

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1978

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank Your

Honour for recognizing me. I am rising on an urgent matter, Sir, involving a breach of the privilege of this hon. House. I might say for the benefit of the House that I am raising it at the earliest opportunity. I did do Your Honour the courtesy of calling on Your Honour yesterday afternoon to let Your Honour know that I intended to raise this matter at the earliest possible moment and this is the earliest possible moment because Your Honour was not in the Chair yesterday all day, we were in Committee of the Whole on Supply.

The matter, Mr. Speaker, involves statements, innuendoes and insinuations made on Thursday night past by the hon. the Premier when we were in Committee of the Whole and we were debating the estimates of the Premier's Department, Executive Council.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, made statements involving the cost of the Opposition's telephone bills and singled out the cost of my telephone bill without tabling the information in connection with other members' telephone bills. Now I did not mind that, Mr. Speaker, because I am quite prepared to have my telephone bills laid on the Table of the House. I am quite prepared to do that, Sir, and I hope that all other hon. members, including ministers, are prepared to do the same thing. But that is not the main point at all, Sir. The main point is that the Premier in making these allegations and these statements and these innuendoes has really opened up a can of worms.

The first question, Sir, that we have to ask as members of this House; what about,

MR. NEARY: now, confidentiality?
Mr. Speaker, are members telephone bills being tampered with? Is there any such thing now as confidentiality? Can, for instance, a person outside of this House who wants to call a member of the House collect, can he do so and give him a tip on whether it be a scandal or whether it be bits and pieces of information and what have you? Can he call a member of this House knowing that the information is going to be treated as confidential? Or can the Premier send one of his staff down to the Department of Public Works any time he feels like it to find out who has been calling members of this House or who members of this House, indeed, have been calling?

MR. MORGAN: Why not?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MORGAN: The taxpayers are paying for it, everybody should know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I should like to point out that when a matter of privilege comes up there is an extra responsibility - if one wants to put it that way - on the Chair to maintain order, because nobody can intervene. I cannot hear a point of order and I think, also, there is an extra incumbence on the hon. member making the point of privilege not to enter into debate but to state clearly his submission of a breach of privilege, but that everybody should avoid debate.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.
As a matter of fact, Your Honour, the member who just spoke put his finger on a very significant aspect of this whole serious situation that has developed. The hon. gentleman said, Well, why do the taxpayers not have a right to know? The problem is that the taxpayers do

MR. NEARY: not know, It is the Premier who has sent, through his minister - and I do not know which minister it was, whether it was the Minister of Manpower or whether it was the present Minister of Industrial Development - the Premier asked the minister to get this information from the Department of Public Works.

Now, Sir, here is what has happened, Mr. Speaker - to answer my hon. friend - this is a very serious violation of the security regulations of the Newfoundland Telephone Company inasmuch as no member of this House, no person in this Province, nobody but nobody on the face of this earth has the right to tamper with members' telephone bills, to ask for information about -

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - bills, Mr. Speaker. They have no right, nobody but nobody unless, Mr. Speaker, they have a search warrant issued by the court of this Province under the Newfoundland Telephone regulations nobody but nobody including the Premier of this Province has a right to inspect, to tamper with or to give out information on member's telephone bills. It is a very serious breach of trust and it is a violation of the security regulations of the Newfoundland Telephone Company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these Nixon-like tactics have undermined the

MR. NEARY: immunity of the members of this Legislature, Sir, and Mr. Speaker, they have served, Sir, to intimidate members of this House in the carrying out of their duties and their responsibilities on behalf of their constituents and on behalf of the people of this Province.

Now Your Honour has to remember the context in which these statements were made by the hon. the Premier. First of all, Sir, it was the Minister of Transportation and Communications, who, through innuendo, suggested that there was something wrong with the members' telephone bills. And then about ten or fifteen minutes later, the Premier let it slip out in a rage, described in the press, Mr. Speaker, here is the context, the scenario, described in the press as getting redder and redder and getting madder and madder at the Opposition, especially at me, who was the one who was cross-examining the Premier at that time.

So, Sir, it was done in a rage and it was done deliberately. And now, Sir, Your Honour knows that one of the most serious breaches of privilege of this House is intimidating members. That is the most serious breach of privilege that any member of this house can commit. I would submit, Sir, that the hon. the Premier has breached the privilege of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is, how far can the Premier go in these Nixon-like tactics by sending for information to the Department of Public Works?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: How far has the Premier gone?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think I understand the gist and, indeed, not only the generality but the particulars of the hon. gentleman's submission on privilege, and I would remind him that he must refrain from debate. If there are any further remarks germane and immediately irrelevant to the matter of privilege I will hear them, but I would not be able to hear any debate on the matter.

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Your Honour. Well the question arises - there are three real key questions that arise here, Sir. First of all, in presenting this information to the House I think the Premier should be made to tell the House what was the motive behind it, why my telephone bill was singled out over and above other members, that is the first thing. And the second thing in conjunction with that question, is it permissible for the Premier, why did not Your Honour be asked to send for the cost of the members' telephone bills? Why would not the Auditor General be asked? Why should the Premier do this, Sir? And, Mr. Speaker, I might point out for the benefit of hon. members of the House, that I tried to get the same information this morning and was refused as a member of this hon. House, was refused. Why does the Premier have the distinct honour and privilege of being able to send to the Department of Public Works for certain information in connection with the Opposition telephone bills, that the Opposition themselves, including the Leader of the Opposition, cannot have. Why, if this information has to be made available and should be made available and should be laid on the table of the House, why is it not done for every member and why is it not done through Your Honour or through the Auditor General? Why does the Premier have to send a messenger from his office to the Department of Public Works to get this information? And, Mr. Speaker, how far, then, can the hon. Premier go with this information? Is the Premier, for instance, or anybody from his office, permitted to tamper with MHA's phone bills without a search warrant? Can they go over and look over, for instance, see who is calling my friend the Leader of the Opposition and who the Leader of the Opposition is calling? And can they go down in members offices down on the fifth floor, if they can do this with telephone calls why can they not do it with the files of members by asking the security to go down in the Opposition office and rifle the filing cabinets of the members? Is this not the same principle, Mr. Speaker?

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1133

MM-3

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I do not think that I am thoroughly familiar with the point raised by the hon. gentleman, and unless there is a very relevant and brief remark I would consider further participation to be debate.

MR. NEARY:

Well, the other brief remark that I want to make, Your Honour - I am not finished with my prima facie case - but can telephones be monitored on instructions from the Premier? This is another matter.

So the

Mr. Neary: three questions, Sir, are first of all, can the Premier or should the Premier be the one to give out any information in connection with members' telephone bills? How far can the Premier go in examining the telephone bills of hon. members? And how far has the Premier gone, which is probably more important, and can telephones be monitored on instructions from the Premier? Mr. Speaker -

MR. NOLAN: Is the Telephone Company involved or -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works merely acts as an agent. Mr. Speaker, I have my credit card here in front of me, and this is very, very important, Your Honour. My credit card, and incidentally I do not use a credit card; I have only used it about a half a dozen times since I have had it, and the hon. the Premier said the other day that I had \$5,700 worth of phone calls on my credit card, which is not true, Your Honour, because I only used the credit card maybe six or eight or ten times in my life. But the credit card is issued in my name, Sir, Stephen A. Neary, MHA, the same as every other member's credit card is issued. This credit card, Sir, - I am the customer of the Newfoundland Telephone Company, the Department of Public Works is merely the agency under which the bills are paid. And before any information can be released on my telephone calls it has to be done with my approval or on a search warrant from the court. Every month, Sir, I have to authorize approval of my telephone bill.

So, Sir, I would submit that this is a very, very serious and grave matter, and breaches the privileges of this House. It is one of the most serious breaches of privilege, Sir, ever brought before this House. The matter has to be dealt with swiftly, as quickly as possible, Your Honour. Members have to be reassured that the hon. the Premier has not in the past or will in the future go and tamper with the telephone bills or the files belonging to members in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am not red nor am I mad this afternoon. I would just like to say I have not heard such garbage in my life, but that is beside the point. I will talk about the point of privilege as I see it. First of all, the reason it came up in the House was someone said, Well, what are the figures? And we found out. And that, Sir, I might say as far as I am concerned is not a matter of intimidation. It is not a matter of confidentiality. It is not a matter of question of the member's immunity. It is a fact that when telephone bills are charged by government members or Opposition members the fact is they are a cost to the taxpayer of this Province, and anything that is a cost to the taxpayer in our opinion, should be public knowledge whether it be the Opposition or the government.

The fact is, Sir, that the cost of the Opposition's telephone bills which I will table now, the fact is that -

MR. NEARY: Table them all if you are going to table them.

PREMIER MOORES: Oh, I will table them, sure, but you asked for the information. You were here the other night when I was asked for this information, and you will get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: But I think, Sir, probably the way to overcome this in the future is not to have unlimited charging of telephone by members but rather the Opposition and government members have a set vote so they have to operate within that vote based on opposition costs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: Now, Sir, the fact is, the fact that an MHA has the right to have his own telephone bills and his own cost, he has it, Sir, if he is paying for it; he does not have any right to his bill or his cost if he is a member of this House of Assembly and being paid for by the taxpayers of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: If he wants his home bill to be charged, of course. No one is talking about tampering with the telephones. No one is talking about what is being said or who it is being said to, but as long as the

Premier Moores: people of Newfoundland are paying for the members' bill, whether it be the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) or anywhere else, the people of Newfoundland will know how much that is costing them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that when I said the member for LaPoile had first place, the credit card number is 0180352, the amount is \$5,656.45, that is the allocation that was given by the department and the Telephone Company, if that is wrong the hon. member can find out where it was wrong, and find out what the situation is.

MR. NEARY: I cannot get it! They will not give it to me!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: But in the meantime, Sir, I have much pleasure in tabling the amount of \$128,000, \$103,000 by the Opposition office the rest are broken down in amounts, I am sure, in the Opposition Office as in the government office. There are a great many members who use it where it is not associated with their particular names, As the hon. member said himself the other day the average of the Opposition is \$6,500. This one in fact is \$5,800.

The fact is, Sir, that, as I said before, it is government's responsibility when public funds are being spent to say where they are being spent, we are not tampering with the telephone conversation. We are not tampering with whom the hon. member is calling, but I think, Sir, it is the public's duty to know how much is being spent by hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter not to be dismissed in a cavalier manner as the hon. the Premier has tried to do. First of all, Sir, nobody on this side of the House, and I would assume nobody in the House, objects to the public knowing how much telephone calls are costing the government on account of either the Opposition or the government backbenchers or the government themselves, as long, Sir, as that information is made public in a general sort of way. And if one man is singled out and threatened, as the Premier did the other night, then every member of this House, Sir, should have that made public including the ministers of the government, point number one. The idea of the Premier of this Province in a gangster-like fashion standing up in this House -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the Leader of the Opposition, and to the entire House, that submissions have to be on the point of question with respect to whether or not there was a breach of privilege and not debate.

MR. W. ROWE: I am trying to make the point, Sir, that there was a breach of privilege. The Premier standing up and in a manner which can only be characterized as intimidating, threatening a member of this House with exposure of his telephone bill or anything else that has gone on, Sir, and singling him out and not providing the information as it applies to other members of this House is a very dangerous, intimidating thing to be doing, that is the first point I want to make. The second point is this, Sir; the Premier by opening up this whole question has now raised many serious questions about how confidential, as my hon. friend has said. Members' phone calls are. Can the Premier order the Department of Public Works, or whoever is in charge of paying these bills, to bring up to his office the phone numbers which have been called by me as a member of this House? No if I have accepted a collect call from my district or from elsewhere in this Province, and therefore the number may appear on the bill, does the

MR. W. ROWE: Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, know that number, the number I have called or the number that I have received as a collect call? Does he know that? Is that information available to him?

MR. SIMMONS: He said the other night he had it.

MR. W. ROWE: Can he determine from that, Mr. Speaker, who I have been speaking to. He may not know the content of the conversation, although, Sir, from what has been said here in the House already, I would not doubt it or would not put it past certain members. Does he know whom I have been talking to or who has been talking to me, which is a piece of information that many people in this Province, operating under these partisan political times we are in, Sir, may want to keep secret and confidential. And maybe that phone call would not have been made at all to me had they known that the Premier can go down to the Department of Public Works and dig up this information, which is not available to me, Mr. Speaker, it is not available to my hon. friend the Opposition House Leader, because he put the question to the test today and asked for the information and it was not available to him. And it would not be available, I would warrant, Sir, if I called up ten minutes from now the Department of Public Works, which I intend to do, and ask for the bills for the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) district, I doubt, Sir, whether that information will be given to me but apparently it can be given to the Premier or perhaps some of the ministers in this government which, Sir, is a clear breach of the privileges of this House and myself as a member and particularly my hon. colleague who raised the matter because he was singled out. It is a serious matter, Sir, involving the possibility of intimidation of myself as a member and every other member on this side of the House.

Now, Sir, the question raised by my hon. friend may even go further and this is why the matter has to be looked into in my estimation.

MR. NEARY: Investigated.

MR. W. ROWE: Investigated. I do not know, Sir, -

MR. NEARY: And charges laid, Sir, if necessary.

MR. W. ROWE: I do not know, Sir, whether in fact there have been breaches of the law or regulations by this government in the relationship with the Newfoundland Telephone Company. How much information does the Premier get or how much is he entitled to because he can use his clout and his power and his office ruthlessly as Premier of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out that the hon. gentleman obviously may make submissions with respect to the point of privilege. To the best of my knowledge he has covered the main areas and

April 18, 1978

Tape 1136

EC - 1

MR. SPEAKER: I do require him to avoid debate.

MR. W. N. ROWE: One other point, Sir, and then I will resume my seat.

The Premier should realize and we, as all members of the House, should realize, Mr. Speaker, that by this kind of a tactic, this intimidating tactic, it may have the effect of causing people who may want to call me up as Leader of the Opposition, or one of my colleagues, to give us a piece of information - I get collect calls all the time, Sir, concerning Exon House. and people who have information they want to pass on to me legitimately and in good faith because they are concerned about that institution and how it was operated. If those people, Sir, thought for one minute that the hon. the Premier or any member of the government could trace where that telephone call came from and perhaps take repressive action against that person in some way, Sir, that would be a clear violation. And apparently, Sir, if this can happen it would be a clear violation of my privileges as a member of the House of Assembly and certainly, Sir, it would be clearly against the public interest where there has to be free access to members of this House by all members of the public, bearing in mind, Sir, as is clearly stated in Beauchesne, that I am not only the member for Twillingate district; my hon. friend is not only the member for LaPoile district; once we take our seats in this House we represent every person in this Province - each of us does, Mr. Speaker - and therefore are entitled to access to the people and from the people in a confidential, trustworthy manner, not to be threatened or intimidated by the Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Government
House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I realize that
debate on a question of privilege is very restricted and
very limited to a minimum number of hon. members, as Your
Honour has ruled, and that the constraints on debate make
it sometimes difficult to deal with a question of
privilege. But let me repeat two or three things for the
benefit of the House.

Yesterday, that same question
was raised in the House either in a question of privilege
or a point of order and ruled out of order by either the
Chairman of Committees or Mr. Speaker, I have forgotten
whom. Consequently, a second raising of the question of
privilege is not in order, if indeed it is a question of
privilege.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us deal
if I may very briefly with the question of privilege.
The hon. the Premier has said very clearly and very
distinctly, and it must be known to anyone with even a
grain of sense that having the total bill broken down on
an individual basis for hon. members' telephone calls
that are paid for by the taxpayers of this Province cannot
and does not in any way interfere with the secrecy of those
using the telephone bill. There is no suggestion by any
hon. member, and the hon. the Premier has said that he has
not, nor has he directed, that there has been anyone
listening in or the slightest bit concerned as to who calls
any hon. member or whom the hon. member calls. Secondly,
Mr. Speaker, to suggest as the hon. the Leader of the
Opposition did - and I try not to get into debate - that
if someone called to give him some particular information

MR. HICKMAN: about Exon House, that by asking or tracing the caller that one would know who called, well, you know, take it to its logical conclusion that one would first have to know that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition received a telephone call about Exon House before you could trace it; otherwise, what calls could be traced or how many would have to be traced.

PREMIER MOORES: No one is tracing it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: How many people would be half-witted enough to advance that kind of an argument.

PREMIER MOORES: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HICKMAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that simply bringing before the Committee, when one is dealing with the cost of operating this Legislature, the amount that is charged for telephone bills to hon. members or to the Opposition Office constitutes intimidation is crazy in the last degree and is not worthy of rebuttal, it is not worthy of dealing with, it does not fall into the category of intimidation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: And the third, Mr. Speaker - and I do believe that I am restraining from debating the issue and consequently I am entitled to the same silence that Your Honour has so properly imposed upon this House on matters of privilege - the third point that was raised as a matter of privilege is that it is a breach of the security of the regulations of the telephone company.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, I hope that we have not reached the stage in this House where the Legislature of Newfoundland is bound or governed by any regulations that

April 18, 1978

Tape 1136

EC - 4

MR. HICKMAN: a telephone company may seek
to impose upon itself.

MR. NEARY: They are bound by law.

MR. HICKMAN: Let me say, Mr. Speaker,
the only -

AN HON. MEMBER: By law!

MR. HICKMAN: That is right, Mr. Speaker,
and I do not need a lecture on that.

MR. HICKMAN: The law is very clear and unambiguous that if anyone wants to listen in to a wiretap there is a procedure which can be followed and that is the only procedure that is ever followed in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Not so with the hon. the Premier.

MR. HICKMAN: So, Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER MOORES: Definitely untrue.

MR. HICKMAN: If it is not true and if any hon. member knows that it is not true, and knows of a wiretap -

PREMIER MOORES: That is right.

MR. HICKMAN: - and does not disclose it to the police, then that member is concealing a crime and should posthaste -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Should posthaste -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: - should posthaste go and tell the police that they know about this nefarious deed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: Go on! Have a bit of sense.

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

I must ask hon. members not to interject.

MR. HICKMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, the only issues that are before the Chair today on the second attempt to raise this point of non-privilege - and it is not a privilege - is, number one, whether the tabling of in this House, or disclosing to the Committee of Supply in this House, the cost of telephone bills constitutes intimidation of the members. Most assuredly not. And in order to constitute a breach of privilege, and in order to constitute intimidation it has to be proven, not beyond

MR. HICKMAN: all reasonable doubt, but it certainly has to be proven. Innuendoes, what someone may read into it, depends upon the mind of the hearer and not upon the mind of the person who is giving it. There has to be some indication of motive and most assuredly the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who raised the point of privilege and presented it did not discharge that onus that is imposed upon him, the very strict rules when one deals with privilege as opposed to points of order. That is number two. Number one, was already dealt with, number two, that it is not intimidation.

Thirdly, the point that it offends some alleged rules, that we do not have before us, of the Newfoundland Telephone Company speaks for itself and I will not pursue that any further.

Fourthly, the comments in debate made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition about the singling out and threatening and intimidating of a particular member, Mr. Speaker, anyone who was present here and simply saw this information being tabled, which is the prerogative of any minister to do, he does not have to wait until he has been asked if it deals with the item before the Committee, and if it deals with the cost and the expenditure of government, then any hon. minister has the right, if he thinks it is in the interest of the Committee, to table it. He also has the prerogative not to table it.

One day ministers are being criticized for not tabling all the information; today one minister, namely the Hon. the Premier, is being criticized because he tabled a bit of information that was obviously relevant to the discussions of the Committee and relevant to the cost of operating the

MR. HICKMAN: government and the supply that is being sought by the government.

Most assuredly, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of privilege, it is not even a point of order, it is a fact that has come out. If hon. gentlemen are going to raise points of privilege every time a bit of information comes out that they think is embarrassing, we will do nothing but deal with points of non-privilege within this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I point out to hon. members that I have heard the hon. gentleman who raised the point of privilege at some length, and the immediate reply by the hon. the Premier at some length, and then one from each side, again at some length - the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Government House Leader. I will hear some further submissions, not necessarily as long as hon. members wish to make them, I will hear some further ones but on these additional ones I would point out that many matters have been covered, and repeating matters already covered is of no benefit to the Chair and perhaps to anyone else, I do not know. It is certainly of no benefit to the Chair, so I ask hon. members now after we have heard four submissions in quite some detail to strictly confine their remarks to pertinent material and hopefully new or additional and not repetition. I will hear the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir followed by the hon. gentleman for St. John's East, and judge after that whether it will be necessary to hear anyone else.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the House because this matter, I believe, is quite a grave issue. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. SIMONS: there is certainly intimidation here. I feel it. I am not at all embarrassed by anything that has been tabled. That is not the issue, Mr. Chairman. But I am intimidated by the possibilities. The Premier has not yet said, and perhaps the question could be put to him eventually, as to whether he saw anything except the totals.

Now if we check the transcripts of the other night when he was allegedly speaking about Special Action Group and what this has to do with the Special Action Group I do not know, but the Minister of Justice suggests it does - but Mr. Speaker, if you check the transcripts of the other night when the Premier was making reference to this point, I think he inferred at that time that he had substantially more information than the totals. If it were only the totals I would not be particularly upset about the issue. And perhaps in time he can answer the question, indeed, whether he has had access to more information. And if he has had, Mr. Speaker, if he has had one telephone number, one only, if he has only had one telephone number from which a call originated to me, irrespective of the matter - I know the telephone bill does not cite any precise of the telephone conversation but it does tell the originating number, Mr. Speaker - and if he has one number then that alone is grounds for intimidation. That alone suggests that he has information which could seek to intimidate me or intimidate those who would call me about an issue.

The Leader of the Opposition has covered this matter fairly well so I will not go over it except to say that I certainly share the concern that there is the possibility here of intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, what the Premier has tabled today re-enforces our concern about possible intimidation. He has not,

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, tabled the costs of telephones for each member of the House of Assembly. He has not done that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) you all.

MR. RIDEOUT: Including the minister.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I checked with the table in the last two or three minutes and they had one document. Does the table have a second document since -

AN HON. MEMBER: No. No.

MR. SIMONS: - containing all the members of the government side of the House?

MR. NOLAN: Not the ministers' though.

MR. SIMONS: Not the ministers'.

MR. NOLAN: Not the ministers' and not the Premier's.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out that the hon. gentleman is repeating submissions which have already been made, and I did point out at the beginning, after heard two from each side at some length, that it would be improper for me to allow repetition of the previous submissions. So I point this out to the hon. gentleman and ask him to conclude his remarks.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the information for each of the members, and that includes Cabinet Ministers insofar as their district responsibilities are concerned, and until you have that you cannot do any fair comparison. I submit, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion that this was done for one reason, very clear to me, it was done to intimidate. It served that purpose and I think the Premier needs to be disciplined accordingly for doing it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words, not on the emotional issues that have occurred - and perhaps this maybe should arise immediately afterwards as a separate point of privilege - but I think perhaps it should be considered together. I want to voice

MR. MARSHALL: the objection over the continuance of raising points of privilege in this House from time to time without grounding it on the basis of any authority or any authoritative quotations from Beauchesne, from the Standing Orders, or from May or what have you. All it does, and all it has done, is really served to disrupt the business of the proceedings of the House.

Now I have not heard Beauchesne quoted but I could draw Your Honour's attention to just a couple of passages in it. First of all, "A question of privilege ought rarely to up in Parliament." It seems to come up here quite frequently. This is paragraph 113, Your Honour; it goes on to say: "But a dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of privilege." It goes on in Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, paragraph 105, coming back to paragraph 106, to say, "Although either House may expound the law of Parliament, and indicate its own privileges, it is agreed that no new privileges can be created." And there is

MR. W. MARSHALL: set forth in the ensuing paragraphs, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112 and so on, exact and precise definitions of what constitute points of privilege and what do not constitute point of privileges. Now all we are getting from the points of privileges that have been raised, no matter how aggrieved hon. members may feel from time to time, is just getting up and making blanket statements that privileges have been infringed without any substantiation whatsoever. I feel that this is a wrong practice and can only lead to: and is in fact leading, to disruption in the House. Now there is one other quotation, if I could find it here, that I would like to draw to Your Honor's attention before I sit down: "A matter of privilege also must be one which has recently arisen involving the privileges of the House and in calling forth its immediate interposition." Now this matter arose, Mr. Speaker, either yesterday or the day before, I do not know, and it was somebody rose on it at that point of time. Now my point that I am making is that this is a book that we have, here are the Standing Orders which we have, May which we have, we hear points of order and points of privilege as have occurred here, no matter how aggrieved hon. members may feel from time to time, without going back to authorities, without quoting the reasons for it, and this can only lead and is in fact contributing greatly and immensely to the disruption and the disgrace to which this House has descended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear one further gentleman from each side. I say that so that if hon. members wish they agree among themselves whom it will be, and if they do not then obviously I exercise my prerogative.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House when situation arose the other evening as the Premier, who is always in the House, was very quick to point out earlier this afternoon. This is one thing that really bothers me and I am sure it must concern the Premier.

MR. J. NOLAN: For example, the hon. the Premier is a gentleman who spent some time in the House of Commons, as did the Minister of Fisheries. I am subject to correction whether this matter ever arose at that time in connection with phone bills for any member of the House on either side, whether it was PC, NDP, Liberal, Social Credit or whatever. Has this ever come up in any parliament anywhere at any time? And not only that, I am sure that the hon. the Premier, if he is so interested in digging out information, would want it to be accurate. For example, let me say that in my own case, where I am now listed and I suppose I will be reported by the press as having spent \$36.43 on long distance calls, that is inaccurate. I spent more than that.

MR. MORGAN: You are not doing very much.

MR. J. NOLAN: And so did many other members. For example, I noticed my friend from Burgeo has not got a cent charged to his name

MR. MORGAN: They do not phone for him.

MR. J. NOLAN: All I know is it may be charged to the - it was charged to the Opposition office.

MR. SIMMONS: I did not use my credit card.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, could I please have silence?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will ask the hon. gentleman to continue relevant to this point.

MR. J. NOLAN: I am not interested in getting involved in a name-calling, cat-calling debate on this thing.

MR. J. MORGAN: Your colleagues.

MR. J. NOLAN: Now look if the Bonavista Barbie Doll wants to keep it up, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to do so but I want silence.

MR. MORGAN: Come on, Dancing Dollars!

MR. RIDEOUT: Name him, name him! Get clear of him!
Name him!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask no further interruptions.

The hon. gentleman to my right to continue, pointing out the stricture I made a few minutes ago. Then I said I would hear one further hon. gentleman to my left if in fact one wished to, I would not insist anybody else speak, and that would be it.

MR. J. NOLAN:

Mr. Speaker, again now that we have a list of the Opposition members, and I notice not the Cabinet ministers and not the Premier, we do not have their telephone bills, I can only assume that perhaps all of this came up in a moment of real anger the other night and maybe that is why it came about. Perhaps under the Financial Administration Act and so on there may be very, very good reason why this should go through Public Works or the Department of Finance but it seems to me that—and I am not going to say, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to insist in any way that the Premier is interested in intimidation or using confidential information to intimidate members and so on. As a matter of fact, if any other member, perhaps, or lots of other members had brought this point up I perhaps could understand it. I cannot

Mr. Nolan: members and so on. As a matter of fact, if any other member, perhaps, or lots of other members, had brought this point up I perhaps could understand it, I cannot understand the Premier doing it, knowing him as I do. That is the one thing that bothers me about this thing.

But the fact is that here we now have a situation where, whether it is right or wrong, there are people in this Province who may want to call the hon. the Premier tomorrow who may be reluctant to do so because of the fact that they now have this doubt instilled in their mind out of the debate that has come from this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have a couple of things that we have to examine here. One is there any possibility of this matter being handled in future, although perhaps the damage has been done, through the Internal Economy Commission and therefore under the aegis of the hon. the Speaker, whom I would suggest none of us would question, obviously we have elected him to this position. The second matter is this; I do not know exactly what transpired, whether the Premier himself went down to the Minister of Public Works; whether the Minister of Public Works, whoever it was at the time, went to the Premier; whether it was the Premier's Executive Assistant who went down and demanded certain information, whether there were calls to the Telephone Company. The telephone company is on trial here, Mr. Speaker. And I suggest it is the business of this House to find out if the telephone company was involved in any way in providing information that they had no business doing, giving to the hon. the Premier or to the member of Conception Bay South or anyone else, if it is a confidential matter. They operate in a monopolistic situation in this Province, and they above all others must show beyond a shadow of a doubt that they can honour the trust that has been placed in them.

Now surely this matter is a most distasteful one. I do not know what prompted the hon. the Premier to do it, frankly. I do

MR. NOLAN: not know. I do not know.

PREMIER MOORES: Oh, oh! Someone over there asked me in Committee.

MR. NEARY: No, no, no, no.

MR. LUSH: - to discredit members.

MR. NEARY: It was the Minister of Transportation and Communications who raised it in the first place and then the Premier, in a rage, threw it down on the table of the House.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We are really getting into -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We are getting into a quite peripheral matters now. I would ask -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. member for Conception Bay South to conclude his remarks.

MR. NOLAN: Well, I only want to say that for me as a member of the House of Assembly that this is a most unfortunate day. And I believe that all hon. members, if they will put aside for a moment their blatant partisanship which we are guilty of from time to time, that this is something if we let it continue in this vein, in this light, it may be a threat to me today but I will guarantee you that it will nail you tomorrow. And the people will not be well served. If anyone is abusing this situation for God's sake let us settle it, but do not blanket everyone here as though we are a bunch of crooks, because we are not. And I am speaking for members on both sides of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: It is a shame, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that I will hear- I will keep the number of submission even on both sides- that I will hear one hon. gentleman to my left, the hon. member for St. John's North. I will not hear any further submissions then. I will point out if hon. members, any hon. members on either side, feel that they have a point or a submission or an argument or an authority or a citation which be of help in giving my decision on this matter, certainly I will be pleased to receive it in

Mr. Speaker: private; send me a note or give it to me orally. I would ask them to do that within an hour after I leave the Chair, within an hour, because I hope to have the matter resolved later today. So after I leave the Chair if there are any hon. members who have some citation or argument or submission they wish to give, I would ask them to give it to me within an hour after I leave the Chair.

