first class. I approve of that, Sir, and I wish that I had been one of the people to go to Ottawa recently. My hon. friend, next time I hope he will look after me, make sure that I get as far as Montreal anyway, and I will make it from there to Ottawa. But Air Canada is carrying on that tradition, first class.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no more first class.

MR. NEARY: There is no more?

AN HON. MEMBER: Cancelled.

MR. NEARY: I remember once, Mr. Speaker - you know, we were under the impression, we were told that all ministers they were so high and mighty, they were like God Almighty, that they had to travel first class. I was not told it by my former boos. I was told it by a high ranking government official. The thing to do was for ministers to travel first class. And I remember, I think I only did it twice.

AN HON. MEMBER: See the time.

MR. NEARY: No, it was twice. I remember, the second time it was, I got aboard of an aircraft in Montreal, Air Canada, and this fellow with a few drinks in, an old buddy of mine, sidled up to me and said, "Oh you are a big shot now. You are too good to sit back with me now. You are riding first class," he said, "and you will have a job to drink all the booze that they will give you from the time you leave Montreal until you get to St. John's, and you will get a special steward to look after you, or stewardess." And he said, "You got her made, boy. And me," he said, "poor old me and the poor old taxpayers are paying for it." My God, I said to myself, how true, against my principles. I guarantee you I changed that in a hurry. I never rode first class on the aircraft again. And ministers would do well, they would be thought more highly of, they will find out more of what is going on in Newfoundland and what is going on in the world if they would just hobnob with the ordinary person and instead of being tempted to ride first class on Air Canada, if you have to go to Ottawa on a trip, go economy, sit down with your buddies. You will not become polluted or contaminated with the ordinary

people. You will find it most enjoyable. And so, Sir, we are going talking about retrenchments and cutbacks and belt tightening and what have you, this is one area that the government should take a good hard look at.

Maybe I am going a little bit too far. Maybe I am being too hard when I say auction her off down at Torbay, down at St. John's Airport. Maybe that is going a little bit too far. Put her in moth balls for the next couple of years and the Ministers of the Crown and the Lieutenant-Governor, and the Leader of the Opposition, who can joke about it and tell his colleagues that I used it once and went down with the Lieutenant-Governor, he is just as guilty.

MR. ROBERTS: How about emergency cases?

MR. NEARY: Emergency cases? Well, Sir, I cannot think of an emergency case in this province that could not be taken care of if that aircraft was up in De Havilland or wherever it came from.

MR. HICKEY: That aircraft saved more lives than you could ask for.

MR. NEARY: Well I hope the minister is right, Sir. Well then use it for that purpose.

MR. HICKEY: And the one before it.

MR. NEARY: That is not an excuse, Sir. What they are doing now, they are baiting me into saying, oh yes, the aircraft saved lives, so we can use it, we can drink all the booze we want aboard of it. That is justification for it. That is no justification for it. You cannot trick me into that.

MR. HICKEY: Saving one life is justification.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but saving one life does not entitle the minister to booze her up all the way to Toronto aboard of her.

MR. HICKEY: Who?

MR. NEARY: No, not that particular minister but a minister, does it?

AN HON. MEMBER: That was for saving my life.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, it is one area, Mr. Speaker, the government should take a look at, and the misuse and the abuse of the car pool, another example, the car pool.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a place on the Northern Peninsula.

MR. NEARY: No it is not down on the Northern Peninsula. It is right out here on the back of Confederation Building.

Mr. Speaker, they can

joke and carry on all they like about it, Sir, but when the ordinary people have to go into the supermarket in a taxi, and dig down in the bottom of their little coin purse and try to get out enough money to pay the taxi, and haul their groceries out in the cold and in the wet, and parked out front is a chauffeur-driven car, chauffeuring some minister's wife or some high government official's wife off to the supermarket it is time, Sir, to sit up -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is nonsense!

MR. NEARY: That is not nonsense. Sir, I saw it and I see it every day.

MR. MURPHY: It is a very broad statement to make in this House and every minister is under the suspicion that a taxi or a chauffeur-driven car paid by government picks up our wives and brings them shopping. You know, I think there must be a limit to charges made by members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. minister want me to name names? Just say the word.

