



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 5

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1975

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to welcome to the House on behalf of all hon. members thirty-one students in grade eight from St. Patrick's Hall in St. John's along with Brother King who is accompanying them. I am sure all hon. members wish a very hearty welcome to the students and to Brother King and hope that their visit to the House will be an enjoyable one and an informative one.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

HON. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that today, with the approval of Cabinet, I have issued an order dismissing from office four members presently constituting the Rural District Council of Halfway Point, Benoit's Cove, John's Beach and Frenchman's Cove. A commission of administration has been appointed to administer the affairs of the municipality comprised as follows: Mr. Kevin Barns, Chairman and Convenor; Mr. Gregory Chaytor, Deputy Chairman and Deputy Convenor; and Mrs. Margaret Barns.

The dismissal of the members of the Rural District Council resulted from the findings disclosed during the course of a municipal inspection, which were subsequently confirmed by the Auditor General. The elected Council has been dismissed because the inspection report and subsequent audits disclosed substantial evidence of mismanagement of the affairs of the town. The reports did not, however, disclose that funds had been misappropriated by either the elected councillors or the staff. Mr. Speaker, I must emphasize that the commission of administration will serve in a temporary capacity only and that in due course, when the affairs of the municipality are placed upon a proper basis, an election will be held so that the taxpayers of the municipality can be given the opportunity to elect a new council.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the hon. members of the House of Assembly about the situation in the Bay d'Espoir area that has received so much publicity recently. The people of Conne River some weeks ago undertook to blockade a forest access road built by this government and thus prevent Ralland Forest Products Limited from harvesting timber allocated to them by my department.

I refused to meet to discuss the problem as long as the confrontation existed. I am pleased to report that last Friday the blockade was removed and I was then able to meet them in Conne River on Sunday last to discuss the matter.

The wood supply situation is complex and requires study. My staff have been compiling detailed inventory statistics for the entire area since the Bay d'Espoir forest management unit was established there less than a year ago. The forest management plan for the unit will be completed this winter, hopefully by the end of March, and we will be in a position then to consider allocation of resources in a detailed manner.

There are several wood-using industries that require supplies in the area and I am confident - and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I am confident - that there is an adequate supply of raw materials not only for the short term, but for the life of the industries.

The large mill established by Ralland Forest Products is important for many reasons. It is in many ways a response by private industry to the Forestry Task Force Report and the new government forest policy.

It is the first mill in the province that can produce high-grade, kiln-dried hardwood lumber and compete in the export market for this manufactured product. We have known for some years now that this province has good stands of birch that have never been utilized adequately. The use of birch stands in the area will complement rather than compete with other industries.

The mill is a completely integrated operation that utilizes all of the forest resources. Softwood and hardwood are used, small dimension wood is salvaged as pulpwood, and even the slabs from the sawlogs are converted into a product that is useable in the pulp and paper industry. We have guaranteed this company an adequate supply of raw materials, and the small area disputed by the Conne River people is part of this allocation. It is legally committed to the company and still remains so committed. I have explained this to the Conne River people.

On the other hand the people of Conne River have built a large saw-mill and this has received substantial assistance from government since we recognize it as a good undertaking. They are concerned about their long-term supply of wood, and rightly so. Road construction this year has given them access to more than a million board feet and a cutting permit has been issued to permit this harvest. The amount of wood in the disputed area is not in my opinion critical to the short-term operation of the Conne River mill, but it is critical to Ralland Forest Products at certain times due to road access problems that are short-term, soft roads.

From discussions this morning I am satisfied that the amount of cutting on the area in question during the next few months will not jeopardize our ability to solve the allocation problem some months hence.

I have indicated to the people of Conne River that the allocation of specific areas are subject to review and negotiation, but that the total supply of wood to Ralland Forest Products must and will be provided. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the same applies to the Conne River Enterprises mill. There are adequate supplies of raw materials available in the area for the use of both, and it becomes a matter then of allocating the supplies on a rational and economic base. To do this requires detailed inventory of the existing forest stands. This information will be available by the end of March, and at that time I plan to meet with all parties concerned and work out an allocation that will more clearly identify the future supplies for both.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to reply briefly to the statement from the minister. Mr. Speaker, this matter is one that is of considerable concern to me by virtue of the fact that it is in my district. The enterprise of the people of Conne River has been well demonstrated in the last year or so, particularly with the formation of the Conne River Native Enterprises Company. And indeed if you were to trace back three or four years to the - indeed about three years ago to the study which government authorized, the study done by the Research and Productivity Council of New Brunswick - you will find that the Conne River community was identified as having the highest incidence of welfare payments in the entire Bay D'Espoir area, the community -

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

I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members the rules with respect to replies, not replies, but brief comments upon ministerial statements, and I am quoting from Section 91 of Beauséjour which is found on page 84 and which has been frequently referred to in this legislature.

"When a minister makes a statement on government policy or ministerial administration, either under routine proceedings, between two orders of the day or shortly before the adjournment of the House, it is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or the Chiefs of recognized groups " - I may add that in this House it has been the custom for some time that an hon. member on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition or on behalf of the chief of a recognized group, "that such persons are entitled to ask explanations and make a few remarks but no debate is then allowed under any Standing Order."

I think the operative point there that I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members is that the entitlement is to ask explanations and make a few remarks and it is very clearly defined. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly seek your direction on this matter. I was of the opinion or at least attempting to make a few remarks and shall continue to do so. I was making the point

that only a couple of years ago the Conne River community was receiving per capita more welfare than any other community in the Bay D'Espoir area. That is no longer the case. Indeed it has, I believe, I do not know about the highest, but either the highest or the second highest employment rate of any of the seven communities in Bay D'Espoir. That achievement, that turn-around, is brought about largely by the industriousness of the people together with some assistance from the federal government under the Local Employment Assistance Programme.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of extreme concern that the issue -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - which makes the subject -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is my opinion that the hon. gentleman has gone beyond the clearly defined limits of parliamentary procedure as outlined in Beauchesne. He has not asked for explanations, nor asked for any question for clarification. And, obviously what he is saying - remarks, that is a very general term but I do think the hon. gentleman should either ask for an explanation or a question.

The remarks, if they are going to be general remarks, should obviously be brief.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that in total I have spoken for less than two minutes, and I would submit that is very brief.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not the point of issue. That is not the point.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to make brief remarks? Do I have the right?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I do not intend, and indeed the rules prohibit me to enter into debate with the hon. gentleman. I believe that the remarks I made are clear and readily understandable, and the hon. gentleman does not have the right to dispute the ruling from a presiding member and the presiding member does not have the right to allow him to do so.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, Sir.



Your Honour's ruling is quite clear and it seems to me to be eminently understandable. I know my colleague understands it and is certainly trying to adhere to it. All he is attempting to do, Sir, is to make what he understands to be, and I understand to be, a few brief remarks with respect to the statement delivered to the House a moment or so ago by the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. If Your Honour is to rule that my colleague is making remarks which Your Honour does not consider to be brief, well that, of course, is a matter which would have to be dealt with when Your Honour makes such a ruling. But I submit that until then my colleague should be allowed to carry on with what he is doing, which is to make a few brief remarks with respect to the ministerial statement made by the gentleman from Menihek.

MR. ROBERT WELLS (Minister without Portfolio): To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. We have been forebearing in that matter. We did not interfere or make any points of order on what the hon. member was saying. Obviously the custom and tradition of the House in good taste would indicate that a few brief remarks or a question be kept to a minute or two.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the minister to the initiatives he has taken since he took over his present portfolio. I have had occasion to discuss the matter with him on a number of occasions and I want now publicly to commend him for his initiatives. This matter was brought to the attention of the previous minister on a number of occasions. Indeed the old issue has been smoldering for more than a year. And I am delighted that at last the minister has seen fit to take some initiatives. I do hope that the matter can be straightened out to the satisfaction of all concerned as he indicates it will be. The one regrettable aspect which reflects in the statement is that it has taken so long to get a forest management plan for this particular area. However, I do hope that it can be completed this Winter and if so it will be certainly welcomed by all persons, all companies concerned, not only the two to which he refers, the Ralland and the Native Enterprises, but also the number of small sawmill operators in the area who have a very real vested interest here which should be

protected as these negotiations are pursued.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of clarification I wonder if the minister could tell the House, Sir, whether or not -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! We are not at the point in the proceedings for oral questions. I did not know if the hon. gentleman was getting up on a point of order or a point of privilege but we are not yet at the point for oral questions.

MR. NEARY: No, the minister's statement that I am asking now.

MR. SPEAKER: I would have to point out to hon. members that the right to make brief remarks, ask questions or ask for clarification is limited to the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of other groups or the spokesman, a spokesman for either such gentleman, and the hon. member will not fit into that category.

MR. NEARY: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I would think, Sir, that I am spokesman for this particular matter in my own group.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. NEARY: No?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no group. No, the ruling has been made and the hon. gentleman who is a veteran in the House knows that he cannot debate it. I do not see any group in the area.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, for a point of information, Sir. Does the gentleman, Sir, the hon. member who just took his seat, does he speak, is he the spokesman on this particular matter for the caucus that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! This is - actually this is out of order. The hon. gentleman's question is out of order. I think it is fairly clear what the rule is and that is the Leader of the Opposition or the leader of any other group may speak, ask questions or explanation or brief remarks, or another member, another hon. member speaking on behalf of such leader. And when the hon. gentleman spoke he spoke on behalf and used the right that the Leader of the Opposition has and he exercised on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition would be precluded, I think, from then getting up and exercising it the second time.



PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

HON. H. COLLINS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am standing to table the annual report for the year ended May 31, 1975 of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission.

MR. ROBERTS: Are there a number of copies?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are adequate copies for all members and the press.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

HON. F. D. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, in response to the question from the member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) yesterday, regarding the status of power for Williams Harbour, we have been in touch with Mr. Henderson of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission, and they are presently drawing up their plans and what they hope to do for next year. And upon obtaining further information, I will pass it on to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

HON. W. HOUSE (Minister of Education): In response to the question yesterday from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for the extended day policy, the school day in vocational schools was extended from two to three hours, and we had accommodation for 740 extra people and 540 of these avail of the opportunity.

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

HON. J. MORGAN (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) with regards to the road known as Custer's - Custer's Head Road, that road was reconstructed by our own forces in my department, but there has been no contract let for the paving of that road.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. W. CARTER (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question put to me by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) concerning ownership of the facilities in that community, I should advise him that the facilities are owned by the government and that negotiations are now underway to find an operator, and we are hoping that it will be in operation by next season.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is Fox Harbour.

MR. CARTER: In Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

HON. C. BRETT (Minister of Social Services): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) of yesterday's date, he wanted to know whether or not the \$50 increase applied to people who had been paid? And the answer is yes, that it has been paid to all those who qualify. Some of the cheques went out in September and the remainder in October.

Also, Sir, I would like to table the answer to Question No. 585 on the Order Paper.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, and ask the minister if he can now tell the House what the expected life span of the Buchans mine is going to be? Or is the minister in a position to supply the House with that information at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. J. CROSBIE (Minister of Mines and Energy): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to inform the hon. House on this matter at this time since I have never looked into the matter. I remember it being mentioned in the House last year. I mean, I will have to inquire again as to what information we have on it, and I will be only too pleased to do that, and I will do it, but I cannot say right off the bat what the expected life span is.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: A question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs in connection with a statement today. Could he tell the House the names of the four people who were dismissed?

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

HON. B. PECKFORD (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Speaker, I do not know off the top of my head the names of the people who were

dismissed from the council, and furthermore I do not think it would be very appropriate to give the names here in the House. I think that we should just say, as what we have said now, and leave it at that and go on with the business of getting the municipality running on an even keel again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Could the minister tell us whether or not criminal action or any other type of action, further to what he has already explained, is contemplated by his department?

MR. PECKFORD: Sir, I would suggest very humbly to the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) that he listen more closely to ministerial statements, because it was clearly and explicitly stated in that statement that there was no misappropriation of funds or any other kinds of actions undertaken or done by the former council that would dictate any criminal action necessary.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary question; The hon. gentleman from Lewisporte asked whether any action, criminal or otherwise to be taken. The minister has dealt with the criminal aspect.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not understand otherwise.

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot help it if the minister does not understand, Mr. Speaker. We can only use the English language or French in this House. Let me try again then in a supplementary; can the minister tell us whether the department proposed to take any other action and particularly civil action to follow up on the situation which has been uncovered at -

MR. PECKFORD: They were dismissed.

MR. ROBERTS: which has been uncovered at Halfway Point, Benoit's Cove, could the minister indicate what further action if any is to be taken. I refer particularly to civil action.