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the following points should be noted: all long distance calls, either charged to a credit card or to another phone or where the charges are reversed are recorded on the bill. And this is the way it is, and this bill is paid by Public Works. This is the arrangement we have. Public Works funds are voted in this House, and funds voted in this House are public. Therefore -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: - therefore, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: If I could be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker. Therefore unless trunk lines are used, Mr. Speaker, this is the way it is. Phone calls that are made and charged to our credit cards are public information. This is the way the telephone system works. And unless we use trunk lines or carrier pigeons or perhaps stool pigeons there is no way of keeping confidentiality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I did indicate to the hon. gentleman that if it is on the same matter what my decision was. I realize that the hon. gentleman has been standing some time, and I would certainly be pleased to hear a submission from the hon. gentleman or anyone else in private, but I have heard a lot of submission on it, forty-five minutes, and I really think it would be a dangerous precedent to allow it to go any further. I understand how the hon. gentleman feels and I trust he understands my position as well. I did state that I would not hear any further submissions, I have endeavored to keep the number of submissions even on both sides of the House. If I hear an additional one to my right I am in fairness required to hear an additional one to my left if anybody rises. However, I will certainly be pleased to hear from the hon. gentleman a submission in private.

MR. WHITE: Well, on a point of information, Mr. Speaker, The fact of the matter is that my name appears here on this list with a \$3,000 charge appearing after it. There are a lot of hon. members here who have made phone calls and there is no amount appearing after their names. I think it should be clarified here in the House as to why some members have made phone calls and some members have not or under which category their name falls. From the point of view of my constituents that does not bother me in the least, but from the point of view of my position here in the House I certainly want this matter clarified. It is totally confusing. It appears that some members have made phone calls by using their credit card and some obviously do not use their credit card. So Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter and I would suggest that every single member of this House be heard on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I heard the hon gentleman on a point of information. I will be pleased to hear from any hon. member privately but I do have to -

MR. CALLAN: I have a point of information as well.

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1141

AH-2

MR. SPEAKER: I have made my ruling. As I say I will see any hon. gentleman. Any private submission has the same authority or persuasiveness as hearing it publically.

MR. WHITE: It is being reported publically, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: I realize that, but we do have precedents. I have heard and I think granted quite some leeway in hearing the submissions, I realize it is an important matter, and I think I have given a generous rather than a restrictive interpretation of the rules, and having done that I can only use my own judgement, my own discretion. I do that and now call Statements by Ministers.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: I do not want to test

MR. W. N. ROWE: the patience or the indulgence of the Speaker, because, Sir, you are held in esteem in the House on both sides.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: But, Sir, I rise on another point of privilege, a point of privilege which arises, Sir, as a result of the information tabled by the Premier of this Province subsequent to the time that I rose to make my submission on the original point of privilege and therefore had no opportunity to speak to this matter which is now before the House, as I would submit, Your Honour, is the case with my hon. friend who just spoke and my hon. friend who wanted to speak a moment ago.

We have had laid on the table of this House to be promulgated by the press of this Province as public documents, Sir, information which is totally false and misleading.

AN HON. MEMBER: And inaccurate -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Inaccurate. And that is the subject matter of my point of privilege. I had hoped to have risen this matter again on the original point of privilege, but, Sir, I cannot, as a member of this House, sit here and see this inaccurate information put forward by a Premier who has already breached, apparently, the privileges of this House, and this is another breach of the privilege. What I am saying, Sir, is this; I know from first hand knowledge that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), Sir, has spent hundreds of dollars of public money making 'phone calls, on his credit card and on the Opposition 'phone, to his district and from his district carrying out his public duties. I know that, Sir, he knows it, and not a cent appears opposite his name on this public document.

MR. FLIGHT: Three thousand dollars for the year.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am here listed as opposite a number, 018-0408, as having spent \$119 of public money making 'phone calls. Sir, I would vouchsafe that I spent several thousand dollars on 'phone calls since becoming a member of this House and I would be unworthy of my position had I not done so, the 'phone calls that I am making day and night, Mr. Speaker. Now, down below here it says, Liberal Opposition Office, 737-3393. There is an amount of money charged to that, \$103,000, but Sir, I have never made a 'phone call on that particular number. I usually use my credit card. If I charge it to another number it is 737-3390 or 737-3391. That number does not appear apparently, on this bit of paper. What I am saying, Sir, is that there may be some reasonable explanation for it, but, on the face of it, we have been abused in this House by the Premier tabling wrong information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: And, Sir, that is a point of privilege as well -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: - which can be added to, I would submit, Sir, I would say it could be added to the original point of privilege as additional information for Your Honour of the way this House has been abused by Her Majesty's ministry.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. the Government House Leader, I will point out that I will regard the matter brought up by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition as a separate, distinct point of privilege. Obviously it is related, but it is separate and distinct

MR. SPEAKER: and it was recognized on a separate point of privilege. I say that for more than semantic reasons, because the only other possibility would be that having made a decision to go on, I altered it. This is in its own merit a separate point on which a decision will have to be made.

The hon. the Government
House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this second alleged point of privilege points out so clearly and corroborates so clearly the comments made by the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) that the point of privilege in this House is being shockingly abused. This is no more a point of privilege than it is a so-called point of information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Am I going to be permitted to have the same courtesy extended that this side of the House has extended to the other side of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must insist that there be no interruptions.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour wishes I can once again cite the appropriate sections of Beauchesne, which were already cited by the hon. the member for St. John's East, which says that a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact do not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege, nor, Mr. Speaker, does this submission now made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition come even close to falling within

April 18, 1978

Tape 1142

EC - 4

MR. HICKMAN: any of the categories listed or set forth in Beauchesne as constituting a breach of privilege of the House. It is at the very most a difference of opinion on -

AN HON. MEMBER: Information.

MR. HICKMAN: - information tabled in the House. And if any hon. gentleman on either side of the House tables information, he can be subject at the appropriate time to questions to verify what is contained therein. And if any hon. gentleman in the House comes to the conclusion that there is a different interpretation that can be placed on information that has been filed in the House than that which has been placed on it in the past, he or she has an absolute right to rise in the House and say, This is my interpretation. But it is not a question of privilege. It could not conceivably fall into the question of privilege. It most assuredly is not misleading the House or lying to the House. And not falling into any of these categories, but mainly because some hon. gentleman opposite says that 'As my name was not shown opposite any particular number as having had any telephone calls, therefore there is an attempt to mislead the House,' this is absolute nonsense, Mr. Speaker. And if the time of this House is going to be taken up in using points of privilege when they are not points of privilege, then, Mr. Speaker, this House cannot conceivably do the work for which it set up to do or the work that I might remember that some hon. gentlemen were screaming in January and February that should be done so we could

MR. HICKMAN: debate the great issues before the Province, They have not raised one yet, not one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Again before recognizing other hon. members I will point out that I have heard the hon. gentleman who raised this point of privilege and the immediate reply by the hon. Government House Leader with a generous interpretation of the rules. I will now insist that others speaking to it confine themselves entirely to the point at issue, which is an allegation of a breach of privilege because information tabled in the House is allegedly inaccurate.

So I will remind all hon. gentlemen to keep their remarks brief and strictly to that point.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, my name appears here, and there is a figure beside it, \$664.90. Now, Mr. Speaker, I use my credit card all the time. I do not use the 737-3393 except when I am here in St. John's. If my constituents were to find out that \$664.90 when I have to go through about three telephone exchanges when I am at home and then dealing with the various government departments, if my constituents were to find out that I only spent that amount of money I think they would think there was something wrong with me. That, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is an incorrect amount. It is more like a monthly charge rather than a yearly charge, and yet at the top of this sheet it says that these are telephone costs from February 7, 1977 to February 1978, and it is not a correct figures and I have been signing my credit card telephone bills each month since I have been elected.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to correct, Sir, something on this sheet that was tabled in the House today by the hon. the Premier which is misleading. I cannot say the Premier deliberately set out to mislead the House, but it is not true, Sir, it is misleading,

MR. NEARY: it is false information. It says that, under my name, 018-0352, \$5,656.45, and then down below it says, includes local service. Well, Sir, I just pointed out to the House a few moments ago that I do not use a credit card, that I use the telephone number down in the office, so that information there, 018-0352, is false and misleading information. And I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to have my telephone bills put on the table of the House. There is nothing to be ashamed of, I have nothing to hide. All other members should be prepared to do the same thing. My telephone bills can be put on the table of the House for inspection by all members in this hon. House, and the taxpayers if they want to look at it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that matter checked into by Your Honour because this is another example of a breach of privilege of this House, something that Your Honour has to remedy. I do not know what it is but in both cases, Sir, I presume that members are prepared to make substantive motions to have the people who are giving the House this false and misleading information, to have them severely reprimanded.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova, followed by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. LUSH: Again, Mr. Speaker, I just want to refer to the inaccuracy of this information and point out again if the information is to be made public that it indeed be accurate and as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said, he did not object to this being public information, neither do I. I am not at all concerned about this being made public other than when it is that it be accurate information. In my own case, I use a credit card ninety per cent of the time and as was suggested by some other hon. member previously, this looks in my case to be more of a monthly charge than a yearly charge.

MR. ROBERTS: Daily perhaps.

MR. LUSH: No, I would not go that far.

MR. LUSH: And the other thing is, Mr. Speaker, the number used here, 018-0357, is just a number that was used since the New Year.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Just since January of this year. I had another number from February up until January. This number here, 018-0357, was a number that I received only in January.

So, Mr. Speaker, certainly this is misleading information and as I have said before, I do not object to this kind of information being made available to the public, but if it is, let us ensure that it is accurate.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, in keeping with Your Honour's request that I be to the point, I will be very brief. I just want to say again that the number opposite my name is one that I have only been given since January, so the \$242.00 that is next to that number is certainly nowhere close to the amount of charges against my credit card. The other point I want to say is that I lived every day in my district for about seven months of the year and I would rather see \$6,000 or \$7,000 after my name because, Your Honour, that is closer to what it is, not the \$242 for only a couple of months. So it is definitely misleading, definitely inaccurate and if we are going to have the information for Heaven's sake let us have the right information.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the three hon. gentleman who are now standing and then I will cut it off.

Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the arguments being put forward by the spokesman on the other side are to the effect that the information now tabled is not correct. Well, the situation is that the taxpayers of this Province have paid the Newfoundland Telephone Company through the Department of Public Works a total of \$128,000 for twenty members of the Opposition and a total of \$31,000 for thirteen members on this side of the House of Assembly. These payments have been made, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: If I could get some order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, these payments have been made to, in this case, a private company, Newfoundland Telephone Company by means of charges made both through two sources; number one, through credit card charges and, number two, through the use of two telephone numbers, one being 737-3400, which is the government side of the House of Assembly, and the other is the telephone numbers 737-3393, which is the telephone number of the Opposition. Now what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that because the company concerned is being paid by the taxpayer's dollars and because the information is being supplied to the House of Assembly from the source that pays the company concerned, at this time I am firmly convinced that the information is correct.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte followed by the hon. member for Bellevue and that will be the end of it.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of points with respect to - if I have any protection as a member of the House, I am a bit confused with respect to this matter since the information given today, and I am sure Your Honour can see the inaccuracy of the

MR. WHITE: information because the information is inaccurate by omission, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about fifty-one members here in the House who presumably have equal rights as members, we are all elected in our constituents and we come here to serve, Yet Mr. Speaker, the names of ministers and the telephone calls they made, whether for political purposes or on government business, have not been tabulated here so the members who are not in Cabinet are being discriminated against in that sense.

Mr. Speaker, one also has to look at the fact that a number of members from the other side of the House are living in St. John's in their districts where the main offices and the main Civil Service staff are located in Newfoundland and therefore have no occasion to call long distance. I would like to make that point, Mr. Speaker, because it is very important. It is also important to note, Mr. Speaker, that a number of members on this side live in St. John's but not in their districts, as I do, and therefore when they call their districts they call their districts on the Opposition telephone downstairs, and when they want to call Civil Servants when the House is not in session they can do it from their office which is located in Confederation Building, I on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, must receive a collect call from somewhere in my district, one of the twenty communities, and then must make another credit card call to St. John's to get the problem solved, and then another call, which I charge to the credit card, back to my constituent.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. WHITE: So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is very important that this matter be clarified now. It bothers me, I am not sure what terms of reference I should be using in respect to making telephone calls. If my wife is in Lewisporte and I want to find out whether or not there are messages for me at my house, because that is my office since the government will not get me an office in Lewisporte, then am I allowed to call my wife in Lewisporte to get messages? Surely this House has some kind of

MR. WHITE: responsibility to give terms of reference to the members of it. Either that or we are going to be treated like children, or responsible men who are elected by the people of Newfoundland. And I am not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, to sit here in this House and be intimidated, I want the protection of the Chair in this case, the protection of Mr. Speaker, and I think this matter should be handled totally and exclusively by Mr. Speaker and not by government members who by -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: -who by complete partisanship have a vested interest in trying to make it appear to people on this side of the House and make it appear to the people of Newfoundland that we are deliberately abusing public funds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Why are you not down inspecting your tavern in a government helicopter?

MR. WHITE: Shut up and go home.

MR. NEARY: We do not use helicopters to inspect our clubs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The final submission. The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, most of the points that I had in mind I think have already been mentioned. I did want to draw attention to the fact that at least one Opposition member who represents one town, a rural town, not St. John's, but one rural town, his telephone bill is five times as much - well, almost

Mr. Callan: five times as much as mine and I represent thirty-six towns in my district. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the press when they report this will report it in the light that it should be seen in. But obviously, St. John's members should not have any long distance calls at all. They do not have to phone the Gander Employment Office, as I do. And they do not have to phone the Welfare Office at Arnold's Cove or Whitbourne or anywhere else, as I do. They do not have to phone Ottawa looking for a federal wharf, as I do, and all the other things that we have to do.

But, Mr. Speaker, most of these points have been covered. All I want to do is ask a simple question by way of information; Can it be assumed that our credit card numbers will be changed as of today? The fact is they are made public now and I would not want somebody out in the general public charging a call to my credit card number.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

o o o

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have no petition, Why I rise is I would like to extend my congratulations, and I am sure all members of the House, to an hon. member who participated in a certain event yesterday, and if I had your permission I would like to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: It was done last night.

MR. NOLAN: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: It was done last night.

MR. NOLAN: It was done last night? I am sorry.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to Question No. 43 asked on the 22nd. day of March, 1978.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Health because it involves drugs and medication and so on, but he does not seem to be in his seat again. I will therefore direct it to the hon. Minister of Social Services since it involves his department as well.

I understand the minister and some of his colleagues were visited by the representatives of a Federation of Senior Citizens and Pensioners, looking for a commitment from the government on this whole vexatious question to them, Sir, of whether the government is going to bring in a plan to pay for the drugs and medication of our senior citizens so that they do not have to go without some of the necessities of life in order to, in some cases, spend a great proportion of their incomes, usually low or usually fixed, on something as costly as drugs and medication.

Now, Sir, we were visited by the same group and had the brief submitted to us. What I would like to ask the minister is will the minister indicate publicly whether or not he has made a commitment to bring in legislation, the legislation necessary, to allow the senior citizens of this Province, Sir, to have the dignity of having their medication and drugs, particularly in chronic cases, paid for at least to a high rate substantially by the government of this Province? In other words, Sir, really the incorporation of -

MR. NEARY: Pharmicare.

MR. W. ROWE: - Medicare or Pharmicare into our Medicare programme. A programme of Pharmicare for our senior citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I was Chairman of a committee of ministers who met with the delegation this morning. And they presented a

Mr. Brett: brief to government which, in essence, requested free drugs for senior citizens. Very simply the answer to the hon. member's question is, no. We will not be introducing legislation in this session of the House. But I am very pleased to be able to tell him that government is looking at an overall programme of both social services and health services to senior citizens.

This particular item of need would cost the Province right now approximately \$1.8 million, and as the member knows that amount is not in the Budget this year. However, as I said, we are looking at an overall programme, and just recently, something like two months ago, my deputy minister visited Manitoba

MR. BRETT: where they have an excellent programme for social services and health services to senior citizens and he has brought back a complete report. We are taking a very serious look at it and I am sure that with block funding, which is now in effect, it may be possible to implement some parts of that programme which is now in effect in Manitoba. But we will not be introducing legislation this year. No.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The minister has indicated he has given no commitment to the group who visited him today. The minister has given no commitment to the group who visited him today or otherwise to the public, that the government is going to bring in this kind of a programme.

Now let me ask the minister this supplementary question. Is the minister telling me, and this House, that for the amount, \$1.8 million, less money, in other words, that it has been wasted in the last three or four months on the Action Group, \$2 million - is he telling me that the \$2 million -

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is entering into debate which is most definitely precluded under question.

MR. SPEAKER: The point made is certainly a valid one. The hon. gentleman may not enter into debate.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, fine, Mr. Speaker, I respect Your Honour's ruling and I will not enter into debate. Let me ask the minister, is it true that the \$1.8 million, or less than \$2 million, the amount which is equivalent to the amount being spent on the Action Group, would in fact cover the cost of a pharmacare programme for the senior citizens of this Province? Is that correct what I am saying, \$1.8 million for a year would cover pharmacare for the people over sixty-five years of age in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, this government has just introduced, quite recently, a new regulation, the Social Assistance Regulations, for items of special need for senior citizens which could conceivably cost this Province an awful lot more than \$1.8 million, and this new regulation will enable senior citizens to buy drugs if necessary. If there is a senior citizen in this Province today -

MR. NEARY: What is the regulation?

MR. BRETT: - who cannot afford to buy drugs, and if drugs are necessary, then there is a programme to take care of such a person.

AN HON. MEMBER: Publicize it.

MR. BRETT: It is publicized, of course it is publicized. So in actual fact there is no one in this Province suffering for the want of drugs.

MR. NEARY: Were you looking at television last night?

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is the minister saying? He is talking about a welfare programme, is he?

MR. BRETT: Well what are you talking about? Are you not talking about a welfare programme?

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRETT: Well, who is going to pay for it?

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about a universal programme.

MR. BRETT: Yes, who is going to pay for it?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Let us take the \$2 million, Mr. Speaker, that is being squandered for political purposes, the Action Group, and pay for pharmacare for the people of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

PREMIER MOORES: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition can read he will see the Action Group was \$1.076 million and not \$2 million. It was \$1.3 a minute ago, it is \$2 million now.

MR. W.N. ROWE: \$2 million.

PREMIER MOORES: If he would learn how to read -

MR. NEARY: Nixon knows the difference of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sit down, Nixon.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman in asking questions should avoid argument and debate and the only information really that should be in question is what is required to make the question understandable. I think that this is particularly true with supplementaries, supplementary being defined as a question which arises out of the answer. So I would point out that I think with respect to supplementaries that should really have a stricter application.

The hon. member Twillingate.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Thank you for that ruling, Sir. I would also ask Your Honour to rigorously adhere to the rule that no minister or member is allowed to abuse the point of order privileges, to get up and make a speech on a point of fact, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier just did.

Now the point I am making, Sir, is that in the last two or three months, a question I am asking, in two or three months since the Action Group was instituted, and for this remaining financial year, in other words for fourteen months or so, \$2 million of public money is being squandered and what I want to find out from the hon. Minister of Social Services is whether I was right in asking if that amount of money was transferred to a pharma-care programme it would in fact cover it. Now he has indicated that it would, Mr. speaker. Now what I want to ask him further, by way of supplementary, is this, is there a programme for the - not for the people who are on welfare Mr. Speaker, who can have things paid for, not for the people who pay

MR. W. N. ROWE:

have their insurance programmes which will pay for the drugs. I am talking about the people in the middle, Mr. Speaker, the working poor in the case of working people, people on low incomes with large families, and in the case of the elderly people, people with small incomes, not necessarily on welfare, but who have old age pensions who have to spend a substantial amount - \$100 a month, for example - on medication because they are chronic users under doctor's prescription of drugs and medication for some illness or other. What I am asking is, Is the minister trying to tell this House that there is a programme in existence now which is in the nature of a family care programme or is it an extension of the normal social service welfare programme whereby indigent people or people on very low incomes or no incomes at all can have drugs paid for by the Department of Social Services? What exactly is he telling the House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware of the fact that there is no family care programme as such in effect in this Province. He is very much aware of that. He is also very much aware of the fact that there is no person in this Province that shall suffer for the need of drugs. If there is any person in this Province who cannot afford to buy drugs, then my department will buy the drugs for them. Any indigent people can receive drugs.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary by the original questioner, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Did I hear the minister correctly that the minister is stating publicly here now that no person - he did not say indigent, except at the very tail end. Well, indigent, Mr. Speaker, there are people who can suffer financially and not be completely penniless.

I am asking the minister if I heard him correctly when he said that no person in this Province is suffering today, any chronic drug user, user of medication or prescription, suffers today financially because of the fact that he has to use drugs chronically - any elderly person, senior citizen has to use drugs, he does not suffer financially, is that what the minister is telling this House?

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: We will state it again.

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that any person who is suffering financially. What I said was that no person who is suffering physically as a result of not being able to get drugs -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is all wrong.

MR. BRETT: - and the hon. member is aware that any indigent person in this Province who wants drugs can get them.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, then I will recognize the hon. the member for Conception Bay South on another line of questioning.

MR. W. N. ROWE: We are not talking about indigence, Mr. Speaker. I want to see, Sir, how the minister perceives his duty to the people of this Province. If somebody has \$400 a month coming in in income from pensions - old age pensions

MR. W. N. ROWE: and otherwise, supplements and other sources, he and his wife - and has to spend \$125 on drugs or medication during that month, or \$100, for example, is he considered to be indigent or is that an acceptable expenditure of money on drugs proportionate to his income in the eyes of the minister?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, a person receiving \$400 a month, living in the city of St. John's or in an urban area, could very well be an indigent, whereas a person living on Random Island in Trinity North receiving \$400 a month may not be an indigent. It depends on where the person lives in the Province. Conceivably a person who lives in a rural area does not need the same amount of money to live as a person in, say, an urban area.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. BRETT: That is right, exactly. Most people in rural Newfoundland own their own homes and therefore they do not have the added expense of having to pay rent. And also in the cities it is more than likely they would have to burn either oil or electricity, so, you know, there is no comparison in the two. But in any case I repeat what I said, that any indigent person in this Province can receive free drugs.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Social Services.

On CEC television last evening, Here and Now, a lady from the West Coast, Deer Lake, appeared and stated quite simply, as did the broadcaster who

April 18, 1978

Tape 1147

EC - 4

MR. NOLAN: was involved, that she was suffering medically because she was not able to take advantage of the proper nutritional diet. Not only did she say it, and the broadcaster, but also her physician said so. She is a recipient of social services. From the information divulged in the programme it would appear that an additional \$50 a month would suffice. She applied for it and was turned down. I believe a gentleman by the name of Smith who is

MR. J. NOLAN: in the service of the department was consulted. Now what I would like to know is since we have the physician's public demonstration of his concern for this lady. The minister also appeared on the program. What is the situation regarding that lady as of this moment?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that it is very unfortunate that cases like this come out in the public -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. C. BRETT: No, just a minute now. I have always tried to keep individual cases away from the press and from the public, because sometimes it can be very embarrassing-not for that reason. But this is a rather sad case, it is true. That lady originally lived in Grand Falls. I think, and then moved to Deer Lake to live with relatives and did for some time. But mainly because of her multitude of illnesses she had to move out and we were successful in finding an apartment for the lady. It is certainly not the best but it is warm and clean and comfortable but rather small. The information that came out on CBC was incorrect. I do not know where they got their information, but following the program I got a written report from my officials and I find that-I am not sure what the figures were given on CBC, something like a \$140 a month or something like that? But in actual fact this lady is receiving \$311 a month from the Department of Social Services, \$135 of which goes for rent, but that includes heat and light, so the remainder of the money she has. That total figure is made up of \$156 basic social assistance and \$105 for rent and additional assistance of \$50 for a total of \$311.⁸⁰ In actual fact the information given on CBC was incorrect and the only real problem there, I think, is that the quarters where the lady is living ^{are} rather small. Now in addition to that I would like to point out to the hon. member that all medication is free, all drugs are free, transportation to and from doctors is free. If there is any need for, well, for repairs-in this case it would not be included because she is living in rented accommodations. But in actual fact the total amount being received is not \$140 - odd a month, it is \$311 and things are not really as bad as they seem.

MR. C. BRETT: Before I sit down I would like to point out to the House, Sir, that prior to 1972 this lady would have received the large sum of \$90 a month for everything—that is food, heat, light what have you, plus she would have got \$20 a month rent, plus the fabulous amount of \$10 a month for special food. And now today, just six years later, she would — the basic assistance is no less than \$201 with rent of \$70 and special assistance of \$50. So that is a big change over a period of six years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. J. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member stated that the accommodation was a bit small. The member appeared on the program — the minister did, I did not. The garbage is in the kitchen with the bit of food she has, which does not provide a proper nutritional diet, is. The doctor said, not the hon. member of this House, her physician said that she needed additional quarters other than what she had, and she needed the necessary funds to have a proper diet or her health will not improve. This is not a partisan debate. What is the minister doing?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. C. BRETT: I would like to advise the hon. member that there are probably hundreds if not thousands of people in this Province, certainly hundreds of people in this city, who would very much like to have far better accommodations than they have but unfortunately they cannot be found, and it is also most unfortunate that many of our landlords refuse to rent to welfare recipients. I think I pointed that out in this House before that if either one of us, any of us here, had an apartment to rent this afternoon, tomorrow, the next day, last week — the last person on earth that any of us would rent to would be a welfare recipient and that is one of the greatest problems that my staff is encountering today, that we cannot find suitable accommodations for welfare people. Landlords, tenants do not want them and the end result is that

Mr. Brett: a lot of the recipients of welfare end up in slum housing. And there is actually very little that can be done about it because the housing is just not available. So the lady on the television is no different from hundreds of others in this Province, and thousands like her in our country and Canada.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Sir, there was a time in the Department of Social Services when a person could qualify for drugs or could qualify for transportation or could qualify for rent. Now my understanding, Sir, is with the cloak and dagger attitude now of the department, that unless you qualify for everything in the department you do not qualify for anything. In other words, you cannot receive - Mr. Speaker, this is the policy that has been followed for the past several years, that you just cannot qualify for a drug card. If you do not qualify for social assistance you do not qualify for anything, period. Unless the policy has changed recently, Sir, that has been the policy that the minister has been following for the past five or six years.

Now the minister also, Mr. Speaker, under the Social Assistance Act of this Province has the right, the minister personally, himself, has the right to approve \$50 in a special allowance. In cases where there are extenuating circumstances the minister can, himself, without coming to this House, the minister can with a stroke of the pen -

MR. WHITE: And his regional director can.

MR. NEARY: - and his regional director can, pay out \$50 in a special diet, in a special allowance under extenuating circumstances. Will the minister tell the House if the minister has ever used that authority? And if not, why not, why not?

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

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the minister has not because it is not necessary for it to come to the minister. My staff have used it literally thousands of times and I guess they will continue to do so. As for the first part of, well I guess the preamble to his

Mr. Brett: question, I am surprised that the hon. member who was one time the Minister of Welfare, it was called then, is so naive -

MR. NEARY: No, it was not.

MR. BRETT: - because he is very much aware of the fact that there are literally thousands of people in this Province who are receiving, for example, drugs only -

MR. NEARY: No, they have been taken away recently. People on a DVA allowances -

MR. BRETT: - there are others who are receiving rent only, and many different forms of social assistance.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary the hon. member for Lewisporte, followed by the hon. gentlemen for Windsor-Buchans, Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. WHITE: When the Minister of Social Services was outlining the amount of funds this particular lady was on television last night was getting, he did mention the \$50 additional social assistance. Could the minister tell the House when the lady was awarded this extra \$50?

MR. NEARY: Yesterday.

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I cannot give the exact date but I know that she is getting the extra \$50.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the House whether or not it has been since this came to public attention? I am sure his memory is good enough to remember that.

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I will have to go back and check that out, but I know it was not approved, say, within the last twenty-four hours. It was definitely several weeks ago.

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

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary to the Minister of Social Services.

Is it not a fact that when an applicant makes an application to the Department of Social Assistance for a drug card, specifically a drug card, that the issuance or the non-issuance of that drug card is left to the discretion of the welfare officers or the regional superintendent involved?

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

MR. BRETT: Yes, that is true. Most of the decisions are left to the field staff. They operate under the regulations of the department, so, you know, naturally they can make their decision under the regulations.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to advise the House so as there will be no confusion as to whether there is preference shown, and welfare officers are people with weaknesses and strengths like everyone else, would he undertake to advise the House as to exactly what the requirements of a Newfoundlander who is entitled to a drug card? What exactly are the requirements that will permit an applicant to receive a drug card, income circumstances? Because I think - and I do not believe that the welfare officers should have that discretion, I think it should be outlined as to what an applicant - the qualifications or the requirements before - so I would like to hear exactly what are the requirements before one is rejected a credit card in terms of salary, income, from any source.

MR. NEARY: He does not know.

MR. BRETT: What do you mean, "He does not know"?

MR. NEARY: Send for your deputy, boy!

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, first of all an applicant would have to qualify for social assistance. I realize there could be borderline cases, there could be extenuating circumstances, but again the welfare officer would operate within the regulations and if a person did not come within the very fine guidelines, say, it does not necessarily mean that he would not get a drug card, because there could be extenuating circumstances.

MR. FLIGHT: One further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: By way of a short preamble, the indication has been made in this House here today that no person in Newfoundland who needs a drug card would be so denied. Now, Mr. Speaker, if a person who receives \$150, a single person, from old age security and indeed receives more than he would receive if on welfare, under those circumstances his application for a drug card is rejected because his income is greater than it would be if he were on social assistance. However, that particular person may indeed need half the \$150 he receives to buy drugs.

MR. BRETT: You are answering your own question.

MR. FLIGHT: I am suggesting to the minister that drug cards are being refused people in that income category. They are being refused and I can document the cases that are being refused and I think the minister owes it to the House to explain why they are being refused.

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

MR. BRETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I explained during the Question Period, a person could be receiving \$150 in Buchans and be considered indigent, and a person could be receiving \$150 in Random Island - the example I used - and not be considered indigent. It is

MR. BRETT: true that a person may be receiving - well, let us not stick to the figure - if a person is receiving more on old age security than they would on social assistance, then initially, the initial reaction would be to refuse the person because he would not qualify for help from the provincial government. But again, it does not necessarily mean that the person will be turned down, because there could be extenuating circumstances. You can have one person on old age security whose medical expenses could be \$300 a month, and you could have another person whose medical expenses are nil, so obviously, the person whose medical expenses are \$300 a month is going to get more consideration, or will qualify moreso than the person whose medical expenses are nil. So there is no real hard and fast line.

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

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, respecting the brief presented to the minister this morning by the Federation of Senior Citizens and Pensioners, following that presentation I heard two releases, one from the minister who indicated that there would not be - for the want of a better expression - a pharminicare programme brought in this present year. On the other hand, I heard the chairman representing that particular federation indicating that they had quite a congenial meeting and he was very hopeful, and he was given every indication that something would be done within this year respecting a pharminicare programme or something equivalent thereof.