MR. MURPHY: You made the charges. Now substantiate.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I am not that small or petty. I go every day and pick up my kids from school, not every day, just about every day.

MR. MORGAN: Name names.

MR. NEARY: Do you want me to name names?

MR. MORGAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I will not be baited into that. But I can point the finger.

MR. MURPHY: No, no. Many people -

MR. DOODY: If you can make the charges, make them.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I can make the charges.

AN HON. MEMBER: - continuation -

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes! I can see the press picking it up now and saying, oh yes, Neary accused today somebody of picking up somebody's kids down at school.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. NEARY: Yes, sure I can and so can the Minister of Finance

because his kids go to the same school that mine go to.

MR. DOODY: On a point of order. Are you suggesting that my kids are being brought to school -

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, no, no. No, I said - no, no, that is not what I said. I said the Minister of Finance can also name -

MR. DOODY: I drive my kids to the same school.

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is right. And we both see the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: This is ridiculous.

MR. NEARY: We both see the same thing going on. But, Sir, I am not going to - I am not going to be petty or small about it, but I am going to suggest, I am going to suggest to the minister responsible for that department that he send for the reports, the daily reports. He can find out - he has got the reports at his disposal - find out what the cars are being used for. It has to be put to a stop, Sir. Otherwise, how can you expect, Mr. Speaker, the poor, old ordinary soul over in the supermarket picking up his bit of bologna and so forth, how can you expect him to think that this hon. crowd are sincere when they talk about retrenchments and cutbacks.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Did you ever have a car from the pool?

MR. NEARY: Did I ever have one? Yes, Sir, I had it. When I had it it was used properly. I used it for government business.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: I save the government thousands of dollars because I drive it myself.

MR. NEARY: Well, the minister should be congratulated and should have a talk to his colleague, the Minister of Finance.

Anyway, anyway, Sir, that is another area, that is another area that would be worth taking a look at. Now, let us see where I am here Sir. Oh, yes! Silver Anniversary of Confederation, another \$10,000,

another \$10,000, Sir, in the Department of Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the minister could tell us what that is all about? Silver Anniversary of Confederation, \$10,000. It has already cost the people of this Province, Sir, close on \$4 million for Silver Anniversary Celebrations and now we got peanuts thrown in here this time, \$10,000. What is all that made of? Well, the minister presented the -

MR. HICKEY: A very good thing, the Constabulary Band.

MR. NEARY: Well, then it should be listed Newfoundland Constabulary Band and not Silver Anniversary Confederation Celebrations.

MR. HICKEY: It would take a book four miles high if you listed everything that way.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if they had listed, if the minister had - and I do not know whether it is the Constabulary Band or not.

MR. HICKEY: My word.

MR. NEARY: Well, the minister gives me his word. Well, I would say that is probably a good thing. But, Mr. Speaker, then again there are so many of these items in there - bands and cultural affairs and historic objects. Could not some of these, Mr. Speaker, could not some of these been postponed, be moved down the list of priorities? Would not the Newfoundland Constabulary Band, would they not, would they not still practice and play if they did not get this \$10,000?

MR. HICKEY: There is no way they would have gotten that \$10,000 now.

MR. NEARY: You mean it has already been paid out?

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please!

I would remind members that an hon. member has the right to be heard in silence, and the remarks are to be directed to the Chair.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making here is that we have too much of these little amounts, and they all add up to hundreds of thousands of dollars. You know, we started off with an Arts and Culture Centre, in St. John's I think it was. It was a - was it a centennial gift? A centennial gift to the Province?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no.

MR. NEARY: No?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Part of it.

MR. NEARY: Part of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was about \$8 million. We put up \$6 million and Ottawa put up \$2 million.

MR. NEARY: Well, you know what culture affairs - we started off, you know, struggling trying to find a few dollars - you know what cultural affairs amounts to today in this Province. \$4,000,818.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Annually?

MR. NEARY: Annually. I am sure there is room, Sir, in that vote to do a little cutting, a little - yes, the minister says yes. Well, why did the minister not tell us he was going to do it to show his sincerity to the people of this Province? Look in the public accounts, let us see what it says -

MR. MORGAN: Cut them all down

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MORGAN: Be political, cut them all down.