MR. PECKFORD: What do you want done? All action necessary, as I understand it, that can be taken by the department has been taken, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the Minister of Social Services, Sir, would indicate to the House what the government's policy is at the moment for paying social assistance to families of workers who are on strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the government's policy has not changed. We will not pay social assistance to people who voluntarily withdraw their services from employment.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary to that question -

MR. SPEAKER: If I may, it is something of a technicality but just to keep the procedure straight, if he is speaking to a supplementary, the hon. member would be asking a question which in fact is a supplement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, a point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! But certainly for purposes of clarity when another hon. member asks the question then in fact it is a question he is asking. The rules refer to the right of a number of

supplementary questions at the discretion of the Chair, and that could become confusing if the term supplementary is to be used by other hon. members.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the reason I rose on supplementary is that question, I had the question or at least a question pertaining to the thing and it applies greatly to the people in my district, and the supplementary being this to the Minister of Social Services; how does the government reconcile the directive that no welfare will be paid to men and women on strike in this province with the fact that all that is required in this province to receive welfare benefits is proof of need of the recipient?

MR. BRETT: This is not necessarily so, Mr. Speaker. I admit that probably this government has been somewhat inconsistent, and although I am not permitted to here I can certainly point out that so was the former administration, most inconsistent in this respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General and the Acting Premier. Would the minister indicate to the House if a date has yet been set for the Attorney Generals or the Ministers of Justice in the Atlantic Provinces to meet to discuss the renewal of the RCMP contract in the Atlantic Provinces, and if so when will the meeting be held?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it had been hoped to hold the meeting in December but following the meeting of officials yesterday in Fredericton a decision was made to hold the meeting of the four Atlantic Provinces Attorney Generals in St. John's, Newfoundland on Monday, January 5, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier, Could the Premier inform the House whether or not in view of the announcement

that no Anti-inflation Review Board office will be located in Newfoundland whether or not the government plans to protest this to Ottawa?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, certainly we are anxious to make sure that the policies of the Anti-inflation Review Board are kept up to scratch in this province as well as anywhere else, and for that reason we have asked that representation and that an official outlet be located here in the province. That has been done, Sir, because we cannot depend, as we have done too often in the past, I suppose, on the credibility of open line shows.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Health. In the mini budget brought down on Monday it was decided to defer the opening of the new Carbonear Regional Hospital. Could the minister be more specific as to the deferred date of opening please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be more specific. The date of the opening of the Carbonear Hospital has been deferred to the year 1976.

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

MR. HODDER: I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.



MR. HODDER:

Does the Water Services Division of the Department of Municipal Affairs plan this year to provide pumps and well houses for recently drilled wells in the District of Port au Port?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are going to do what we can to provide pumps and well houses to as many artesian wells in all the districts of the Province, because there has always been a lag each year from the number of wells drilled to the number of wells that can be developed, and so we try and take them on a priority bases and do those that have the greatest need and then try and pick up the rest of them the next Spring. There is a lot of difficulty here around the Province in doing a lot of that, primarily, Mr. Speaker, because a lot of Water Committees had indicated to the department earlier on in the game, even last year as well as this year, that they were prepared to just get the well drilled this year and to be prepared to have patience and wait for another year to have a full development of it, Even when we put a pump and a well house on the well then the distribution lines must be put in in many cases, and so the three stages all become one. There have been some real problems and we are trying to do what we can to provide as many pump houses or pumps and well houses to as many wells as we can where the need is greatest.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, what I believe to be a supplementary, although it may be a supplement as Your Honour earlier indicated, but would the minister undertake to table, he would not have the information now - to table a list showing the number of wells drilled but not pumped or pumpable this year compared to, say, the last ten years or any period he wants, because there are a certain number of wells throughout the Province that have been drilled 300 feet or 400 feet \$2 thousand or \$3 thousand or more worth but no pumps provided and no way to use the wells. So would he agree to take it as notice and to ask his officials to draw up a list just showing how many wells were drilled this year for which pumps have not been provided and how many wells were drilled in each, say, of the past five or ten years, any period he wants, that were drilled but for which pumps were not provided in that year?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I cannot commit myself to that because that is a pretty difficult assignment and I would have to investigate a little further in the department to determine whether in actual fact that kind of information can be forthcoming quickly like the Leader of the Opposition wants.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary; if the hon. gentleman cannot get it for the past few years, surely he can get it for this year because he was the one referred to this.

MR. MORGAN: That is argumentative.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. Member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs could tell us, if it is not too early, perhaps he cannot do it until the budget for next year comes down, but can he tell us now whether it is the firm intention of the government to do some drilling of artesian wells in the coming financial year?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can say that it is the intention of the government to continue the artesian well programme, there will be more wells drilled next year, no question. But the first priority next year will be to try and develop those wells that already have been drilled and to continue on with more well drilling as well. I might just mention, Mr. Speaker, in talking about artesian wells and water systems and so on, and a lot of wells that have not got their pump houses and so on, there is an experiment under way in the Province where we have been taking people off the welfare roles and putting them to work on digging lines in those communities where they do not have councils and where they have Water Committees to help to try and reduce the unemployment rate and to provide employment and get water systems for a great number of our people.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to direct a question, Sir,

to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Could the minister tell the House when we can expect the snowmobile regulations to be drawn up and published?

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

HON. J. ROUSSEAU: The wrong department, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Who is responsible for snowmobiles, is it the Minister of Municipal Affairs? No, Highways! Transportation? No!

MR. MORGAN: I cannot help you there.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, would the Minister of Tourism -

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the real minister please stand up?

MR. NEARY: Will the real minister please stand up? Sir, would the Minister of Tourism tell the House when the safety regulations and other regulations governing the operation of snowmobiles in this Province when they will be drawn up and published and gazetted?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, a paper as promised by the government is before the government at the moment and should be ready shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier: In view of the fact that the Minister of Transportation and Communications has stated that no contract or agreements exist for the paving of the Custer's Head Road to Hant's Harbour - Hant's Harbour to Custer's Head Road - there is no contract or agreement for the paving of that road, could the Premier give the reason why one of his own colleagues, in fact a Cabinet minister, saw fit to put in print that that road would be paved by September 30, 1975, during the election campaigns.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: The question is argumentative, one which implies debate and the matter would be better covered in debate rather than in Oral Questions.

MR. F.B. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It must be an additional question or another question.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Okay, another question or an additional question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. WELLS: We cannot have a supplementary to a question which has been declared out of order, Your Honour.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Another question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Will the - in view of the fact that the Premier said that all promises made by his government will be kept, what does he intend to do about the paving of this particular road -

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

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, that also is improper and argumentative.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That is what the Chair was about to say to that question, argumentative and implies debate and is not a proper question at this period in the proceedings, of the routine proceedings for Oral Questions.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Good try, you know, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Would the minister be prepared to table a list of all contracts that have been awarded for the paving of roads in this Province which have been terminated because of weather conditions this year and which are supposed to be carried on next year. Table a list.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Can the minister indicate why the answer is no, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That question, too, is out of order. The hon. member has the right to ask the question, the rules are quite clear, and the hon. minister may answer it or he may not answer it. But a refusal by a minister to answer a question is not subject to debate or further questioning.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health, and try to give the minister something to get his teeth

into. Can the minister tell us when we can expect legalization of the denturists in this Province?

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

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can say that there is a Committee which has been established and is looking into the ways and means of coming up with appropriate legislation as a result of the Select Committee's report last year. I am expecting to get that information from the Committee by the end of this year.

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

MR. STRACHAN: I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industrial Development. Would the minister tell the House what is occurring with the setting up of the Labrador Coastal Development Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The concept is still under active consideration.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy. Relative to the Lower Churchill development, would the minister inform the House whether the government intends to proceed with the awarding of contracts for which tenders have been called?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I had planned to make a statement on the Lower Churchill project tomorrow, but with reference to the Gull Hydro site we would not be proceeding with any contracts on the Gull Hydro site.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Justice inform the House, Sir, whether there have been any charges or prosecutions or convictions under the Companies Act, for companies that have violated the Companies Act in this Province in the last, say, four or five years?

MR. HICKMAN: Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I wonder would he indicate when the contract for the ferry service from McCallum to Gaultois to Hermitage for which tenders closed on September 15, will be awarded?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot at this time indicate when a contract will be awarded because tenders were called and bids received but my department found it difficult to analyze the bids, to evaluate them, mainly because the tender was not called for any specific requirements. For example, the tender was not asking for the size of a boat -

MR. SIMMONS: Who wrote the document?

MR. MORGAN: - the number of days the boat would travel from Hermitage to Gaultois or across to McCallum - in other words, the frequency of travel - the rate of fare to be charged to the people in the area or the subsidy. And it is very difficult to determine that kind of thing in an area without having a very intensive study done.



Now I have asked the officials of my department to do a more intensive study to determine the requirements, number one, of the area, look at the fare which the residents can afford to pay and the amount of isolation if you wish, of these communities. When that is done, then tenders will be recalled-or called again on a specific requirement so that people can bid on a tender asking for a special and specified requirement.

So, until that is done, Mr. Speaker, there will be no tenders awarded for a ferry service from Hermitage to Gaultois and McCallum.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate to the House who wrote the specifications that appeared in the tender document, that appeared in the paper?

MR. MORGAN: Repeat the question again.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister indicate in view of his dissatisfaction with the specs that appeared, would he indicate who wrote the specifications? They did appear at public expense in the paper, and I wonder who wrote them.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will make it clear again that the bids that came in, for example, had different size boats, number one. They indicated different times of travel per day, different times of travel per week, different fares and different subsidies. I did say it is difficult to evaluate the tenders received -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - and until we came -

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

The hon. minister may not have heard the question correctly but at least as I heard it the information now being given by the hon. minister would be an answer to a different question, but not the one -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if I may repeat the question for the minister's information it was, who wrote the specifications that appeared in the paper in calling the tenders?

MR. ROBERTS: Was it the minister's officials or somebody else?

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I put a question to the hon. the Premier, Sir? Would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if there are any late developments, up-to-date information on whether we are going to get cable television in Newfoundland before the end of the year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. It is something that interests a fair number of people, but we have not been advised by the CRTC nor did we expect to have been advised by them until they have made a decision. I was talking to the chairman some weeks ago immediately after the hearings here, and only to find out how long he thought before a decision would be made, and they were hoping at that time before year end. But other than that, that is very old information, I have no further information.

MR. ROBERTS: Was that Chairman Juneau or Chairman Boyle?

MR. MOORES: Chairman Boyle.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I might address it to the hon. Minister of Industrial Development, with reference to the answer he gave my colleague for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan): Could the minister indicate whether the active consideration which he and his officials are giving to the Labrador Coastal Development Corporation is proceeding along the lines of the legislation which was tabled here in the House and given first reading only, I believe, in the last session?

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: It is along those lines. There could be riots down there.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate to the House, Sir, now what the government's position is on the Lloyd's River diversion? Does the government intend to go

ahead with its original plans? Have they been cancelled or what is happening concerning the Lloyd's River diversion?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has had considerable information given on it. When the hon. gentleman himself was in government there was no information on the environmental consequences of hydro development.

The position on the Lloyd's -

MR. NEARY: None of your dirt now.

MP. CROSBIE: I could not be dirty to the hon. gentleman. I notice, Mr. Speaker, while I was gone he invited my resignation and I am in the midst now of completing it.

I think, Your Honour, a few months ago, after the government announced and reported to the public on the possibilities of developing the Lloyd's River diversion, it was announced that work was ceasing in connection with the Lloyd's River diversion. That will be and that will cause a heavy expense on the country's upkeep, as was explained at the time, during the next three, four or five years.

But despite that fact the project was halted. If there is any suggestion or if we intend to start it up again, it will then be announced again and those who object can put forth their objections again and those who support it can announce their support again.

But, as at this moment, Mr. Speaker, it is as dead as the proverbial Dodo, but a Dodo can always be resurrected. I can just assure the House that if we decide to resurrect it it will be announced so that hon. gentlemen will have a chance to give their opinions on it.

But that decision was made and it is a costly one, but it is made and that is still the decision. If there is any change, we will certainly advise the House.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier: Could the Premier indicate to the House whether the government intend to abolish the Department of Recreation and Rehabilitation or whether they intend to retain it in its present departmental form?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: A study is presently being done by the Secretariat of Planning and Priorities with the objective being that the department will, in all likelihood, be abolished as a department and be -

MR. ROBERTS: And be separated out.

MR. MOORES: - into divisions into other departments. And, Mr. Speaker, until the final report is in, I would be wrong to make a definitive statement. But in asking an opinion, I think it is likely. But I will await the report and the final decision before making a final comment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the Premier indicate when we might expect to get the report and to have some idea?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that amongst some other changes, we would like to make within the next two weeks.

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

MR. SIMMONS: A question for the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development. I wonder if he would undertake to table a list of Rural Development Authority loans which have been made during the past two years, including in the list the purpose for which the loans were awarded or given and the amount of the individual loans?