Could the minister indicate to the House, Sir, whether the minister is correct in his statement or the Chairman representing the Federation of Senior Citizens and Pensioners? They appear to be contradictory statements.

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I accept no responsibility for any statement made by any person other than myself. I am not aware of what statement the gentleman made. I am aware of the statement I made but I am not aware of the statement that Mr. Rowe made and therefore, I accept no responsibility for it.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to present in writing to the Chairman, Mr. Melvin Rowe, I believe it is - yes, Mr. Rowe, no relation by the way -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: This is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing very funny about this matter. Apparently the Federation of Senior Citizens and Pensioners have a misunderstanding here because the two statements made in the press at dinnertime were quite contradictory and I would ask if the minister would undertake to write the Federation and indicate precisely and exactly what the government's stand is with respect to bringing in some form of a pharomicare programme within the year, or whether it is going to be next year, at least, indicate to those senior citizens what the exact stand of the government is because there is obviously some definite confusion in this respect.

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the minister will continue to deal and to co-operate with the group that I met this morning and if I feel it is necessary to write the federation I will. If I feel it is necessary to meet with them and discuss their problems orally I will do that. But I do not at this time particularly intend to

MR. BRETT: take any guidance from
the hon. member across the House.

MR. F.B. ROWE: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, a question

MR. MOORES: for the hon. Minister of Social Services. Just a few minutes ago in the exchange over the pharmacare and possible financing by the Province, the minister I believe indirectly indicated that something might be done this year under the auspicious of the newly arranged block financing programme. I want to ask the minister did he mean to mislead the House in that Bill C57, the new Social Services Act -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must require the hon. gentleman to rephrase that question since it is unparliamentary to allege that somebody is deliberately misleading. Putting it in a hypothetical sense would also bring that rule into doubt. I am sure the hon. gentleman can find another way of phrasing his question.

MR. MOORES: I would like the minister to clarify his statement with regard to the Province's financing under block funding in that Bill C57, the new Social Services Act clearly states that senior citizens are not considered financable under block funding.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT: I do not know if he means Bill C56 or Bill C57 but the proposed new Social Assistance Legislation is no longer a question, the thing has been done away with and block funding is in its place. What I meant to indicate to the House was this, that under block funding there will be more dollars available to the Province next year and conceivably the government will be considering new programmes and one of the programmes it will be considering are some of the ones put forward by the Federation delegation.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLEMR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Head XIX - Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all Mr.

Chairman this being the first time that I have had the opportunity to speak in this house this year I want to take this opportunity to welcome to the House the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) who is not in his seat right now but on behalf of my constituents and myself I would like to welcome him to the House and also my friend the hon. friend for Ferryland (Mr. Power). I hope they both have a long stay, certainly to the end of this sitting and certainly -

MR. NEARY:

Do not be wasting your time 'boy.'

MR. DINN:

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) Mr. Chairman, does not think it is important for me to congratulate members coming in here to the House but I reserve the right to be able to say my few words in silence and I wish the hon. member would observe the rules of the house and give me that privilege.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the second time that I have had the opportunity to speak on the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Indeed, I am proud again this year to put forward a programme with increased funding in many areas and with the obvious policy of government to help the rural areas of this Province whether it is with respect to housing or with respect to water and sewer systems, water and sewer to unincorporated areas, assist the municipalities who I consider, Mr. Chairman, to be in the front lines of

MR. DINN: government in this Province, because these are the people who are out there on a day to day basis looking after the problems of their communities. Not enough is said by hon. members in this House with respect to thanking them for the assistance they are giving all of our citizens in getting the much needed services that they so richly deserve.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this year I feel that in my first twenty minutes maybe I will run down through many of the important items that the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation will be dealing with in the coming years and have dealt with in the past year.

I feel first of all, Mr. Chairman, that we should discuss the Whelan report, and obviously in the first twenty minutes I will not be able to discuss in great detail the Whelan report although I think possibly much time should be spent in this House discussing things of this importance, because that will be the blueprint for municipal government in this Province in the future.

After the Whelan report was presented to the Department of Municipal Affairs, a Steering Committee was set up with representatives from Planning and Priorities with representatives of the Federation and representatives from the Department of Municipal Affairs. That Steering Committee, Mr. Chairman, has made many, many recommendations to the department and to government, and many of those recommendations have been implemented, many of them will be implemented and some of them, of course, may not be, but certainly will be considered in great detail and if and when these things can be implemented they will.

MR. DINN:

Last year, Mr. Chairman, in this House we passed a new municipal grant system. Now that municipal grant system was brought in here on the recommendation of the Steering Committee and approved by government but would only be put in place because it is so vitally important, Mr. Chairman, when and if that system would not adversely affect the municipalities in this Province. Having gone through many months of attempting to work out the formula as set out in the Whelan Royal Commission Report as to how municipalities should be funded and assisted by government, the formula as set out by Whelan, in our opinion, to this point in time cannot be implemented. Now the reason for this, Mr. Chairman, is that we have 310 or so municipalities in this Province and if we were to implement the new municipal capital grants system approximately 167 municipalities would have no benefit from it whatsoever. Indeed, many of those municipalities would be adversely affected. Because the basis around which that grant system works is that property tax for one be implemented, is that there be no special grants. In these situations the smaller municipalities, the rural, small municipalities in this Province would not be assisted and, of course, that is totally contrary to the objects of the policy of this government with respect to development of our rural areas, development of the fishery, industrial and rural development, development in excellence in what we have and certainly to adversely affect the small municipalities in this Province at this time would be a crime of the highest order. So until we can perfect that formula, Mr. Chairman, we cannot implement, we cannot proclaim that bill, that act that was passed in this House last year.

April 18, 1978

Tape 1152

IB-3

MR. DINN:

The next thing, Mr. Chairman,
I would like to address is the new capital projects
board set up in the Department of Municipal Affairs and
Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, that capital projects board has put into place all of the requests made by municipalities, have presented an excellent programme to us and this year, Mr. Chairman, of the over 200 projects that have been sent in to be analyzed and to be put forth to government. We intend that since we cannot implement all of these 200 projects this year, since it would be financially impossible to implement these projects this year, Mr. Chairman, I have asked the capital projects committee to take these 200 projects and in the next few months lay out for this government and for this province a five-year programme so that all of these projects can be attempted to be put in place or if not put in place in five years at least to have a programme whereby they can be implemented over the next five or ten years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, twenty minutes as I have said is not very much time but the next thing that I would like to deal with as it involves quite an area, certainly my district and many districts in the St. John's area, all the districts in St. John's and some in the surrounding area, I would like to deal a little bit with the Henley Report. This year, Mr. Chairman, hopefully if all things go well we will have before the legislature a bill for regional government in the St. John's or Northeast Avalon urban region.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, can I have silence from the hon. member for LaPoile who seems to be abusing the privileges of this House by totally and completely interrupting every speaker who gets up in this House to try to speak and attempt to debate the issues of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Hon. members will remember that one of our Standing Orders is that hon. members may make remarks in such silence that other members of the committee can get full understanding and I would ask hon. members to bear this in mind.

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I may have to call upon the protection of the Chair as I go on. Mr. Chairman regional government.

MR. DIXON: in my opinion, not only here in the St. John's or Northeast Avalon urban region is one of the most important things that will come before this Legislature with respect to local government in this Province. We have many problems in the Province. Mr. Chairman, one that I can think of is the firefighting problem whereby small municipalities because they are organized can buy fire equipment, fire trucks and that kind of thing and they have to, because they are human, because we have the best volunteer fire brigades of anywhere in North America, have to service not only their communities but all the surrounding areas. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, regional government is the only way whereby we can provide funding on a regional basis so that these small municipalities do not have to foot the entire bill for the whole area.

So, Mr. Chairman, regional government for the St. John's urban area is a start. It is not the total thing, and I think that down the way when we see how well regional government operates and serves the people of the communities involved there will be a demand almost for regional governments in other regions in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I will touch briefly now on the Patterson Report. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans brought it up last year and we discussed it in this House of Assembly. At that point in time

MR. DINN:

I spoke to the hon. member with respect to how we should upgrade the town of Windsor so that the town of Windsor, if it ever did want to amalgamate with the town of Grand Falls and Bishops Falls, that they would be upgraded to a point where they would walk in as proud partners in a total community. With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, we extended the NIP program to the town of Windsor whereby the municipality's share of the NIP funding would be provided by the Province because, Mr. Chairman, the people of Windsor are paying their share, and that has to be recognized. Having recognized that and understanding, with the problems they have in that municipality, I think we have to see, we have to take the exceptions and we have to take these places like Windsor which is, by the way, the oldest town in Newfoundland, we have to look at these special areas, we have to find out what the problems are and we have to solve those problems. I think, Mr. Chairman, down the way it may be possible to implement the recommendations of the Patterson report, and in doing so, the town of Windsor, the town of Grand Falls and/or the town of Bishops, we will go in as equal partners and we will go in with our heads held high.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to spend one or two more minutes on the housing, and I want to give hon. members opposite time to debate the issues, debate the estimates and ask all the questions, and hopefully, I will be given an opportunity to answer most of those questions, I would like to deal very briefly with housing in the Province.

Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult in this Province today to put a comprehensive housing program together for a year. This year it is made even more difficult because the budget of CMHC which is normally approved, by the way, in January or February every year so that we can get our budget in place so that we know what dollars we need to complement the dollars of the Federal Government, CMHC, their budget has not been approved yet. We have talked to the Federal Government, we have written to the hon. Minister of State for Urban Affairs, the Hon. Andre Ouellette, we have attempted to find out, for example, if the NIP program is going to continue which in this Province, Mr. Chairman, is one of the most important community programs that we have, the NIP program,

MR. DINN: because along with that goes the RRAP program, the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program. We have gotten funds approved for Windsor in the past year but that only does part of the job. If NIP does not go on, if we do not find out fairly soon that NIP funds are going to be available next year, then the ongoing program that we want to and we have to provide for a town like Windsor cannot go on. So, Mr. Chairman, it is very important, and hon. members opposite should know that unless NIP is approved fairly soon that we will end up at the end of this year not using up all of the funds that the Federal Government lays on the table for use in these NIP areas, and also, we will not be given the opportunity, we will not have the time to use up the monies available for RRAP in NIP areas, and rural RRAP in those areas that are designated in the Province.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, for example, what happened last year with our rural RRAP program. We started out last year carrying on negotiations with the Federal Government and attempting to get many areas of the Province - we had them prioritized as to where the needs were. We started out and we tried to get many areas of the Province pinpointed so that we could lay out a comprehensive program of development.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Prioritized?

MR. DINN:

Prioritized. Prioritized

MR. DINN:

by the federal and provincial governments I might add for the information of the hon. member opposite. Mr. Chairman, we started last August having gone through many areas of the Province picking out specific areas, last August-September to indicate to the federal government areas like Twillingate, the whole provincial district of Twillingate, the area of St. George's, Mr. Chairman, the area on the Northeast Coast, Cow Head and Parson's Pond and areas like that and extending it along where the need was. Port au Port, Mr. Chairman, which was put down to the federal government for assistance with respect to not only rural RRAP but also with respect to the Rural and Native and Rural and Remote Housing Programme that we had last year.

So we have put all of these forward, Mr. Chairman, and in February when the funds for the federal government terminate at the end of December, in February Twillingate was approved, Lord's Cove and the part down on the Burin Peninsula was approved and areas up on the Northeast Coast were approved and the district in St. George's from St. Teresa's, I believe, up through St. George's and Stephenville Crossing and on up to, I forget the name of the small community, better St. Teresa's to the South I believe. The upper end of that is up beyond Stephenville Crossing and St. George's. So we got those approved, Mr. Chairman. Having gone through all the discussions all the way up to August and putting the request in, we got those approved in February of this year. That Mr. Chairman, cannot happen again. But it appears as though what will happen in somewhere around June, late May or June, the federal government will lay on

MR. DINN:

the table millions of dollars for which it will be impossible for this Province to take up those funds.

Now, just to give you an example, Mr. Chairman, just to show that this is not isolated, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is not isolated in its dealings with CMHC. The Province of Nova Scotia, for example, in their co-op housing programme last year had the capability, that started out with the funds made available for 300 co-op housing units. And before the year was out they found that before having gone through all the discussions, as we did in RRAP and many other housing programmes, having gone through all these discussions found out that when it got to the end of the year they never got the areas approved and consequently never used up the federal funds to the tune of - in fact they only used half of their co-op programme or about 150 houses.

So this is the kind of thing that goes on. It has gone on for the past couple of years. Last year it was a particularly difficult year in dealing with CMHC and with the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs and this year it appears that it is going to be even worse. Because whereas in the past years we have had the budget approved by CMHC in January and February, this year it is not approved to date nor will it be approved, Mr. Chairman, for the next few months. So, Mr. Chairman, I believe my time is up. It is unfortunate that twenty minutes is not very much time but I will get an opportunity to speak on the estimates a little further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, we have six hours allocated in the estimates for debate on this particular department.

MR. WHITE:

It was our feeling on this side that we should at least give some priority to this department, Mr. Chairman, because we feel that it has been the most downgraded department in this government particularly, Mr. Chairman, within the last couple of years. It is our feeling that the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing has been downgraded, Mr. Chairman, to the degree that very few councils in this Province have any respect at all for the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Mr. Chairman, it was always a priority department in the eyes of most Newfoundlanders. I am sure the former minister recognized it as being a very important department but within the last

MR. WHITE: couple of years the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing has abrogated all its duties with respect to the people of this Province and we now find, Mr. Chairman, that it is nothing short of a political department and could best be described, I suppose, as the pork-barrelling department of this Government, the pork-barrelling department, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: The only reason for the existence, that we can see at the moment, Mr. Chairman, of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing is to keep some of the constituents, and I say some of the constituents of some of the districts represented opposite, happy around the country because, Mr. Chairman, nothing whatsoever is being done in most, and I say most, of the districts represented on this side. You have a situation, Mr. Chairman, where ministers on the other side are driving the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing around the bend with their constant fighting and scratching over the little bit of money that there is in Municipal Affairs and Housing. He is being hounded to death by his Cabinet colleagues for this little bit here and this little bit there, and consequently, Mr. Chairman, by the time it comes around to trying to find something to do a water project, a much-needed water project, in some of the other districts of the Province there is nothing left whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: The Minister is completely rattled.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman. I do not know if the Minister realizes, or not, what he is actually doing.

MR. NEARY: The Minister cannot take it.

MR. WHITE: I was watching a TV show last night called 'Holocaust' and I do not know how many members say it, I think it was on cable television, and it was the story of the Jews and how they were treated in the Second World War, and it reminds me of my constituents, Mr. Chairman. They are almost being whipped by this Government because a Liberal member represents them, being whipped up against the wall. They are being whipped. They are being punished, Mr. Chairman, because

MR. WHITE: they had the gall to put in a Liberal member in the last election. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the mentality of this crowd opposite is such that they feel that our constituents will be whipped into shape to the point of voting for this crowd in the next election. Well what a second thought they have coming to them, Mr. Chairman. My constituents and constituents of other members on this side of the House can hardly wait to return the punishment that has been inflicted upon them within the last few year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me come to a couple of specific examples with respect to the blatant pork-barrelling that is going on within the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It is worse than anything we have seen, Mr. Chairman, since 1949 and probably anything we have seen since 1833 when Responsible Government was brought into Newfoundland. Last year, for example - Let me explain to you, Mr. Chairman, about the incompetency that exists in the Ministry of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing - Last year it was near Christmas before most of the projects that could have gone ahead last Spring and Summer were approved to go ahead. It was near Christmas, Mr. Chairman, because they could not make up their minds where the money should go and they were holding back some of it, I assume, for Twillingate, \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 of it for Twillingate, Mr. Chairman, which is another issue we will be discussing. The municipal councils around Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, were told to get their priorities in to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing around the middle of December of last year, that is a year ago December past, but it was almost a year after that, Mr. Chairman, before the various capital works projects that were going to go ahead in this Province were approved and ready to go ahead. Consequently, projects that should have been carried out last Summer and Fall, projects that should have been giving employment last Summer and Fall, are still not going ahead and will not be going ahead until this Spring and this Summer.

MR. WHITE: Lewisporte; a case in point, Mr. Chairman, where because Lewisporte has a fantastic tax base they did manage to get a few dollars out of this Government but they did not get approval for it until it was almost too late, it was too late to do anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Municipal Affairs does a grave disservice to the Capital Projects Committee that has been established in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Listening to the minister you would think that the Capital Projects Committee are the be-all and end-all of any projects that are going to be approved in Newfoundland and Labrador this year. The committee was set up, Mr. Chairman, as the minister says, to give some priority to the

MR. F. WHITE: various projects that would be carried out in this Province. But I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that once the report of the capital projects committee goes to Cabinet it is put aside just as quickly as it comes in the door and the only consideration for any projects being approved is who represents that particular district in this Province. Why do we not call a spade a spade and be honest and truthful about it? Now last year, as an example last year the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing was good enough to face the music and to put upon the table of this House a list of all projects that went ahead and the amount that was expended in each one. That was last year, Mr. Chairman, and we could see then that out of about sixty or seventy projects that went ahead there were about five or six that went ahead in the districts represented on this side of the House. Now this year we attempted to get the same thing and, Mr. Chairman, on July 8, 1977 a letter was written to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing by the then Leader of the Opposition asking for a list of projects that were to go ahead in the Province and this was the reply that came back, Mr. Chairman. The year before that I say the projects were all listed and all tabled so we could see where the projects were going to be carried out. Now the Hon. gentleman on the other side talks about disclosing information concerning the expenditure of public money even down to a one dollar telephone call, well why do they not disclose what money was spent where and when on capital projects in Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. WHITE: This letter from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing the 22nd of July, 1977 - "I refer to your letter of July 8, 1977. It is not the policy of this department to provide lists of approved and deferred municipal capital works projects. Any information, of course, on the specific municipal capital proposal in any part of the Province will be given immediate attention." Now, Mr. Chairman, not only is this government being totally blatant with respect to the awarding of various projects in Newfoundland but now

MR. F. WHITE: they are covering it up, Mr. Chairman. They do not want the people in other districts in the Province to know where the money is being spent. They will not even put the information here in the House. I say to the minister that before his estimates go through here that we are going to demand to know what projects went ahead last year and where they went ahead, Mr. Chairman, before we agree to start voting money for the blatant expenditure of public funds for the sake of political consideration.

The minister gets up and talks about, Mr. Chairman, NIP and RRAP. Now why does he not tell us who was responsible in his debate for the grand total of \$5.8 million being returned to the Federal Government last year, \$5.8 million. Out of a budget of \$7.5 million that was allocated only \$1.6 million was spent, the rest had to be returned to the Federal Government because this crowd never ever got around to having it spent or arranging to have it spent, Mr. Chairman. Consequently that money, I am told by Federal people, has been spent since that in other Canadian provinces and we so desperately need money here, Mr. Chairman, so desperately need money and here is over \$5 million being sent back to Ottawa because of total incompetence in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing with respect to allocating this money to be spent. The like of that, Mr. Chairman, was never known I am sure in Newfoundland. Any other minister over there I am sure would be only too willing and too glad to have an extra \$5 million to spend in Newfoundland at a time when unemployment is so high and people are trying to get jobs and yet, Mr. Chairman, we have a department that cannot even get around to spending \$5.8 million and it has to go back to Ottawa and be reallocated to other provinces in Canada. Most of it, I understand, Mr. Chairman, went to Quebec. It was offered here but they did not take it. They never had time to get around, or they were too incompetent to get around to allocating it and having it spent under RRAP and NIP and, Mr. Chairman, it had to be sent back to Ottawa. Disgrace! It is an absolute disgrace, Mr. Chairman, for that kind of thing to be going

MR. F. WHITE: on in the most disadvantaged province in Canada. The likes of that was never known I am sure.

MR. NEARY: What a silly little incompetent -

MR. F. WHITE: Now water services, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that after how ever long the minister has been in this department that he should find out what the Water Services Division of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing is for. What is it for? We were told last year that there was a certain amount of money allocated in the Water Services Division for the drilling of wells and small projects that could be carried out to bring suitable water to people in rural Newfoundland. We were all under the impression that this

MR. WHITE: money was going to be spent. A lot of the projects were allocated, I even got \$8,000 or \$10,000 in my own area, Mr. Chairman, and we find out now that for some reason, and the minister did not tell us and I hope he does, this Water Services Division almost totally nonfunctioning. We would like to see this particular division of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Chairman, stepped up, improved and we feel that something very concrete for the rural areas of this Province could be done if water services were tied in directly with Canada Works projects that are being carried out in rural areas. Yet for some strange reason, Mr. Chairman, we can get no co-operation with respect to water services, we do not know if it is functioning. Wells that were supposed to be built last year were not dug, places where small services were supposed to be installed last year were not installed so we would like to know, Mr. Chairman, why that happened and what is going to happen to water services this year. We notice that there is money in the Budget for it again this year, Mr. Chairman, over \$1 million for water services in Newfoundland is in the Budget this year and we would like to know what is going to be done with that particular division of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Mr. Chairman, a good comment on the way that this minister has handled the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing would be to ask hon. members to point to the controversy and the mish-mash with respect to regional government on the Avalon Peninsula. Mr. Chairman, everybody is confused, The City of St. John's is confused, all the small regional councils are confused, nobody knows what the minister is up to. The minister is not trying to find out what the councils want or what they desire, he is afraid to move because of political reasons. A piece of legislation came in here last year, Mr. Chairman, and it was objected to and was withdrawn. We are told today that perhaps, not for sure as the Minister of Fisheries said yesterday, for sure he will be bringing in legislation on a Crown

MR. WHITE: corporation with respect to fisheries, but the Minister of Municipal Affairs says perhaps legislation will be brought in with respect to municipal government in the Province this year. Well, can the minister not be a little more specific, Mr. Chairman, and tell us? He has had over a year to come up with some kind of specific proposal with respect to regional government and here it is, still nothing being developed, still no proposal coming forward from the government who are supposed to be taking the lead in regional government in this Province. What is happening, Mr. Chairman? What is going on in that department? Has it been thrown away? Has regional government been forgotten altogether? What is going on? Let us hear from the minister with respect to that. He gets up and talks about the Whelan Royal Commission and about all the recommendations of the Whelan Royal Commission that have been put into effect but he did not mention, Mr. Chairman, one specific recommendation of the Whelan Royal Commission report which was brought in about three years ago which has gone into effect. I would like to know what they are, Mr. Chairman, I have not seen very many differences with respect to the operation of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing so let the minister tell us what specific recommendations of the Whelan Royal Commission were brought in within the past couple of years.

And let the minister also - he made a little reference to special grants. I would like to find out about the allotment of special grants in this Province - laid upon the table of this House like the telephone bills were today, the allotment of special grants by this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Per district.

MR. WHITE: Per district, yes, Mr. Chairman, per district where are they going? It is the biggest pork barrel in government, Mr. Chairman, special grants. There is an allotment in this budget for special grants and they go to whoever the minister feels like giving them to. It is the worst political abuse that is going on in this government, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the whole thing should be realigned, a new minister appointed and the whole thing straightened

MR. WHITE: up. It has gotten totally out of hand, Mr. Chairman. The minister knows it and the government members know it, everything is being hidden. So we want the minister to come forward with some facts, Mr. Chairman, not get up for another twenty minutes and give another speech on something that might happen this year. Let us have some facts, let us find out where all the capital works projects went ahead last year, let us find out where they went ahead, let us find out how much money was spent in each one, Mr. Chairman, and let us find out, if we can what projects are recommended this year, the list of priorities that the Capital Projects Committee are being given. We are being told over here that some of our projects are being given priority, some were even told they were number one, they will end up being number 100 when the Cabinet gets through with them with the knife they have.

So, let us find out,

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, what is going on in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. We can see frankly, absolutely no reason why there should be a minister of the department. The deputy minister could handle that perfectly well because once it gets to Cabinet, that is where the Department of Municipal Affairs is being handled, that is where it is being chopped up, and that is why, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing is being totally and absolutely down-graded and destroyed by this particular minister and this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman the hon. gentleman has spoken some length on what the minister is not doing and what the department is not doing.

MR. WHITE: I said what it was doing too.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Okay. I will accept that.

I would like to dwell for a few moments on some of the things that government is doing, and particularly the minister and the department. I would like to begin with something that is most important -

MR. WHITE: (Inaudible).

MR. N. WINDSOR: I beg your pardon?

MR. WHITE: Are you (Inaudible).

MR. N. WINDSOR: No. Are you?

I would like to carry on, Mr. Chairman, to deal primarily with the regional government concept that undoubtedly has to be one of the most major pieces of legislation to be introduced in this House in recent years particularly in the realm of the municipal affairs and local government. So nobody can deny, I think, it is evident not only in the St. John's area which is the area we are looking at first, but in the whole Province. There is a great need for regional co-operation. What form of regional government is most appropriate? How much authority it should have is a matter for debate, and I would suggest would vary from area to area. But certainly

Mr. N. Windsor: there is a need for reducing the duplication of effort that many communities, particularly small communities, that are side by side, -

AN HON. MEMBERS: Including MHAs.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Including MHAs, yes.

- communities that are side by side who all need certain services and who are all on their own approaching government or otherwise trying to raise funding to provide services for their own communities. I am sure I could give you hundreds of examples in this Province where small communities could accomplish what their objectives are far better by joining together in a regional effort instead of having three communities in a row trying to obtain a fire truck, and three communities in a row trying to obtain a youth centre, three communities in a row trying to obtain an arena, and a solid waste disposal site and so forth, a concerted effort, a combined effort could accomplish the same objectives far better in a co-operative manner.

Now to deal primarily with regional government in the St. John's area. Let us not confuse regional co-operation with loss of autonomy because there need not be. Municipalities that may become involved in a regional government system need not lose their authority, their autonomy to deal with their own affairs. One fine example that we already see in place due largely, due primarily to the efforts of the department, and certainly the minister has made tremendous efforts in this regard, is the Bay Bulls water supply system - \$35 million, Mr. Chairman, has been spent on a regional water supply system in this area.

AN HON. MEMBER: Provincial and federal money.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, obviously it is a federal-provincial programme. Most regional programmes will, by definition, be federal-provincial shared programmes. And so they should be. Why should not the St. John's area in this case receive help from the federal and provincial governments to install a major regional water supply system? Why should any municipality here provide a system that is serving more than one

Mr. N. Windsor: municipality? That is an excellent example of regional co-operation with or without a regional government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. WINDSOR: And it shows that this sort of thing can be done without a regional level of government because this system was designed and built without a regional government. We do not have one yet, but we will hopefully have one in the near future. But it is a case where government stepped in and said, It is absolutely imperative to increase the water supply for this area, let us get on with the job and do it, and it was done. It is a case where prior to this the City of St. John's were essentially a regional authority. They were providing regional services to a number of bordering municipalities. They should not have to do that. There should be a regional authority responsible for that.

 And it is important to clearly define what regional responsibilities are, and what local responsibilities are.

MR. WINDSOR:

The water supply is one prime example. But I say water supply, distribution of that water to homes in the area, is clearly a municipal responsibility, the operation of the water system within the municipality. But the source of supply, the treatment and the transmission to the municipal boundary, is a regional responsibility. The reverse of that, Sir, is the sewage disposal. Collection of sewage is obviously a local responsibility. Trunk sewers, treatment plants are a regional responsibility. And there is a clear distinction between the two.

Solid waste disposal, obviously a regional council should not be involved in picking up garbage at one's home. But the disposal site, whether it be by incineration, whether it be by solid waste disposal sites - an actual dump sort of situation - properly managed, is a regional responsibility and should be operated by the regional government. And this is one that applies: I am sure hon. members opposite have areas in their own - I am aware of areas in their districts that could benefit by a regional co-operating effort in solid waste disposal.

Fire protection is another one. The City of St. John's at the moment essentially - or the city is not; really, I guess, the Department of Justice is operating a fire protection system. This should be expanded to really give adequate protection to the whole area, the whole region. Transportation is another one that is becoming very obvious, particularly in my district where the City of St. John's are claiming that they are providing free service to the town of Mount Pearl, which is utter nonsense, Sir. First of all the route that travels - I will just take a moment, I do not want to get into district matters in this particular debate but I will just take a moment to dwell on that one. The bus route

MR. WINDSOR:

that the city operates through the Town of Mount Pearl is, although it loses money, it is the most viable route that the City of St. John's has. And the resident of Mount Pearl who gets on a bus has to pay an extra twenty-five cents as he crosses the boundary of Mount Pearl, whichever way he is going. So he is paying extra because he lives outside the City of St. John's.

Now I am not denying that maybe there is still a deficit. But I dispute the figures that the St. John's Transportation Commission are putting forth that the city is losing something like \$70,000 on that particular route. They may well be losing the \$70,000 but it is a very long route that goes from one end of the City of St. John's to the other, and you are talking about only that loop through the Town of Mount Pearl that is directly relating to the town. I would suggest that most of the passengers, and therefore most of the revenue, is generated by passengers in Mount Pearl. But it unquestionably is a matter for negotiation. If the city is losing money on that portion of the route, then I am sure the town would be only too happy to sit down and discuss it with them and hopefully find some means of sharing in that deficit. With that also, it is not only residents of Mount Pearl who are using the bus on that route. You will find residents in Newtown and Topsail Road and the West Hills area who walk into Mount Pearl and take the bus. And here the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board of course should be involved in those negotiations as well.

But regional planning, Sir, is something that must be undertaken in a co-operative way, particularly as you get urbanized areas that are developing very closely

MR. WINDSOR:

knit to one another. It is one matter if you have municipalities separated by five miles or ten miles. That is one thing. Then individual planning efforts may be satisfactory. But when you have an area such as the St. John's urban region area where you have a hodgepodge of communities that are intermingled, intertwined, developing together, it is absolutely essential that a co-ordinated planning effort be put into it. That could be best co-ordinated by a regional authority and I see it as one of their prime functions. That is not to say that they will tell the City of St. John's what they should do or what they should not do, but it should certainly be a forum for co-operation in that regard.

Sir, I do not think that regional government should be imposed either, as was recommended by the Henley Report. It is one thing to say we should have a regional authority and here is what it should be. Perhaps economically and technically that may be the best system or the best form of regional government because there are any number of forms of regional government that

MR. N. WINDSOR: could be put in place. Perhaps, many years down the road, the system that was recommended would be the best, and I am talking about, of course, the expanded City, the enlarged City of St. John's. But you cannot just consider economics, ease of operation, ease of management; you also have to look at the social aspect. Is it acceptable to the people whom you are saying should become part of an expanded city? Is it fair to say to residents in Mount Pearl who, for twenty-three years, have worked to develop a municipality with its own identity, its own structure, to say to them, 'You must become a part of the City of St. John's; you will no longer have your own elected town council'? Is it fair to say to people in Wedgewood Park, or people of any other area, for instance? With that, of course, you have to weigh economic benefits against social benefits. Perhaps the economic benefits far outweigh the social ones, but if not, we have to consider very carefully the wishes of the people.