MR. NEARY: No, no, no, no, no. Not cut them all down. Man cannot live on bread alone. He has to -

AN HON. MEMBER: But if there is a lower income -

MR. NEARY: He has got to have a little bit of a - let me see where it is here. I cannot find it there now. But, anyway, Sir, I am sure as I am standing in this hon. House addressing this House today that there is room there for savings. There is room for belt tightening.

I am not against cultural affairs. I like to go over once and a while. I went over and saw the Amazing Kreskin.

MP. DOODY: Is that what happened?

MP. NEARY: I tell you it might do the Minister of Finance good to go and see the Amazing Kreskin.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, it would.

MR. NEARY: And lo and behold, sitting up in the box was Lord Taylor, the former president of Memorial University, sitting up there with probably one of his complimentary tickets from Memorial University. The poor old taxpayer cannot get in, the poor old ordinary person. Here they are sitting up in their boxes. I doubt if they paid for their tickets. I would like to go over, take the kids over to see Victor Borge. I have seen him three times so far. I really enjoy the man. The Signal Hill military tattoo is \$39,000. I suppose we have to leave that there. Does that create any employment? Can that money be saved? Is it doing any good? That is the pet project of the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MP. NEARY: What is the minister saying? Are they nit-picking here or what?

AN HON. MEMBER: Student employment.

MR. NEARY: It is student employment. Well, Sir, it is time we did something in this Province to create a little bit of employment.

Mr. Speaker, is it not also about time, Sir, that the Minister of Finance and the government of which he is a part laid their cards on the table as far as MCP is concerned in this Province, Medical Care Programme. One thing that the former Minister of Health did before he made his departure - and no wonder my friend, the member for Corner Brook or for Humber East (Dr. Farrell) or wherever it is would laugh - one of the last acts of the former Minister of Health was to make sure before he cleared out that his buddies in the medical profession were going to get a good whopping increase -

DR. FARRELL: A very small increase, you mean.

MR. NEARY: A very small?

DR. FARRELL: Very small.

MR. HICKEY: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Ah, the Minister of Tourism now coming to the defense of his colleague and saying it is very, very small.

DR. FARRELL: Yes, very, very small.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, it may be small in amount but it is big in volume. A man of integrity certainly made sure before he left that he looked after his buddies and they got their increase. It may have been within the guidelines, I do not know. But, Sir -

DR. FARRELL: We are within the guidelines, twelve-and-a-half percent.

Mr. Neary:

Well, the hon. member is not practising now so he does not participate in this.

DR. FARRELL: No, well no -

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, you know, the hon. minister is an hon. man.

I remember once I called him a foreign-born despot -

DR. FARRELL: A foreign despot.

MR. NEARY: A foreign despot in this House. I must say I never regretted anything as much in my life. He turned out to be such a decent fellow that I was sorry, Sir, that I said that. But the minister, a medical man, I am sure that he might have a few suggestions and ideas and proposals that he could put forward in this hon. House that would save this Province, the economy of this Province being wrecked by MCP. We have created a monseer, Sir, that is going to chew us up. No? There is so much duplication of service it would frighten you.

DR. FARRELL: There are abuses on both sides.

MR. NEARY: Abuses on - again, Sir, let me make one thing abundantly clear. This is not a condemnation of all the doctors. As the minister rightly points out one rotten apple can spoil a whole barrel and sometimes, Sir, in the professional field that is what happens. But I think the day is gone past now when you would start walking by and you are expected to tip your hat to the doctors and to the lawyers. They are all hon. decent men, not all of them, there may be one or two who are not. But, Sir, we hear rumours, and I am sure the Minister of Finance is having a many sleepless night over this that MCP could wreck the economy of this Province if something is not done to bring the thing in line, and maybe the doctors are getting everything they are entitled to, maybe they are. Last year we heard of some in this hon. House, some whopping salaries, I think, over \$100,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Gross.

MR. NEARY: Gross, \$100,000 by one individual. Why, he must not have slept at all. He must have been in the office night and day, twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year around the clock. Over \$100,000 gross, just an ordinary medical practitioner now, not a specialist.

DR. FARRELL: His net might be \$30,000.