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would not want to provide the hon. member with adverse frustrations for the next year in trying to get involved in - the answer is, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health, Sir, could inform the House if his department is taking any steps, or intends to take any steps, any measures to cut down on the high price of drugs in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: A question for the hon. Minister of Transportation and

Communications. The construction work on the new Carbonear bypass road has stopped, is it the minister's intention to continue construction or has it been shelved under the restraint programme?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, all contracts that were let, if they are for paving contracts, if work has stopped because of weather conditions, they will continue on next Spring.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Health was about to get to his feet to give me an answer only Your Honour cut him down, I think. No? Well, okay, Sir. I will try again later.

Would the Minister of Public Works and Services inform the House if his department has received a request from the university or the principal of the Regional College in Corner Brook to have a second residence built for the Regional College in Corner Brook before next year, before the college opens next September?

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

HON. DR. T. FARRELL (Minister of Public Works and Services): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, no, Sir, not at this time, no formal request.

MR. NEARY: Informal?

DR. FARRELL: Well, I have had some informal remarks passed about it, but that is all, Sir, at the present time, Certainly not for next year.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South, (Mr. Morgan) the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Could the minister indicate whether any steps have been taken to prevent a repetition of an incident which occurred on Tuesday in the St. Lunaire area of my riding where approximately eighty children who had come up to school in the morning on a school bus and were not able to return to their homes, they had to spend the nights in other people's homes. And the reason given by his officials was that there was not enough equipment available to clear the modest amount of snow which had fallen that day?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, my department is now in preparation for the Winter maintenance programme, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that that kind of situation will not reoccur, and in the next two weeks we will be in full gear for our Winter maintenance programme.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker.

A supplementary question: In view of the fact that Winter has come on the Northern Peninsula could we advance the preparation and have a little actual action? There is a foot of snow down.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy. The answer to this question I do not think was related to the previous question that I asked. Could the minister please inform the House if tenders called in September for cutting and clearing of brush relative to the transmission lines from Churchill Falls to Goose Bay have been awarded?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: I could not answer that right off the bat, Mr. Speaker, so I will have to ask and find out.



ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order (3). Committee of Ways and Means, the adjourned debate on the budget.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, members will recall on Tuesday I had, when the House rose, Sir, I had just completed my introductory remarks in the budget debate. As the hon. House is aware, Sir, in this debate as the lead off speaker for the opposition side of the House I have unlimited time. Mr. Speaker, a lot of members may have wondered how this came about, and I have heard a great deal of comment, Sir, both inside and outside of the House of how this came about. Well, for the benefit of the new members, Sir, who may not understand, and maybe some of the old ones, Sir, who may not understand, it came about, Mr. Speaker, because the Leader of the Opposition who traditionally leads off in all the major debates on the opposition benches relinquished his opportunity to speak in the budget debate. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition, for what reason I do not know, relinquished his position, of course then the heavy responsibility of leading off this major debate on a matter that has arisen only once since Confederation, and that is bringing in supplementary estimates, the heavy responsibility then fell on my shoulders.

It is not, Mr. Speaker, a matter of playing games, not a matter at all, Sir. I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition relinquished his opportunity to speak. Maybe he did not think this was a very important subject. Maybe, Your Honour, he was too lazy. Maybe he was sick. Maybe he was not interested. I do not know. The leader of the old guard Liberal Party has his own peculiar way of doing things, Sir, and far be it for me to criticize him. But, Sir, I would submit to Your Honour that when Your Honour recognized me when I rose in my place in this hon. House that I rose as a right. I rose because I was sent here by a group of people in this Province by secret ballot and I have the right to speak whenever I deem necessary in accordance with the rules and regulations of this hon. House and that is precisely what I am doing, Sir. If other arrangements, Mr. Speaker, were to be made then they should

have been made with prior consultation, with all the parties represented in this House. The makeup of the House now, Sir, is a little bit different than it used to be, and when arrangements are being made, when the Leader of the Opposition wishes to relinquish his opportunity to speak in a debate such as the one that is before the House now, when he wishes to delegate that responsibility to some Johnnie-Come-Lately or some junior member of his caucus then it should be done, Sir, it should be done with -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. NEARY: It should be done, Mr. Speaker, with prior consultation with all the parties that are represented in the House. You have the old guard Liberal Party. You have the leader of the Liberal Reform Party and down here you have the leader of the Independent Liberals in Newfoundland. And so, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am in my second day, going on two and a half hours now speaking in this debate because I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is one of the most important matters that has ever been presented before this House and it is not something that should be brushed off on some insubordinate, or some junior member. And I would have expected, Sir, and I was disappointed that the

MR. NEARY: Leader of the official Opposition in this House did not lead off this debate and set the tone and set the trend for the members of this hon. House, especially, Sir, the newer members who are probably frightened to death to get up to make a speech, probably shivering and skaking in their shoes like I was the first time I came into this House.

The first speech I remember I made in this hon. House -

MR. DOODY: 1972.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not in 1972. It was 1962 and when I finished -

AN HON. MEMBER: Over in the other corner.

MR. NEARY: - when I finished, I was over right where the Minister of Education is right now, just inside the rail, and I am after going up the House, one side, coming down the other and now I am getting right back to the rail again. When I finished my speech that day, Sir, I thought it was one of the poorest efforts that I had ever made in my life. And I thought that I was a little bit experienced in public speaking, had knocked around the trade union movement and so forth. I got a little note from my former boss, the Premier of the day. He sent me down a little note and I still have it home, I gave it to one of my kids to put in their scrapbook, and on it he had, "Steve, that was one of the finest speeches I have ever heard in this House." Now he may have been trying to flatter me.

MR. DOODY: No!

MR. NEARY: He may have been trying to prop me up because I felt that I had let myself down, I was so nervous. I was not quite as nervous as the Minister of Finance was on Monday when he brought in that mini budget.

MR. DOODY: Wait until you bring yours in.

MR. NEARY: And, Sir, if I had to bring in a document like that I would be pretty nervous too. But I was not quite that nervous when I made my first speech -

MR. DOODY: You would be up and down the House -

MR. NEARY: But I certainly did, Sir, I certainly did appreciate that little note and I shall never forget it. And you know, the irony of it, Mr. Speaker, that when I spoke in this hon. House on Tuesday, the next day the same gentleman who is now not Premier of this Province - went out of the House, has now come back in the House again - had that little kind word again, Sir. He has not changed a bit. He called me over yesterday afternoon when the House sat and he said, "You know Steve," he said, "that was one of the finest speeches that I have ever heard in this House. Your material," he said, "was excellent. There is only one thing I disagree with you on," he said, "and that was the fact that the university did disclose their budget." He said, "I forced them too." I said, "Well, Mr. Premier," because I always call him Mr. Premier, I said, "I beg to differ with you again but I do not think they did." And of course the argument is still unresolved. He thinks that they did. I do not think that they ever did.

But the point I am making is that here he was again ready to pass me a bouquet, pass me along probably a badly needed boost to my morale because here I am, all alone down here, fighting the battle of the ordinary people of this province, a big responsibility, Sir, a heavy responsibility because the ordinary people of this province look to me to fight their battles for them.

So I appreciate the kind remark, not only of the former Premier but of all the other gentlemen who came to me after that speech on Tuesday. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I thought it was one of my better efforts. Although there was a lot of interruptions in it and I cannot wait to see Hansard because the interruptions were coming fast and furious, Sir, were coming hot and heavy from the government side.

But, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour will remember that I said before the House reconvened that I would resist, and I would deflate any attempt in this session of the hon. House to get down to character assassinations and personalities. I said, Sir, that this hon. House should have zeroed in on the problems and not the personalities or the individuals and that

is what I attempted to do on Tuesday. And I must congratulate Your Honour so far on the way this House has progressed this session. The atmosphere is completely changed although I did not hear all of the speech that was made yesterday, Sir. I understand there were a few low blows struck at personalities. That is most unfortunate, Sir, because remember, Mr. Speaker, that I made a solemn promise, I gave the people of this province my word of honour that I would personally resist that sort of thing and deflate any attempt of any other member in this hon. House who thinks this Assembly

is for clowning around and making fun of they way people speak, whether they are from Upper Island Cove or from LaPoile or from Bell Island or wherever they are from. You know, we are not all blessed, Mr. Speaker, with high education. We did not all have it within our grasp or within our power, Sir, to be sent off to boarding school when we were little boys in short pants. Some of us had to get out in this world, Sir, and work for a living and work our way up and get knocked on the head and kicked around and knocked down.

AN HON. MEMBER: In a fishing boat.

MR. NEARY: Not in a fishing boat. I did not - well, my friend may have to do it in a fishing boat. I did it for a mining company. The first job I had was loading and unloading a truck delivering stores to the mine. And I did not have the opportunity, Sir, to be sent off to boarding school. But I consider myself as good as any man in this hon. House and I have had to work my way up and God only knows it has been an uphill battle. I have had to fight as well as other members, I am not the only one. There are other members in this hon. House who have had to fight insurmountable odds to get where they are and if somebody does not like their accent I would say that is tough. They may be better men. They may be more brainier and they may have a better contribution to make to this Province and to this House than all those high mucky-mucks who have their certificates plastered on their wall who think that they own this House and that they own this Province. Well, Sir, I have got news for that crowd. The revolution, the revolution, Sir, is starting to take place in this Province. And thank God there are more ordinary people now in the House than there used to be. But we still have not got enough fishermen and enough farmers and enough truck drivers and enough office workers and enough of the ordinary rank and file but we are getting there. The make-up of the House is much different than it was. And when we change the legislation so that the public purse, the public treasury will pay some of the election expenses it will even change more drastically, Sir, because everybody



will be able to seek public office whereas now, as my hon. friend and former boss, the member for Twillingate, has pointed out so often, you have to depend on the rich people. You have to depend on the charity, on the welfare of those who have the money in order to run as a candidate in an election and get into this hon. House.

That is one thing in the Throne Speech I must say that I was glad to hear on opening day, that there is going to be legislation to change that in the next session. So I hope that we have seen the last time that we have gone through the last election when members have to go around begging and borrowing a few dollars to pay for their election expenses, to run as a candidate in a free country so that they can become members of the legislature and do something for their country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be a very great honour today and Tuesday for me to be the one to lead off the debate on the opposition side of the House. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make this abundantly clear, that if the tradition of the House had been followed, and there had been no monkey business, no fiddling around, and there had been prior consultation with all the parties in this hon. House, Sir, I would have recognized the fact that it was the role of the Leader of the Opposition in keeping with tradition to lead off this great debate. I would have even, Sir, considered giving up my speaking time to the former leader of the government in this Province, the member for Twillingate. If he had risen in his place I would have declined. I might have even declined in favour of the very charming lady that we have in this hon. House, Sir, for the first time, I think, since - well, long before Confederation, the second time in our history I believe, we have a lady with us. But nobody else, Sir. I have too much pride, and I think that I have as much to offer, and I think that I can say as much, and I think that I can make as many good points, and I think my speech

will be as good as any other that could be made in leading off this debate. I hope, Sir, that I will set a trend for this hon. side of the House, especially for the newer members who probably do not realize what it is all about. But, I have to repeat, Sir, to the newer members that in a major debate, a major debate like the one we are in now, it is the Premier on the government side and the Leader of the official Opposition that carries the ball and sets the example, sets the trend. Now, Sir, that responsibility has fallen on my shoulders and I will try to do the best I can this afternoon to put forward, Sir, the views of the members on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there were a number of examples of extravagance and waste in the estimates that I pointed out the other day. I am not going to go over them again, Sir, and I am not going to devote too much more time talking about the extravagance and the waste, and they are numerous in the estimates, Mr. Speaker, numerous. But, Sir, one thing that I have to mention here this afternoon - I am not going to talk about the Premier's gas guzzling Cadillac. Maybe, Sir, if the Premier wanted to show the people of this Province that his government is genuine and sincere in belt tightening, retrenchment, cutbacks, that there will have to be harsh measures, it might be a good idea, Sir, if the hon. the Premier got rid of that big automobile to conserve energy and drive around in a Volkswagen Rabbit. Why not, Sir? It would be a good example for the rest of the people in this Province and it would show beyond any doubt that the government is sincere and just not clowning around in this matter of belt tightening and retrenchment.

But the one point I want to talk about, Sir, is that while we are hearing about belt tightening, retrenchment and cutbacks of all kinds and asking the ordinary people of this Province to make all kinds of sacrifices, you see all kinds of expensive furniture being brought into Confederation Building. Some of the new ministers feel and some of the old ones too, Sir, that have been transferred from one department to another feel that it is a sort of a status symbol to have a posh, luxurious office, and there are all kinds of

recliners and chesterfields and settees and what they call over  
in -

MR. DOODY: Where?

MR. NEARY: Coming into the Confederation Building! Where,  
Mr. Speaker? All the minister has to do is go and look around  
him. Drapes, new drapes are being put up to windows practically  
every day, wall to wall carpeting, new desks, mahogany desks.