In my particular case, as I relate to my own district, of course the message is very clear from the residents of Mount Pearl that. They do not want any part of being part of the City of St. John's and that expanded city. There are a number of reasons, emotional certainly, there is an emotional issue here. At one public meeting I said, "Look, we have to leave emotions out of it; let us not make any decision based on emotions". Somebody immediately popped up and said, "You can say that all you want, but it is an emotional issue and you are not going to keep emotions out of it". And that may be true. There are other reasons; there are reasons of identity, of course, which is not emotional; there is access to your local officials; there is the question of whether a town the size of Mount Pearl can be best served by being part of a super-city or - I do not like that term, that is a misnomer - of an enlarged city which has a council of nine people at the moment and maybe it would be expanded to ten, twelve or fifteen people. Would their interests be best served by being part of the that city, or are they better served by having their own elected council of seven people, elected from within that area?

MR. N. WINDSOR: There is a clear dividing line between the Town of Mount Pearl and the City of St. John's. So I say, let us not impose a form of regional government that is not acceptable. Let us put in, as I think is being proposed by the minister, enabling legislation to let the most acceptable system of regional government evolve. Really, what it amounts to is that we are saying, 'Here is the basis of a regional government, here is the legislation which will form the basis of legislation which can be expanded, amended and enlarged upon, and which does provide the opportunity to implement any of the recommendations, and it does not preclude any of them.'

MR. NEARY: (inaudible) and sit down.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The hon. gentleman wants me to sit down so he can take another four and a half days to say nothing, I suppose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: (inaudible) who is going to (Inaudible)

MR. N. WINDSOR: Anytime at all, Mr. Chairman.

So, Sir, all I am saying is that I do support a regional government in the area - not one that is imposed, not one that goes against the wishes of the people - but certainly one that will allow for orderly development of a regional government system that will best serve everybody in the region.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal briefly with another report that is very important in the area, and this covers the whole Island more so that just the St. John's area, and that is the Whelan report. Sir, there are a number of recommendations there and this deals, of course, mostly with finances of municipalities in the whole Province. The minister has mentioned the possibility of a new municipalities act. There are a number of things that need to be covered by that act that I am looking forward to, a couple of them, by the way, that came up very recently in the Mount Pearl election. One is the need for an advanced poll. It applied very much so to Mount Pearl because a large number of residents out there work outside the town on a shift-type system, say, with the

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1161

RT-3

MR. N. WINDSOR:

St. John's Fire Department or the St. John's police force and who could not get time off to vote in that election and I did have a number of complaints from people who were unable to vote because the Local Government Act as it now exists does not provide for an advanced poll. Similarly, the time for nominating of candidates for council was very limited;

MR. W. WINDSOR: in this particular case it was one day, and I had at least two people who said to me they were out of town and they were seriously considering offering themselves for office but they were out of town on business for three or four days and were not there on nominating day and therefore could not be nominated. So I think that is something we have to look at.

I think also, although it may not be too simple a thing to do, but we must have a good look at offering remuneration for councillors. Local government today, as provincial government, is very time consuming. I think we have to have a look at making it possible for town councillors, mayors and councillors to receive some remuneration for their time and efforts. Many of these people, all councils of course at the moment, as hon. members are aware, are operated purely on a voluntary basis with the exception of the city of St. John's and I believe the city of Corner Brook which are covered under a different act. No town councils, or none of the councillors are paid but I think that is something that we will have to have a look at. Obviously there is a problem there of funding, finding the money. Most municipalities cannot afford to pay their elected representatives in their councils but we will have to have a look at that as being a justified cost of operating a municipality and perhaps work it out on some basis of a percentage of the total revenue of the municipality. Certainly to operate a town of 10,000 to 15,000 people today takes an extreme effort, an extreme amount of time and these people should be given some form of compensation no matter how small.

But to deal with the Whelan Report, which is a more general thing and which covers the whole Island, there were several recommendations in there and I will just go through them very briefly, touch on some of the main recommendations and some of the action that has been taken as a result. One thing which somewhat leads into regional government itself was a recommendation of a more systematic approach to decision making particularly as it deals, and the hon. member who spoke

MR. N. WINDSOR: before talked about this, the distribution of funds for capital projects in municipalities. The province has established very recently by legislation a municipal capital projects board which deals with the distribution of capital funding. Real property tax is another issue that was recommended. It was recommended that all municipalities should receive as their prime source of revenue taxes based on the real property tax system. We all know, I would think, that the city of St. John's has a rental value system. They are the only municipality, as I understand, in North America that still uses that antiquated system and are of course working towards changing to the property value system, the real property value system.

Certain sundry taxes in many cases have become nothing more than nuisance taxes to municipalities to collect and in many cases the cost of collection exceeds the revenue.

I am running out of time. Well, I will have a chance perhaps later, Mr. Chairman, to get back to this and to deal further with some of the recommendations of the Whelan Report and the action that has been taken.

Thank you.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, in this few minutes allocated to me I want to address myself to specifically one town, the Town of Windsor. Now I note, Mr. Chairman, that the minister talked glowingly of the NIP programme in Windsor and I can see that the NIP programme as it is envisaged for Windsor, as it is put in place, is a good thing and it will go a long way to upgrading the municipal services and private properties in Windsor. But, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned that is enough said about NIP. You could have included the whole town of Windsor under the NIP programme, you could upgrade all of Windsor's problems today with a NIP programme and you would not have addressed yourself to the problem that exists in Windsor today and that is the problem that I want to talk about, Mr. Chairman.

April 13, 1973

Tape No. 1162

JM - 3

MR. FLIGHT: The town of Windsor, one of the largest towns in Newfoundland and certainly one of the largest in Central Newfoundland has been denied from the time it was incorporated

MR. FLIGHT:

and to this day the means of growing, the means of funding its own growth. There is no tax base, Mr. Chairman, in Windsor today. The only income the town of Windsor is permitted is what I will refer to as residential tax, residential property tax. There is a business tax there but what that business tax means to Windsor is incidental, Mr. Chairman. And the minister, Mr. Chairman, alluded to regional government. One day Windsor and Grand Falls will, I presume he was saying, become amalgamated, and he said that what he wants to see is that Windsor upgrade its services and facilities to a point where they go in with their heads up as equals. Well the minister well knows, Mr. Chairman, unless he changes his attitude towards the town of Windsor, unless the Municipal Affairs Department recognizes and changes their attitude, that will never happen. The gap is getting wider by the day in Grand Falls and Windsor, Mr. Chairman.

When is the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dinn) going to concede to the annual, semi-annual, the annual request of the town of Windsor to fund a tax base, to fund an industrial park for the town of Windsor? I want to hear the minister when he stands up, Mr. Chairman, outline his plans for Windsor, outline to this House how under the present structure, under the present situation, vis-a-vis Grand Falls-Windsor, he ever expects the town of Windsor to reach the plateau that he just referred to a minute ago whereby they will go in as equals.

Mr. Chairman, this administration the past six years have denied the town of Windsor the funding, the attention it needs in a way that will never permit the type of thing that the minister alluded to of happening.

MR. FLIGHT:

I would like to hear the minister explain why it is, Mr. Chairman, that some source of funding has not been found for the town of Windsor to build a tax base. The town of Windsor, Mr. Chairman, is, for all intents and purposes, bankrupt. Their revenue is such that it simply maintains the basic services. They have not got a dollar in capital account, not a cent. They cannot improve their level of services. They cannot meet their debentures, their interest payments, without coming back to Municipal Affairs and requesting special funding to help them pay the bills, pay the day to day bills. Windsor is not interesting in coming any more for that kind of a handout, Mr. Chairman. The solution to the problem is to assist Windsor in providing a tax base, fund that industrial park that they have requested time and time again from this particular minister. Fund that industrial park, Mr. Chairman, and Windsor will not have to come back on a day to day basis for special funding from Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister why it is that ways cannot be found. The industrial park in Deer Lake, Mr. Chairman, I understand was funded by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation using Central Mortgage and Housing funds. If that is not so the minister can confirm or deny. Then why is the same privilege not given to Windsor? Why is that kind of funding disallowed to Windsor? They have been asking longer than Deer Lake. The economic situation is such that they deserve it more than Deer Lake. And I am not knocking Deer Lake's right to an industrial park. More power to Deer Lake, you know. But I am just using the example, the kind of things that have

MR. FLIGHT:

gone on in Municipal Affairs up to this date.

Let me give the House, Mr. Chairman, Windsor's performance this past four and a half years. Windsor has in four and a half years, this present town council and most of them re-elected, doubled its property and business tax, that is if you look at the mil rate that existed four years ago. They have moved their water rates from \$6.50 to \$10.50 per month. Now, Mr. Chairman, this past year Windsor has undergone a reassessment of property values which had the effect of tripling the amount of money it costs a resident to live in Windsor. That is the kind of performance that Windsor town - oh yes, the minister can shake his head. The assessment had the effect of doubling the property values after the town council of Windsor - what is the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: Read it through.

MR. FLIGHT: Okay, let me go through it again.

Over this past four and a half years Windsor moved its new rate from six and a half cents to twelve. That is effectively doubling the mil rate. Right? Then last year, just recently, within this past six months, Windsor had a reassessment of values, a reassessment of residential values which in effect doubled the assessed value of properties in Windsor. That may well have had the effect, if the minister wants to get mathematical, of

MR. FLIGHT: tripling the monies paid by residents of Windsor to the town council, and in some case more than tripling it -

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe quadrupling it.

MR. FLIGHT: - maybe quadrupling it. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what Windsor has done. Windsor has reached the saturation point, Mr. Chairman, and sometime this year the mayor of Windsor and the town council is going to have to come to Municipal Affairs for special funding to meet certain commitments and the minister and his department are going to insist that to justify getting more money from Municipal Affairs you are going to have to raise your tax. Well, Mr. Chairman, that cannot happen any more. Windsor has got to a point where it cannot stand any more taxes. I am amazed that you can get people in Windsor to serve on a town council knowing the problems that they are going to take over, knowing the lack of funding that they are going to have to service their town, and knowing the kind of co-operation or non-co-operation they will receive from the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

In that particular area, and that is the important one, Mr. Chairman, that is the important one, the minister, if he is going to do justice to his department, is going to have to explain when he rises why it is that Windsor has been consistently denied the funding for an industrial park, denied means of creating a tax base that would then allow them to grow, to compete. And, Mr. Chairman, this business of Windsor one day amalgamating with Grand Falls, as the minister alluded to, to come in as an equal, the cards are stacked in Grand Falls' favour, again, more power to Grand Falls. The gap gets wider, Mr. Chairman, the gap gets wider. Every potential businessman moving into Central Newfoundland today, regardless of whether he wants to establish in Windsor, has got no choice; Windsor has got no land serviced whereby that business can move in and help establish the tax base. It is deliberate, it has to be deliberate, Mr. Chairman, I have sat in on meetings with the present minister and with members of the administration who have acknowledged this is the problem, cut and dried that is the problem. Windsor has got just as great a potential for growth as any

MR. FLIGHT: town in Newfoundland today and more than most, and they are being denied the right to grow, they are denied the ability to grow. And the minister talks about a great regional concept when he is now permitting a policy to exist that makes that regional policy concept impossible to ever achieve in Grand Falls-Windsor, impossible to ever achieve. As I said, the gap is getting wider, Grand Falls, for various reasons, and the main reason is again that Windsor was downplayed, Windsor was ignored, completely and totally up to this day, and in Grand Falls it was poured in, More power to Grand Falls! The minister knows the problem, I may not have done a very good job in articulating it here right now but until the minister faces that problem he will never have the chance to talk about regional government or amalgamation in Grand Falls because Windsor can never come to where he is suggesting it will come; it will never get to a point where, number one, they would go in as an equal and, number two, Grand Falls may accept them as an equal or otherwise.

So unless the minister decides to take the bull by the horns in Windsor and solve the problems, Windsor will continue to stagnate. It has reached a plateau, it cannot grow anymore, it cannot maintain its basic services based on the revenue that this government permits that town to have and to span and to control. It cannot happen, and the minister knows that. So you can bring in five more NIP programmes - and I am grateful for these NIP programmes, If the minister wants me I will concede that it is quite possibly through his concern and through his designating Windsor as a NIP project but that is nothing - you can bring in five NIP programmes, you can declare the whole thing, put in \$10 million today in Windsor in NIP. It appears to me that if you put a programme in a town that has got the effect of widening the streets then you increase your snowclearing bill, so the strain is going to become greater although we are upgrading the services, although we are going to have a RRAP programme that will upgrade houses you are increasing the cost of administering

MR. FLIGHT: that town. So, Mr. Chairman, unless the Minister of Municipal Affairs recognizes the problem, recognizes the injustice that exists in those two towns, unless he recognizes what is happening in Windsor we will never get to the point he alluded to where we will have a regional government. The gap will get wider. It will get to a point, Mr. Chairman, where we will not get a town council to administer to the affairs of Windsor, He was lucky to have gotten one under the circumstances this past election only for the dedication of the past council, who have done what I just found out, doubled the tax revenue. And all the funds that Windsor has available to them are the residential rates. What would happen to St. John's today or Mount Pearl or any other town if their tax base was denied, if the only source of revenue was the residential tax? The biggest town in Central Newfoundland today is being forced to exist

Mr. Flight: on residential tax, and that is expected, as the minister just said so grandly, to upgrade their facilities so they can go into amalgamation with Grand Falls as an equal. What nonsense! What nonsense! And Windsor suffers. Windsor is caught in the middle.

Mr. Chairman, Windsor will not accept another cash increase. If the minister wants to keep pouring money into Windsor as a stopgap measure is helping pay this bill when it becomes due, helping to pay off this insurance, helping to pay this debenture, helping to pay payroll, if he wants to do that over the next few years, and he wants to spend \$1 million or \$5 million doing so if that is the way he chooses to go that is the way it will have to be. If he were smart, if the minister were prepared to tackle the problem head on he would take a quick look and say, how much money are we going to have to put into Windsor over the next five years to help them pay their everyday operating bills. And let us put it in now, chunk oh! one go into an industrial park that would have the effect of creating a tax base for Windsor, and then Windsor would go seek its natural growth and would, like Grand Falls, then not have to come to the minister for handouts. So either that approach is acceptable with Windsor or Windsor will continue to be a problem, the people of Windsor will suffer, continue to suffer with less than decent services and facilities, and will never be permitted to reach the potential that it has, the ability that it has, all the ingredients are there for it to reach.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to hear the minister when he gets up to tell me whether or not, to tell this House whether or not Municipal Affairs is going to take that attitude with Windsor.

And again, Mr. Chairman, let us talk about the funding: if funding for an industrial park is available to one town in this Province, 90 per cent of the funds coming from Central Mortgage and Housing, then it is available to another town in this Province. And I want to hear specifically why Municipal Affairs will not fund or will not provide the funding under any scheme available to fund an industrial

Mr. Flight: park for Windsor that would alleviate the kind of problems that I have alluded to.

If the minister decides, if the decision is made, if we are going to go with the industrial park, then I will welcome that, and I will be the first one publicly to give the minister credit for implementing that kind of a programme. And the minister who does that is the only minister who is going to have done Windsor the justice that it deserves.

So, Mr. Chairman, coming of that particular aspect I want to talk about the regional water supply, Windsor-Grand Falls-Bishop's Falls, when that regional water supply concept was envisaged it was meant, as the minister knows, to supply water to Windsor-Grand Falls-Bishop's Falls. That regional water supply is now supplying water to Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls, but not Windsor. There is concern in the town, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons, not all of the reasons, but one of the reasons that Grand Falls came off the Exploits River supply for water and went to a regional water supply was the fear of contamination of that river - you know, a bad water supply. Well Windsor has the right to have the same fear. Windsor is now taking, has always and is presently still taking its water out of the Exploits River. So if there was any fear of contamination for Grand Falls then obviously there must be a fear of contamination for Windsor, which in itself is enough reason to hook Windsor into the regional water supply right now.

The other issue with the regional water supply, Mr. Chairman, is that I would advise the minister that it is costing Windsor, the town that has not got the money to do it anyway - you are probably doing it in the long run - \$40,000 a year to maintain its present pumping facilities, those pumping facilities are obsolete and will have to be replaced in the next year or so at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Now would the minister when he gets up indicate to me and to the Town of Windsor and to the

Mr. Flight: Committee when Windsor is going to be hooked into the regional water supply? Why had Windsor not to this date, to this point been hooked into the regional water supply? And I will point out here, Mr. Chairman, also that Windsor's ability to develop an industrial park is tied essentially to tying into that regional water supply because they need that source to continue to service. But that is not a condition. When the thing was envisaged in the first place it was a Windsor-Grand Falls-Bishop's Falls regional water supply. And there were no conditions, any future growth or what have you for Windsor. The condition was that Windsor would have been hooked in.

MR. FLIGHT:

as was then and there. However, for some reason Windsor had been denied the ability and the right to hook into that system. They now need it. They are asking for it. They require it and I want the minister to indicate to the House when he stands up number one, why it is taking so long to hook Windsor in. He knows now the need is there. When can Windsor expect to be hooked into the regional water supply and, Mr. Chairman, I might point out that it has to be now. If Windsor's problems, if the contamination issue, if the lack of, water pressure, a water source for the future expansion of the town of Windsor or any future growth - it needs it now.

So, Mr. Chairman, in this particular few minutes those are the two issues I wanted to address myself to. There are other issues, obviously, with regards to municipal affairs of great concern to me and my district. but that, Sir, I would say to the minister is probably the overriding issue in my district today in as far as municipal affairs is concerned. It is Windsor. And they have bled that town has bled long enough. They have been treated as, and I do not consider them second-class citizens I will guarantee you, but they have been treated as second-class citizens and they have laboured under that and they have bled. And it is time, Mr. Chairman, that this House and this administration would tackle the problem as it exists and would recognize Windsor's rights and Windsor's needs and recognize the injustice that that town has been subject to from, as the minister indicated, from the time of incorporation.

We know - I am not going to go into the Grand Falls situation but we know why Grand Falls is so affluent. We know. It is a combination of a lot of things. The mill

MR. FLIGHT:

for one and the fact it was a company town for another that created the base and then, of course, because the base was there is the only reason I can see that the successive governments of the day including this one - everything gravitated to Grand Falls. And, as I say, the gap gets wider. Any potential business, or anyone building a house, why would they go into Windsor today given the situation? The gap gets wider, Mr. Chairman. Windsor has been treated as a second class town, as second class citizens. Thirty per cent minimum of the population of Windsor works in Grand Falls, Mr. Chairman. They are contributing as much to the economy of this Province as any other town in Newfoundland.

Price (Nfld.) today would be hard put to exist and carry on their present operation without the town of Windsor. That gets into another thing, Mr. Chairman, because Price (Nfld.), in my opinion, has had a - it is a good thing the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Maynard) is not here, he would say again I was flicking Price. But Price has not met its obligations in as far as the town of Windsor is concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, if Windsor is going to have a prayer to reach its potential, to grow the way a town deserves to grow, for the people to live in decency like they are entitled to live, the way they see it in an adjacent town, that one day they may become the one city, if that is going to happen, this minister is going to have to recognize some of the injustice and recognize the rights and the needs of the people of Windsor. Mr. Chairman, I will be sitting waiting to hear the minister address himself to some of the points I have just raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A number of members of the Committee wish to speak. So as is the rule we go from side to side.

The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, just a few words in the debate on the minister's salary, the first heading in the estimates of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I will say I would like to see more of the kind of speech just made by the last speaker. He talked very sincerely -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - about the problems in his district and it is unfortunate he is not the official Opposition spokesman on Municipal Affairs. Because the official spokesman on Municipal Affairs stood this afternoon in the House of Assembly and viciously attacked the minister, viciously attacked the department and the civil servants in that department by charging that Municipal Affairs is becoming a pork-barrelling department, it is becoming a department that is only for the sole purpose of keeping Progressive Conservative members elected. And these are very serious charges because they reflect on many a good man who is now working in that department and worked before in that department.

Mr. Chairman, when statements are made to the effect that the Department of Municipal Affairs and the present minister is inflicting punishment on a district that kind of a charge, inflicting punishment on a district -

MR. J. MORGAN: Water Service Division of that department by the way, an excellent division and is doing a fantastic job of supplying cheap water supply sources. I say cheap because they are not costly, involving elaborate design work, involving consulting engineers etc. but a very simple means of supplying water to many families around rural Newfoundland where there is no form of local government. But the Opposition spokesman, the official Opposition spokesman on Municipal Affairs says the Water Service Division is inoperative, is not working, is not functioning. Well I can say, Mr. Chairman, it functioned quite well last year in Bonavista South district because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MORGAN: It functioned in Amherst Cove and it functioned in Newman's Cove in Summerville. I would like to add to that, Mr. Chairman, maybe the hon. member for Lewisporte is not aware of what is happening in his district. Maybe it is because the water committees out there and the councils think he is ineffective. They do not go through him to get things done because the fact is, Mr. Chairman, last year in 1977, talking about water services, Stoneville and that is in Lewisporte district, I think, yes it is in Lewisporte district, Stoneville got \$9,200 for artisan wells and that is more than Amherst Cove and Newman's Cove combined in my district - \$9,200 for artisan well water supply, a very moderately priced water supply system. The funds were allocated by the Department of Municipal Affairs last year, Mr. Chairman. Also in Laurenceton, and that is also I think in Lewisporte district, I am pretty sure it is, \$2,500. That is number two. Now combine these two and that is more than Bonavista South got last year for artisan wells. Of course, I was not complaining because we got a fair share. I thought we did because of the fact it was the time of government restraints and there was not an unlimited amount of funds available. There are not too much funds available for water services, for municipal services.

MR. J. MORGAN: And I go on, Mr. Chairman, and I recognize that I again earlier said that the hon. gentleman who got up and said that nothing is happening in water services in Lewisporte district—I forgive him for that because I think what is happening is, as I mentioned earlier, that the residents of the area are coming in directly and dealing with the minister who is quite receptive to delegations coming in from around the Province and they are ignoring their MHA because they feel he is not effective in getting things done for them out in Lewisporte.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, it goes on - Boyds Cove is also I think in the district of Lewisporte - Boyds Cove \$2,500 for an artisan well water supply system and it goes on down to Brown's Harbour. Brown's Harbour gets a grant as well for artisan wells. So these are four communities in Lewisporte district where the government is simply pork-barrelling funds to PC districts. Well now that is very interesting. He made a very serious charge, which I think is very serious, that the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing is flipping out special grants, flipping them out to Bonavista South and Bonavista North and out around Green Bay and out around the Exploits district, flipping them out, lots of funds for PC districts. But, Mr. Chairman, again the councils down there apparently, those properly formed councils, incorporated areas, they also apparently are not dealing through the MHA because last year -

MR. HICKMAN: I want more.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I can see why my colleague from the Burin Peninsula is saying he wants some funds because listen to this, Mr. Chairman, special grants last year - the pork barrelling government, pork-barrelling funds in the PC districts -

AN HON. MEMBER: Beer barrelling likely.

MR. MORGAN: The councils come in to St. John's in delegations and representations again over and above the MHA, as apparently he is unaware

MR. MORGAN: of what is happening in his own district, so Birchy Bay last year got a special grant of \$1,500, a special grant over and above the revenue grant.

MR. P. WHITE: That is true, yes but it is unbelievable.

MR. MORGAN: He agrees it is true but it is unbelievable he is saying. Campbellton got \$1,000, Change Islands got \$2,000, Comfort Cove-Neustead \$3,000, Little Burnt Bay \$3,000 and on she goes special grants, Mr. Chairman, over and above revenue grants and we are pork-barrelling funds. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is a -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could get some silence from the seals on the other side of the House, the hon. seals.

So the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we have a minister who recognizes the needs of the people

MR. MORGAN: Irrespective of where they are in this Province, he has civil servants working with him who are also recognizing the needs of the people around the Province, and I take exception to the kind of charges made this afternoon by the spokesman, the official spokesman in the Opposition, on Municipal Affairs and Housing.

The official spokesman charges that the water services are not functioning, the Government is pork-barrelling funds in the PC districts and it is only going to get the Liberal members elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Well I would say, if that is an example of pork-barrelling, maybe the residents of Bonavista South will look at Morgan and say, 'Morgan, what are you doing, not getting any funds down in your district last year?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: But of course, on the other hand, there is a very elaborate system going in Bonavista costing the taxpayers of this Province \$7,000,000, strictly provincial funds, \$7,000,000 with a long term, and I cannot stand up in the house and say, 'I want more, more, more'. I have to be realistic. We do not have the funds to go out and spend more, more, more as the Opposition keeps on asking for, with petitions and demands. On the one hand they are saying, 'Reduce the taxes in the Province'; on the other hand they are saying, 'Give us more services'. Oh, come on! How naive do you think the people of this Province are? You know, there is a limitation to how - You can feel the people of this Province are naive, but they are not that naive, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the present Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is operating at a time when there are limited funds to spend on municipal services; in fact, there are limited funds to spend on any of our social services, call them such as that, around the Province, and we have to zero in funds to spend on development of our Province in our resource-based industries. We have

MR. MORGAN: to emphasize more on developing our Province more so than spending funds to provide services without being able to afford to pay for them in future years. And that is what is happening. It is because these funds are not there that the minister is having a very difficult time. I can recognize, being in Transportation for two and one-half years and looking at the demands from people around the Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - the demands from around the Province, Mr. Chairman, of people wanting roads done there and roads done here, and pavement here and pavement there, and reconstruction, and new bridges, and all that, I can recognize what the present minister is going through, with demands from people around the Province. The demands are very obvious, not only from the Opposition but from many councils and delegations coming into this building.

MR. NEARY: Silly -

MR. MORGAN: But the fact is, the minister does have a limitation in the funding available to him to spend on municipal services. I can say, today, Mr. Chairman, without hesitation, that the present Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is doing an excellent job under the conditions that we have to work under today in government restraint. An excellent job!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: My colleagues all agree with me. And to have the official Opposition spokesman again stand in the House of Assembly -

MR. NEARY: It is a good place to stand.

MR. MORGAN: I listened yesterday, I think it was on Fisheries, and I listened to the minister replying to negative criticism from the Opposition spokesman. I listened to other points - There were a few positive points on Tourism, I do not know how but there were, but every comment made from the official spokesmen of the Opposition side - maybe it is because the Opposition spokesman on Tourism is a good, positive gentleman from Fogo - that is because he was in his attitude and comments

MR. MORGAN: very, very positive, but on a normal basis the front bench over there, the front bench in particular—except from Labrador, the Eagle River member—the front bench over there seems to be totally, totally wrapped around the idea of getting up and - negative, negative, negative, negative - everything is negative. There is no future to our Province, there is no future to getting water and sewers, there is no future to anything that is happening in our Province. Nothing! There is no future. It is criticize, criticize, criticize.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Well I again will say, Mr. Chairman, that I feel that the last I would like to do, and I will before the debate is over, is to talk about the problems I have in my district on water and sewer as the hon. gentlemen from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) just did. I thought it was an excellent way of handling the estimates. You can stand up and ask for information about certain policies the Government has, not attack the minister, attack the policies. Do not attack the minister, attack the policies of the Government. If you have something constructive to offer, offer some ideas and change the policies. If the policies are not working for your district as they are presently formulated, well maybe you can arrange to have the policies changed or at least try to get some influence in having the policies changed but standing in the House for the sake of standing in the House and criticizing the minister and criticizing the officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs or any other department is wrong. So I would recommend the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition, in particular, to take a good example from the last speaker over there and talk in a positive way, put forward

MR. MORGAN:

suggestions and ideas as to how improvements can come about in their own districts, how improvements can come about in general in our Province. Let us put an end to this negative, negative, negative criticism. I would say again that I do expect to get back in debate again because I know that the Opposition spokesman is going to try to retaliate for the way he made a fool of himself this afternoon by trying to pretend that the P.C. districts get it all and Lewisporte district gets nothing. ^{Because} Mr. Chairman, they are punishing my constituents out there. They are inflicting punishment" he says "on my constituents." Inflicting punishment as if the hon. minister, you know, goes down and sits down and says, okay, well now Lewisporte does not get anything this year because of the fact that they are a Liberal district.

I know that the minister is not of that nature. I wish sometimes he would be of that nature. The minister doing as, I mentioned earlier, and I will say it again before I complete my few remarks in this regard that the minister is doing an excellent job under the present circumstances and he is being fair and recognizing the needs of all of our Province and not just certain areas of our Province. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I was about to rise on a point of order or information or something because I wondered if this very entertaining ten minute little anecdote was free or whether indeed we had gotten in here without our tickets somehow because that was a highly entertaining item, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan) just went through a list and he missed a couple of important items. I think in fairness to the Committee

MR. SIMMONS:

we should add to his list, we should remind him of a couple of items he forgot to remind the Committee of in this year of restraint when the government is finding it in its heart to give a couple of thousand dollars here and \$1,200 there. They gave another couple of special grants too, Mr. Chairman, in this year of restraint. A little community called McConnell got a little grant, \$2 million. Another little community called Bob's Cove got \$47,000.

MR. WHITE: That is right! That is right!

MR. SIMMONS: You want to preach restraint, Mr. Chairman, let us tell the whole story about the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) going from Gander to Grand Falls in a helicopter to go on an open line show.

MR. WHITE: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: And some poor woman in Deer Lake is like all the rest he says, she can sit in the one-room house with no bathroom while he eats up the money to ride to an open line show in Grand Falls.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

I would like to remind hon. members that in Committee the remarks should be directed towards the head. When we are on minister's salary, latitude is allowed, but despite that the remarks except for a glancing blow perhaps should be directed towards the heading under discussion.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I now recognize how the minister got away with it. He never even made a glancing blow. Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan) before I get away from him because we have much more important issues. He defends the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dinn). Now the Minister of

MR. SIMMONS:

Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dinn) least of anybody in this House needs any defense, least of anybody in the Cabinet needs any defense because, Mr. Chairman, unlike any other minister, practically any other minister in that government he is not responsible for the decisions that are being administered in the Department of Municipal Affairs. He is not making those decisions. He is the figurehead, He is the guy they call the minister because somebody has to be the minister, but he more so than almost anybody else in that Cabinet has absolutely no say over the decisions of government as it relates to his department. So let us deal with that one in that fashion because that is all it is worth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of things that I want to say in relation to my district and I hope to say in the next day or so in this Committee or in the budget debate if they ever have the guts or the courage to call it, Mr. Chairman, or in the Throne Speech if they ever call that again. This evening I am prompted to get up because I have listened to most of what the minister had to say in his opening remarks, I listened to what the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) had to say and I found it strikingly significant that there was a glaring omission from the remarks of both gentlemen, there was no reference whatsoever to another item that is costing us an awful lot of taxpayers' money in this year of alleged restraint,

Mr. Simmons: the Mount Pearl arena, Mr. Chairman, not a single word about that fiasco of all fiascoes.