MR. NEARY: Yes. You know, I am so gullible and naive, Mr. Speaker, that I, you know, believe the hon. member.

But, Sir, there are too many cases of duplication of service, and I do not want to get into the technical aspects of it. The ministers in the House, I think, know what I am talking about. Doctors are reckless and careless, and they are going to have to realize that this plan has to be kept intact in their interests as well as in the interests of their clients or their patients. And they should exercise a little austerity and a little belt tightening and a little caution otherwise, Sir, otherwise the whole thing, the whole programme may collapse and Ottawa is not as generous as they used to be. So again, the minister evaded and avoided giving us, giving the House any information on the Medical Care Plan. And I really hope, Sir, I hope that the minister, before this debate ends, will give us a comprehensive, full, detailed accounting of Medical Care in this Province, no holds barred, pull all the punches, lay it on the line, tell it as it is. And I am sure that even the doctors will probably welcome a forthright, honest, straightforward accounting, as I am sure some of the doctors must be worried about the way that this programme is going. And I am not going to say anything more about that, Sir, except that I think it is high time that the minister laid his cards on the table as far as Medical Care in this Province is concerned.

Another example of where we could save a few bucks is EMO, E-M-O, Emergency Measures Organization. It is thirty-five years since we had the second World War. EMO was established, I think, during the war or - yes, during the war.

MR. DOODY: We are ready for the next one.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DOODY: Ready for the next one.

MR. NEARY: Well if the minister keeps tantalizing the people of this province we may have a third world war sooner than you think. But, Sir, is that necessary? Is that \$154,000, is that really necessary? Does it serve any useful purpose?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: It does. What useful purpose?

MR. MURPHY: Emergency welfare.

MR. NEARY: Emergency welfare, emergency welfare.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, not war measures.

MR. NEARY: Now what does the minister mean by emergency welfare?

MR. MURPHY: We had a few cases last year with the tremendous damage done to the fishery and everything else where all the welfare officers went to work under this. There were many other cases where there were emergencies. There was a strike in Port aux Basques where we had thousands of people stranded.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could not that have been organized without carrying this unnecessary burden -

MR. MURPHY: We did not create it, Sir.

MR. NEARY: - twelve months out of a year.

MR. MURPHY: We inherited it. We are making the best we can of it.

MR. NEARY: I see. But are you phasing it out?

MR. MURPHY: No.

MR. NEARY: Well personally look, I do not want to see anybody lose their job.

MR. MURPHY: Good.

MR. NEARY: And the minister may think I am on the wrong kick here altogether, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see one person lose their job.

MR. MURPHY: Well all right, forget that, now go on to the next one.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, these people could be put doing something useful.

MR. MURPHY: Such as?

MR. NEARY: I do not know. I mean I am not the government. If I were I -

MR. MURPHY: But sure why are you saying this when you do not know, Anybody can say that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I could find something useful.

MR. MURPHY: You would do an excellent job in welfare services.

MR. NEARY: I could find something useful for these people to do, Sir. I am sure now all - look, can anybody tell me, can the minister tell me what they do from 9 o'clock or 8:30, whenever it is they go to work, until 5 o'clock in the afternoon? What do they do?

MR. MURPHY: Would the minister want to reply to that, the Minister of Justice?

MR. HICKMAN: What?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. MURPHY: What do they do in the morning?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I wish to point out in order to avoid - hon. gentlemen sit down. Thank you - in order to avoid any confusion which might develop later that every hon. member has the right to be heard without interruption. Now in applying that there are obviously, it would appear to me, circumstances in which when an hon. gentleman is speaking he invites and is willing to have certain dialogue and to pose certain questions and is willing to yield for certain answers, and when that, in the Chair's opinion is the case, then the Chair will not interrupt because it is being done, as far as I can judge, with the acquiescence, consent and agreement of the hon. gentleman. But I wanted to make the point so that it will be perfectly clear that everyone does have the right to speak without interruption and when the Chair permits it it is because, in the Chair's opinion, the hon. member speaking is willing to acquiesce and to agree. But I wanted to make it clear that the rule itself is quite precise.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and, Sir, I think I will finish with that particular item and go on to the Electoral Office, the Chief Electoral Office, operation of the office which has responsibility for carrying out the various functions necessary to hold elections, including compiling voters lists, remuneration and hiring election officials.