I remember when I first became Minister of Social Services. The  
minister before me, who is now the Leader of the official Opposition,  
took his desk with him when he went, moved it down on the main floor,  
down in the Department of Health. I did not go out and buy a new desk.  
I was given a desk that was owned or used by the late Dr. McGrath.  
That desk, Sir, I used right up to the time that we got thrown out  
and the P.C.'s took over.

So the hon. the member for Twillingate yesterday quite  
rightly pointed out that if we are going to talk about retrenchment  
and cutbacks, well let us be serious about it and let us not start  
talking about renting more office space and building up more empires  
and letting the bureaucrats expand out into, I think it is fourteen  
now buildings the government offices are in.

Make it fifteen, then sixteen and the next thing you know you are up to twenty or thirty. Let us be serious about it, Sir, and let the Premier put his foot down and lay down the law and say, no more of this expensive furniture and wall to wall carpeting and expensive drapes and expensive paint for your offices.

Mr. Speaker, there were two or three things mentioned in the budget by the Minister of Finance that concerned me very, very much, Sir. It concerned me so much, Mr. Speaker, that I had to put through several calls to Ottawa to find out whether or not the statements that were made by the minister were correct. The first matter, Sir, that I want to deal with is the matter of equalization payments to Newfoundland in the current fiscal year. The minister stated, Sir, in his budget that the equalization payments to Newfoundland in this current fiscal year were going to be cut by \$15 million. They were going to be cut, the minister said, by \$15 million. Well, Sir, I want to tell this hon. House that the Treasury Board officials in Ottawa were shocked and amazed and disappointed and upset to hear the Minister of Finance in this Province make that statement. And they denied it and said that it is untrue, and it is an insane statement to put in the budget that the Government of Canada - as he tried to leave the impression - that the Government of Canada, Uncle Ottawa, was going to cut the equalization grants to Newfoundland this year by \$15 million. What happened in actual fact, Mr. Speaker, was that the former Minister of Finance last March overestimated, based his figures on the wrong information, and so it is not a cut, Sir, it is an error in judgement on the part of the former Minister of Finance and on the part of the administration. I wish my friend would stay, because I got a few things I want to talk about in connection with Intergovernmental Affairs so I hope the minister will stay around for awhile. I will not ask for his resignation this afternoon, but I will come pretty close.

MR. DOODY: How long are you going to speak?

MR. NEARY: Oh, I will not be very long - another four or five days, probably.

Mr. Speaker, do you know the record, I think, for speaking in this House is held by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who spoke for five days once, five full days on the fisheries, on one subject, on the fisheries.

MR. MURPHY: Fifteen out of seventy-five days.

MR. NEARY: Oh! No, I only got about a few topics. I could do it, Sir. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, all the historians and all the people who follow politics in this Province have now gone to the history books to see if I have created a precedent by being the lead off speaker in a major debate in the House of Assembly, being an Independent Liberal member, and I say Liberal, Sir, with a big "L." You know, Mr. Speaker, I may even outdo the former Premier. I may even, Sir, make the Guinness Book of World Records when they have finished their research. Certainly I believe it is the first time in the history of Newfoundland that a leader of an Independent Liberal Party opened up the debate.

But, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the equalization grants, Sir. So far this year, Mr. Speaker, this Province has received \$194 million in equalization payments from the Government of Canada. This latest figure, Mr. Speaker, is based upon a review that was done no later than September past, a month and a half or two months ago. And the hon. Minister of Finance knows, and if he does not know, I will tell him now, he should know



that equalization payments are not a set amount. They could vary. They could go up or down. It is a very complicated procedure, a very complicated formula. I do not intend to go into it but it depends on the amount of revenue that is taken in by all the Provinces, not only Newfoundland. That is right, Sir. And then it is reviewed, I believe, three or four times a year. So how can the minister say it has been cut by \$15 million?

MR. DOODY: No, I said it was \$15 million less than I had hoped for.

MR. NEARY: The minister left the impression, Sir, and implied, left the impression in the minds of the people that Ottawa was cutting it.

MR. DOODY: No, no, I did not, Sir.

MR. NEARY: No? But anyway, Sir, not only that, Sir, but the minister could not even make the statement that it is going to be because it may not be \$15 million less. It could be \$15 million more. The \$194 million already received was a result of a review as of September of this year, and in January, Sir, a month and a half from now or less than a month and a half from now, another review will take place following which the payments could be increased or decreased. And so it is grossly unfair, Sir, for the minister to leave the impression that Ottawa had sliced off \$15 million off equalization payments to the Province this year.

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

MR. DOODY: On a point of order. I think if the hon. gentleman opposite were to read or even had listened to the budget speech he would not have gotten the impression, or at least I would think he would not have gotten the impression, that I was trying to mislead the people of the Province or the people of anywhere that we were sliced \$15 million off what Ottawa owed us. That was not what I said and it was not what I intended. I said we got some \$15 million less than we had hoped to get. And I am quite familiar with the equalization payments and so is my hon. friend across the House. I did not mean



to mislead the House or to mislead the public. And I want to make it a matter of record that this is a very important matter with me. Misrepresentation in the House of Assembly is a very important point and is one that I have never been guilty of, Sir, and hope I never will be.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The Chair will take those remarks as a point of explanation rather than a point of order. I think it is reasonable to take the view that there was a misunderstanding between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance just made the same statement again. Maybe I am not hearing him properly but the hon. minister said we got \$15 million less this year than we got last year.

MR. DOODY: Less than we had hoped for.

MR. NEARY: Than we had hoped for. We got \$15 million less this year than we had hoped for.

MR. DOODY: Than we had hoped to get this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hoped for and budgeted for.

MR. DOODY: Right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hoped for and budgeted for.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the point -

MR. DOODY: I would like to be able to help you but -

MR. NEARY: I know what the hon. minister is saying, Sir, but the point that I am making is this.

MR. DOODY: What?

MR. NEARY: That we still have, Sir, in this current fiscal year, we still have five months to go and that situation could change drastically over the next four or five months and instead of being down it could be up. Last year we only received \$182 million in equalization payments. This year so far we have got \$194 million and it could be much more than that.

Another statement, Sir, in the budget debate that concerned me very much was the minister's reference to DREE. Maybe he can straighten me out on this one.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, before my hon. friend gets even more confused on DREE than he is on this one, perhaps for the sake of the record of the hon. House and the people who are listening I should maybe refer the hon. House to page four of the budget speech and I quote, Sir, -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister making a point of order or is he asking me a question?

MR. DOODY: I am raising a point of personal privilege because I have been, perhaps, indirectly accused of misleading the House and the public and this is certainly a matter of grave concern to me, and one I think that is of importance to this House. And it says here, Sir, "With a general slowdown of the national economy and with taxation changes in Quebec, Ontario and Alberta, we have been advised by the Government of Canada that our equalization entitlements will be \$194,200,000 or \$15,800,000 less than what we had originally budgeted." We did not say that we were sliced. We did not say that Ottawa did anything wrong to us. We did not say - we said that we got \$15,800,000 less than we had budgeted for. With great respect, Sir, that is the point that I think has to be made in the record.

MR. DOODY: Now, Sir, he can proceed with getting the DREE bit snarled up.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about DREE for a few moments, Sir. Last year this government signed a ten year DREE agreement, I believe for \$100 million and, Mr. Speaker, I am told by the Ottawa people that another agreement and I believe the minister or somebody in the House hinted at this there last week, another agreement is to be signed either in December or in January for another \$70 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nothing wrong with that, nothing wrong with that, Sir, Ottawa again pouring it into the province through the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. But, Sir, what alarmed me about my discussions with the Ottawa people was the fact - and this merely confirms, Sir, what we have been saying on this side of the House for months and months past - that the province is in serious financial difficulties, that the province is having very, very severe financial problems. We have been saying that both inside the House and outside the House and this was confirmed, Sir, in my discussions with the Ottawa people, that the government now, even before they have gotten their new DREE agreement, and I not prepared to make a categorical statement on this, Sir, but I can only repeat what I was told that concerns me very much, and the minister may be able to put my mind at ease and I hope that he can -

MR. DOODY: I would like to try. It is not going to be easy.

MR. NEARY: No, well it may not be easy -

MR. DOODY: It is a matter of mind.

MR. NEARY: - but I am told that the government is now asking the Government of Canada - not for progress payments - are asking for advance payments on DREE money before it is actually spent, or before the work is even on stream. It seems to be a little bit odd, Sir, and a little bit unusual. If it is true, if it is indeed true, Sir, and I do not see the minister leaping to his feet to deny it -

MR. DOODY: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I am leaping to my feet -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So, Sir, I hope that the minister will set the record straight on that particular matter. Is this confirmation that the province is bankrupt?

MR. DOODY: You have not gotten to the point yet.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister was not listening. The point is that the province, the Minister of Finance, Sir, his colleague the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, are asking the Government of Canada to follow a most unusual procedure and pay money to the province on DREE projects before the work is even started or before it even gets on stream.

MR. DOODY: We are only trying to get some of our own money back.

MR. NEARY: The minister will have an opportunity to clarify it. I am putting a question to the minister because -

MR. DOODY: - when I make my remarks.

MR. NEARY: Yes, when the minister makes his remarks he will have ample opportunity to -

MR. DOODY: It is going to take you a while to get the equalization thing straightened out.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I got the equalization payment straightened out.

MR. DOODY: Okay. Carry on.

MR. NEARY: I got it straightened out to the extent, Mr. Speaker, that the minister better start doing some pretty fancyfoot work in explaining his statement to Ottawa. They are pretty disturbed, pretty disturbed about the impression.

MR. DOODY: I was there yesterday and they seemed to be quite amiable.

MR. NEARY: Yes well maybe they did, maybe the minister was up there trying to get some of this DREE money that I was talking about. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and talk about the Ottawa situation. I will merely refer to one other example, and the minister is very familiar with this and there are other ministers in the House probably more familiar, and that has to do, Sir, with Eastern Provincial Airways.

Members will recall during the election (if I can find my notes here) during the election,

Sir, the Premier announced that Eastern Provincial Airways were going to be given a loan of \$3 million, \$3 million, of which \$500,000 would come from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and \$2.5 million would come from DREE.

AN HON. MEMBER: A loan or a guarantee?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? A loan or a guarantee? I do not care what it is, Sir, I am talking about the procedure, the political overtones, the political backlash to that whole matter of this \$3 million for Eastern Provincial Airways to expand their operation in Gander.

MR. DOODY: They should not be in Gander?

MR. NEARY: The announcement was made, Sir, the hon. the Premier before approval was granted by DREE. And the approval has not been granted to this day, yet Eastern Provincial Airways have their \$3 million, and the Province, poor old Newfoundland, is expecting Ottawa to refund \$2.5 million of it via the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. There is no guarantee, Sir, that Newfoundland will ever get that money. I hope they do. I know that negotiations are going on at this very moment to try and get this \$2.5 million back into the public treasury. Maybe Ottawa is stalling, maybe they are being stubborn now, because the announcement has already been made during a political campaign. There is no glory, there is no honour, there is no advantage to Ottawa rushing it up, maybe they are stalling it. I do not know what the reason is. But I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, and any of the gentlemen who are sitting in this House who sat in the House of Commons and who moved around Ottawa know that they are pretty upset in Ottawa that the Province went ahead and did something on its own, blindly, without approval of DREE, and are now more or less trying to force the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion into coughing up the \$2.5 million. Sir, I hope - Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Province is successful and that we do get that \$2.5 million back. But let it be a lesson, Sir, to the ministers in the future, and the Premier especially, not to be going around making announcements about things before they are finalized. Ottawa can only stomach a certain amount of that. They can only put up with a certain amount of it, and



then they will rebel, and they will give the Province a little flick on the wrist. And I would suggest that is probably what is happening in this case. They were embarrassed over the whole thing, and it might have jeopardized our position to collect that \$2.5 million. Somehow or other I do not believe that it will, I hope it will not, the Province cannot afford it. And certainly EPA will never pay it back.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will.

MR. NEARY: Will they? How much are they into the Province for now?

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask your buddies!

MR. NEARY: They cannot even - well I should not say that -

MR. SPEAKER: (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to find out if they -

MR. SPEAKER: (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! The hon. member will address his remarks to the Chair, please!

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. I do not know, Sir, I would like to get an update on the EPA outstanding debts. They borrowed, I think, it was \$10.5 million of the taxpayers money, One of the last things that the former administration did in 1971 before we got the heave ho! was to approve a \$10.5 million loan via the - was it the Newfoundland financing? What was the name of that?

MR. DOODY: NIDC - Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation.

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation, I thank the minister, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Any time you need help, Sir.