MR. NEARY: Nor the Bell Island arena.

MR. SIMMONS: If you want to talk about pork-barrelling, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Tourism wants to talk about pork-barrelling, let us talk about the Mount Pearl arena for a few minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: If you want a good example of pork-barrelling - I was going to say in a good Liberal district, tongue in cheek. Do not lecture me today about pork-barrelling to the tune of \$2,000 in my friend's district, when I see what an almost criminal, not almost, scandalous, Mr. Chairman, it is scandalous, an absolutely scandalous absolutely scandalous affair that is going on in Mount Pearl. We tried to ferret it out here in the last year or so. Today they skate over it by not mentioning it, Mr. Chairman. This nefarious scheme in Mount Pearl where they are shovelling out the money \$150,000 here, \$200,000 here, \$350,000 here so that an arena, a much needed facility in many communities in this Province which should have cost, in the case of Mount Pearl, perhaps \$200,000 or \$300,000 or \$400,000. My friend from Ferryland (Mr. Power) could do with the difference between the \$300,000 or \$400,000 and the \$1 million that it cost. We could build a couple of other stadia that -

MR. RIDEOUT: Plural! Plural!

MR. SIMMONS: If that is correct.

MR. SIMMONS: We could build another couple of arenas.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Get your facts straight.

Ah, I am the one who got my facts straight and the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) when the whole thing comes out, Mr. Chairman, as it will, I have been checking the Hansard.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Why?

MR. SIMMONS: I have been checking the Hansard of last Spring when some questions were asked.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Tell me all about it.

MR. SIMMONS: I am going to tell you some about it, Mr. Chairman. I may not have all of my facts straight, but I have one fact straight, Mr. Chairman, and it is this, it is this, it is a fact way of prediction. I predict that this government which is being wallowing in one scandal after another -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - a few feet from us now there is a public enquiry going on -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has come up.

MR. HICKMAN: That last comment by the hon. the gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is totally and absolutely out of order, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

MR. SIMMONS: Will you let me justify it?

MR. HICKMAN: I ask that it be withdrawn irrevocably.

MR. WHITE: Let him justify it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order. Mr. Chairman I made the statement that this government has been wallowing in one scandal after another. I stand by that. I am prepared to justify that to the Committee if I am allowed to do so. If there is anything about the terminology that is unparliamentary I shall be all means withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The word 'scandal', one does not have to refer to Beauchesne for this, the word 'scandal' if it is applied to an hon. member or to an indentifiable number of hon. members, members of the House, in terms of their function as members would be clearly unparliamentary. As far as I am aware the word was applied to the administration as opposed to members of the House, and I would think that this would fall more into the partisanship to which the Committee and the House itself does give some countenance. So I would say that if my interpretation of that is correct I could not rule that the word 'scandal' as applied to the administration as opposed to the members of the House as members

Mr. Chairman: would be unparliamentary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I was saying that this government is wallowing in one scandal after another. If the Minister of Justice wants to take that one personally then if the cap can fit let him wear it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am saying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: I knew the hon. gentleman would walk into it, I would now ask that that comment be withdrawn.

MR. WHITE: If he wants to if the cap fits let him wear it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: If the cap fits let him wear it.

MR. SIMMONS: I have said that the government is wallowing in one scandal after another. If the minister gets sensitive on that point then I cannot help his sensitivities. That is his problem not mine.

MR. NEARY: The minister is responsible for the RCMP -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I think we are on a slightly different point here. I think that the word 'scandal' was now, if not applied directly at least obliquely towards an hon. member, And I am sure that no hon. member in this House would wish to do that, because if it should happen it could go one way or the other in times in the future. So as not to leave any flavour to the Committee's deliberations in that regard I would ask the hon. member if he would clarify that he is not applying scandal to the hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Not at all. I withdraw any reference oblique or otherwise. Mr. Chairman, I was making the general statement, the minister as he admitted was trying to walk me in or suck me in or whatever his terminology was. I have other things on my mind today, Mr. Chairman, and I say that this government has been wallowing in one scandal after another. I was making some reference to an enquiry that is going on a few feet from here down in the Philip Place right now on public spending in the

MR. SIMONS: Department of Public Works and I could make reference to the Scrivener affair which has never been resolved to our satisfaction but we are not finished over here with that one yet. We are not finished with that one. But I want to talk about the Mount Pearl arena and make this prediction, Mr. Chairman, that this Mount Pearl arena and its financing and the circumstances surrounding is now shaping up, I predict, into just the latest of a series of scandals surrounding this government, just the latest in a series of scandals. This one, Mr. Chairman, is going to touch the hearts and minds of just about every Newfoundlander who has been told that all they can have for a system is \$1,200 or \$2,000 in that kind of thing, told that they cannot have a stadium down in Ferryland although it has been built on paper several times, told they cannot have an arena in Bay d'Espoir in my district, told they cannot have arenas elsewhere, and then we hear that we now have an arena just a few miles from us that cost about three times what it should have. I hear from citizens in Mount Pearl even over this weekend that the management of the stadium—and I cannot comment on its competence, and that is not my intention here today to indict the competence of the management because I do not know the individuals involved, but I do know one aspect, one result of the management; and one result of the management is that certain groups in there, and I am thinking in particular of the figure skating group, are getting very badly discriminated against. Now I will just throw that in as an example because that is not the thrust of what I want to say to the committee this afternoon. I just want to use that as an example. The thrust of what I want to say is quite different and the member for Mount Pearl knows I only have twenty minutes and I dare say he is hoping that if he can get me off on a number of tangents I will not get to the issue that I really want to raise here this afternoon.

I want to ask the minister if he indeed will now give the committee some information on this Mount Pearl arena. It has been sloughed off, slated over in this House in the last year or so.

MR. SIMMONS: We have all known that there was a lot more to it than meets the eye and yet somehow we are told not to worry, that everything was going to be okay. Well, Mr. Chairman, everything is not okay and I have information that this whole matter of the Mount Pearl arena is now under a police investigation, confirming, Mr. Chairman, some of the things we suspected about that operation for a long time. The minister has refused to give information to the House on it. I checked the Hansard for last year when his estimates came through, and also earlier in March month when he was answering some questions and we put a number of direct questions to him and at no time did he think it seems that the committee was entitled to any information on the subject.

Well now, Mr. Chairman, he finds himself today, the 18th day of April, just about a year since he was given the opportunity to come clean on it, he now finds himself really holding the bag, really holding the bag, Mr. Chairman, on this one. Now we are talking about restraint and we are supposed to be good boys, the Minister of Tourism tells us, and not to ask for too much. And then we look around us and see how the money is being squandered right, left and center. There is no end, Mr. Chairman, to the squanderings of this government, that special Action Group, that so-called Newfoundland Information Service, the whole business in Public Works that we talked about in this House a year or so ago-or last June, which is now the subject of a police enquiry and the subject of a public enquiry. Just no end, Mr. Chairman, to the ways in which this government has squandered money. They not only squandered it but squandered it in very, very, very suspicious ways.

Now, Mr. Chairman, today, as of today the books of the arena are not in the arena anymore. They are down in the hands of the RCMP Fraud Squad. The books of the Town Council of Mount Pearl relating to the arena are not in the town council office anymore. They are down in the RCMP Fraud Squad office. The books and the records of the president of the minor hockey league in Mount Pearl are not in his home anymore. They are in the offices of the RCMP Fraud Squad. The

April 13, 1973

Tape No. 1171

JF - 3

MR. R. SIMONS: books of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the books of the present Minister of Municipal Affairs relating to the Mount Pearl Arena, are not in his office ;

MR. SIMMONS:

anymore. They are down in the police office, the RCMP Fraud Squad office. Now, Mr. Chairman, we get trod on and walked over, ridiculed because we ask a few questions about how they are spending the money in the public treasury. We are told we are asking too much when we say, I have got a community of McCallum that was promised five years ago some water by the Premier, some drinking water at a cost of about \$20,000 and they are told to hold off in the name of restraint because the poor country cannot afford another \$20,000. Then we see the Premier in all his glory on television announcing another special Action Group where they are going to shunt a couple of million bucks up to Montreal to his friends.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have had all the talk I can take about restraint in this House. I have had all the lectures I want to hear about restraint from this hon. crowd. Let them practice what they preach. I will be the first, Mr. Chairman, to subscribe to a policy of restraint if I know it is being practiced all around. But when I am asked to practice restraint and I know it is only an invitation to be walked into a situation where my constituents will suffer while the Premier's friends will go on in as lucrative a fashion as ever, that is not restraint and I am not going to be walked into that one, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: The Bell Island arena is equally as big a scandal, by the way, \$500,000 worth of scandal.

MR. SIMMONS: Where is the end, Mr. Chairman, to all this?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) talking about your former (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Yes. Well, okay. But they did not benefit by it. It was the hacks, the political hacks over there

MR. NEARY:

that got it, Gendreau and his partner and political hacks.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dinn) -

MR. NEARY: I will have a few words on that, do not worry.

MR. SIMMONS: - has a couple of choices, Mr. Chairman. We gave him the choice last year during the estimates. We gave him almost a free ride last year although it is not fair to put it that way because we felt that as a first year before the Committee he ought to have a full opportunity to establish his credentials and we gave him that full opportunity. We put some questions to him and we were a bit suspicious about some of the answers we got, particularly on the Mount Pearl arena, but we were willing to bide our time knowing that it would come out in good time anyway, as it has.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister today has a couple of choices. He can either continue toeing the line that has been given him by the few in Cabinet who have vested interest in the matter, or, Mr. Chairman, he can decide to protect his own hide and come clean when we put some legitimate questions to him as we put to him about the Mount Pearl arena last year. He must be thinking about the words of an old Methodist hymn, "All the what might have been."

MR. HICKMAN: That is not a Methodist hymn.

MR. SIMMONS: How would the minister know?

MR. HICKMAN: Because I am one.

MR. SIMMONS: I hope the minister is a better Methodist than he is a minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. W. ROWE: He is a lapsed minister and a lapsed Methodist.

MR. SIMMONS: Because if he is not the church would take some action the Premier is afraid to take; they would kick him out.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Chairman, all the what might have been. How nice it would have been, how much more simple it would have been for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dinn) if he had not taken the advice of a few of his political cohorts last Spring and had come clean on this Mount Pearl arena. I will tell him some of the net results if he had come clean last Spring. One of them is that the police would not have had to move in today into Mount Pearl and barred the gate after the horse is gone, because I suspect that is what has happened. I have reason to believe that is what has happened. He would have saved the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars. He would have saved his colleague, the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) a lot of political embarrassment. He would have saved his administration, the administration of which he is a part, a lot of political embarrassment, and he would have saved the municipality and the recreation group, the minor hockey group in Mount Pearl, an awful lot of embarrassment. And, as importantly, he would have seen to it that several hundreds of thousands of dollars was being properly spent. That was his choice last Spring.

Mr. Chairman, he did not pursue that choice. Perhaps the heady days of being minister just for

MR. SIMMONS: a few weeks and perhaps that had some effect on it, I do not know, but I know the result. The result is that today the minister finds himself in one awful quandary and I would rather he have to make that decision than me because his decision is clear—either to continue to toe the line, to mouth the lines of his political advisors who will tell him, 'we can ride this one out.' They even think they have ridden out the one on the Special Action Group but they have not heard the end of that. They have not heard the end of the Bell Island arena.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right.

MR. SIMMONS: They have not heard the end of Scrivener.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: They have not heard the end of the Public Works scandal.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Just the tip of the iceberg, that is all.

MR. SIMMONS: Just the tip of the iceberg, my friend says, just the tip of the iceberg, and if they think they are going to ride this one out, Mr. Chairman, how much gall do you have to have? How long do your fingernails have to be to be able to hold on in these circumstances like they did the other night after they were defeated in the House? How long and how tough must your fingernails be to hold on in these circumstances? How much longer will it go on? In the name of the people of Newfoundland, how much more will they have to take from this outfit that preaches restraints and practices licence, practices drunken licence with the people's money? Mount Pearl is just the latest example. I predict it is only the latest and there is more to come. I am working on a couple of others myself.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. J. DENN: Mr. Chairman, obviously I should take a little time to go down through some of the comments made by hon. members opposite and hon. members on this side of the House. First of all, Mr. Chairman, last year after my opening twenty minutes hon. members opposite got up and they said, you would think the minister would talk about the

MR. J. DINN: Whelan Royal Commission Report and the Patterson Report and the Henley Report and things like that instead of talking about water and sewer subsidies and special grants and this kind of thing. Last year they got up and tore into me because I did not do that. This year I got up and I went into the Whelan Report and the Patterson Report and the Henley Report and I figured I would take a few minutes later on to get into a few more other things of importance to this province, of importance hopefully to hon. members opposite, and what do we get? Hon. members opposite get up and they attack me about the special grants and the NIP programmes and the RRAP programmes and what we did not do and what we should have done. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to - I have been inside taking a little smoke, holding myself back because I do not want to get into what I got into last year, but I am forced to, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we will have to get into it. Special grants we will talk about. Now special grants, every hon. member opposite knows, ^{are} at the total discretion of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, total discretion. If I want it to go it goes, if I do not want it to go, nix, it does not go. Special grants, last year \$293,600, Mr. Chairman, in PC districts. Mr. Chairman, \$473,992.93 in Liberal districts. ^{And} that may change because I am going to come under pressure from all hon. members on this side of the House to change that this year and I will resist that, Mr. Chairman. I will resist that because I want to see to it that all municipalities in this province are treated fairly.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Chairman, there is another little statistic. The hon. member for Port de Grave, whom I believe is sitting there as an independent, should be over here because he does not go along with what is going on in debate in this House. He has gotten up several times and said so. The hon. member for Port de Grave \$17,500 in special grants and in water and sewer subsidies \$730,000. Water and sewer

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1173

JM - 3

MR. J. DINN: subsidies in PC districts the figures, the facts, this is what is paid out, this is what is in the estimates, Mr. Chairman, PC districts, water and sewer subsidies for 1977-1978 - \$4,335,000.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, in hon. members opposite districts, \$4,366,843. Mr. Chairman, in Conception Bay South in special grants, \$230,000 last year, forced to pay it to Conception Bay South, could not help it, Mr. Chairman. Now, I do not want to get into this but I have to defend what hon. members opposite have said. I mean, that is the kind of situation that I am into. I started off and I hoped that the debate would be on a high plane, that we would talk about Municipal Affairs and Housing in this Province and how we should direct our energies and so on. Now the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), the shadow--and that is all he can be described as, the shadow, after today, a shadow of what I thought the

hon. gentleman was - well, Mr. Chairman, he got up here and he talked about all the dollars that went back to the federal government and was dispersed into Quebec. Mr. Chairman, NIP and RRAP, he alluded to NIP and RRAP in Newfoundland and Labrador for last year. Well, Mr. Chairman, we will have to get into a few facts there because Mr. Baker was out in Gander shooting off with his inaccurate figures. The hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) got up today and used the same inaccurate figures and shot off, and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) went off to the press, listening to Mr. Baker, ran off to the press with the same kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman, the facts on NIP and RRAP: Last year, Mr. Chairman, not only in NIP, not only did we spend what we had to spend, what we were given to spend, but we went back, I went to my colleagues in Cabinet and I pounded on the desk and I said I can get more dollars from the feds if you will give me more dollars. I will

MR. DINN:

be able to put NIP in Windsor if you will pay the municipality's share-which is unprecedented,by the way. It has never been done before. It is not done in St. John's or in Corner Brook. But in Windsor's case we went to my colleagues in Cabinet, the partisan people on this side of the House, and I said, Look Windsor cannot afford their share, they cannot afford their twelve and a half per cent. Help them out. They are the oldest municipality in this Island. Help them out. And they did. They helped them out. Last year, Mr. Chairman - well let us go through a few of the figures, the exact figures.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. DINN: Look, I would have gone into your problems because I think you made, the hon. member made, excuse me, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member made some very good points in this House when he stood up to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Chairman, that is the way that I wanted to see the debate on my estimates go. I wanted to see the hon. members concerned about their districts, get up and speak about their districts, talk about their people, tell me about their problems and see if there is something that we can work out for them. But no! We had the hon. shadow from the opposite side, who is over in the doorway now, will not even sit in his seat and cannot take it generally, who got up and spoke about what went back to the NIP programme. In NIP we spent more than we could.

Now, let us talk about RRAP. Dollars went back. It was not 5.8 per cent. It was 4.8 per cent. A complete disgrace! A complete and utter disgrace!

MR. DINN:

And if the hon. member opposite had gotten up and given that fact and stated clearly what happened, if he had investigated a little bit and found out what happened he would be able to make a point in this House that should be made. There are points that should be made about different programmes and we are going to talk about RRAP right now, Rural Residential Rehabilitation Assistance and ERAP as it applies to NIP.

Mr. Chairman, NIP is almost totally controlled because we go up and pound on the desk and say, we got the dollars, put your dollars down and we will spend them. So they are kind of forced into it and they have got to lay the dollars out. In ERAP, after NIP is approved, they apply the ERAP funding, totally federally controlled in the NIP areas, totally federally controlled by CMHC and, yes, Mr. Chairman, that is a disgrace in this Province. Because last year -

MR. PECKFORD: Told to him by Bill Tarrant, the man who financed Trudeau's swimming pool.

MR. DINN: Hear, hear. That is the man. That is the exact gentleman that you are talking about right now. Mr. Chairman, ERAP in NIP areas is totally controlled by CMHC, the federal housing

MR. DINN:

agency. Last year approved funding \$4 million of which 2.4 went back into the coffers, because they did not spend it, 1.6 we spent, they spent. Mr. Chairman, RRAP in non-profit areas because, they said, we want to deal with other people, we do not want to deal all the time with the provincial government, we want to deal with the non-profit areas. So they put \$500,000 on the table for that, never spent a cent of that.

MR. NEARY: Did George McLean pay his bills yet?

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, rural RRAP; and I explain to hon. members opposite what happened to rural RRAP this year. We sat down with CMHC, we discussed the programme, we identified particular areas, we got into all of these ramifications, and from August all the way through to February before rural RRAP got approved. Now we had some approved from last year and we shoved the funds in there as best we could, but we had Twillingate approved - we had Twillingate proposed, not approved. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, if he were interested in his district would now be listening, Mr. Chairman, because this is important, because the member of parliament for Gander - Twillingate stood up out in Gander, went to all the media and gave the facts about the RRAP programme. The RRAP programme was proposed for the Twillingate district in September 1977 and never got approved until the funds were cancelled in December; not a penny spent in the district of Twillingate, proposed, by the way, on a partisan basis by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing through me. Twillingate, partisan; partisan, that is what it was, a partisan political thing. St. George's, where there was no election last year, was proposed at the same time, that came through in February. A great time when the federal funds are cancelled at the end of December, great stuff! So if the hon. member wants to talk about what is going on federally, what is going on with the federal programmes, maybe he will go to Mr. Baker or somebody else up there where he is getting these inaccurate facts and ask him what in the hell is going on, because Baker does not

MR. DINN: know, the hon. member does not know, Mr. Chairman, and he does not care.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman just used what I consider to be unparliamentary language, Sir, The hon. gentleman apparently is on the brink of a breakdown and I would ask Your Honour to discipline the hon. gentleman. If there were school children in the galleries, Mr. Chairman—fortunately the people in the galleries are a little more mature at the moment—but if there were children there that would be a disgrace, Sir, shameful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know if it is unparliamentary or not, I could not rule there but I would like for the hon. minister to refrain from using the word.

MR. DINN: Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I will accede to your wishes, but I am being provoked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Chairman, that takes of NIP and RRAP. And maybe the hon. member would agree with the hon. member of Parliament for Gander-Twillingate when he says that all of the programmes should be operated by the federal government, And I will just throw a CHIP programme at him that is another disgrace in this Province, where the federal government throws it all on the table, where you have 36,000 houses that could have insulation in them right now, where you have to call Montreal -

MR. WHITE: Not anymore.

MR. DINN: You had to, You had to until we pressured the Minister of State for Urban Affairs in Edmonton, when ten Ministers of Housing from all across Canada jumped on his back and told him that he better shape up or he could ship the programme out, it was no good, There are only two provinces that it is any good to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: I would like to talk about, Mr. Chairman, Windsor because I respect the hon. member for getting up and speaking about his district and talking about what we would like to do for Windsor. Now I am not sure, I am not sure right now if the industrial park is the answer because we have an industrial park over in Grand Falls.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. DINN: Wait now! Mr. Chairman, I will listen to the hon. member when he gets another twenty minutes in the House and I will attempt to address myself to those remarks also. Windsor is not connected to the regional water system.

MR. DINN: if the hon. member would look into the budget this year, there was a new Head in there for Engineering - Consulting, and we have \$600,000 in there for which we are attempting to get a final design done for several areas in this Province so that we can get on with the water and sewer program more quickly this year so that we can get a lot of it done before the snow flies.

One of those areas, the hon. member should know, Mr. Chairman, in an effort to try to provide him with some information, he will know that the consulting firm of Proctor and Redfern has been appointed to have a look at preparing the final design for hooking up Windsor to the regional water system. That, I believe, is the first step because the water system they have, the hon. members knows, may be a very serious health problem, and the pumping system they have out there in the Exploits River just cannot handle the situation. So the first thing we have to do with respect to Windsor as I see it, and I could be wrong, but as I see it, is to get that regional water system hooked up so they have a good system. Do not discount what good NIP can do because NIP in Windsor can do several things. It can fix up the distribution system that needs to be fixed up, as the hon. members knows well. It can fix up the streets so that you have something to plough, because right now there are areas in Windsor that you cannot plough, you just cannot get at them with a plough. So it will do things like that. It will widen some of the streets. NIP, having been approved, will repair the houses and the general atmosphere -

MR. FLIGHT: That was a tax base.

MR. DINN: - the general atmosphere of the community. Next, having gotten the regional water system hooked up, as I see it you need that main road through there. You need that.

After that, Mr. Chairman, there may be many things that we can do for Windsor and I will certainly look at all of the possibilities of the things that can be done, and they have all been presented to me, by the way. We have, right now, just about a

MR. DINN: total plan for the Town of Windsor because I see it as a particular problem, and I think that if we can upgrade the Town of Windsor it will be kind of a feather, not in my hat because the hon. minister that served in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing before I arrived there initiated this program. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, it was under his auspices that the regional water system was completed, just about. We would not have a regional water system to hook up to right now if the hon. member had not pushed for that system. And so, this goes on from minister to minister and, hopefully, before I am through, and I have served for a year and a half in Municipal Affairs and Housing and if I serve until September I believe I will set some kind of a record, for the past ten years anyway.

MR. NEARY: You will not have all your marbles when you are finished.

MR. DINN: I may not, Mr. Chairman, have all my marbles when I am finished but I had them when I started, and the hon. member never had them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, there are other hon. members opposite that may want to get up and speak about specific problems and I would like to deal with them. I have gone through a good portion of this Province. I have visited quite a few councils in Newfoundland and Labrador; as a matter of fact, in Labrador last year. the hon. Chairman of the Social Policy Committee and all of the members of the Social Policy Committee went to Labrador, we visited Churchill Falls, we went to Northwest River, we went out to Cartwright, Ropedale, Makkovik and Nain. We stayed, by the way, when we were in Nain, down at the hon. member's hotel, and we were treated royally down there, and I want to put on record in the House that I appreciated that and certainly I hope to get back to Nain this year if I can possibly do it.

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1176

RT-3

MR. DINN:

It is God's country. It should never have been named as the land God gave to Cain, but God's country, because that is what it is down there, Mr. Chairman, and if there is anything that we can do with respect to doing things for the people in Labrador - because the first time that I had ever been to Cartwright impressed me. I travelled along the road - I arrived at the dock in Cartwright, got into the back of a truck and went over an atrocious piece of road, and immediately when I got back in the Department, I

MR. DIMN:

arranged to have a special grant to fix up the road so that at least a bus could get over it because it was a complete disgrace, Mr. Chairman, and hopefully we can do something for Cartwright and some of the other problems, by the way, Mr. Chairman, that were identified in Labrador when we visited there last year. Since I only have a few more seconds left, Mr. Chairman, hopefully I will get onto other problems some time tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wish now to give my decision on the matters raised earlier today. In so doing I wish to establish at the very outset that this is legitimately a matter on which the Chair can rule. And I do that just by drawing to the attention of hon. members May, page 160 to the effect, "The special position of a person providing information to a member for the exercise of his parliamentary duties has been regarded as enjoying qualified privilege." And also Mr. Speaker, Jerome, House of Commons, Ottawa November 3, 1977, a very general statement but I think applicable here in the context in which I have referred

MR. SPEAKER: to it, and he said, "the responsibility for the security of these premises, the offices of members in the buildings and the privileges that we enjoy here is," he said, "my own responsibility." I mention that merely to point out that it is a matter of legitimate concern of the Chair in an area in which the Chair is entitled to hear arguments and to make a decision.

In my decision, basically under two headings - and I will have to take them separately to avoid confusion - first the actual points of privilege raised, the decision with respect to that; and, secondly, I will inform hon. members of instructions I have given and new procedures I have as of today required with respect to expenses incurred by members in their duty as members and in making 'phone calls and receiving 'phone calls in their official capacity as members of the House. There are two areas. First, with respect to the actual points. The first point of privilege raised was essentially an allegation that there had been an infringement of either or all of three areas, the immunity of members, the confidentiality of communication between members and constituents, and intimidation. That was the allegation. If I had found any evidence of intimidation, a breach of confidentiality of communication or infringement of immunity of members there would obviously be a prima facie case.

What I have done in order to appraise myself of questions of fact was to call to my office the Deputy Minister of Public Works, Mr. Whelan, and the Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Peckham, and advise them in what capacity I was putting the questions to them, and ask them specifically for what information were you asked and what

MR. SPEAKER: information did you give. And the unequivocal answer of both gentlemen was that what was asked for and what was given was in fact what I now have in my hand, which is two sheets, the lists of names, Opposition members, numbers opposite and amounts opposite, and the same thing for government members. So I am unequivocally of the opinion, and I have unequivocally accepted the word of these gentlemen, Mr. Whalen and Mr. Packham, and I am unequivocally of the opinion that the only information asked for, the only information given, related to cost of phone calls of various members and that there was no information asked for or information given with respect to the identity of anybody placing a phone call or receiving a phone call. That being the case, then, there has not, in my opinion, been a breach of privilege.

The second specific point of privilege was with respect to the accuracy of the information. It was alleged that the information on one or both of these sheets was in fact inaccurate. I also put that point to those two officials of the Department of Public Works and from their reply and my own examination of the document, I can only come to the following conclusion; that certainly if one looks to the left and sees an hon. member for So and So and then the far right column an amount attributed to him, in some cases that, I have no doubt, is inaccurate, but I have to explain by saying that on both sheets there is, if you wish, a block amount. In other words, apart from every hon. member having his own phone account, there is a general account for, marked here, Liberal Opposition Office, and a general account marked on the other one, Government Members Office, and these have aggregate sums and obviously there is no breakdown, nor am I am sure that there would be under present procedures, of who used the phone in each particular instance. I can only assume, I do not know, that the reason for the inaccuracies is that a number of calls, obviously a large number of calls, for both groups, have been charged to the general office account. In other words, an hon. member might say

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1178

101 - 1

MR. SPEAKER: to a secretary, "Will you get me So and So," and that would go on a general office account. So in that sense there are inaccuracies but there is nothing I can do about it, nor would I regard the inaccuracy itself as a breach of privilege. I think it is inaccurate in the sense that the amount is not a legitimate reflection of the phone bill of any individual member; that amount could be more or it could be less but there is no way of determining that because so many calls are made just by asking a secretary, "Will you phone So and So," and that goes on a general block account. That deals with those matters.

Now on the second area. It is, I think, indisputable that the House of Assembly has a distinct identity of its own. It is not a branch of government. It has its own rights and privileges and its own identity. I am of the opinion that procedures have not always reflected this fact, and the general procedure now used with respect to billing and paying for phone calls is essentially the same one used since 1949, except at a certain period credit cards came in, that is the only difference. And basically what happens is, this is a systems thing, and general systems have always been used here, is that non-members make calls, bills are sent to the Department of Public Works, where there are individual members accounts, they go to the individual member for signature or authentication, then they go back to the Department of Public Works; Public Works instructs Finance to pay them and the data remains on files in some vault somewhere, presumably that is what happens.

Now I have today given instructions to the following effect, and this will be effective as of now,

MR. SPEAKER: that telephone bills with respect to all members, Government and Opposition, will henceforth be directed to the Speaker's Office. Now perhaps I should have prefaced that by reading from May, page 160, "Administrative action has also been taken to preserve the liberty of the electorate in communicating with Members of Parliament." I am not suggesting that liberty has been abused. I am taking an action to further entrench it, if you wish, to further entrench the liberty of the electorate in communicating with Members of Parliament. And if one could be so bold as to amend May, I go so far as to say, not only the liberty of the electorate in communicating with Members of Parliament, but the liberty of Members of Parliament in communicating with their electorate.

So with that in mind, telephone bills for all members will now be sent to the Speaker's Office. The Speaker's Office will be responsible for getting the necessary authenticating signature from each individual member, or from the responsible member in the case of a block vote, presumably the Leader of the Opposition in the case of the vote for the general amount under Opposition Office, and Government House Leader for the government office.

Now the Speaker's Office will then, after having it authenticated, instruct Finance with respect to payment. The Speaker's Office will retain the documentation. And with respect to documentation now on file, the procedure when it went through the Department of Public Works, that department has been told that this is to be regarded as documentation of the House. So those are the procedures which now apply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You cannot trust the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: It being six o'clock I leave the Chair until eight this evening.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
TABLED
APRIL 18, 1978

APR 18 1978

MINISTER OF JUSTICE

IN ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 43

- (1) Is there a psychiatrist assigned to Her Majesty's Penitentiary?

ANSWER:

Yes. Visits are made, by him, on a daily basis for the purpose of examining, assessing and treating inmates that are referred by courts, medical doctors, classification personnel, etc.

- (2) If the answer is "yes", give the name of psychiatrist.

ANSWER:

Doctor D.T. Paulse.

- (3) When was the psychiatrist appointed to Her Majesty's Penitentiary.