Well, Sir, I do sincerely hope that that job is complete for the next four or five years. I hope, Sir, that that is all behind us now for the next at least four years, if not five years. And there are some reports that the hon. the Premier may not run again, he may let it go right down to the wire and then bow out gracefully and let the Minister of Fisheries move in and take her over. But, Sir -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Crosbie) seems to have fallen into disfavour. He was not even in the House yesterday when the Budget was being brought down. I do not know if coming events cast their shadows before them but we have been hearing all kinds of reports of how disgruntled he is lately. But I forecast one time before, Mr. Speaker, that he would not last out his term of office and I will predict it again, Sir, predict it again now that he will not finish his term of office.

AN HON. MEMBER: Everyone has to leave sometime.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, unless he is changed - he is a very stubborn man - unless he is changed, Sir, I do not think he can stomach this kind of thing. I do not think the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Crosbie) can stomach the kind of thing, Sir, that we saw in this hon. House yesterday.

And before six months is out, Sir, I would not be one bit surprised but the hon. Minister of Finance - or not Finance, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, will not come back across the House, but will leave gracefully and fade into oblivion. I really believe that, Sir. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we have this electoral office, the Chief Electoral Officer, who earns a substantial salary from the taxpayers of this Province, who has absolutely nothing to do for the next four years, while we are waiting for all the political infighting to take place, when the Leader of the Opposition will lay his fortune on the line, and no doubt the member for Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) will be in there fighting. What was that song they used to sing, Away We Go.

MR. MURPHY: Steve is unlisted.

MR. NEARY: And there may be one or two others in there, and the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. ROBERTS: How about you, Sir?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am not power mad. I cannot become Premier of this Province. I am all alone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I have my portfolios that I am shadowing. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I have one of the most responsible jobs in this hon. House, because I am looked upon in this Province as the spokesman for the ordinary people that I have referred to so much this afternoon that make up ninety-nine point nine per cent of the people of this Province, the unofficial Ombudsman, because the other fellow even though I was - no, I did not get a chance to speak in that debate. I was over in Harbour Grace addressing the vocational school students. I was not allowed to speak in the afternoon because of petty infighting, and we let that thing go through before I could get a good dart at it. He does not justify his existence, because all he does is look into mistakes that were made by ministers. Does anybody realize that that he cannot - if you go out and buy a lemon, a car, that he cannot look into it? He can only look into mistakes that are made by the government.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what the legislation says.

MR. NEARY: That is what the legislation says but people do not realize that.

MR. HICKEY: Where did the legislation come from?

MR. NEARY: The legislation came from this House of Assembly.

MR. HICKEY: I know that, but who drafted it?

MR. NEARY: Who introduced it? Who brought it into the House?

MR. HICKEY: Who else but the former administration.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could somebody get me a water boy, Sir?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the Ombudsman at a later date. It is no fault of the individual in that job. He is doing the best he can under the circumstances. He is restricted by his terms of reference, by the legislation. He cannot do anything. His hands are tied. All he has to do is try to correct errors made by incompetent and inept ministers and high officials of the government. That is all he can do. He is spending most of his time now on Crown Lands claims, Crown Lands applications that we have all had a go at, I suppose, in our day, and now they have gone under the Ombudsman as the court of last resort. But anyway there it is, but we will deal with that a little later. But I am dealing now with the Chief Electoral office.

MR. NOLAN: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. NEARY: A question? Sure, go ahead, fire away. Did you ask your leader if it were all right?

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the hon. member is aware that it should not be mistaken that the Ombudsman is not in the position that he is in order to do the job of members who are elected in various districts to serve. That is a danger there.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I can always count on my old buddy, my old reliable colleague there from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) to set me straight, Sir. You know, I am glad the hon. member brought that to my attention because now I have learned something that I did not know before.

MR. DOODY: Well now you got one friend to be thankful for.

MR. NEARY: Thank God, I have a friend, a friend indeed, a friend in need.