MR. NEARY: \$10.5 million. They were already into the government for \$6 million, and they wanted to overhaul their jets and buy a couple of new jets so they refinanced the whole operation by borrowing another \$10 million or \$10.5 million from the public treasury. I do not know if they are meeting their commitments and their obligations or not.

MR. DOODY: They are.

MR. NEARY: Well, probably they are, but I do know this, Sir, there is no secret, everybody knows it, that for the first half of this year they operated in the red and they have had to cut their schedules.



MR. DOODY: They could have cut a lot of people in downtown Gander, if you prefer that.

MR. NEARY: I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker. I am coming to that if the minister will only give me a chance. They were not very concerned about Gander when they allowed EPA to spend \$5.8 million over in Halifax to build a training and maintenance center. Where was the minister then? And, Mr. Speaker, is the House aware that \$3 million of that is coming from DREE? The government of Nova Scotia negotiated the proposition. This Province did not have what it takes, Sir, to negotiate with EPA to get that training center and maintenance center out in Gander, out in my friend's district, the district of Gander, and the minister himself on the board of directors of Eastern Provincial Airways-without pay, so he tells me! I take his word for it.

They allowed that training center to be put over in Halifax. Sir, I would say it is more than the thin end of the wedge that they got in there. It is the blunt end, and I would not be one bit surprised but resulting from that blunder, that colossal blunder on the part of the administration that you are likely to see more of the EPA operations shifted over to Halifax, Nova Scotia. Our airline, we own it, Sir! We started it, we own it! The former Premier of this Province helped the thing get started, put public money into it. And, then they allowed - all they had to do was lay down the law and say, look you are not putting it over there.

They say, well, you know we are consolidating our operation. Consolidating their operation! Consolidate it in Newfoundland. We own the airline. We are providing a service for the Atlantic Provinces and for Montreal. It started off as an airline to service Labrador. That is right, Sir, to service Labrador. There was no way that you could get in and out of the Island of Newfoundland to Labrador. You could come in from the other end, Quebec Air, and the Province of Quebec could do business in Montreal but not Newfoundland. So, we had to take steps to try to correct that. So we built up this airline which Mr. Andy Crosbie, brother of the Minister of Mines and Energy, was chairman of the board of directors. We built it up at the expense of the people of the Province.

When the time came, Mr. Speaker, to reap the benefits, to get a big training center and a maintenance center, where do you think

this government let it go? They let it go by default. I have talked to the people over in Halifax. The government of Nova Scotia had no competition as far as one province or the other getting that maintenance center. There were no hard-nosed negotiations, no laying down of the law to Eastern Provincial Airways, to say, you must build it in Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, from what I am told it was economically feasible to build it in this Province just as well as over in Nova Scotia.

Ah, the minister shakes his head. Well, Sir, I have it from experts and they are just as good as experts as the minister. They are. They are. I am prepared to put my experts up against the minister's experts any time.

MR. DOODY: I know. That is why you headed for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, you have to get an appointment over on Bell Island now to see the Minister of Finance. He has come a long way since he had his arm down in the pickle barrel.

MR. DOODY: That is the first time you mentioned that in the speech.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right.

So, Mr. Speaker, when they had the opportunity to do something for Newfoundland they lost out to Nova Scotia, and \$3 million of the \$5.8 million coming from DREE. The administration should be ashamed of themselves, Sir. Now when EPA came along looking for \$3 million to beef up its operation in - and you know, Mr. Speaker, I am not quite clear, I am not really quite clear yet on what that loan or guarantee is for. What is it for?

There has been no drastic change in the operations in Gander. Is the money being used, or any portion of it being used, or any of the interest on it being used to maintain, to look after the operations of the airline, to take care of their deficit? No? Well, let us hear the minister tell us when he gets an opportunity to speak in this hon. House.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it may have been a grandiose scheme, Sir. People may have thought that it was great for Newfoundland to own its own airline and to look after the Atlantic Provinces and Montreal. I am one of these people who did not think it was a great idea unless, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Nova Scotia, the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Government of New Brunswick kicked in, kicked in their share, apart from the assistance and the grants they get from Ottawa. Let them kick in and pick up the deficit for this airline. Why should poor old Newfoundland, the poorest of the poor of the four Atlantic Provinces, why should we always be the ones to lash it out to EPA when we are servicing the Atlantic region, the Maritimes, providing them with an air service? Why over in Prince Edward Island they never had an air service until we gave it to them. But they did not put anything into it. They are getting off scott free.

AN HON. MEMBER: We should help the rest of Canada when we can.

MR. NEARY: Help the rest of Canada? By all means, Sir, help the rest of Canada. Can little Newfoundland afford that kind of a luxury to build up a part of the empire and the family compact? I say, no, Sir. I say, no, and before any more grants and assistance are given to EPA let the other provinces kick in. Oh! They are putting this training centre and maintenance centre over in Halifax, let Halifax put up the cash, the do-re-me the spondoolics. We have not got it here. We will be lucky if we can get that \$2.5 million back from DREE.

Mr. Speaker, enough on that topic, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy is out of his seat at the moment, but I hope, Sir, that he is within listening distance of what I am about to say.

During my deliberations, my discussions, - and I am glad we had Private Members' Day yesterday, Sir, which gave me an opportunity to do a little research, to do a little fact finding. And I want the Minister of Finance to tell this House whether or not the information that I have received from Ottawa is correct and that is, Mr. Speaker, in connection, Sir, with the amounts of money that are supposed to be turned over to this Province by the Government of Canada for loss of gear in the last year? I do not know if members are aware of it or not, Sir, but this programme, the money for this programme, comes from the Government of Canada, via a programme called, the Federal Natural Disaster Fund, the Federal Natural Disaster formula. And every time we get in trouble here and there are losses of gear, Ottawa has to declare it more or less a natural disaster and that is how funds are made available to the Province. The first \$1 per capita has to be put up by the Province of Newfoundland. So that means right off the bat, before Newfoundland fishermen or Newfoundland, as a Province can qualify, \$500,000 has to be put up by the Province.

Now, Sir, I am told that Ottawa at this moment owes the Province of Newfoundland, under this Federal Natural Disaster formula, owes the Province of Newfoundland somewhere in the vicinity of \$4 million to \$5 million. The Government of Newfoundland is reimbursed only, Mr. Speaker, when they submit their bills, submit their audited accounts to the Government of Canada. They have not been submitting their accounts regularly, Mr. Speaker, and the Government of Canada supposedly is in arrears to the Government of Newfoundland to the tune of \$4 million. But that is not the alarming part of it, Sir, although that is bad enough. My Ottawa informants lead me to believe that because of the investigation currently going on in the Department of Fisheries that they have either notified the Province officially, or are in the process of notifying the Province, that not another cent will be paid until this investigation is over and matters are cleared up.

That is a pretty serious matter, Mr. Speaker, if it is correct.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why bring it up?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am only relating to the House what my Ottawa sources told me.

MR. DOODY: What kind of sources?

MR. NEARY: Usually reliable, Sir. I would say very, very reliable sources say that there is \$4 million outstanding, between \$4 million and \$5 million. And the Government of Canada has either notified the Province or is in the process of notifying the Province that they will not be reimbursed, that they will not get another cent until the matter of this whole investigation is complete.

MR. DOODY: Through them, through you or through the Government of the Province?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance can be as funny as he likes, Sir, but it is a very, very serious matter.



Mr. Neary.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the matters that I wanted to touch on, Sir, in this debate. I do not want to be accused of filibustering in this hon. House, Sir. I am not going to be like my former boss, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). I am not going to speak for five days. I probably could. There is enough ammunition, Sir, to throw at the government to keep a member, if he is doing his job in this hon. House, to keep him going for four or five days. I do not intend to hog the session, Sir. Some of the new members are anxious to get up on their feet and make their maiden speeches, and we are all looking forward to some of the oratorical experts that we have amongst us, Sir, stand up in this hon. House, with their bright new shiny faces and make their maiden speech. I hope that before I sit down, Sir, that I will establish a trend.

Mr. Speaker, let me make one thing perfectly clear though, and I have heard the Leader of the Opposition say this so often, Sir. You know, in the last few days, despite the fact that the Minister of Finance has come into this House, and the Premier said outside the House and inside the House and ministers have parroted what he has been saying about having to take harsh, drastic measures, member after member, Sir, on the Opposition benches are getting up and saying, what time are you going to carry out your promise to put the waterline down in Pigeon Inlet? What time are you going to put an artesian well down in So-and-So place? What time are you going to build that hospital that you promised us during the election? And you know, Mr. Speaker, if there is one exception that I would make, one exception that I would make to belt tightening, retrenchment and cutbacks, is hospitals. I think hospitals should get priority over everything else. And I am as disappointed as any man in this House that the hospital in Port aux Basques is not going to be built. It has been shelved,

MR. NEARY:

construction has been postponed. And there is going to be a violent reaction from Port aux Basques where you have men and women on the same ward because they do not have any accommodation, they do not have the space. And I do not blame these people for being hopping mad. I do not think that Mr. Trudeau meant to include hospitals in wage and price controls and cutbacks. I do not think the man, Sir, who went around this country crusading for the just society - retrenchment, inflation, cost of living, high prices or what have you - I do not think that he meant for hospitals to be cut back. That is the only exception I would make for the rule, but nevertheless, Sir, members are still - they apparently have not been convinced yet - members are still standing in their place in this hon. House and playing a little petty game of politics with the government. And the members will say, when are you going to put down the artesian well? When are you going to put a pump in the well? When are you going to do this? When are you going to do that?

And, Mr. Speaker, I said before this session of the House opened that I would stand here as the watchdog over the people of this Province, and if it meant criticizing the Opposition I would do that too, criticizing the government, voting with the government, voting with the Opposition. I am a free man. I am out from under the thumb of any machine or any rich people or well-to-do people. I am my own man, and I am obligated to nobody except the people who sent me to this hon. House. But when I hear people make contradictory statements, Sir, it gets me right up tight. You hear one fellow saying, one member saying, "Oh, it is a good budget because it has \$600 for grants to people who are building houses or buying houses for the first time. It is good in that respect." Then you have another member saying, "No, it is a bad budget because motor registration fees are gone up by sixty-six and two-thirds per cent." Then you hear another member saying, "No it is a good budget because all clothing is now exempt from the sales tax." Then another one would say, "No, it is bad because they did not exempt this or they did not exempt that." Mr. Speaker, to use an old cliché that the Leader of the - the old guard Liberal Party has used so often, "You cannot be half

pregnant. You are either for it or you are against it." The question that everybody and every member on this side of the House has to ask himself, "Will the budget do the job that its intended to do?" That is the question, Sir, that we have to ask ourselves. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance has not even convinced the members of this House that there is need for retrenchment and cut back. Otherwise -

MR. MOORES: It did not have a chance.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MOORES: It did not have a chance.

MR. NEARY: Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, - No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier did not hear the earlier part of my remark.

MR. DOODY: He did not hear it from the oratory angle.

MR. NEARY: That you would not have members standing up and saying to the Premier, "When are you going to carry out your promise you made during the election down in Pigeon Inlet?" Would you have that kind of thing? Or would you have members that are genuinely and sincerely trying to zero in on the real problem?

Mr. Speaker, by way of summary I would say that the need for this House being forced for the first time since Confederation, and I would submit, subject to correction by my former boss, probably one of the few times in the history of Newfoundland, but certainly, Sir, the first time since Confederation that supplementary estimates had to be brought into this House, and I would submit, Sir, that they arise from two factors, two factors: First, Sir, and foremost I would submit to the House that the Minister of Finance, the hon. present minister's colleague at the time did not present realistic estimates of revenue, and on the other hand realistic estimates of expenditures when the original estimates, Mr. Speaker, were tabled in this hon. House last Spring. And I pointed out one gross example this afternoon, Sir, and that was his error in arithmetic on the entitlement of this Province to equalization payments. And, Mr. Speaker, secondly, I would say that

at the time the former minister delivered his budget of expenditures and revenues to this Province there was no way - and the minister emphasized this, I think, himself in his budget on Monday - there was no way, Sir, which anyone could predict the total impact of inflation on this Province, neither could they estimate provincial expenditures or provincial revenues, or for that matter, Sir, the income of the individuals in this Province.

So there are two reasons, Sir, why we have supplementary estimates before this House and we are forced to discuss these estimates at this time, a month before Christmas, two reasons. Mismanagement on the part of the administration and inflation. The government cannot escape, get out from under completely and I am prepared, Sir, to admit that a large part of the problem, not only in this Province, the minister can tell us in Canada, all over the world, is caused by inflation, but part, part, I do not know how much, part of the blame can be laid right on the shoulders of the administration. I am not so naive and stupid, Sir, as to say, well they built up peoples' hopes and expectations during the election. What party, Mr. Speaker, what party does not do that during an election? I would not want to be a member of a party that was going to spend all the money that was promised by the other major parties in this Province. I would not be a part of a government to find that kind of money either. As it happens the P.C.s snuck back in by some fluke. They got back in and they are shouldered, they are faced with the responsibility of now putting the Province back on an even financial keel as my hon. friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) termed it the other day.