ANSWER:

May 28, 1975

- (4) Number of referrals from Her Majesty's Penitentiary to the Waterford Hospital during the calendar years 1975, 1976 and 1977.

ANSWER:

All referrals from Her Majesty's Penitentiary to the Waterford Hospital were admitted and treated as "In-Patients". The exact number of referrals are:-

1975 - 10

1976 - 18

1977 - 6

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1978

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

1901-01. The hon. member for Trinity Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I should not take up much -

MR. NEARY: No breaks from him yet.

MR. F. ROWE: No boy, no breaks.

MR. NEARY: No breaks yet.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I will not take up much time of the
Committee here except that I am going to compliment my colleague
and friend from Lewisporte (Mr. F. White), who got up here this
afternoon as the spokesman for Municipal Affairs and Housing,
and told it the way it is with respect to the administration of
the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Sir, I fear very much, as well that this department,
of all departments, has become one of the pork barrel departments of
this present administration. And Sir, I, though my colleague, the
member for Lewisporte, proved that beyond any question whatsoever this
afternoon. Now, Sir, I realize, as does many members in this
Committee stage, Sir, that I believe the total request for capital
funding for water and sewerage this year is something in the order
of \$228 million, the total request for the whole of the Province,
and they are still coming in. And the vote for that particular amount
is something in the order of \$12,500,000. In other words, there
is only \$12.5 million available for a request this present year - well
this is what the minister told me in his office. The requests coming
in are in the order of \$228 million, in excess of \$200 million.

Now the reason I mention that, Sir -

MR. DINER: \$12.5 million.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, well that is what I see the vote for -

MR. DINN: This is for water and sewer subsidies.

MR. F. ROWE: Water and sewer systems, so the \$220 million is requests for what?

MR. DINN: That is a request, but \$12.5 million - if the hon. member will permit, the \$12.5 million is the amount that will be paid in this year coming on subsidies for water and sewer systems that are in the ground.

MR. F. ROWE: Right.

MR. DINN: Guaranteed loans. Pay offs.

MR. F. ROWE: Plus. What else is available for water and sewerage? Anything?

MR. DINN: Yes, well that is done through the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation -

MR. F. ROWE: Which totals what? I am just asking the minister a question. This is the purpose of Committee, Mr. Chairman. I am asking - we can have an exchange.

MR. DINN: You go on. I am sorry.

MR. F. ROWE: No, I am asking the minister.

MR. DINN: I should not interrupt the hon. member.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not mind having questions answered in a - you know, go back and forth the floor. The total amount being made available by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing is what? Totals what?

MR. DINN: That will be determined.

MR. F. ROWE: That will be determined.

MR. DINN: A little later on.

MR. F. ROWE: So we do not know yet.

MR. DINN: That is right. When the programme is complete, the Capital Projects Committee -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the minister must have something in his estimates. I visited the minister's office - now, Mr. Chairman, this

MR. F. ROWE: is the point I was trying to get at - I visited the minister's office with a number of delegations, representing various incorporated communities in the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde, and I was informed, as were the members of these delegations, that something in excess of \$200 million in requests were being made of the department. Now I said that I have discovered \$12.5 million. The minister said there is some additional money which has yet to be determined to cover such requests but the only thing we have to go on here at the present time is \$12.5 million. If you want to double it, fine, if you want to triple it, fine. But the point that I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is this, is that there are other scandals going on in this Province. There were scandals mentioned this afternoon and nobody had to take it back. There are other political scandals going on in this Province other than those brought forward to the Committee this afternoon, Sir, and that is the scandal and the scandalous behaviour of ministers and/or the Premier of this Province, particularly during election campaigns, going around, meeting with various councils, and promising verbally that money would be made available immediately for water and sewerage in their particular communities.

Now, Sir, I am quite willing to give two or three specific examples. The Premier of this Province during the last election visited a community, I do mind mentioning the name of the community, the community of Bay de Verde, in the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde, which, as I described last year, has become a miniature - well, a massive cesspool. I mean, we have a very serious health problem there. And during the last election the Premier himself met with the newly formed council and promised, it is in the minutes of the meeting, that a water and sewerage system would be started in that particular community immediately.

MR. F. ROWE: This is 1978, Sir, and time and time again the officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing have sent up through the minister, presumably through Cabinet, that the water sewage system be started for the community of Bay de Verde based on the serious medical problem and potential health hazard in that community. Each time, Sir, every indication was given to me, as the member representing the district, and the council, that that was of top-number one priority and every indication was given that the funds would be voted for 1976, 1977 and again here now in 1978. And, Sir, I can only appeal to the minister to once and for all push this request that has been recommended by his own officials of his own department, push it through Cabinet and have it approved because there is a serious health problem in that particular community, high blood pressure and, to put it quite literally, Sir, the people are drinking, as one gentleman explained it to me, drinking their own water in that particular community. It is as serious as that. I have requested the report of the Department of Health on that particular community from the Minister of Health and I have yet to receive that health report. I would only assume it is so serious, Sir, that the Minister of Health refuses to send it up to me. But I have requested it three or four months ago and I have not received the report from the Department of Health on the community of Bay de Verde. It is a very serious situation, Sir, and I hope that that the minister will see fit to have Cabinet approve that particular project this year.

Sir, the Premier, to give you another example of political scandal, walked into the Town Council Office at Old Perlican during that same election when the first phase of the water and sewer system was being installed in that particular community and promised these people that any ongoing project as far as water and sewer is concerned would continue, they would not stop a project. The project was stopped in the first phase in 1975 after the provincial election and the second phase has been requested every year since and there has not been one single dollar voted for the second phase of the water and sewer system for the community of Old Perlican. Now, Sir, that is what I mean by

MR. F. ROWE: political scandal and what I mean by this department being used as a pork barrel department with respect to the administration. It is a serious situation, Sir.

And a point that I raised earlier that if the requests are in the order of something in excess of \$200 million and the government, knowing full well that they can only provide \$12 million or \$15 million or \$20 million for such work, I would suggest, Sir, that the Premier and the ministers on the other side would be held in higher esteem if they came out and told it the way the Premier indicated he would be telling it and that is the way it is. The Premier during the last election indicated that his administration would tell us the way it is. Well, the way it is, Sir, is that the request totalled in excess of \$200 million and the money available is somewhere around the order of, say, \$15 million, just to round it off. And every member opposite, particularly the Premier, knows full well that they cannot go around this Province, particularly during the heat of election campaign, and make all of these foolish promises knowing full well that they cannot be kept.

Now, Sir, I have one more example of a community, which shall remain unnamed for obvious reasons, where a delegation visited the Premier himself to make a case for funds for continuation of their water and sewerage system and the meeting was a very congenial one, Sir,

MR. F. ROWE:

a very congenial one. When the delegation was leaving, Sir, somebody just said as a joke to the Premier, "Now Frank"; if I can be permitted to use, just to make a quote from the Premier's office, "Now Frank, that is a good PC community, they should get their funds for water and sewerage." And the reply from the Premier of this Province, Sir, was "Why else would they get their funds."

AN HON. MEMBER: No!

MR. F. ROWE: "Why else would they get their funds." Now I was a witness to that with five or six other people there. "Why else would they get their funds." And, Sir, lo and behold, when the messages went out, the two communities that I mentioned earlier, zilch, in spite of the recommendations sent up by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the officials. The other community, which did not quite have the same need, did not have the same health problem, got a fairly sizeable grant for the extension of their water and sewerage system based on, I would suggest, the comments made by the Premier of this Province. Now, Sir, the minister got up this afternoon in the committee stage and he was telling us how he pounded the desk and pounded the table and made sure that certain things were done. Well I would ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to get his tin of spinach in him before he goes to the next Cabinet meeting and, Sir, instill into the Premier and into the Cabinet the serious health problems that exist in the community of Bay de Verde and the commitments that have been made to Old Perlican. Sir, we had this favour hopscotch formula that the Premier came up with the year before last, that if you had a community that had the first stage done in year one and did not get funds in year two they were guaranteed in getting funds in year three. That did not happen last year, Sir, it did not happen. And I will reiterate that in spite of the severe health problems in Bay de Verde and the fact that I am told - the minister and myself had an argument about this when I quoted the minister but I will repeat it because I can remember it very

MR. F. ROWE: clearly, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing indicated to the delegation from Bay de Verde that their request was at the top of the priority list with respect to the installation of water and sewerage.

MR. DINN: Not so.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Sir! Yes, yes, yes, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not tell us that.

MR. WHITE: You tell him that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) privately.

MR. F. ROWE: He did not tell me privately, Sir, He told a delegation from that particular community. And it is my understanding from officials that in fact that had gone to Cabinet as top priority and that is where it ended. Now, Sir, I am afraid that my other colleagues can get up and give examples of the same thing.

MR. FLIGHT: All kinds.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I would suggest that the Cabinet consider the various recommendations that go before them based on nothing else but the recommendations of the officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Because, Sir, I am acutely aware - I do not attend Cabinet meetings - that the results indicate that decisions made with respect to the approval of funds for water and sewerage for the various incorporated areas in this Province are political decisions made in Cabinet, political decisions made in Cabinet.

Now hon. members can talk about, you know, it is close to an evenness with respect to the numbers of millions of dollars spent in the Liberal districts and the PC districts. I wish my hon. friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) were here tonight because if you removed that particular district from the situation you will find, Mr. Chairman, - if you remove that particular problem from the total - you will see quite a difference in the various PC districts compared to the Liberal districts. Sir, I will use three examples here tonight in order to substantiate essentially what my colleague the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) was saying this afternoon,

MR. F.B. ROWE: that this department very unfortunately has turned into a pork barrel department. Foolish promises are being made, particularly during the heat of elections, that are way beyond the capacity of the Province to fulfill. I think that is a shame and it is a crime because the expectations of the people living in these communities are raised and when the crunch comes they end up with no money and you have people there not knowing what to do, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, can you imagine yourself living in one of these communities? You have your beautiful washroom, toilet, showers, plumbing, the works, and year after year you hold off the building of a septic tank, for example, on investing in a septic tank because you keep hearing that the government is going to come across with funds to the council for the installation of water and sewerage. And this is going on in many, many communities, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing indicate clearly and squarely to the various incorporated communities throughout this Province when they can expect to have funds made available for their water and sewerage systems. I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, that the communities that I have mentioned, Old Perlican for example, would rather hear tomorrow, would rather hear this - I am not recommending that the minister do this - but they would rather hear this, You are not going to get the second phase for three years but you will have it in three years. They would rather hear that than to hear you may get it, you may get it, you may get it, for three years.

MR. ROUSSEAU: (Inaudible) for three years.

MR. F.B. ROWE: No. There goes the minister for Menihek. Sir. The member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau), Sir, does not have this kind of worry because -

MR. FLIGHT: IOCC takes care of it.

MR. F.B. ROWE: IOCC takes care of his two communities, Sir. I suggest that the minister, the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) spend a weekend in Bay de Verde.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I did.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Okay. Well, the minister should know very well what I am talking about. The people there are wondering whether they should invest in these systems or whether the government is going to provide funds for the installation of water and sewerage.

Sir, I was going to make one other point but I did not realize my time had gone by so quickly. I did want to substantiate with a couple of examples, but as my colleague representing and shadowing the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing indicated this afternoon, Sir, I would rather that the minister tell it the way it is and hold the reins on the Premier of this Province from going around patting people on the back, having congenial, cordial little meetings with town councils, smiling and saying, Do not worry boys, you are going to get it next year when, in fact, that is not what happens. So I would like the minister to address himself to that particular point, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Before I recognize any hon. member I have a small announcement to make. It is my privilege to inform the hon. members of Committee that the executive and staff of the Labrador Resources Advisory Council that is representing all the communities in Labrador are with us this evening. They are in St. John's to present the annual report to the government and to attend a series of meetings.

They are represented here by the chairman, Mr. Toby Anderson, and by members Joshua Burdette,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ed Bonnell, Bud Rumboldt, Mike Normore, Pat Cabot, and also, executive director Bill Flowers, field worker Clara Michelin and secretary Winnifred Connors. I am sure all hon. members would like to welcome them here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take twenty minutes this time, I am just going to answer some of the questions put forward by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, just to clarify how the estimates, respond to or show what happens with water and sewer systems and how they are financed and so on: First of all, what happens is what we see in the estimates are the dollars that will be spent this year, this fiscal year 1978 - 79 for water and sewer systems that have gone on,

Mr. Dinn: that have started, are in phase one, two, or three or completed. And they are systems that have been installed or some phase of the work has gone on, and that is what we will be paying in subsidies to municipalities for the payoff of those systems.

Now how this works is this, is that this year, for example, the Capital Projects will make recommendations to the minister. The minister will take all these capital projects, go through them and find out at what phase they are in, and how quickly we can implement either phase one, two, or three, what ones will be completed this year, and what ones we will go forward with with respect to new water and sewerage systems; Go to government then and get approval from government for funds for water and sewer systems. Then what we do is we notify those municipalities that have been approved. The municipality then gets a guaranteed bank loan for that first phase or second phase or third phase or whatever it is. When that phase is completed we go to the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation which gets dollars and pays back that guaranteed loan, and finances the water and/or sewer system over a forty year period.

So what we see in the Budget, the \$12.5 million is what we are going to pay on water and sewer systems in the past. What we will see next year if we do, say, \$21 million worth of work in the 1978-1979 fiscal year, what we will see next year is what we will pay on the systems that we have, the \$12.5 million, plus the additional for what systems we started in phase one, two, or three, or whatever in this year. So that will show in the estimates next year and it will go up by - if you will notice over the past few years it has gone up by sometimes \$1.5 million or \$2 million or \$3 million. You will see that increase as the years go by and that is what we will be paying for, past systems. Okay?

Now with respect to what I said to a council -

AN HON. MEMBER:

As clear as mud.

MR. DINN:

- as clear as mud! - what I said to the council

Mr. Dinn: of Bay de Verde. I can stand here, I can get the hon. member to bring the same people into my office, and I can stand up in front of them and say, without fear of contradiction, that I did not say that they were on top of, in the middle of or on the bottom of any list. Now this is not to say that they were not on top of a list, because Bay de Verde is pretty close alphabetically to the top of a list, on any list alphabetically.

MR. F. ROWE: Alphabetically, I should hope so.

MR. DINN: But with respect to where they sit -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: With respect to where they sit prioritywise -

MR. MORGAN: Take him out to Bonavista.

MR. DINN: - all I can say to that is that last year the final -

MR. F. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member want the information or not? Because this is important, I believe, to him especially with respect to the town of Bay de Verde because I believe that there is a problem there. It has been identified to me, and I think possibly we can do something about it. Now that is not saying that is going to be done this year. Hopefully it will. I think it might. I do not know.

MR. WHITE: When will we know?

MR. DINN: I do not know. Shortly, by leave.

MR. MORGAN: By leave!

MR. DINN: Now this is serious. The fact of the matter is that last year we got a list - there is no denying that - also with that list we got where that sat with respect to was final design done? Is there a health problem? How much will this cost? Some of these phases, for example, would cost \$750,000, and we felt that \$750,000 for a phase in a particular town was too much because, as the hon. member has said, towns are getting frustrated because we cannot do them all at one time. And if I were in any of those particular

Mr. Dinn: towns I would be frustrated also.

But with respect to Bay de Verde, this year the hon. member will note, and I brought it up earlier this afternoon, that if he looks down through the estimates, I forget the number on the estimate because I do not have the book here in front of me, but if he will look down through the estimates you will see \$600,000 for engineering and consulting work.

MR. F. ROWE: For design too.

MR. DINN: For design, right. Now if he would check with the Town Council of Bay de Verde you

MR. DINN: will also find out that that final design will be done before, or pretty soon after, the Capital Projects go to my colleagues for approval. Now we could not do it last year and there were other projects that we could not do, and there were some projects, by the way, that we took on last year that did not have the final design done and did not get done, and the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) alluded to that today. We finished the estimates last year, we got approval for the different projects, and before we could get the final design done - the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) will remember Trinity, for example, Bonavista Bay, that did not get the final design done until late September and could not go to contract.

So in Bay de Verde's case, the final design was not done. What was done in Bay de Verde, Mr. Chairman, just to clarify for the hon. member, what was done in Bay de Verde was a preliminary design and that preliminary design does not tell them how and what has to be done.

MR. PECKFORD: You cannot go to tender with that.

MR. DINN: We cannot go to tender with that, that is absolutely correct as my hon. colleague informs us. What we are doing now in several municipalities, some of which will not go forward this year because we are going to try to attempt to complete some of the ones that have been ongoing and complete phase two or three of ones that have started, and hopefully the new projects, which is what we have gone to final design for some of these on, Bay de Verde being one, Project Management and Design is the consulting firm and they have been appointed to get on with the job so that if the dollars are made available that could be one of the ones that would go ahead.

AN HON. MEMBER: Could be.

MR. DINN: But that is all I can say at this point in time.

MR. F. ROWE: Could I ask a question?

MR. DINN: Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the hon. minister has yielded.

MR. DINN: I yielded, Mr. Chairman, for the hon. member to

MR. DINN: ask me a question.

MR. F. ROWE: Just a question, Mr. Chairman, it is not meant to be an embarrassing one, but would the minister this year, out of courtesy to all members on both sides of the House of Assembly, undertake to inform each MHA when each one of these councils are sent a telegram indicating whether or not their projects have been approved or disapproved because it is a discourtesy, I would suggest, to hon. members of the House, you know, for other people to have the information and not the members themselves.

MR. F. ROWE: Want me to give you a poll captain?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Now last year the hon. member will know that, realizing the frustration that some councils were going through, I endeavoured not only to send out telegrams to the councils to indicate which ones were going forward.

MR. WHITE: That was nice.

MR. DINN: Yes, it is nice to hear, all councils like to hear that. But I also inform councils which ones were not. And it will not be too long before they will know, I mean they will at least know for this year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated this afternoon in debate, that the Capital Projects people have about 200 requests in, over 200 requests actually, for capital projects, and what we are attempting to do and, when we get the capital projects programme set forward for this year, what we are going to attempt to do is to take all of these projects and put them in an order so that we will know what is going to be done in the next four or five or six years. So that we have a five year plan, like the hon. the Minister of Fisheries has for fisheries. He has a plan of how to go forward. The Capital Projects Committee of my department -

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible)

MR. DINN: And that is exactly what we need. The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who did very well on special grants this year, and artesian wells and all this kind of thing, that is the kind of thing that we need in this Province because we cannot go on in a - we have a programme but the programme seems to be flexible. What we are trying to do is to put some kind of a little better direction and we have this committee set up, they are doing an excellent job and hopefully we will be able to announce what is going on in the next few years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! There are many members who want to speak in the debate of course and it always places the Chair in a bit of a difficult situation, but one tries to remember who has been attempting to get up longest so I recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of suggestions from the other side that we not be so negative in debating

MR. T. LUSH: the estimates, that we be more positive, and I want to assure the hon. House that is not within my personality to be negative. I have to wrestle with myself to be negative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. LUSH: I have really got to talk to myself, but in this I must say with these particular estimates that I find just the opposite, that I find that I cannot be positive. How can I be positive when, Mr. Chairman, there is such a desperate need for public services in my own district, such a desperate need for water, such a desperate need for improved roads? When you have that situation, Mr. Chairman, there is no way that a person can be negative.

In the last six years, or since 1972, since this government assumed office, in my district there has been approximately \$2 million spent. In six years, \$2 million - not very significant, Mr. Chairman to meet the tremendous need. Broken down that is \$170,000 spent in Salvage over three years for an artesian well system; Glovertown, \$617,000 spent for a water and sewer system - \$617,000. The minister knows the story on Glovertown very well; they did not receive any capital expenditures or capital funding last year. And then Port Blanford, \$127,000 for a total of \$914,000 over six years and I might say that pretty close to 90 per cent of that has been spent in the district since I have been the member there and the rest, the other 20 per cent, spent while the present member for Bonavista South was the member for my district or part thereof.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to be positive in as much as I would like to be positive. And I would like to compliment our spokesman for the fine job that he did in presenting his talk to the estimates this afternoon. The minister, I thought, was very unfair to the member for Lewisporte and at one point almost got to name calling the hon. member for Lewisporte. Indeed he said that, referring to the shadow, he said he was only a shadow of what he thought he was, this man was only a shadow. And the description that immediately raised to my mind of the minister was that the minister is a mirage.

MR. T. LUSH: For hon. members, a mirage is an illusion, something that does not exist, and from the comments of what the member for Lewisporte was saying I could not help but thinking, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is indeed a mirage.

But, Mr. Chairman, on to the needs of my own district. I have mentioned just about \$2 million spent in the past six years. I have given the exact figure of \$914,000. Stretch that for a few thousand for artesian wells, stretch it for a few thousand for road grants under the sixty - forty cost sharing arrangement, and the outside figure certainly would be \$2 million. Now the question that I would like to ask the minister is this, how does this compare with the total amount of capital expenditures allocated to, let us say, Bonavista South over the past six years?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, or Green Bay.

MR. T. LUSH: How does that compare with the capital expenditures allocated to Trinity North over the past six years?

AN HON. MEMBER: 2 per cent, 'Charlie'.

MR. T. LUSH: How does this figure \$2 million compare with the capital expenditures spent in Bonavista North in the last two and a half years? Mr. Chairman, if I could be provided with these figures I think they would tell a story.

MR. LUSH: That is the kind of information that I would like to be able to get my hands on, Mr. Chairman, and then I would have some idea of what criteria are used in selecting communities to receive capital expenditures. That is the kind of information that the minister should provide if, indeed, the situation is as the hon. minister outlined it this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, the minister a moment ago said he knew the towns were frustrated. I am glad that the minister knows the towns are frustrated, municipal areas, incorporated areas are frustrated. I can tell the minister now why these towns are frustrated. The reason they are frustrated is because there is no equitable formula for the distribution of capital expenditures - there is no rhyme nor reason to it. Mr. Chairman, if there is some criteria then the minister should lay it upon the table of the House. If there is some criteria laid out, what is the criteria? Is it the tax base of each town? The ability to pay? Is it the needs? Is it to develop industry in the area? If these are the criteria then certainly the minister should not be ashamed to lay the criteria upon the table of the House; neither should he be ashamed to lay upon the table of the House the recommended list that was sent to his department from the Capital Projects Committee last year. That would certainly answer a lot of questions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. LUSH: If the minister were to lay upon the table of the House the list of communities that were selected by the Committee to receive funding for water and sewer, then there would be no doubt in the minds of the councillors of Clovertown, who last year kicked up such a furore when they had their -

April 18, 1978

Tape 1187 (Night)

EC - 2

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report no progress - not report.

MR. HICKMAN: Did the hon. gentleman yield?

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Sure.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, that is a doubtful motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ok!

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order, the hon. gentleman did not yield. The hon. gentleman was not recognized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I did not hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman yielded and I move the Committee rise and not make a report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I did not recognize the hon. gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody else -

MR. NEARY: You are stalling, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman is deliberately stalling the Committee.

MR. NOLAN: Shocking! Shocking! Shocking!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I feel I can rule on that. I did not recognize the hon. member. The hon. member from Terra Nova was speaking and he was more or less interrupted. I did not recognize the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I made my ruling. If you want to challenge it there is a way to go about it.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I was answering-

MR. NEARY: Utterly partisan!

MR. LUSH: - the minister to his point when he said that the hon. minister -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

April 18, 1978

Tape 1187 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. LUSH:

Sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I cannot accept the last remark by the hon. member for LaPoile and I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY:

What was the remark, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I did hear the word 'partisan', 'very partisan'.

MR. NEARY:

Well, if Your Honour heard that I withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the big reason for frustration among municipalities in Newfoundland today is because there is no equitable method of distribution of funds for capital expenditures in this Province, no rhyme nor reason, and I was saying if the minister is convinced that there is some justifiable criteria on which these selections were made then he should table the criteria, and also the minister should table the list of communities that were selected by the Capital Projects Committee last year, then that would solve a lot of questions that arise in people's minds in respect to the allocation of these funds. But in the eyes of councillors when they look around and see this community getting a water and sewer project and that community getting a water and sewer project and they left out for so long that this creates a feeling of animosity, conflict and

MR. LUSH: fierce competition among the municipalities of this Province to scramble after the public dollars. If there were some equitable means I think there would be much better municipal relations in this Province, you would not find the conflict that is presently in existence. The hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) talks about regional councils, I certainly agree with regional councils but I would suggest first that the minister has to get our present system working, that has got to work, let us get that working, let us iron out the bugs in that, let us iron out the inequities that are in existence in this present system, and let us come up with a more equitable means of distributing funds so that municipalities will get together and fight for the common good of all the communities in a given area. But such is not the case, Mr. Chairman, such is not the case and the government have made their own problems by an inequitable method of allocating funds.

And what I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to know is what councils last year, for example, what councils last year in Newfoundland received road grants outside of the regulations, that is the sixty-forty cost sharing arrangement? What councils in Newfoundland last year received monies outside of that grant, not in accordance with these regulations, were there any? I sort of have been fed that information that there was a council in Gambo receiving such grants for a road other than the sixty-forty cost sharing; that was a commitment of course made by the Premier in the by-election. They are having some difficulty I think getting other monies for their other roads, there was just one done, Church Hill where my parents live, and I am very pleased about that, very pleased about it. I can go and drive very comfortably to my parent's house now so I am not at all -

AN HON. MEMBER: What district is that?

MR. LUSH: Bonavista North. And I

MR. LUSH: do not begrudge this to Gambo, my home town, do not begrudge it. I am talking about the equitable treatment, and when this is not done the conflict that this causes and the animosity between communities in Newfoundland, and we cannot afford to have that. We want to have our communities working together, and as long as that system is in existence we are not going to have any co-ordinated effort among our communities, no harmony, and we are going to have this conflict continually and it is up to the minister to bring a stop to this.

Mr. Chairman, it is dreadful the conflict and the animosity that is in our local communities because of this distribution of funds-

MR. WHITE: He will never live it down, boy.

MR. LUSH: - this terrible method of distributing funds in the Province and the minister certainly must take a look at this situation. There are terrible municipal relations in this Province right now, Mr. Chairman. I have a question I would like to raise with the minister, although it is not in any way following out of anything I am saying, but I think it shows the lack of support services to municipalities and the question is related to legislation helping councils to collect their taxes, the tax default of the residents in their communities. The legislation says, as I recall it, that there is a minimum fine of twenty-five dollars to be imposed upon people who are in tax arrears and then the legislation goes on to say that the courts shall force the people to pay the outstanding taxes.

I do not know whether or not the minister is aware that this is happening. The minimum fine is not being imposed of twenty five-dollars, neither are the courts directing the delinquent taxpayers to pay that tax. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is tremendously defeating the town councils, self defeating when the courts do not make the people that are in arrears to pay that tax. Then what happens the next year? Of course nobody pays, because all they are going to get is a ten dollar fine slapped on them. I wanted to bring that

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1188

AH-3

MR. LUSH: to the minister's attention because it is an important area and one that has been brought to my attention by several councils in the Terra Nova district,

Mr. Lush: and it is something that certainly needs immediate attention. The legislation is there, and it should be enforced. It must be enforced to give councils the kind of support that they need in collecting revenues. Heaven knows it is difficult enough in many of the communities to get revenues, and when they get delinquent taxpayers and no method of getting it back, then something certainly must be done to ensure that this does not happen in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Municipal Affairs is a major portfolio for all rural Newfoundland in particular. And we need sane, rational policies, equitable policy to help these areas develop, areas without the essential services of water and sewer and good roads. I have alluded to some of the needs in my district, and I just want to finish on the artesian well programme. I am not sure, and I think maybe this is what the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) was suggesting when he was referring to the artesian well programme. I do not know where this programme is now. It used to be a minimum of five families applying in an unincorporated area.

MR. NOLAN: Fifteen now, is it not?

MR. LUSH: I do not know what it is now.

MR. NOLAN: What is it 'Jim'?

MR. LUSH: I got some information fed to me to say that it was only going to be recognized on a community level. I went to my district and formed three Community Water Committees, three, and I did that last year because I sort of got some advanced notice that this was going to be the situation. Still these three communities have made their applications, but no response. Nobody from the department to go down and take a look at the situation and to study it as is normally done to stall for time, but not even that activity. That would have been grateful to see somebody down there studying the situation. So I do not know now whether it is five families, whether it is fifteen families is the requirement, or whether it is all of the community, I do not know. And I would like for the minister to answer

Mr. Lush: that. And if it is to be a Water Committee for the total community, then what time is the minister going to notify these communities? What is going to happen to those applications that have been in the Department of Municipal Affairs for three, four, five years whatever. What is going to happen to them?

AN HON. MEMBER: Filed under G.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I am getting letters every day from people who applied for an artesian well back three years ago, four years ago, whenever the programme started, and no action. What is going to happen to these people if all of a sudden the Department of Municipal Affairs is going to embark upon a new programme.

And this points to another reason for frustration within our towns, the lack of information that is fed to the communities with respect to new policies and new developments. Last year the minister no doubt will recall that this change in policy was elucidated or illustrated through this questionnaire which the Department of Municipal Affairs wanted a commitment from the people, a commitment from 80 per cent of the people that they would pay X amount of dollars for water and sewer, or water or sewer whatever the case, a different amount in each situation.

But, Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correct, that councils received very little of this, very little notice. It was very close to the time when they had to be submitting their budgets. It did not give councils a chance to call meetings with the public, and to talk this situation up, and to try and spread proper information, and to try and get their people to see the necessity of making a contribution towards water services or water and sewer services. So, Mr. Chairman, no wonder that we are having difficulty in municipal areas to get people to come to that kind of a commitment, that they should feel that they have to pay for services when there is not sufficient information flowing out to them when the department never gave councils time enough to be able to disseminate this information and to talk to their people about it in a sane and

April 18, 1978

Tape 1189

PK - 3

Mr. Lush: rational way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: (Inaudible).

MR. NOLAN: Shame, 'Luke'! Shame, 'Luke'!

AN HON. MEMBER: The member is going to move that the Committee
rise.

MR. NOLAN: Shame, 'Luke', Shame 'Luke'! I never thought
of it would be you.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am just about finished up
now.

MR. LUSH: I just want to clue up my brief remarks by saying that, yes, towns are frustrated in this Province, municipal areas and unincorporated areas, they are frustrated because of the inequitable way that the monies of this Province are allocated, in a way that has no system, no reason, nor rhyme. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that there is probably a lot of jubilation tonight in the members on the opposite side of the House, since they heard the poll.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - there is fifty-eight per cent in their favour and forty-two in the favour of the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: I would just say that was a 400 people poll, by the way. But I do not think the Leader of the Opposition was too happy when he came home on Saturday from Quebec and read the editorial in The Evening Telegram. If he were, I think he should be over in his seat now controlling his members and especially the member for LaPoile (Mr. Heary), who is trying to destroy the credibility of this House. The Premier is gone, he is attending a function tonight, a special function.