But, Sir, this Chief Electoral Officer is going to be sitting over there for the next four years twiddling his thumbs with nothing to do. What is he going to do? Can the Minister of Justice, in all conscience, stand in this hon. House and justify this job, this position, this \$33,300 a year? Can he? He will probably get up and make a stab at it and say, oh, well the voters' lists have to go on continuously, and this and that has to be done. Well, you could do it in your spare time. I could do it in my spare time. Any member of this House could do it in his spare time. There is absolutely no justification, Sir, in this world for having that a permanent position. One time the magistrates used to do it. They were seconded from the magistracy. I think Magistrate Strong was the - I believe his wife is still over there working in the office - he was seconded to go in and do that for one or two or three elections. He did a very fine job. But, Sir, now we have a permanent Electoral Officer in the person of Mr. Harvey Cole, and I have nothing against Mr. Harvey Cole. He is a very fine gentleman. But I am sure that Mr. Harvey Cole, if he were standing in this hon. House, would agree with me that he would like to have a job, a position, where he could earn his keep.

and not be retired on \$33,500 a year over on, just above the Grace Hospital there - LeMarchant Road. No, not LeMarchant Road. Is it LeMarchant?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Over there, Sir, sitting in his office every day. Is there anything more monotonous and boring, Mr. Speaker, than to have to get out of bed in the morning and go down to the office, Sir, go down to the office with nothing to do, no challenge facing you, not a thing to do, no elections on unless, of course, the Leader of the Opposition is correct and we are going to have an election in a year or two, that the mortality rate of the P.C. caucus will be so great, there will be so many defections, so many bail out and so many go across the House and so many get in wheel chairs that the Leader of the Opposition may be right that we may have an election in a year or two. Or if the people turn on the administration viciously because they have not shown the leadership that the hon. Leader of the Opposition told us about on opening day that we would like to see so much of.

But anyway, Sir, unless something drastic, unforeseen happens; unless, Sir, the Premier tonight becomes the proud father of triplets and drops dead with the fright, unless there is some quirk of nature, something unforeseen happens, we are not going to have an election in this Province for the next four or five years. That is my opinion, Sir, with all due respect to the views of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, another one of my former bosses.

MR. NOLAN: You have had a lot of them, have you not?

MR. NEARY: I have only had two. I have only had two, Sir. The hon. member has had two, the hon. the former Premier and the hon. Leader of the Opposition. So we are equal. But now I am my own grandpa. I can do my own stuff and I am doing it today, Sir, as the people of this Province expect me to do it. That is to stand up for truth and honesty and decency and justice.

Ah, the member can grin away. Let us see what he can do when he stands in this hon. House without a note in front of him. You know, Mr. Speaker, you were reminding members today, Your Honour,

of the rules of the House. One thing, Sir - and I have never insisted to this rule being enforced, but just for the benefit of some of the new members - it is not permissible to read a speech in the House. You can have your notes in front of you. It is not permissible to read a speech. But not all members, Sir, are gifted like Your Honour or the member for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) or the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) or the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) or the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doody) or the hon. the former Premier (Mr. Smallwood) or the hon. Leader of the Opposition. We are not all gifted that way, Sir. We have to bring our notes in. We are not all intellects.

Probably sometimes it is a good thing we are not because we can look at things with a little common sense and that is what I am doing today, Sir. But Your Honour will, I think, agree that speeches are not supposed to be read in the House. But if members want to read them, I could not care less. If members want to stand on their heads suspended in midair from the lights, I could not care less, Sir, as long as they are doing their jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Great contributions to go to heaven.

AN HON. MEMBER: Great stuff.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, it is great stuff. I am dealing with the electoral officer. There is one example. I do not want to see the man fired, terminated, lose his job. I would just like to see him doing something useful for the Province, for the people who are paying his salary. I am sure that he would welcome that too.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance when he brought his budget into the House yesterday, the Fall budget, commonly known now throughout the Province as the mini budget, the minister did not tell us how much money is included in the various subheads for Mr. George McLean, if there is any, and what services Mr. McLean is now providing in return for his payments.

I notice, Sir, in the Department of Education there are \$200,000, film acquisition and delivery, and several other places in estimates there is money allocated for film. Is this necessary, Sir?