I would like to be able to help them. I would like to be able to help but there is nothing you can really get your teeth into. The minister has not fired up the House and fired up the people and set goals and objectives that we can all aim at. He has not even convinced the House, members of the House, he has not, the minister has not convinced the members of the House because otherwise, Sir, they would not be fiddling away the time saying, what time are you going to put a pump down in this well or what time are you going to drill a well?

Maybe the minister has a few surprises up his sleeve for us. Maybe he is going to shock us one of these days. But, Mr. Speaker, we here in this hon. House finally must come to grips with the true facts of life regarding income and financial expenditures in terms of today's dollars and must not delude ourselves further, Sir, with an idiotic belief that Santa Claus even at this time of the year is going to come to our rescue.

My advice, and I know, Sir, that the members will not probably pay any attention to what I am going to say but my advice - well, the Minister of Finance might, because what I am going to say was right up his alley, he will probably agree with it - individual members of this House must stop playing politics and trying to bulldoze the government into carrying out election promises that involve little goodies for individual districts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go over and take your seat.

MR. NEARY: No - Ah! Mr. Speaker, I have heard that so often since LaPoile. Ah! The rumors come back to me. The caucus is not airtight yet. Ah! He is going over with the Tories, they say. He is set.

I remember one gentleman telling me the Leader of the old guard Liberal Party says, "Ah! He has given up his principles," because I went down and used Newfoundland Information Services to get information into my district of LaPoile. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight on that. There is no censorship. If anybody thinks in this House for one moment that the Minister of Public Works and Services looks at all my releases and censors my releases, that is completely false and untrue. And if that ever happened, Sir, if that ever happened I would cut it off so fast. I have had nothing but co-operation, Sir, and the minister says, why did I not say that last year. I was not allowed, was



MR. NEARY: one thing. And in the second place, Mr. Speaker, the service is there, there is nothing I can do about it, it is going to be there for the next three or four years and I promised my constituents out in LaPoile that they would have a two-way pipeline to the House of Assembly, information into me, information back to them, Sir, and that is the best way right now that I know how to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the hon. gentleman will take his seat for a moment, this is with reference to or pursuant to Standing Order 31 and by no later than 5 o'clock I am to inform the hon. members of the House what matters will be up for debate on the motion to adjourn at 5:30. I have notice of two such matters and they will be called in the order today in which they were received.

The first one from the hon. member for LaPoile and relates to his question to the hon. Premier of a couple of days ago, the matter of government plans to increase productivity in the province with special reference to the work stoppages and lost man-days of the last year.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And the second matter is one of which notice was given to me by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and relates to his question of yesterday to the hon. Minister of Justice and relating to the appointment of the third Judge of Appeal in the province. Those are the two matters of which notice has been given and which will be up at 5:30.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but hearing that snide remark, why do you not go over and take your seat. I remember, Sir, when I was fighting the battle and carrying this Opposition on my back alone for the last three and a half years, when I did not know what morning I was going to wake up -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, not what morning I would wake up and hear a few of my colleagues had joined the PC Cabinet. It would not have surprised me one bit. I have not sacrificed any principles, Sir. My Liberalism is with a big "L", and not with a small "l", and I do not have to kowtow to any man in this province except the people who sent me here. And when the



government do things that I deem to be in the best interest of my constituents and the ordinary people of this province, Sir, I will vote in favour of it. When I think they are not doing things in the best interest of the ordinary people of the province, I will vote against them and I will give them a smack in the gob. And when the Opposition are not doing their job, Sir, I will give them a little flick on the wrist. Not that I am not a Liberal or that I should go over and take my seat on the other side, I am too much of a Liberal for that, Sir. I am not a coward or a traitor. I never was and I never backed away from a fight and I never tried to make excuses for my colleagues, never criticized them or condemned them when I got up and spoke in this House I was all for them. And there were no knife stabbing or back stabbing on my part. I fought the battle like a man, Sir, and if I had to do it alone down here with the help of my colleague, the former Premier, the member for Twillingate, if we had to do it down here in this corner alone we will do it, but let us be men about it, not cowards.

MR. MORGAN: While they are back stabbing.

MR. NEARY: Aw, Mr. Speaker, it will all come out in the wash, Sir, it will all come out in the wash. They can try to smooth it over all they like but, Sir, I am in a position where I can level, lay it on the line and I am a better Liberal and I always was, Sir, a better Liberal than half the crowd that criticized me put together.

So, Mr. Speaker, the members of this House must stop playing politics and trying to bulldoze the government into living up to some of these foolish and irresponsible promises they made during the election. They were trying to get back into power, the Liberals were trying to get in, the NDP were trying to get in, they were outbidding one another but now, Sir, the election is over. It is behind us

and all members of the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, must now drop this nonsense of trying to fight for local interest headlines and concentrate on the number one job, Sir, that we have before us in this Province. And that is to whip into shape and to amend if necessary, if the minister is agreeable, the proposed budget that the minister brought in in this House last Monday so that it will show the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, that you and I, Sir, and every member of this hon. House of Assembly of both the government and opposition benches, Sir, are truly sincere in the will to win this war against inflation.

Hence, Your Honour, I would urge every member of this hon. House of Assembly not to support this budget. I would like for my colleagues, the members on the opposition benches, members on the government benches, immaterial of what party you belong to, not to support this budget in its present form but to bring in amendments that will put some muscle and put some teeth into it.

MR. DOODY: You want more taxes?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am not talking about more taxes. I am talking about the extravagance and the waste that the government show by example. And I do not have to go back over some of the reasons I gave yesterday, by putting the government aircraft in moth balls and today by telling the Premier to put his foot down with ministers buying big red expensive carpet and drapes and what we used to call sectional furniture, chesterfields and settees and recliners. Show by example, Sir, bring in amendments, and alter the budget if it needs to be altered or it does not do the job, if the minister did not get his message across. Let us spell out the retrenchment and the cutbacks and the belt tightening that the government is going to do.

How do you expect, Sir, how can the minister expect the ordinary Newfoundlander to turn down his thermostat, to cut back on his spending when the government is still living high on the hog, footloose and fancy-free. So, let us put a little muscle and a little teeth into it, Sir, that will give us in this Province, give everyone in this Province, even if it involves a little bit of inconvenience, Sir, and a little bit of hardship, give everybody a real chance to

halt and cut out the economic cancer, Sir, which is eating away at the well-being and the very morale of our people in this Province today.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

HON. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult act to follow, needless to say. I do not know how many hours that was. First of all, Sir, I would like to congratulate you on your election to the very high office of Speaker. I am sure that it had to be one of your moments of extreme joy in your very illustrious career as a politician and as a very learned man.

I would also like to congratulate my two colleagues, the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), who has been appointed Deputy Chairman of Committees, and the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins), who has been appointed as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Debates. In every case I think the Premier's choice was a wise one.

I would like to say, Sir, that I am particularly pleased with the success of the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) who has finally proved after all these years that it is possible for a Tory to be elected in that area, rural Newfoundland and maybe

MR. BRETT: does away with the myth that the Liberals or the Grits have a hold there that could not be broken.

I would also like to congratulate all the new members of the House, and those of course who were re-elected, and especially my hon. friend from the district of LaPoile. I am very sincere in this, Sir. I join with many other when I say that but for him there would have been practically no opposition in this House in the past three and-a-half years, and it is great to see him back, as I said. A very difficult man to follow. I would not even try. But your wit, hon. sir, and your cutting remarks sometimes are indeed a pleasure.

On the 19th of November, as I said, some of us, some of you are here for the first time. For me it was also a first. Believe it or not, Sir, it was the first time in my whole life that I ever laid eyes on the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the only living father himself. It may be hard to believe but it is true. A Newfoundlander, thirty-nine years of age -

MR. MURPHY: In person.

MR. BRETT: Oh, yes! I mean in person. Not on television, in the flesh. But as I said, a Newfoundlander, thirty-nine years of age who spent three and-a-half years in the House of Assembly, that I never did actually see the hon. gentleman before. I feel that I have to, while I am talking about this hon. gentleman, make some reference to the last election in that in his remarks, I think it was on opening day, he mentioned how sorry he was that his member in that area was defeated, Mr. Bren Power. I wish to assure him I am not sorry.

But I do understand, Mr. Speaker, that both the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had some difficulty in finding someone to run against me in the district of Trinity North. They finally found two sacrificial lambs. And there was another gentleman who - well I do not know if he were a Liberal or a P.C. or what he was but I think he has run for just about every party that we have in the Province. But obviously he was not wanted either by the Leader of the Opposition or the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) so he set himself up to run as an Independent Liberal.

Now the end of that little story, Mr. Speaker, is that neither one of the three saved the'r nomination. But I repeat, hon. Sir from Twillingate,

(Mr. Smallwood) I certainly do not regret the defeat of Your Mr. Power.

Getting back to - and I do not want to engage, Sir, in any repartee with you because I am sure if you get up what is going to happen to me. But another one of your comments on the 19th - and I could not help but note this, and I have to speak about it - you said, Sir, for the first time in the history of Newfoundland this Province now has a minority government. I assume that you were basing that on the fact that we received, and I am not absolutely certain that these figures are correct, but I believe that we received 46 per cent of the popular vote. Now I assume that you are basing your statement on that fact. Well if this be true, Sir, it necessarily follows that we have a minority Liberal Government in Ottawa because they received 43 per cent of the popular vote which is 3 per cent less than we did.

I suppose, Sir, it necessarily follows that you must be in a minority position yourself because I understand that you also received less than 50 per cent, as a matter of fact, I believe you received 40 per cent of the votes cast in the district of Twillingate.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this Fall budget, and I am not going to refer to it as a mini budget, is inflation. And when I think of the campaign that was waged at least in Trinity North, and if the same type of campaign was waged all across the Province by the Liberal and Reform Liberal parties, then I shudder to think what the results would have been had either one of them received a mandate from the people of the Province rather than us.



inflation, what is it? I do not pretend that I can describe it to any length. There are many causes, but in my own humble way I would describe it as, and if you do not mind I will read it, "an economic and social condition which exists because a demand for goods and services is greater than the supply."

And this leads me to the question, what were the plans of the Opposition to curb inflation? And going on from there I will take a look at the platform, or some of the points in their platform, during the last campaign. And one of the things that they stressed, they talked about, and no doubt they won votes on it, was the abolition of school taxes. I know it was used quite a bit in my district. It is sort of maddening, because - I will not suggest that they intentionally misled the people, but it was made to sound that the Tories, the dirty Tories who are responsible for school taxes in Newfoundland. And we have today, I believe these figures are correct, we have fourteen school tax authorities in this Province, eight of them were set up under the former Liberal Administration and six of them under this Administration. Now in my opinion this does not make the dirty Tories the fathers of school taxes.

Probably one of the worst things that we did was to agree with the fact that the people of St. John's should pay school taxes, and that included the business people of St. John's. Now I do not know of one single solitary soul in Trinity North who is mad with me because the people of Grand Falls, Corner Brook, St. John's or wherever have to pay school taxes. Now where was I?

AN HON. MEMBER: You were going nowhere.

MR. BRETT: That is all right. You do not have to listen you can go outside. There is lots of room.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I should point out to the hon. minister and to all hon. members that hon. gentleman are suppose to be referred to as the hon. member for this district or that district. It may seem like a minor rule or it may not, It is put there by people more learned and with more experience than I, and I think in fact it does have a very real purpose. So I would suggest to all hon. members that that form



address which in fact is required be used. The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question that I was going to ask, Sir, was where did the Opposition Party plan to get the \$11 million that we would no longer be collecting if we did away with school taxes? Of course the answer which the hon. Leader of the Opposition gave was that he would get it from general revenue. And what, Sir, may I ask, is general revenue, and from whence does it come? Does it come from taxes or does it not? I believe, Sir, I believe very strongly that anybody who listens to that nonsense, if I may call it so, realizes that if we were to do away with school taxes and if we did not put on some other tax, but if we took it from general revenue without increasing taxes, and if we were going to give the same level of service to school boards, then obviously that money had to come from some other department. And another question, would you take it from Health? Would you take it from Welfare? From whence would you get it?

MR. BRETT: I think, Sir, that every member of this House and I believe that the majority of the people of Newfoundland know that school boards are clamoring for more money, and I also believe, Sir, that everybody in this Province realizes that we are probably the only Province in Canada that does not have a school tax throughout the Province. In all the other provinces it may not be a school tax as such but it is a tax levied for the purpose of education.

Now this leads me to say something about school boards. In this time of restraint, cutbacks, I am going to make a few remarks at the risk of upsetting my colleague, the Minister of Education, and also some of my friends across the Province who are employed with school boards. I do believe that a lot of our school boards are living beyond their means. I believe that they, like many other segments of our society, have to stop and take a look at where they are going or, as the Premier said, where we are at.