MR. NOLAN: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been made.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman opposite, whom we have known for some time -

MR. RIDGOUT: He is gone berserk.

MR. NOLAN: - has always been known as a good Christian member, whatever else he may be known for.

MR. WOODROW: That I have.

MR. NOLAN: And I do not -

MR. WOODROW: You are wasting time, boy.

MR. NOLAN: And I do not think that he, above any other partisanship that any of us might have been guilty of in the past, Mr. Chairman, we have never associated this kind of an attack on an hon. member who is not even in his seat. So therefore I would think that the hon. member would not want to have it as a matter of record of this House which is recorded in Hansard, and will be read by countless generations to come, God help them. But the fact is that I am sure the hon. member would want to withdraw that remark at least to give our hon. friend an opportunity to defend himself. If he is going to use these tactics at least have the decency -

AN HON. MEMBER: And the relevancy.

MR. NOLAN: - and the relevancy to do it while the hon. gentleman is here in the House. Please, I would hope that the hon. member would behave towards the members opposite as he would have us behave towards him, surely.

MR. WHITE: - Despicable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I feel that in the heat of debate the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was irrelevant, so it is not a point of order, I would ask him to please be relevant.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am really thinking and listening and as not only the members on the opposite side of the House, but all of us, when we think of water and sewerage, and roads in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, we forget the terrain. Why in fact there are places, for example, who knows Trinity - Bay de Verde more than I do?

MR. F. ROY: I do.

MR. WOODROW: No, my hon. friend. My mother came from Red Head Cove -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. WOODROW: - and I know every rock in Red Head Cove, and I was going to say, let us take, for example, Red Head Cove alone, how could you put a water and sewerage system in Red Head Cove? And in fact there are places, for example, in the Bay of Islands district, there are places in Labrador, and take Flat Rock and many other places throughout the Province. I do not think there is enough money, I was going to say in the Bank of Montreal, but I do not think there is enough money in God's world to look after all the water and sewerage systems for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. And I think that when we get up to speak I think we should try to face things realistically. That is the important thing, is it not? Face it realistically.

Now I notice from the estimates that they have gone from \$37 million to \$53 million, and the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing is not an easy one to operate because in the urban and the rural

MR. WOODROW: areas of the Province you have people who are looking for improved water services, or water services, whatever the case may be. So in actuality it is a very, very difficult department to look after. But I must, at the outset of my few remarks, I must congratulate the minister, He is young, he has vim, he has energy and I believe sincerely he is doing a very good job. I hope he continues to do the job he is doing.

Now I also realize that the Opposition have a job to do as well. It is their place to criticize and may I say that - they are all after leaving almost - may I say that I think they are doing a very good job, and that is what they are supposed to do. I do not think the day will ever come again in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador when we will have, say, ninety or ninety-five per cent on this side or vice versa. I think, thank God, these days are gone because people now in the Province are no longer party minded. You have a certain group, I know, they are no longer party minded, what they are doing now is they are voting for the man.

I think if the hon. member for - goodness, to forget is shocking - Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), I feel if he wants to be re elected I think he will.

MR. WHITE: Bay of Islands?

MR. WOODROW: Naturally I hope he will be elected under a PC banner in his own district the next time. I am sure he will. It is too bad to have him over on that side of the house.

MR. NOLAN: Now watch your language.

MR. WOODROW: Now, Mr. Chairman, I told the story last night, I made it in the form of a story, about the hon. Minister of Fisheries, who visited my district in March 1976 and there were some good things came from that.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. WOODROW: Now also I had a visit from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on June 18th., June 13th. of last year.

MR. NOLAN: He only goes to Mount Pearl.

MR. WOODROW: And at the time he was busy and said he was trying to meet the Council in Corner Brook, and the joint councils, in fact he spoke at the joint councils, but there is one important thing that was needed in the Bay of Islands district and that was an incinerator. There was an incinerator needed for the South shore of the Bay of Islands. And I must say that the councils out there, the Rural District Council of Halfway Point, Benoit's Cove, John's Beach, Frenchman's Cove, the Community Council of York Harbour and Lark Harbour, they got together on it, they negotiated it, they talked it over and now it is becoming a reality.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: It has been approved. I am very happy, in fact, to know that, I hope that incinerators will be used in other parts of the Provinces as well because I think it certainly would be a great save on the disposal of garbage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, you know, thanks be to God, I can say all is not doom and gloom. I think I have been trying—and I should not use the word "I" I suppose. It sounds a little bit selfish sometimes. Maybe I should use, like Bas Jamieson, I should use the word "we". In fact it is we, with the councils and the member in fact and the people

MR. WOODROW:

of that community have been doing our best to try to provide the needs of the community and especially in the field of water and sewerage, in the field of roads and in the field of fire-fighting equipment as well. We have in fact just to briefly run over it, we have a very good water system on the way in the community of Cox's Cove, I think at the present time they are probably in their third phase now. They are constructing a dam at the present time which will hold one million gallons of water and it is not only going to be a good thing for the people but it is going to be a good thing for the fish plant over there as well. Also in the community of McIver's, they are working over there, I think they will be in their second phase this year. And the community of Gillams as well, in fact, they are also doing well. I do not know if any hon. members have ever visited the community of Gillams but it is a very fine community. They happen to have a man over there who works, I would say he puts in one hundred and fifty per cent of his time, not one hundred per cent but he puts in one hundred and fifty per cent of his time in doing honest work and as a result of having a man like Mr. Alfred Banks the community is making great progress in the field of water and sewer.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, could you get some order back in the gallery there because with the conversation going on I cannot hear the hon. member speaking.

MR. WOODROW: Now, Mr. Chairman, we are also working on the community of Meadows and finally \$77,300 worth of design has been done for the Department of Urban Management and Design. It was paid for from the engineering survey vote in 1977 and we are hoping that some more money will be spent in the community of Meadows this year. In fact, the council has been very active over there and working along with the member and I think this really is very encouraging.

Now even though something like \$700,000 was

MR. WOODROW: spent in the community of Mount Moriah, the community is growing and they still want more and I suppose that is the way it should be. It is nice to see the communities in every part of the Province growing but as the community grows they want more and more and they naturally have a right to more. Also along the South shore of the Bay of Islands, that is from Halfway Point to Franciman's Cove, water supply improvements, phase one, Project Planning and engineering Limited have permission to design these for the first phase in the amount of \$305,000. It is only in the planning stages, I do not know when the work will be done but I hope it will be done sometime, I hope in the next two or three years. The communities of York Harbour and Lark Harbour have not been pressing for water and sewerage. In fact they have been blessed really with a good flow of water from the Majestic Hills that surround the community. However, in the community of Lark Harbour, Project Planning and Engineering Limited were appointed

MR. WOODROW: in 1977 to carry out a feasibility study and this, I think, would cost something like \$4,000. And the same thing applies to York Harbour. So I am trying to work along with the communities. That is all, in fact, any member can do. I feel sure that all members, in fact, will work along with their communities as well. I do not mind repeating again as I said last night, it is unfortunate when it comes to a thing like water and sewerage that we have to have partisan politics involved, but I suppose as long as we are living in a democracy, and thank God we are, this is always going to exist.

Now, Mr. Chairman, also in the field of fire-fighting for the Province, I do believe that the department has a very good set up. They give 50 per cent to any community that wishes to buy a fire truck, and of course, the other 50 per cent in fact is found by the community, and I think it gives the community an initiative. And glory be to God, if the government gives them everything what initiative would they have to work?

When I was elected in Bay of Islands I made one promise. I hear so much about promises from the other side. I made one promise and I am keeping it. My promise was to try to do all I could for people, but I had a few priorities on my list; water and sewerage was one, and I had fire-fighting as well. I am really kind of glad to know that some progress is being made in the field of fire-fighting. And I would like to say, first of all, that the urban part of my district which starts at St. Mary's Bridge - or another way to identify it is Dr. Murray's clinic over there in Curling - and it continues on down to the Mount Moriah boundary. And of course, that part of the district is looked after

MR. WOODROW: by the city of Corner Brook.
And I am speaking now about fire-fighting, Mr. Chairman,
and naturally there is no problem there.

And I also learned today that there is - I do not know if it is written or unwritten - but there is an agreement between the city of Corner Brook and the community of Mount Moriah and, I believe, the community of Massey Drive, the district of my hon. friend from Humber East (Dr. Farrell), that these two communities, as far as fire-fighting is concerned, are looked after by the city of Corner Brook. I think that is really wonderful.

And there is also a fire truck in the community of Gillams. I notice here that the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing gave them last year \$1,500 to renovate their fire hall, and they borrowed the same amount and certainly they have done a nice job on it. And the community of Gillams had just got \$7,000 to get a fire truck, but I would like to let hon. gentlemen know that they had their \$7,000 ready as well. So I think that is all right.

And in the meantime, the community of Cox's Cove are negotiating as well for a fire truck. So I think there really is no doubt about it, that is progress. It may be slow, but at least, I suppose, we are getting there.

And I would also like to say probably in general that the urban part of my district once again is looked after by the city of Corner Brook, and in that part we have the NIP area.

Mr. Woodrow: There are some \$4.4 million being spent in the NIP area. Of course, it is, as you know, federal-provincial-municipal, and in that area you have the RRAP as well, which of course brings more money there.

Curling, in fact, the hills up there, Woodbine, Pennell's Lane, what is the other one there? Conway Road - they are impossible to get over those streets in the Wintertime. Now we have the streets through the hills, or sideways - well, whatever you want to call it - and this is certainly going to enhance that part of the city of Corner Brook, and of course that part of the Bay of Islands district. And this certainly makes me very happy.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in the field, for example, of roads, I speak now of the by-roads or the council roads, however you refer to them, there is still a lot to be done in this field. And I am trying now to get the minister to do something about the road we call Farm Road.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is it?

MR. WOODROW: Farm Road. That is the road that leads into the Temple Collegiate in Gillams, and it takes children from Hughes Brook in my hon. friend's district for Humber Valley (Mr. House), and down to and including Cox's Cove. At the present time to upgrade that road there needs to be about \$75,000 spent on it. I hope that some agreement will be reached so that road can be done because it is a very important road in the community of Gillams, and, I say, on the North Shore of the Bay of Islands.

And again, in fact, the community of Summerside have been upset over this week over roads. Third Avenue, in fact, to get that road properly done it would cost something like \$40,000. So you can see -

AN HON. MEMBER: You only have half a minute.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Chairman, it takes a lot but thank God we are getting there, and I want to wish the minister every

Mr. Woodrow: success in his department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to be very long because I know there are a number of my colleagues who want to speak on these particular estimates because they are very important to their districts.

But I do want to make a couple of references, Mr. Chairman, to a few things that were raised this afternoon particularly by the Minister of Tourism, when he got up and unleashed a vicious attack on me for some of the comments that I made in opening my remarks this afternoon. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to say I do not think it is any accident that today in Gander a new Trans-Canada Highway agreement was signed, and also an announcement made within the past few days about a start being made this year in completion by Fall of the Changes Islands ferry terminals. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, it is no secret, it is no accident that this has come about within weeks after the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) being removed from the Department of Transportation and Communications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: And I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if that particular gentleman were still in the department that Changes Islands would have to go another year or two without having any new terminal facilities going ahead, and also we would still be riding over bumpy roads on the Trans-Canada Highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: So if the hon. Premier has not done anything else within the last six months that has been smart, Mr. Chairman, removing that hon. gentleman from Transportation and Communications was very, very smart indeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman got up today and said that the community of Stoneville, which is an unincorporated community in my district, received \$8,000 last year from the Department of Municipal Affairs for artesian wells. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that he should recheck his facts, because the town of Stoneville, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. MORGAN: The shadow knows!

MR. WHITE: - got \$100,000 from Canada Works to carry out -

MR. MORGAN: The shadow knows!

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, is it possible - I have been sitting in this House for the last two and a half, three years right across from the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and to my way of thinking, I cannot even get this out without the hon. Lip keeps continuing, so I would like to be heard in silence, Mr. Chairman, if you do not mind, by that hon. gentleman. Because his mouth is as big as the rest of his body.

MR. NOLAN: The Bonavista Barbie doll.

MR. WHITE: So, Mr. Chairman, if you would I would ask that you either throw him out of the House or have him keep his mouth shut.

April 18, 1978

Tape 1195 (Night)

EC - 1

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, if you would, I would ask that you either throw him out of the House or have him keep his mouth shut.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member requests silence for his remarks.

The hon. member.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying with respect to Stoneville, the town did receive a grant from the Canada Works for \$100,000 and there was an \$8,000 grant from the Department of Municipal Affairs to provide some piping, although that was a bit delayed and it was almost Christmas before the pipe got on scene, and I would say to the minister that in the coming year certainly he should look at the Water Services Division. The same thing applied in Brown's Arm. The hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) said Brown's Harbour - that shows how much he knows about some places in my district - but Brown's Arm, Mr. Chairman, did receive a small grant for an artesian well, but nothing developed on that and I do not know why Water Services kept telling me that it was going to go ahead and it never did. The same thing with Boyd's Cove, Mr. Chairman; that was supposed to go ahead last year, but nothing developed with respect to that. Lawrenceton, one well was dug there, Mr. Chairman, and that was the total number of artesian wells dug in my district last year - one well in Lawrenceton.

But the best of all, Mr. Chairman, is Little Burnt Bay, and I think the minister would be wise to check this out, because he did give the community council of Little Burnt Bay a definite commitment on \$23,000 of a survey with respect to artesian wells being drilled to determine whether or not there was suitable water within the community. That commitment was given verbally by the

MR. WHITE: minister, verbally by his officials. His officials say today even that that commitment was given, Mr. Chairman, but right after the Twillingate by-election I received a letter saying that the \$23,000 had been expended and it would not be available for Little Burnt Bay. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the situation is on that and I would like for the minister to tell us when his time comes to speak again, if he does have the opportunity to speak again and is not railroaded by his colleague.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that members of the Capital Projects Committee have been done a grave injustice by ministers on the other side putting the onus on the Capital Projects Committee, some of whom are listening to this debate, by indicating that they are responsible for the method in which capital projects for the Province are approved each year. Now, Mr. Chairman, I asked the minister this afternoon when I spoke to come clean with the House, to tell the House exactly the way capital projects are approved in this Province. They are approved by the Cabinet, Mr. Chairman, no other way. There is no other system, there is no other method, they are approved by the Cabinet. The Capital Projects Committee simply collects the necessary data from the various town and community councils around the Province and then they make their recommendations to Cabinet. Now, Mr. Chairman, their recommendations to Cabinet have no basis whatsoever with respect to approving capital projects. Capital projects are approved by the Cabinet and are based on partisan, political thinking. Now why do we not realize this fact, Mr. Chairman? And to back up what I am saying, I am asking the minister to please table in this House, as I asked him this afternoon - yesterday, Mr. Chairman,

April 18, 1978

Tape 1195 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. WHITE: we had to ask the Minister of Fisheries three times to tell the House what the government's position was with respect to the equity and the Nordsee deal in Harbour Grace. Now this is twice today that I have asked the minister to table in the House a complete list of all the capital projects that went ahead in this Province last year. His predecessor, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) did it, Mr. Chairman, and I have them here and we could refer to them,

MR. WHITE:

criticize them at will and give our opinions on them. Now I am asking the present minister to do the same thing - table in this House, Mr. Chairman, a complete list of capital projects that went ahead in this Province during the past fiscal year. We are now being called upon once again to approve monies for expenditure in the Department of Municipal Affairs this year and we still do not know where the money that we approved last year went. So all I am asking, Mr. Chairman, is for the hon. the Minister of Municipal Housing to be a man, to table in this House exactly where the money was spent, exactly where the projects went ahead and so on because he mentioned this afternoon some figures which indicated that a large amount of money had been spent in opposition districts last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister knows and I know and everybody else knows that \$3 million of the \$4 million that the hon. gentleman mentioned went to Conception Bay South, or just about that amount, and \$1 million went to Carbonear, so that is two districts on this side. What happened in the rest? Absolutely nothing, Mr. Chairman. I think the minister in all fairness, if he expects us to approve all this money for him this year coming in this Budget, and all we are asking is that he table the list so we can look at it and see. Mr. Chairman, we had a situation in this House last year and the year before with respect to Rural Development. We could not get the list of monies that were approved for the various rural development loans and grants and we tried to get that tabled in the House. We could not get it tabled. We have been trying now, Mr. Chairman, to get the list of capital projects tabled and we cannot get that tabled yet. This afternoon the Premier comes in in his usual small way and flicks out the cost of a few telephone bills, and that shows the kind of priority that the hon. the Premier has for development in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to ask the Minister of

MR. WHITE: Municipal Affairs and Housing what he intends to do about the commitments, something to the tune of \$20 or \$25 billion that were made during the Twillingate by-election - about \$20 million or \$25 million on municipal services alone that were made during the Twillingate by-election. Many of the telegrams, Mr. Chairman, approving the funds were sent out the night before voting day. The day before voting day, Mr. Chairman, on the night before people were going to the polls, the councils all received telegrams from the minister indicating that the money had been approved. I would like for the minister to tell us about those approvals and what happens to that money, Mr. Chairman, that was allocated during the Twillingate by-election. Mr. Chairman, I think here that we should call upon the member for Grand Falls district to justify his promises to the people of Twillingate district during the by-election with respect to municipal affairs.

Mr. Chairman, at best it is hypocritical and at worst downright deception for the former Minister of Rural Development to resign over an unkept promise to the people of Grand Falls district when he made dozens in the Twillingate by-election. So where is his moral integrity now in this House and why do we not hear from that non. gentleman with respect to the many commitments that he made to God-fearing Newfoundlanders who took the commitments in good faith during the Twillingate by-election? I would like to hear about that and I will be saying more on that, Mr. Chairman, when the time comes for me to speak in the Budget debate later on.

I would also like the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Chairman, to tell us the system whereby CMC loans and grants are made for water and sewer systems. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a whole file here of CMC approved loans to municipalities in Newfoundland and for some strange reason, Mr. Chairman, the districts in which they are approved are very similar to the districts represented by non. members on the opposite side here, Mr. Chairman - Pasadena, Dover, Massey Drive, Corner Brook, Clarendville, Bonavista, other places,

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 1196¹

JM - 3

MR. WHITE: Northwest River, Upper Island Cove, Trinity, Dark Cove, Middle Brook, South Brook, Halls Bay and I can go on, Corner Brook, St. John's, Bishops Falls, Clarenville, Deer Lake, Gander, Grand Falls, Mount Pearl and others, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know what arrangements are made with CMHC and how the system develops. Now from what I am told, CMHC basically make loans and grants available on the recommendation of the Minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and I would hate

MR. WHITE: to think for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that with this government's record of finding all kinds of ways to pump the various little bits of money that are available into their own districts that they have also found a way to direct federal money into their own districts as well. And I would like to hear the minister tell us about some of those projects when he speaks today. And, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to know something about what my colleague, the member for Burgeo - Ray d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), referred to this afternoon with respect to Mount Pearl. I notice the Mayor of Mount Pearl was here in the gallery a moment ago. We heard on the news tonight where the RCMP conducted several raids today, Mr. Chairman, one of them being within the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and sure, Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are being asked to approve over \$60 million for the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, we should have at least some explanation of why the RCMP are poking around in the minister's department; even today, Mr. Chairman, and tonight with the estimates going through we would like to know.

So I am asking the minister, Mr. Chairman, to come clean with the Committee, to give us the list of projects that were approved last year, where the money was spent, Mr. Chairman, and to let us know exactly what is going on with respect to this. I noticed this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that the minister talked a brief bit about the member for Port de Grave and the money he has extracted from the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and I say, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Port de Grave (Mr. E. Dawe) has good reason to support this government, and I am sure it will be all out in the House before this session is all over.

MR. E. DAWE: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member just remarked, he said that it will all come out before this session is over why I am supporting the government in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

MR. DAVE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. DAVE: The hon. gentleman just speaking made a remark that it will all come out before this session is over why I am supporting this government, I ask that he retract it or explain what is his motive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, I said that the minister referred to the member for Port de Grave supporting the government, and I said, Mr. Chairman, that obviously the member has good reason to support the government and I am sure that before the session is over it will all come out, with respect to the member supporting the government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what I said and that is all I said and I see nothing there, Mr. Chairman, that I have to withdraw.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: It was clearly indicated by the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) the imputation that the member for Port de Grave (Mr. E. Dave) was supporting the government on different matters in the House and in return for that was getting items for his district in relation to municipal servicing. That to me is a very serious imputation on the dignity and the honour of the hon. gentleman from Port de Grave (Mr. E. Dave) and I sincerely hope the Chair will ask the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) to retract that statement.

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

MR. W.M. BOWE: I listened carefully to what my hon. colleague, the member for Lewisporte district, said and he said it twice in this hon. Committee and, Sir, at no time did he impute base motives or bad motives of any kind to any member of this House, including the member for Port de Grave.

MR. W.N. ROWE: So anybody on that side of the House who can derive from what my hon. colleague said to be wrong or imputing base motives, Sir, must be examining the interiors of their own minds. I would say, Sir, that in this particular case it is a case where inadvertently my hon. colleague may have come dangerously close to the truth as far as that side of the House is concerned, inadvertently and unintentionally. And, Sir, if you throw a stone among a pack of dogs the one that is hit yelps.

MR. WHITE: That is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: The scandalous comment that just emanated from the alleged Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, the alleged leader is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: - and the paid-for polls. Mr. Goldfarb, the man who sells politicians like he sells apples, he used to say, Goldfarb defeated the last Liberal Administration in this Province and will continue to do so.

But, Mr. Chairman, to the point of order, The point of order was raised by the hon. the member for Port de Grave. It was he who felt, and I think understandably so, that the comments by the hon. the member for Levisporte (Mr. White) imputed certain motives and questioned the motives of the hon. the member for Port de Grave. It can be very clearly cleared up by the hon. the member for Levisporte standing in his place and saying, "I do not in any way, under any circumstances, impute anything but the best of motives to the hon. the member for Port de Grave."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The point of order I think revolves around the issue of whether the hon. member for Lewisporte meant to imply that the hon. member for Port de Grave in making certain remarks did so for a motive that he did not state. Now I listened with care to the initial remark and also the hon. member was good enough to repeat the remark so there was not much doubt about the words used. It would seem to me that the remark did get into that area. I would suggest that the hon. member would not wish for any imputation of motive that he perhaps did not mean to be left with the House,

MR. CHAIRMAN: so to clear up this issue
I think I would ask the hon. member if he would withdraw
the remark implying motives that were not stated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: On a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A point of privilege has come
up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am speaking on a point of
privilege as a member of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

In bringing up a point of
privilege, I would bring to hon. members' attention that a
point of privilege is for the House to judge on, but on the
other hand, in bringing up a point of privilege the Chair
can only judge on whether it is a prima facie case.

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: You asked the hon. member to
withdraw a remark, Sir, and as a member of the House, because
I want to be guided by Your Honour and I want to make sure
than when I am speaking I do not say anything unparliamentary
or out of order, I would like to know exactly what it is he
is asked to withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I will restate my ruling. My
understanding is that the hon. member for Lewisporte in
commenting on remarks that the hon. member for Port de Grave
(Mr. Dawe) made, stated quite clearly, I think - the meaning,
I think, can be taken to be quite a clear one - that those
remarks were made for a reason that the hon. member for
Port de Grave did not state. In other words, that the remarks
were made for a motive that the hon. member for Port de Grave

MR. CHAIRMAN: did not avow. In other words, for unavowed motives.

I would bring hon. members attention to the section in Beauchesne, section 155, which states as follows: "It would be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for prompt intervention. These may be classified as follows: (1) imputation of false or unavowed motives." My ruling was that my understanding of the hon. member for Lewisporte's remarks were that the hon. member for Port de Grave made remarks and he did not avow certain reasons for these and that the hon. member for Lewisporte was implying that he did have these motives which he did not avow.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I can clear this up pretty quick. I do not want to be nasty, and if I said something which -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) it is your second name.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to impugn motives to any member of this House. I do not like it when they do it to me, so I do not want that to happen. When the hon. gentleman sat down there as an Independent last year he announced in a press conference that he was sitting as an independent because he would get more out of the government. Today the hon. the minister indicated he had gotten more out of the government because of that and that is the only reference I make. I certainly had no intention of impugning motives to anyone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would understand that the hon. member has withdrawn any possible imputation of unavowed motives.

The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I want to relate to an issue that was raised

MR. N. WINDSOR: this afternoon by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), and was alluded to a few moments ago by the hon. member for Lewisporte as well, and that is the issue of an investigation that apparently has been undertaken by the RCMP into the construction of the Mount Pearl Arena.

To put in perspective, Sir, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir charged that funds were allocated to that arena for political reasons, that they were a waste of money, that in this time of austerity and tight budget funds could be used better elsewhere.

But, Sir, he did not mention at all the fact that the funds that came from this Province to that project were made available under an existing programme that is designed to assist recreation facilities such as that. He did not mention that the arena for Conception Bay South, for instance, was funded out of that same programme. I am sure he is not suggesting, and the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) would not suggest, that that arena was a waste of money. I am sure that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) would not suggest that the arena built in Windsor was a waste of money, or that the funds allocated

MR. N. WINDSOR:

for that were a waste of money. I am sure the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) does not object to the funds that were given to the arena in Whitbourne. All, I am sure, very well received projects, and the same, of course, goes for the arena in Marystown, Sir - four districts represented by gentlemen from the opposite side of the House, receiving funds under the same programme. Now does that look as if funds were given to Mount Pearl for political reasons? Humbug, Mr. Chairman!

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that funds were wasted. I can assure you, Sir, that the thousand or so people who were in the Mount Pearl arena during Easter break watching the midget tournament there, watching one of our midget teams win the gold medal - one of three gold medals - and a bronze medal that minor hockey teams from Mount Pearl won over the Easter season, I am sure that arena, Sir, is not a waste of money in their minds. I am sure that the 150 young children in Mount Pearl who participated in the Mount Pearl Figure Skating Carnival on Sunday a week and a half ago did not think it was a waste of money; or the thousand or so people who attended that afternoon and watched that spectacle, Sir, they do not consider it a waste of money; nor do the 300 people with whom I attended a banquet on Saturday night, who were participants in the Mount Pearl Recreation Hockey League - they do not consider it a waste of money; or the 300 people who attended a banquet on Friday from the Mary Queen of the World minor hockey programme, they do not consider it a waste of money; nor do the members of the Inter-Town Hockey League; or the thousands of school children who had skating in that arena during school hours over the past year, and, you know, literally thousands of other people who make

April 18, 1978

Tape 1199 (Night)

EC - 2

MR. N. WINDSOR: use of that arena - not a waste of money to them, Sir.

Now, Sir, let us get down to the meat of the thing. Where did money come from and where did it go? I am not about to stand here and defend anything, I simply want to put a few facts on the table. The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) laid no facts out, Sir, simply innuendoes, simply said there is something wrong, the police are carrying out an investigation - so they are. And are we to assume that these people who were involved in that programme are guilty until proven innocent? Is that the way it works in our society? Or do we still have the age-old concept of innocent until proven guilty? This is all I want to get out here tonight, Sir, that there is only so far an investigation. And I welcome that investigation, because there have been so many allegations into the construction of that arena that I think it is time that the facts were laid on the table, that somebody looked into it once and for all and said whether there is some wrongdoing or not. If there is wrongdoing then let it rest on the shoulders of whoever is guilty. I object not at all, Sir, to that - I look forward to it. If somebody has done something out of the ordinary then certainly he should answer for it.

Sir, this Province made a total of \$500,000 available to that arena, which is the maximum that we can make available; \$150,000 was made available in 1975 through the Town of Mount Pearl, Sir, and made available to the town. It is entered in the town's books, was handled by the town's books and disbursements made by the town clerk.

MR. NEARY: But they did not authorize the spending; it was the Committee that authorized the spending.

April 18, 1978

Tape 1199 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, they accepted the vouchers that were presented.

MR. NEARY: They were told to pay the bills.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, they were told. They accepted this audit done by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell Company, a very reputable, national audit firm. On the basis of this audit the town council agreed to pay invoices. Are you going to question the authenticity of its audit?

MR. NEARY: They were told to pay the bills.

MR. N. WINDSOR: They were told to pay it.

Everything that was paid is covered in this audit and I will table it in a moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: If there is anything wrong it should not be tried to be covered up - if there is and I do not know if there is - by any auditing firm. I mean, the firm you refer to was convicted in New York not more than a year ago.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer for what would happen to this firm in New York, but I am sure this is a very reputable firm. I am not trying to cover up anything. I am simply laying out a few facts under which action was taken and the facts under which money was made available to this project. And all I am saying, Sir, is that that first \$150,000 is covered by this audit.

Now the hon. gentleman mentioned gross escalation in construction costs. Yes, costs changed, not escalated - the project changed, the scope changed. The project began as a \$20,000 project to build an outdoor natural ice surface and then certain things became available,

MR. H. WINDSOR:

and I think it is very appropriate that I give credit to a gentleman who is sitting in here tonight, who happens to be now a member of the town council, who was singly responsible for making a donation of \$100,000 worth of ice making equipment from LaBatts Breweries. It was solely due to his efforts that that was made available. And that was the thing, Sir, together with the donation of \$20,000 from the Mount Pearl Mensmen Club, that was the thing that changed the whole scope of the project from an outdoor natural ice surface to - "Well maybe we can build a full-fledged arena which is what we really need." And it went from there.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that funds were given and that the cost escalated. This audit by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell also includes cost estimates for completion, and this is dated - it includes up to October 31, 1976, and I think it was actually tabled December 9, 1976.

The hon. gentleman also mentioned that the cost of the arena was over \$1 million. That is not true. The value of the arena is perhaps \$1,027,000. The actual dollars spent on the arena would be in the order of \$800,000, some \$737,534 was the estimate at this particular time and that is about what actually was spent up to now. If we had an audit done now I think you would find these figures are very much in line with what was actually spent.

The reason for that is because of contributions, such as the ice making equipment, and these are all tabulated here. Mr. Speaker, As I said, I will table this and hon. members can look at it for themselves, \$100,000 value of equipment donated by LaBatt Breweries.