Is it? Can it be cut out? Can that money be used to patch up the leaky holes in the roofs of some of our senior citizens? Can it be used, Sir, to help the sick and the dying and the needy of this Province? Or do we have to have film strips made and slide presentations? We do have to have them made, you say?

MR. HICKEY: Unless you want to stop promoting the Province, of course.

MR. WELLS: If the hon. member would permit. It is very close to 6 o'clock and I propose to move the adjournment of the House for the day. Would the hon. member wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member moves the adjournment of the House I am wondering if he could indicate to the hon. House what the Orders of the Day would be for Thursday and whether he could make it a matter of routine to indicate to the hon. House at the end of each day what would likely be coming up on the Orders of the Day for the following day. Now, you know, Wednesday is Private Members' Day, of course, Could he indicate to the House what is likely to come up on Thursday and could he make this a matter of routine?

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is impossible to say on any given day what the order of business might be the next day, but certainly I realize, of course, tomorrow is Private Members' Day. But it is our intention to call the budget debate again on Thursday.

Your Honour I do move that this House upon its rising to adjourn until Wednesday, November 26 at 3 o'clock and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, November 26 at 3 o'clock.

CONTENTS

November 25, 1975	Page
<u>Presenting Petitions</u>	
By Mr. Simmons on behalf of residents of Harbour Breton requesting that a dental facility be established at the community. Supported by J.Winsor, Mr. H.Collins, and Mr. Neary.	92
<u>Reports by Standing and Special Committees</u>	
Mr. Doody tabled special warrants.	97
<u>Oral Questions</u>	
Government plans to increase productivity. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	98
Mr. Neary expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice he wished to debate it on the debate on the adjournment on November 27.	100
Start on the fish plant announced for Burgeo. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	100
Interpretation of answer. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	100
Query as to whether government has changed plans to construct a new fish plant at Burgeo. Mr. Simmons.	100
Mr. Speaker ruled it not permissible to continue asking the same question in different forms.	100
Query as to whether the government has changed its plans. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	101
Layoffs at the Marystown Shipyard. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	101
Mr. Speaker: the necessity of brevity on answering questions.	103
Meetings of the board of directors of the shipyard. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	103
Improvement of fishing facilities at Musgrave Harbour. Capt. Winsor, Mr. Carter.	104
Number of water and sewer projects cancelled since Sept. 16. Mr. Nolan, Premier Moores.	104
Municipal dump at Upper Island Cove. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	104
Query as to whether a permit for such a facility was issued, then cancelled. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	105
Extension to the Central Newfoundland Hospital. Mr. Rideout, Mr. H.Collins.	105
Status of the proposed Port aux Basques Hospital. Mr. Neary, Mr. H.Collins.	106
Query as to whether the Board of the Port aux Basques Hospital have been informed that plans for a new hospital have been cancelled. Mr. Neary, Mr. H.Collins.	106
Proposed freight rate increases. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	106
Tabling of correspondence involved. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	107
The <u>Norma and Gladys</u> . Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	107
Dispute in the Conne River area over timberlimits. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rousseau.	107

<u>Oral Questions (continued)</u>	Page
Investigation of health hazards at the Baie Verte mines. Mr. Rideout, Premier Moores.	109
The land freeze in the greater St. John's area. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	109
Responsibility for community stages. Capt. Winsor, Mr. Carter.	110
Reducing the speed limit on the Trans-Canada Highway. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	110
The Trans-Labrador Highway. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	111
Dispensing of drugs in the Province. Mr. Neary, Mr. H. Collins.	112
Mr. Flight moved under Standing Order 23 adjournment of the House to debate a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the increasing seriousness of the situation which has arisen as a result of labour disputes.	113
Mr. Speaker ruled the necessity for conciseness in making such a motion.	113
Mr. Roberts argued the necessity of material relevant to debate.	113
Mr. Wells argued that the matter did not fall within the area of parliamentary urgency.	114
Mr. Roberts argued against that stand.	114
Mr. Speaker ruled there was not urgency of debate.	115
Premier Moores moved a motion that condolences be sent to the family of the late Dr. James A. McGrath.	117
Seconded by Mr. Roberts.	117
Supported by Mr. Smallwood.	117
<u>Orders of the Day</u>	
Budget debate.	118
Mr. Neary	118
Adjournment	177