I also believe, and certainly my hon. friend, the Minister of Education, is not going to appreciate this, that in some cases the administrators are most responsible than the school boards.

AN HON. MEMBER: What administration?

MR. BRETT: The administration of the school boards, the administrators I am sorry.

MR. HICKMAN: Superintendents.

MR. BRETT: Superintendents, exactly. I feel that I know whereof I speak in this particular field because I know that some of you are aware that I was one time a business administrator of a school board. It was the Bonavists - Trinity - Placentia Integrated School Board and I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that that board is, as far as I know, is one of the few in the Province that is still solvent.

For my point of view after working with them I believe that they went a little bit too far in centralization. From an administration point of view it was good, but there is one particular field that really used to irk me when I worked there and that was in the maintenance of the school boards. Now this particular board that I just mentioned has a very large geographical area. It is one of the largest in the Province. It

extends from Little Harbour East in Placentia Bay up to Swift Current and then follows the Trans Canada into Port Blandford and then Bonavista Bay, down to Bonavista and then the Trinity Bay coastline from Elliston right up to Sunnyside.

In that vast area, vast is a good word, we had two maintenance men who had to look after all the schools. This meant that if we had a window broken in a school in Swift Current, the maintenance man stationed at Clarendville had to get in his truck--this man was paid a good salary as well as mileage--and drive to Swift Current to replace a window. Now in my opinion this is not good administration somebody can ask the question, why did not somebody in Swift Current put in the window? And the answer is that the attitudes of the people seem to change, they say the government is paying for it, and they just did not want to do it.

Another thing, Sir, and I am talking about cutting back and I do not particularly want to jump on school boards, but the question of equipment was one that always irked me and it is something that I feel that probably our school board administrators should take a second look at, the demand for equipment and supplies. Supplies I do not mind too much, but equipment, you know, there was no way to satisfy it. And it seemed to me that if you - in some communities you had two schools, and if you gave an overhead projector to one, you automatically had to give it to the other one whether there was a need or not. And I know for a fact that there is equipment in schools around this Province that does absolutely nothing more than gather dust.

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps it is bad business management.

MR. BRETT: Is it bad business management and I feel that somebody should look into it. Of course, on the other hand there -

MR. HICKMAN: Your board was solvent.

MR. BRETT: My board was solvent. On the other hand, Sir, there are some - and again at the risk of raising the ire of some people - I do believe that we do have some staff in some of our school board offices that if they were paid for their production or what they produce, they would probably have to visit my department for a supplement. Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: Could you repeat that statement?

MR. BRETT: No, I do not care to. You should be listening. If you were listening -

Mr. Speaker, I note that the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), I believe, has a resolution on the Order Paper with regard to school taxes. I do not know if I have it here or not. Yes, it says Mr. Lush, Terra Nova, the hon. member for Terra Nova, to move:

WHEREAS the collection of school assessments have a default rate ranging from a minimum of 3% to a maximum of 73%;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

While the budget debate and the debate on the Address in Reply are very far-ranging topics, are understood to be debated, the rule of relevancy - and I am not now referring to the rule of relevancy - but there is a rule about the anticipation of matters on the Order Paper, and such a specific anticipation in terms of a specific resolution. I am not saying that the hon. member may or may not, that is not the point. I am not anticipating a point or making a judgement in anticipation.

The question is not whether he may or may not discuss school taxes. It is the specific reference to a resolution on the Order Paper and that specific reference would be anticipation of a matter which is on the Order Paper.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What I was going to say, Sir, is that I am sure that the hon. members knows as does everybody in this House of Assembly that the only monies that this government or any government has is what it collects in taxes, in our case, I suppose, what we can get from Ottawa and what we can borrow. So you can come up with all the fancy resolutions and make all the promises you like, Sir, but it boils down to one thing basically, that is the people of the Province must pay for education and other services. Directly or indirectly we have to get it out of the people. If you do not get it one way, then you have to get it another.

Speaking of inflation, Sir, this Province neither caused nor contributed to inflation, at least in my opinion. You know, it is a favourite pastime of some members of the Opposition to try to make people believe, you know, that it is the dirty Tories who are the cause of the increase in living in Newfoundland, in this Province. That is stupid in my opinion.

The first question that comes to mind is, what is their great leader, what is the Liberal Government in Ottawa doing about it? Now I grant you that some steps have been taken. But I cannot help remembering back to July, 1974 when the hon. the Prime Minister told the people of Canada, "Do not worry," he said, "Everything is all right. There is no need for wage and price control. We have wrestled inflation into the ground." In my opinion, he is not a very good wrestler. I would hate to see him take on Whipper Billy Watson. But, as I say, he told us there was absolutely no need to worry, and I might add that it is beautiful today to see him have to eat his words. But, I contend, Mr. Speaker, that he still has not gone far enough. He has not got the intestinal fortitude to go all the way and I believe that there are holes big enough in his guidelines to drive one of Jim Reid's D-8 tractors through.



MR. ROBERTS: Not quite.

MR. BRETT: Almost.

Now one of the hon. gentleman over there on the other side of the House wanted us to defer the regular business of the House a couple of days ago, and he wanted to discuss some of the labour problems that we are experiencing, particularly in our papermills. And I could not help but think, as I sat here, that I hope we are not, here in the Province, I hope we are not taking an example from the Government in Ottawa, because I wonder why have they not settled the postal strike. And again I hope that that is settled today or in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, they were going to curb inflation - or maybe I should say, were they going to curb inflation? What steps were they going to take? You talk about promises. Here are some of the things that they were going to do. They were going to pave all the gravel roads in this Province in three years. That is two years better than the dirty Tories, not bad. And they were going to put water and sewerage in every crook and inlet in the Province. I do not know what the time limit was on that. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if they realize the cost? Just to pave the roads alone at current prices would cost \$285 million. Now if you add the -

MR. HICKMAN: Per year.

MR. BRETT: Per year, right.

Now if you add the cost of water and sewerage -

MR. HICKMAN: What is it, \$285 million?

MR. BRETT: Two hundred and eighty-five million.

MR. HICKMAN: Per year?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no, no!

MR. BRETT: No, that is the total cost.

MR. MURPHY: Total cost of paving.

MR. BRETT: Yes, right, but at current prices.

MR. MURPHY: That is every main road now, I presume, eh?



MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BRETT: Now if you talk about the cost of water and sewerage then, of course, you are going to get, as one hon. gentleman used to say, not \$1 million, not \$2 million, not \$3 million, not \$4 million, not \$10 million, but you are going to be talking the billions. This is what they said, Sir. But just a few days ago, you know - and they do not seem to be very consistent - just a few days ago the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) presented a petition from a settlement in his district saying that they did not - and, of course, he supported the petition - saying that the people in this settlement did not agree with property taxes. Now I say, no taxes, no services. I mean it is quite that simple, you know, because -

MR. YOUNG: No tickee, no shirtee.

MR. BRETT: Yes, no tickee, no shirtee.

I wonder, Sir, when the politicians of this Province are going to have the guts to stand on their two feet and tell the people that if they want services, then they are going to have to pay for them, And this day is coming. We are going to have to do it. We are going to have to tell people the truth. You know, there is no way that this government or the Opposition, if they were in power, there is no way that we can continue to install, say, water and sewerage, for example, at current prices if the people of the Province are only prepared to pay rates of taxes that were established back in 1950.

Getting back to promises - Mr. Speaker, do you adjourn at 5:30 p.m.?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being five thirty and according to Standing Order (31), motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the Chair.

I recognize the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my remarks have to do with a question that I put to the hon. the Premier, I think it was on Tuesday, and my dissatisfaction with the answer that the hon. Premier gave me. Mr. Speaker, our Province is undoubtedly today in the gravest and most potentially disastrous period in its history. The disclosure, Sir, in Monday's budget speech that nearly 300,000 work days had been lost during the year to date as a result of legal, illegal strikes and lockouts must really shock, Sir, any thinking Newfoundland and any thinking member of this House, Sir, no matter if he sits on Your Honour's right or Your Honour's left. The whole situation, Mr. Speaker, would indicate that neither management nor labour either in the public sector or private sector in this Province truly appreciates the inescapable relationship between productivity in work and the high standard of living we presently enjoy and that which we have set our objectives for in the future, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, government at this moment and every member of this House of Assembly has a binding obligation to every man, woman and child in this Province to come up with a practical, workable, all-embracing plan to restore within our provincial boundaries that industrial relation sanity without which, Sir, we are all truly doomed and will have to depend forever, Mr. Speaker, on handouts from the so-called have provinces whose patience and tolerance, I might say, is gradually running out.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in expressing my dissatisfaction with the answer given me by the hon. the Premier on Tuesday when I inquired about government plans, what plans the administration had to reverse this desperate trend, I was not objecting, Sir, to the sincerity of the Premier's answer but solely, Mr. Speaker, to its failure to provide a reasonable working blueprint for the measures which he and his ministers envision to deal with this very complex, tantalizing and difficult situation. And I ask now, Mr. Speaker, for the

government, for the Premier if he is going to reply to my few brief remarks to disclose to all members of this hon. House and to the people of this Province the precise route the government will be following on the road map of recovery and improving industrial relations in this Province, improving the situation that seems to be deteriorating day by day between management and labour in this Province. And I hope that in his answer that the Premier or whoever answers for the Premier will not try to lay the blame on any particular group of individuals but will face up to the situation and admit man-fashion that all parties are to blame in this particular case and that we have to work out a master plan to deal with this situation. Sir, or I am afraid that we are all doomed, that we will not be able to enjoy the standard of living that we presently enjoy or the expectations and the objectives that we have set for the future.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, the government is very concerned with the problem which is raised by the hon. member. I think first in the time at my disposal I ought to say something about what the role of governments in our society has been traditionally in this matter of labour relations. In our society, which is enlightened compared with certain societies of the past, the role of government is not to be a slave driver or a taskmaster that forces both sides together except in extreme circumstances. The whole philosophy of collective bargaining has been that both sides sit down and they freely and openly negotiate with each other until agreement has been reached. The strike, as it has often been called, is the ultimate weapon in this, that if agreement cannot be reached and has not been reached the workmen, the union members, withdraw their services hoping to force a victory there. But I think we have to recognize that in the collective bargaining field once a strike is entered upon then there are two ways. One can either win or lose and both management and labour have to take that into consideration. And there have always been frictions in management and labour relations and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, there will always be. So that I think

in attempting to come to grips with this situation we have to recognize, and this is something perhaps we ought to recognize in Newfoundland in many ways, that it is not the role of government to impose solutions on everybody in all cases,

MR. WELLS: that if labour and management have essential problems in Newfoundland government cannot always, in fact no government, can usually come up with solutions which will make everybody happy. This is not the land of the Pharaohs, Mr. Speaker, and we are not dictators and government does not impose solutions on people who are each seeking to advance their legitimate aspirations. In the case of the working man it is an aspiration to earn a decent wage, or what he conceives to be a decent and adequate wage. In the case of the companies involved it is the aspiration to run on a proper basis, to make a profit for the investors and to have a decent balance sheet.

And I think the role of government is not to be a government of labour or a government of management and to come down on either side to the exclusion of the other and force settlements. But I think we have a duty to understand what has been happening in Newfoundland in recent months, Mr. Speaker, and what has been happening in Canada, and that is that the inflationary tendency, the extreme inflation under which we are suffering has pushed the demands of the unions and of the working man to the point where the companies that they are dealing with, and even governments, have found it impossible to accede to all the requests. There is just not the money in the treasury, in the case of the Province, for example.

And we heard in the Budget Speech the other day how the demands which the government is very sympathetic toward, the demands of public servants increased the amount that was required in public funds for this current fiscal year by \$20 million over what was budgeted for. And there comes a point both in the public and private sector when the money is just not there. And if business is going to survive, private businesses, Your Honour, they are going to have to have a balance sheet that is not in the red at the end of the year. They might stand it for one year, they might stand it for two years but the time will come when a business however large will go out of business if it does not stay in the black.

Now into this difficult situation we have another thing injected, Your Honour, and that is the Federal guidelines. Now I had the good fortune to attend the meeting yesterday in Ottawa in which this matter was discussed, and it has been far from worked out how this is going to operate, because



if by legislation and by agreement between the provinces the federal government imposes their formula of 8 per cent plus 2 per cent for productivity, and another 2 per cent in certain other cases, but says, as they are saying, as I understood them to say yesterday, "We are going to stand back from the collective bargaining process. We are going to let it take place and if a strike ensues, well then it ensues." How they are going to reconcile this with their guidelines, which in certain cases they want to have the force of law attached to, I do not know, because the guideline is going to be there. Obviously management, whether in the public or private sector is going to say, "There is the guideline. We are going to stick to it." And obviously then, it seems to me, that the union is going to go on strike, or the workers are going to go on strike. So that if you go part of the way, it seems to me, in trying to enforce a system you may have to go the whole way and say, "There shall be no strike." Because the Government of Canada, or the government of the province concerned if there is unanimity there, have imposed solutions on you.

So this is something that is far from worked out and this is something that is being imposed, as I see it, on the normal management or labour relations situation.

Insofar as this Province is concerned, Mr. Speaker, if I have a moment to wind up, we are absolutely concerned, our record is good in management-labour matters, we have insofar as the public service is concerned gone as far as a government could legitimately and decently go in wages and working conditions. Insofar as assistance to the private sector is concerned we have gone beyond the call of duty. We have been available as a government at all times, the Premier and any of his ministers, to do the necessary thing, to sit down to mediate, and this has been one of the hallmarks of this government.

Insofar as the future is concerned, once the federal guidelines have been established, and once it has been worked out between the federal government and this Province how it is going to go and route we are going to take, it is the intention of government to call a meeting or a series of meetings with both management and labour to go into this problem, to raise the question of productivity and the question of both legal and illegal



walkouts in an effort to arrive at a solution in line with the guidelines which will be present. This is our intention as soon as things have got to the stage where it is practicable, Mr. Speaker, to do so.

[The following text is extremely faint and largely illegible due to the quality of the scan. It appears to be a series of paragraphs or a long list of items, but the specific content cannot be discerned.]

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the question which I wish to raise is one which I addressed yesterday to the gentleman from Grand Bank, the Minister of Justice, and really there should not have been any need to raise this question under this procedure. I asked the minister quite simply, Mr. Speaker, I do not recall the exact words, but what I said was: Has the minister made representations to the Minister of Justice at Ottawa, the hon. Mr. Basford, or for that matter to his predecessor, the hon. Mr. Lang about the need, the necessity and the urgency of appointing the third Appellate Judge on the Supreme Court of Newfoundland? The minister gave us a very wordy reply, so wordy indeed that Your Honour was forced to call the minister to order, but the minister did not answer the question so I repeat it again now. All I want to know is whether or not the Minister of Justice of this Province has asked the Minister of Justice for Canada to proceed as quickly as possible with the appointment of the third judge? Or let me put it another way: Has the minister counselled, advised, suggested, recommended or requested any delay in the appointment of this judge? And when I say as quickly as possible, that appointment, Mr. Speaker, as we are all familiar, can be made instantly. A man could be telephoned by the Minister of Justice say on a Wednesday and on a Thursday he could be appointed. That has happened.

We now have in this Province five judges, the sixth, Mr. Justice Goodridge will shortly be sworn in. He is winding up his practice. We are entitled to a seventh. The Government of Canada, I believe, are willing to proceed with that appointment. The Law Society are anxious to have it made. The Supreme Court, the Chief Justice, the Right Honourable R. S. Furlong or the Honourable R. S. Furlong speaking on a motions day recently made it quite clear that the Appeals Court would not be hearing any appeals until the court was properly constituted, in other words, a third Appeal Judge was appointed. There are thirty or forty or fifty or sixty matters under appeal that cannot be heard. There is adequate office space. There are enough offices available for the judges.

They may or may not like the accommodation assigned to them. They may have to be shuffled about somewhat, but there are seven offices available for judges. But whether or not there are offices available at this moment, Mr. Speaker, is not the question. The question is: Can we get the appointment made? Is the minister pressing Ottawa to get it made? Is he on the phone, shall we say, to the minister or perhaps to the minister's special assistant in matters of judicial appointments, Mr. Ed Ratushny, a former law professor at the University of Windsor, I believe, in Ontario? Is this what the minister is doing or is he doing something else? That is what I want to know. When we know, Mr. Speaker, what the minister has done then we will know what further steps, if any, we should take. But we need that judge. The administration of Justice needs that judge. Ottawa must appoint. It is their prerogative. We do not need to be told that. Ottawa, I believe, will appoint. They have acted speedily before this. All I want to know is whether the Minister of Justice for this Province, the man responsible for the administration of Justice in this Province has been in communication with his counterpart in Ottawa, or somebody such as Mr. Ratushny, who acts for the minister and advises him on matters of judicial appointments? Mr. Ratushny has been in Newfoundland, has seen the minister, has seen members of the Law Society, the judges. He came last winter and spent some time with them, I believe. Has the minister urged the necessity for an immediate appointment? The question of space, Sir, is not a barrier, is not a bar. There is adequate space. And in any event from the time when a man is appointed to the bench and he takes up his judicial duties, normally a month or two must elapse, because, of course, the man has to wind up his practice and close out his affairs as a member of the bar preparatory to being sworn in as a member of the bench.

So that is my question, Sir. The minister was asked it clearly yesterday. He obfuscated, evaded, gave us a great plethora of words, but did not give the answer. So I ask him again now: Will the Minister of Justice tell this House whether he has urged the Minister of Justice at Ottawa to act speedily in the appointment of the seventh judge.

the third judge of the Appeal Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland? If he has not acted, does he intend to act and if so, when?

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

HON. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very, very attentively and with some degree of amazement to the comments of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I would have assumed the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a man learned in the law, an officer of the Supreme Court (by virtue of the fact that he is a member of the bar), a parliamentarian of some years experience, who boasts of the fact he has trod the corridors of power in Ottawa and that he knows his way around the corridors of power in Ottawa, would know by this time and know full well that it is not the place, it is not the right, it is not the prerogative of any provincial attorney general in Canada to advise the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada when a vacancy on a superior court, an appellate court or a district court or a county court in any Province should be filled. And it is not my prerogative to follow any other route. I am sure that the hon. Ron Basford would find any other suggestion most offensive.

May I say in passing the appointment of the hon. Mr. Basford to the portfolio, the recent appointment of Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada was unanimously welcomed by all ten provincial Attorney Generals. I said publicly a few weeks ago in St. John's his appointment, his appearance in our midst was like a breath of fresh air. He is not relying on his prerogatives under the British North America Act and he is not treating the ten provincial Attorney Generals as second class citizens but rather he has made it clear to us that in considering amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada, which we as provincial Attorney Generals must enforce, that in considering amendments to any of the federal statutes where he must then look to us for enforcement that he believes in the consultative process.

Insofar as the superior courts of this Province are concerned, firstly, for the record, may I say that it was my good fortune to occupy the portfolio of Attorney General of Newfoundland when this legislature restructured the courts for the first time in 150 years and provided for the position of a separate appellate court. There is no one, there is no



is no one, there is no man inside or outside of this House who is more anxious and has been more anxious than I have been to see our superior courts of this Province fully manned and operating in the kind of efficient and functional manner that litigants and prospective litigants in this Province are entitled to receive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I carried out my duty. I did my duty. Mr. Speaker, when once the act, our act was passed a year and a half ago so that there would be no delay on the part of the Province, but no delay, we provided the facilities for our new courts. The facilities were in place a good six months before the act was proclaimed. We have provided the staff, the posts for the staff, for the administrative posts within the new appellate court. I repeat we were subsequently advised after the court had been constituted and the act proclaimed that the new functional facilities that we had provided were not suitable to the appellate court but would be more suitable to the district courts in St. John's, who now occupy them. We are now in the process of providing, we are now in the process of providing these facilities, new facilities in the Union Bank Building, the former District Court Judge Building for the appellate courts.

May I say in reply to what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said: There are not, and I repeat, there are not seven offices suitable to accommodate superior court judges at this time. The chief justice of the appellate division is still occupying his old office which belongs to the chief justice of the trial division. The chief justice of the trial division is occupying the second office. Mr. Justice Noel occupies the third office. Mr. Justice Mahoney occupies the fourth and last and only office available in the Court House Building on Duckworth Street, St. John's. Mr. Justice Morgan of the Appellate Court is without an office. He hangs his hat in a courtroom that is used by one of the trial judges on occasion.

MR. HICKMAN: The offices in the former Daily News Building are occupied by His Honour, Judge Geoffrey L. Steele and His Honour, Judge Myles Murray. The offices that they used to occupy in the Union Bank Building and I hate to have to try and educate the hon. the Leader of the Opposition are presently full of carpenters and plumbers and electricians and everyone else trying to rectify, trying to change, trying to make these offices (as we will) suitable for the Appellate Court of Newfoundland, the highest court in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has exhausted his time as well as the House. But I for one would give him unanimous consent to allow him to carry on if he would consent to answer the question which I asked him.

MR. WELLS: To that point of order. I think the position has now arrived in the proceedings when Your Honour proceeds to adjourn the House until tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Those in favour "aye", contrary "nay". I believe the "ayes" have it. This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 p.m.

On motion House adjourned until tomorrow Friday, November 28 at 3:00 p.m.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

NOVEMBER 28, 1975.

Rev 27/75

NOV 24 1975

Answer to Question 585

Order Paper 1/75

November 24th, 1975

N11

CONTENTS

November 27, 1975	Page
<u>Statements by Ministers</u>	
Mr. Peckford announced the dismissal from office of the four members of the Rural District Council of Halfway Point-Benoit's Cove-John's Beach-Frenchman's Cove.	279
Mr. Rousseau announced that the blockade of a forest access road in the Conne River area had been lifted and studies launched to find a solution to problems facing forest industries in the area.	280
Spoken to by Mr. Simmons.	282
Mr. Speaker ruled that the Leader of the Opposition, the leaders of recognized groups or their representatives can ask for explanations and make brief remarks.	282
Mr. Simmons	282
<u>Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees</u>	
Mr. H. Collins tabled the annual report of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission for the year ending May 31, 1975.	286
<u>Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given</u>	
Mr. Moores responded to the question asked previously by Mr. Strachan concerning the supply of electrical power to Williams Harbour.	286
Mr. House responded to the question asked previously by Mr. Neary concerning the extended day policy in vocational schools.	286
Mr. Morgan responded to the question asked previously by Mr. Rowe concerning the Custer's Head Road.	286
Mr. Carter responded to the question asked previously by Mr. Strachan concerning ownership of certain fishing facilities at Fox Harbour.	286
Mr. Brett responded to the question raised previously by Mr. Neary concerning the payment of a grant to needy blind people.	287
<u>Oral Questions</u>	
Life span of the Buchans mines. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	287
Names of the persons dismissed from a Rural District Council. Mr. White, Mr. Peckford.	287
Further action contemplated. Mr. White, Mr. Peckford.	288
Possibility of civil action. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Peckford.	289
Government policy for paying social assistance to the families of workers on strike. Mr. Neary, Mr. Brett.	289
Reconciliation of that policy with that that proof of need is all required to obtain welfare. Mr. Flight, Mr. Brett.	290
Atlantic Provinces AGs meeting to discuss renewal of RCMP contract. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	290
Protest to Ottawa concerning lack of location of an office of the Anti-Inflation Review Board in the Province. Mr. White, Premier Moores.	290
Date for opening of the Carbonear Hospital. Mr. R. Moores, Mr. H. Collins.	291



CONTENTS - 2

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Pumps and well houses. Mr. Hodder, Mr. Peckford.	292
List of wells drilled etc. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Peckford.	292
Drilling of artesian wells in the next financial year. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Peckford.	293
Snowmobile regulations. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	293
List of all contracts awarded for road paving terminated because of weather conditions. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Morgan.	295
Legalization of denturists. Mr. Neary, Mr. H. Collins.	296
Labrador Coastal Development Corp. Mr. Strachan, Mr. Lundrigan.	296
Contracts for the Lower Churchill project. Mr. Lush, Mr. Crosbie.	296
Convictions under the Companies Act. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	296
Contract for the McCallum-Gaultois-Hermitage ferry service. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Morgan.	296
Specifications for the service. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Morgan.	298
Cable television. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	299
Labrador Coastal Development Corporation legislation. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Lundrigan.	299
Lloyd's River diversion. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	299
Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation. Mr. Roberts, Premier Moores.	300
Report of the study being made on the department. Mr. Roberts, Premier Moores.	301
List sought of Rural Development loans. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	301
High drug prices. Mr. Neary, Mr. H. Collins.	301
Carbonear by-pass road. Mr. R. Moores, Mr. Morgan.	302
Second residence for the Regional College in Corner Brook. Mr. Neary, Dr. Farrell.	302
Snow clearing in the St. Lunaire area. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan.	302
Tenders for brush clearing for the transmission line from Churchill Falls to Goose Bay. Mr. Lush, Mr. Crosbie.	303

Orders of the Day

Budget Debate

Mr. Neary (continued)	304
Mr. Brett	336
(Adjourned the debate)	346

Debate on the Adjournment

Increased productivity and work stoppages.

Mr. Neary	347
Mr. Wells	348

Orders of the Day (continued)

Page

Appointment of a third Appellate judge.

Mr. Roberts  
Mr. Hickman

353  
356

Adjournment

358