The town of Mount Pearl making land available, providing culvert and services to the building, total of \$40,000. People like Clarke Transportation who gave us a tremendous reduction on the cost of transporting steel from Montreal - \$7,300. Engineering

MR. W. WINDSOR: design and supervision by various qualified engineers in Mount Pearl, one of which included myself - \$25,000, a very conservative estimate. Royal Canadian Legion, Sir, \$13,500 for ice making equipment and on it goes. Concrete Products - \$5,700. And it is time these people were given credit for the donations they made to that area instead of having their name and the project that they donated funds to, dragged through the mud so to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much was spent -

MR. W. WINDSOR: And that amount, Sir - this is what I am getting to - that amounts to a total of donations of goods and services of \$240,000, almost a quarter of a million dollars that was raised and scrounged by the Minor Hockey Association from various firms and organizations in the area. And you add that to the \$737,000 that was actually, or at this time was projected - and I cannot give you a final figure but I can assure you it is in that ball park, something in the order of \$800,000 total cash that was outlaid - you add that and the value is \$1 million. But actual cash outlay you are talking \$800,000.

Now, Sir, I talked about a total of \$500,000.

The hon. gentlemen indicated government gave money to a project and then that project, the cost escalated. It is not true, Sir. This is dated 1976. These are the figures. These are the cost projections - \$300,000 cash. Funds were made available in 1977, Sir, three months after this statement was written, three months after. The government was well aware of what the project was about, what we were getting into.

Now, as I say, that covers the first \$150,000.

It also covers the major contributions by the Mount Pearl Minor Hockey Association, the funds they raised themselves. Those figures are audited here. Here, Sir, I have the financial statement for the town of Mount Pearl for the year 1976, which further covers

MR. N. WINDSOR: that \$150,000 and indicates what monies will be required to complete the arena. And I understand, although I do not have the document, it is only being drafted, I understand that the audited account of the town of Mount Pearl for 1977, the work is being completed, it is being drafted and a preliminary audit indicates that there is no reason that the auditors will comment on anything in that statement relating to the second \$350,000, which also went through the town of Mount Pearl, and is covered in their books. And I will table that statement, Sir, this audited statement of 1976 as well.

MR. NEARY: Well what is behind the statement that -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman talks about government allocating funds. The hon. gentleman who brought that up is the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and has great respect for the Auditor General. I find it strange he did not mention that the Auditor General did not comment on any funding to the Mount Pearl arena in his 1977 report. There is nothing in there.

MR. NEARY: What about the police?

MR. N. WINDSOR: What the police are doing, Sir, I do not know. I honestly do not know. All I know is that somebody, for some reason, has laid some scurrilous charge - maybe it is an accurate one, I know not. All I am saying is that funds provided by government were done so in accordance with the Financial Administration Act, in accordance with programmes already in place, went through the town of Mount Pearl, which is entirely proper,

MR. WINDSOR:

were handled by them. If there was anything, Sir, in the background of minor hockey, then fine. Let this investigation bring it out. But until such time, let us not paint everybody who is involved with that project with a black brush. We are innocent until proven guilty. Sir, these people, and I worked with them in the beginning and I resigned from that association on May 28, 1976, I think it was, that is the date here, May 28th. So I was not involved when funding was provided. I resigned from that association because of the pressures here in this hon. House. Sir, I know how much these people put into it, hours and hours, literally hundreds of residents of Mount Pearl working for that project making a dream come true, Sir, and it is there. And instead of being congratulated for what they have done, almost weekly somebody is standing up or making statements in the press calling them down, saying there was wrongdoing but not making any specific charges, just innuendos, just the McCarthyism type approach, never stating any facts, making any specific charges.

MR. NEARY: Nobody in this House. The hon. gentleman is not referring to anybody.

MR. WINDSOR: No. I did not.

MR. NEARY: Well, make that clear.

MR. WINDSOR: I made it clear. I said, you know, over the past number of months these charges have been made, these statements have been made.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is referring to somebody outside this House.

MR. WINDSOR: Yes. Although the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) this afternoon simply made statements that there were charges laid.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. WINDSOR: Yes, yes. You know, and indicates that there is something wrong. I do not know if there is anything wrong. The enquiry will bring that out. I welcome that enquiry. I welcome it, but let us wait for that enquiry before we say that these people are guilty or anybody, any one person or any group of people collectively are guilty. I welcome

MR. WINDSOR:

that enquiry and if somebody has something to answer for, Sir, then I would be the first one to support any action taken against him.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. GALLAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my few remarks by saying, number one, that anybody who wants to go back and look at Hansard for the first session, 1975-1976, can look up and see that in that first year that I was a member of this House of Assembly I did not take a negative approach. The speeches that I made were positive speeches. That was when I was green. That was when I thought that things were done with fair play in mind. That was when I thought that you could catch more flies with honey than you could with vinegar. But obviously with this government you cannot catch them with either one. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) got up and talked about the negativity and how we are criticizing the government on this side of the House and so on. Then the member went on to tell about all the water and sewer projects that were going on in his district, talked about incinerators, roads. Mr. Chairman, it is so obvious! I cannot stand here and talk about the road work that went on in my district or the water and sewer projects or the incinerators. And I will come to that in a minute.

Mr. Chairman, there is a rumor around that the Premier is buttering up the district of Bay of Islands so that he can run there next time around because he knows he has lost Corner Brook. And judging from what the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was telling us here tonight and in past speeches, I think there might be a lot of truth to that. Now, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon and just a few minutes ago again we heard from the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor). The member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) talked about joint projects, regional governments, regional areas coming together under one government because, he said, the people cannot expect to get a fire truck for one small community or to get an arena for one community.

April 18, 1978

Tape 1201 (night)

IB-3

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, who does the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) think he is? Most of the people in the rural areas of this Province have forgotten more about that than the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) knows. Does the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) not realize that when I for five and a half years served as president of the Trinity-Placentia Stadium Commission and finally, in spite of government by the way - and there is a story to be told there which I will not bother to tell tonight. I could tell about the hundreds of meetings and

MR. CALLAN:

the arrogant attitude of ministers that we met with, the committee met with; the secretary of the Markland Hospital, an employee of the Boys Home at Whitbourne, people who were employed with the government and therefore could not come out and speak out as I did on open line programmes and elsewhere. But anyway that is another story.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Mount Pearl talks about regional areas. The Whitbourne stadium, Mr. Chairman, serves the area from Heart's Delight right on up the shore, I will not bother to mention the communities. Whitbourne, Markland, right on over to Norman's Cove, Chapel Arm, Bellevue, Thornlea, Chance Cove - You know, we are talking about twenty-five communities. We had studies done. We had census records dug up to find out what population we were drawing on. We went up to Dunville on several occasions and sat down with the people in Dunville, Placentia and other councils up there asking them to come in with us. Let us get a stadium to serve the Dunville-Placentia area and our area as well and therefore we will have a better case when we go to government and they did not go along with this. So we got our own stadium, a stadium just as viable and with just as much interest in it as the stadium that serves the one municipality of Mount Pearl.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Bay of Islands talked about incinerators. How many did he get? Mr. Chairman, I have been in this House of Assembly for three years and I have been asking that one incinerator be placed on the outskirts of the boundaries of Chance Cove, the Town of Chance Cove, and not to serve Chance Cove only - to keep the rats out of the community, sure, but the garbage that would go into this incinerator which is now going into an open pit and rotting there on the ground and so on and causing fires and so on, that incinerator if it were placed there would burn and incinerate garbage from Chance Cove, from Jack's Pond Provincial Park, from Bellevue Provincial Park, from Bellevue itself and from summer

MR. CALLAN: cabins, and there are dozens of them there, and taverns and chicken take-outs and so on. I am not talking about an incinerator for one small community. I am talking about an incinerator for a region. A fire truck - the member for Mount Pearl talked about fire trucks for one community. We must get away from the idea. We have been away from that idea for years. Does the member not know that the fire truck that is in Norman's Cove serves Chapel Arm, Norman's Cove, Long Cove, Thornlea, Bellevue and that people who live in these communities get a reduction on their home insurance, a reduction enough that they can pay their service fee with the money they save on their home insurance? What nonsense we hear from some members, the member for Bonavista South and one or two others who think they know all the answers and nobody else knows anything.

Water and sewer projects - Mr. Chairman, there are nine municipalities in the district of Bellevue and not one copper, Mr. Chairman. Did Come by Chance get water and sewer? No. Did Sunnyside get water and sewer? No. Did Norman's Cove, after applying for water and sewer since 1971, did they get it? No. And I could go on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Arnold's Cove.

MR. CALLAN: Arnold's Cove was done before you were back from Overseas if you were over there.

MR. NEARY: Over to Bell Island, he means.

MR. CALLAN: He was in the military, was he not, somewhere?

MR. NEARY: He was across the Gulf.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, is the member for Mount Pearl suggesting that a water and sewer system in Come by Chance will serve several other communities, a region? Is that he is saying? Obviously not. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Tourism, the member for Bonavista South stands up in this House this afternoon and tells us, "Do not be negative. Why are you so negative? You know we are living in a period of restraint." Thirty-one miles of pavement laid in that gentleman's district last year, thirty-one miles! And yesterday, in

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1202 (Night)

JM - 3

MR. CALLAN: yesterday's paper - I have been asking the new Minister of Transportation and Communications for the last week or since his estimates went through the House, I asked him when will you be in a position to tell me what road work I will get for the district of Bellevue? And I have had delegations, dozens of them, in to see the new minister, as I had them

MR. CALLAN: in to see the old, the deposed minister, and got nothing for it. And so I ask the minister when will you be in a position to tell us? Well, in a few days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CALLAN: And yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I pick up the paper and what do I see? A tender call for paving ten miles of road and I said where is Kings Cove and where is this place? I went out in the common room, looked on the map and

MR. MORGAN: You did not know before?

MR. CALLAN: I did not know and did not care. It had no interest to me. Kings Cove has no interest to me. It has no interest to me, and Halls Cove or whatever it is. I was going to check the population figures for these little towns there, Mr. Chairman, I did not do it. I would say there might be ten or a dozen families in each of those couple of communities.

MR. MORGAN: Hard working fishermen.

MR. CALLAN: Do you think that fishermen are not hard working in the district of Bellevue?

MR. MORGAN: I did not say they were not hard working.

MR. CALLAN: You are insinuating it. You are suggesting it, that only the fishermen in these communities are hard workers. Do you think Art Dean down in Southport is not a hard worker? The man who came in here on two or three occasions, the man whom you met in a hotel in Clarendville and said you are going to get your road work done next Spring, and the Spring came and the Summer came and the Fall came and he did not get it. And he comes in now to see the new minister and he meets the former minister on the elevator and the former minister turns back on because he has not got the guts to look him straight in the eye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. CALLAN: And that man, Mr. Chairman, stands up in this House and tells us that we are living in a period of restraint and we

MR. CALLAN: should not expect too much. And this same gentleman, Mr. Chairman, is the man who said, "No, we will not put any pavement in Adeytown, We will put it in Deep Bight, to the very last house, because that is where the boundary ends for Trinity North, represented by the gentleman who is Minister of Social Services. But we will not put it in Adeytown, which is on the same piece of loop road off the TCH, just outside of Clarendville. We will not put it in Adeytown because the imaginary boundary ends there."

MR. MORGAN: Is that Municipal Affairs we are talking about now?

AN NON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Or Transportation and Communications?

MR. CALLAN: I am talking about the same things that the hon. minister brought up this afternoon, red herrings he was bringing in, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Committee of this past Summer. I phoned the Water Services Division and I said, "Do you have a list yet of projects approved under the Water Services Division of Municipal Affairs and Housing?" "Yes," "Do you have anything for Bellevue?" "Yes, Blaketown - \$4,000."

Before I get into that, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should say that this one, by the way, is a well that was drilled four or five years ago and I want to say this, to inject a little bit of humour if nothing else into it, that, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much oil there may be off the Coast of this Island, but I am sure that if there is no oil on the Island itself, because there are enough artesian wells drilled on this Island, which have never been hooked up, which have been drilled in by-elections and federals and so on, if there was oil on this Island it would be seeping up through these artesian wells all over the Island hundreds of them, hundreds of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: We would be all blown up.

MR. CALLAN: \$4,000 Blaketown, never spent by the way, allocated, approved in July, never spent.

MR. RIDEOUT: How come never spent?

MR. CALLAN: Blaketown another one, \$4,000 approved, allocated not yet spent. Dildo -- \$15,000, not one copper spent.

MR. MORGAN: - I would say.

MR. CALLAN: Not one copper spent. And just in case the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing thinks that I am talking about another well, I am not talking about the Reid's well which was drilled a couple of weeks ago and yielded forty gallons per minute. No thanks to the minister or me either. I am talking about Pinsent's well - \$15,000 allocated. It was drilled in the Fall of '75, not one copper spent out of the \$15,000 that was allocated.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was October.

MR. MORGAN: At Gooseberry Cove - \$5,000, not one copper spent. Southport - \$5,000, not one copper spent. North Harbour \$15,000, Coobies - \$15,000, both spent. Why? Why? Both spent, why? Because in North Harbour they were

April 18, 1978

Tape 1204 (Night)

EC - 1

MR. CALLAN: successful in obtaining a Canada Works project - I just forget the figure, \$70,000 or \$80,000 - and so the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing said, Before you can go ahead with your Canada Works project and bring good water to this town, we must install a chlorination system but we will give you \$15,000 to do it. That is the only reason. In Goobies \$71,000, a Canada Works project approved for a water system for that town. As I suggested to the delegation from Harbour Breton a couple of weeks ago when I stood up and spoke in support of their petition that they were presenting to get a municipal building, do not hold your breaths. Do not hold your breaths over water and sewer if you are from Harbour Breton or any other Liberal district.

I told them, When Canada Works comes out fill in your application, that is how you will get your municipal building - like dozens have got them around this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record now as saying that I am convinced that this minister, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is bent, is determined to close up, to withdraw the charters of as many municipalities in this Province as he can possibly withdraw. The fact that a large number of town councils and community councils and municipalities in this Province could not come up with a slate of officers to run for the positions on council, the fact that a large number of people in a large number of towns did not bother to come forward is indicative of two things; number one, they are sick and tired of waiting and expecting to get anything from this government, and number two, there is an intentional plot on behalf of this minister and, of course, on behalf of this Cabinet of which he is a member to close

MR. CALLAN: up as many municipalities as possible. And the last thing that I checked, Mr. Chairman, there were 311 municipalities in this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten new ones this year.

MR. CALLAN: - ten new ones. Most of those were formed in the district of Twillingate during the Twillingate by-election. The Premier was down there and dozens of others going in - 'We want to form a town council here; we will form it here this morning. It is ten o'clock now - by quarter after ten you will have a town council!'

AN HON. MEMBER: That is going!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to tell about a municipality in my district which was charging \$6.00 to have the garbage collected there. And the municipality, an incorporated town with a charter, obviously, as all incorporated places have, they had a fee of \$6.00; they decided last year to increase it to \$12.00 they said in their budget to Municipal Affairs and Housing, and Municipal Affairs and Housing sent it back and said, 'No, we will not accept that -

MR. NEARY: A year for -

MR. CALLAN: - we will not accept that, because last year we introduced into the House of Assembly a bill which prohibits any council from charging a service fee less than \$20.00.' And so the town of Hodge's Cove, Mr. Chairman, was told, 'We do not care that \$12.00 is going to pay your service fee, we want you to charge \$20.00.

AN HON. MEMBER: Per year!

MR. CALLAN: We want you to charge \$20.00, you have no other choice only to charge \$20.00. And so the council resigned. And without going back to the people and asking if anybody else wanted to take over, the charter was just withdrawn unilaterally. And, Mr. Chairman, I am

MR. CALLAN: sure, I am convinced that in the year or two that remains to this government they will be withdrawing charters as fast as you can haul the line, because they have pushed themselves into a corner with promises of water and sewer and so on, and now they cannot live up to their promises so the easy way to do it is ignore these municipalities and make the people get so frustrated and so browned off that they decide, Well, let us throw in the towel and the face-cloth and the soap and the whole thing and let somebody else run this. This is what is happening, Mr. Chairman.

 Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing whether or not his department has yet made a decision - last year they brought in a bill which says that you are not permitted to charge less than \$20.00 a year - this year there will be an amendment

MR. CALLAN: to the Municipal Affairs Department and the Water Services Division, saying that if you want to get an artesian well, you set up a committee and you will get your artesian well provided that funds are approved and so on, but you will not be getting it free, gratis as you did previously, the local committee must come up with twenty-five per cent. I want to ask the minister, when will this new piece of information come into effect, number one, when will this come into effect that a local group, for example, the two in Blaketown who did not get their money last year even though it was approved and Gooseberry Cove and so on, will they have to come up with twenty-five per cent next year? Will they? Or does it just apply to brand new projects, brand new committees? Or does it also apply to committees that are ongoing at the present time with half their money spent or one-third or one-quarter or what have you, or does it apply to only new committees only? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have a few minutes, and I will only take a few minutes, to pass on a remark to the hon. minister who has just talked at length about his estimates, and the member for Bay de Verde, I guess it was, brought it to a head with the conversation about the amount of money being spent, \$12 million, I believe, being spent in the Province, and to amortize the existing water systems, the sewer system. I believe in the conversation there was something like a reference to 224 systems.

MR. DINN: No million, over 200 million -

MR. ROWE: Over 200 requests.

MR. DINN: Over 200 requests.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: 224 requests, I believe, for services in the Province. I think we have 800 communities in our Province today, which is down something like 500 from the original 1,300 communities we had some twenty-five years ago. And I would say that less than half of the communities are incorporated. I think that that is a fair

MR. LUNDRIGAN: comment, three hundred-and-some-odd, less than half of the incorporated communities have services, the full services, and that is an important concern in our Province today. The obvious question is, and this is the one the members are frustrated over, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) talks about his community of Bay de Verde, quite rightly. I know Bay de Verde, not all that well, not as well as the member does, but there are several hundred Bay de Verdes more or less in the Province, Bay de Verdes with problems of water quality, problems of the road system, problems of the housing conditions or matters of this nature, or all of them in probably some level of service. And always we are back on, "What is the Province doing about it?" We look this year at a maximum of \$25 million, I would say, that can be spent on new capital projects, \$25 million. I believe that is the maximum borrowing capability of the Municipal Financing Corporation. So we can look at anywhere from \$12 million to \$15 million to \$18 million to \$20 million realistically being spent on new capital projects. At the same time the minister indicates that if you add up all of the demands for new services, you are looking at demands for over \$200 million, Now there is something wrong.

Number one, we know that in the Province today, if we have got to go on the system of financing that we have, there will be communities twenty-five years from now that will not have proper services. The Province cannot afford the level of service. The people cannot afford to be without them. The people are demanding them. Something has to be done about it.

Now the minister, when he spoke in his Budget Speech, made reference to something that I want to draw to members' attention, and this is nothing new and I am just going to read something and see how far along I will be before members recognize what I am talking about. "In view of the difficulty of predicting with sufficient accuracy the financial consequence of Newfoundland becoming a Province of Canada, the Government of Canada will appoint a royal commission within eight years from the date of union to review the financial position

MR. LUNDRIAN: of the Province of Newfoundland, and to recommend the form and scale of additional financial assistance, if any, that may be required by the Government of the Province of Newfoundland, to enable it to continue public services, public services at the levels and standards reached subsequent to the date of union, without resorting to taxation more burdensome having regard to capacity to pay than the obtaining generality and the reason comprising the Maritime Provinces." Term 29.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIAN: Term 29, which I believe I am correct in recalling that the commission was appointed in 1957, according to the Terms of Union, which was eight years subsequent to the term of union.

Mr. Lundrigan: I believe there was a recommendation that there would be \$8 million paid to the Province to bring us up to the standard that we had - that would be like the rest of the Atlantic Provinces had or the Maritime Provinces had - that was in 1957. And I believe these payments started when the term was accepted by the federal government in 1958. And it had been paid ever since.

Now the minister when he read his Budget speech alluded to the fact, and I hope I am not letting any cat out of the bag, I am pretty certain the minister alluded to the fact that in recent weeks the Province have been trying to negotiate with the federal government some way to make Term 29, 1978 Term 29, not 1958 Term 29. 1958 Term 29 gives us \$8 million in revenue in our Province.

MR. NEARY: If you look at (Inaudible)

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And if you look at the schedule for income for the revenue of the Province this year, you will see listed in the schedule \$8 million from Ottawa under Term 29. Statistics have been drawn up and information has been accumulated to show that that \$8 million is worth maybe no more than twenty cents to the dollar of what it was in 1958.

Term 29 today if it were applied would be looking at anywhere from \$30 million to \$40 million a year for Newfoundland and Labrador, \$30 million to \$40 million a year. We contend, and I contend very strongly, and I have said it frequently in my speeches around the Province over a period of years, some of them in Twillingate, over a period of years in federal politics that we should have a renegotiated term, particularly Term 29, and other terms relating to Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Province cannot tolerate the standards that we have, the standards of services that we have. And the Province cannot afford to pay any more for the services that we need. You

MR. LUNDRIGAN: cannot burden the people any more than we have already without further burdens, without further tax burden, we are the heaviest taxed people in Canada. You cannot take any more money. Every time you impose a new tax it is a further disincentive, a further disadvantage, a further dampening of enthusiasm for development. It hurts the public. It creates the problems that cause the conflict and the animosity that we get in the House, and we did today over social services, because it creates people at a lower level, a lower income, a lower standard of living. And that is the choice we have. If we want more services the choice we have today is pay more money ourselves. And I have said for years that this House should take a definitive, firm stand and say to the federal government, Thank you very much for your equalization payments. Thank you very much for the various forms of assistance in fisheries. Thank you very much for the various tax advantages. But we cannot afford many a thing that we have got to have in our Province today, a firm, definitive stand has to be taken to get a better deal under some of the terms which were drafted in 1949.

MR. NEARY: You cannot get (Inaudible)

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No disregard to the Fathers of Confederation in 1949. No disregard. Nobody has the preception to look ahead thirty or forty years and see what the expectation of the people will be, what requests of the people will be, what the demands will be in this day and age. No disrespect for the people who drafted our Terms of Union. I think they had a tremendous amount of foresight. Under this particular term it is a prime opportunity for Newfoundland without any - what was the word which was used today - without any precedent being set for the rest of the Provinces, to give us a better deal. Now I am not going to say what the last official word is, but I have the feeling, as I was a party to the discussions that went on, that there was not a big lot of sympathy at the federal level

Mr. Lundrigan: to look at the legitimacy of the argument that we should renegotiate, particularly Term 29. I cannot see any argument. There is no other province that is involved in the same situation, there is no other province has that kind of aid, term, which is specified precisely for the reason that we are talking about today, to give the Province a better advantage, a financial advantage to be able to go and do the things that the people need in this Province. And this is one of the things that, I think, we should address ourselves to. I do not believe it has been brought out and talked about.

Obviously there is a problem. Every member, like the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) who is vying for attention among his colleagues is one of the limelighters, and I think he is a very effective spokesman -

AN HON. MEMBER: Absolutely.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He is certainly a colourful spokesman, an aggressive spokesman. He got up today and said about his riding, all of his communities without the services. I know many of them myself, represented them for a half a dozen years in Ottawa. And so did the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe). Many of his communities, like Bay de Verde, one of the oldest communities in our Province.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: a difficult community to service, like many of our communities, because the people inhabited the Province in a way which was not out of regard for services. You did not go down in Red Head Cove because you settled there for service. You settled there because it was in the proximity to a fishing community. It was the best available space for you to set up your fishing premises.

Fogo Harbour is an example, where it is going to cost a fortune to give the people of Fogo Harbour the facilities they need. Because you have got people around a harbour and a massive amount of rock, have you not? The same as you did in Wesleyville. And because of the difficulty of providing services in our Province, not like you will find in many of the rest of the parts of Canada, like the Prairie Provinces, with a pick and shovel you can put in a water and sewer system overnight in the average small town on the Prairies.

MR. CALLAN: You should not be promising.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: There is nothing to do. What is the member talking about promising?

MR. CALLAN: You should never have been promising in the '75 election and the by-election.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What does the member want me to do about it? I have already resigned my Cabinet seat over it. Does he want me to buy a cross and a pound of nails?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What is he interested in? What is he interested in? The hon. member got up here this afternoon and talked about me down in Twillingate. I can never remember making a promise. As a matter of fact, in 1974, the reason I lost the election in Bonavista - Trinity-Conception, is I stood on seventeen platforms in the riding and told the people not to look up to your politician, look to yourselves for your

MR. LUNDRIGAN: strength. Do not expect me to do all of your work for you. Do not expect me to answer all of your questions. Do not expect me - you have got to look to yourselves for your strength. And I was so honest about it that I had people walk out of my hall. The member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) remembers all that. They walked out of the hall. they said, "This fellow is not going to do the work for us because he is too honest,"

MR. CALLAN: Could I ask a question?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Sure ask a question.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the former minister a question because he is saying that we cannot afford it, and we all agree with that, And in '75 -'76, when I sat down there and stood up I said, If the government say they cannot pave any roads in this Province this year, the people in Hillview, and in Southport, and other communities will understand if the government say we cannot afford to do it. But what is happening is the PC districts are getting the pavement and Hillview and Southport still have not got it. And perhaps while I am on my feet - you know, why is it that water and sewer was approved for Norman's Cove in July of '75 and then in October of '75, following the general election, that water and sewer project was cancelled on a technicality?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly a serious matter.

MR. CALLAN: That is very serious.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is certainly a very critical and serious matter, Your Honour. And as a matter of fact, I am confused and the reason I am confused is that only a matter of a few weeks ago I was in the Trillingate by-election, along with my colleagues, whereon we set a record for the number of votes we received in a

MR. LUNDRIGAN: traditional strong Liberal riding.

AN HON. MEMBER: 1,800.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And, Mr. Speaker, I paid every nickel out of my own pocket for that campaign and the hon. member should watch his gab when he is talking that kind of a language. Not everybody has the disrepute that the hon. member seems to be accusing members of having. I do not know where he gets his expertise at. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, I consistently heard the whole campaign theme of the hon. gentleman and his hon. colleague, and they put on quite a good campaign, quite an excellent campaign, They fooled the majority of the people. A very good campaign.

I heard them, Mr. Speaker, say, "Do not vote for a Tory because when you vote for a Tory you are not going to get anything because Bonavista North has not got a thing." All day long, Bonavista North, They promised them this and they did this, they have not got a thing in Bonavista North. "If you want to get action vote for a Liberal." As a matter of fact, most of my constituents are saying, "I am not sure about this fellow Lundrigan, I am not sure about this fellow Dinn, I am not sure about this fellow Woodrow, if you want to get any action in this Province you need to be a Liberal because this government is more inclined towards the Liberals than they are towards the Tories." And down in Rural Development I got clobbered because those are the statistics, as they will be brought out in the estimates as they are being debated. And the member cannot be serious, he cannot be serious when he stands with that kind of a question.

I have been listening for the last two weeks, and I have been doing more listening than speaking, which is a very unusual trait for me, and, Mr. Speaker, I have heard the Leader of the Opposition stand up, and of course he is sort of riding a little bit high the last few hours, I have heard him on talking about his poll and so on and everybody knows my attitude about polls, it is the same as the dogs'

April 18, 1978

Tape No. 1207

XII - 4

MR. LUNDRIGAN: attitude towards poles.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: But you know, I think the dog has the right
attitude toward poles.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In any event speaking about dogs and poles -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I have heard the Leader of the Opposition the last few days. He promised if he gets elected as the Leader there is going to be no cutbacks anywhere on anything. No cutbacks in education, no cutbacks in student loans, no cutbacks in this. He was up today, the elderly people came in and made an excellent presentation. The minister quite properly said that you cannot have any likelihood this year. We have already got our Budget brought in, and we have already got our estimates before the House. I think it is a marvelous thought, if we look at it sincerely and seriously and see what we can do about it. The Leader of the Opposition knows that procedure. That is not what he said to the public though. He gave the clear, definitive impression to the public that there is no problem if you elect me.

Now sooner or later somebody is going to have to face the facts -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! A point of order.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon if Mr. Chairman will remember the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was brought to a point of order and asked to be relevant to the debate. Now for the last ten or fifteen minutes we have heard nothing with respect to Municipal Affairs in this Province. So I would suggest that the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) be asked to be more relevant with respect to this debate, the same rules for all sides.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Order!

All hon. gentlemen must realize in Committee there is quite a wide range of debate, and I am sure that has happened all through this afternoon. I will ask the hon. member for Grand Falls to be relevant, please.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I should do that. I am setting a very poor example as a person who should be setting a good example in the House, and showing some little bit of leadership to some of

MR. LUNDRIGAN: colleagues across the way there.

Mr. Chairman, quite seriously I do believe that we are getting a little bit off the topic maybe in the whole debate. I have been here for the last two or three hours, we have been talking about -every member is talking about how the minister has not adhered to a particular promise. The core of the issue is, I have tried to say the fact that the Province does not have the financial resources either under the Premiership of the Premier of the day or under the leadership of a new Premier tomorrow or next year, the Province does not have the resources, the financial resources to go close to fulfilling the service needs of this Province today.

I was down in the Arm in Durrell, down in George Port in the Arm there, a favourite part of the area of my colleague, and the people had a problem with a water system, and they have got a real serious problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: Durrell?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Durrell. The estimated cost for 1,200 or 1,500 people was \$4 million. That was the last estimated cost of the water system. And the community needs it. They definitely got a real serious problem with contamination, a real problem. In many cases you cannot have the septic systems in at all. And how can we afford to put \$4 million out of our meager little budget into a water system for 1,200 or 1,500 people? The area will never generate that much wealth in the next twenty-five years. See, it is a problem and I am only using this as an example. I am not meaning to pinpoint the Arm.

But you can pick many communities like this, but we cannot afford to service them. But the people cannot tolerate the lack of services. And I think, I quite seriously feel that the Leader of the Opposition has a responsibility here, as well as ourselves, to

MR. LUNDRIGAN: recognize the fact that we did not get under the present terms on this particular issue a good deal. We had a good deal for a while, and maybe it was a relevant kind of a commitment by the federal government. And I think there should be a fairly collective type of pressure applied to the federal government to recognize that that particular term, and I pinpoint that as a way or a means whereby we can achieve our goal where that should be updated to 1978 value.

And I do not know if my colleague the Minister of Finance can pinpoint it or not, but I believe the estimated value of calculating \$8 million in 1957 terms in 1978 terms is something in excess of \$30 million. And if we got that today earmarked and specified for services we can do three times the services that we can do with our own resources. I think we are pushing ourselves and we are stretching to our limit the amount of money that we are spending on services in the Provinces. And I totally agree with colleagues across the way, I totally agree with colleagues across the way that we are not spending \$1 to the \$10 that we should be spending. That is totally a fact. And the people

MR. LUNDRIGAN: will not tolerate us not spending more money. And all I hope is that we can focus in on this, we can perhaps at some point along the way. I think it would be a type of resolution that would go over well in the Legislature. Maybe it might cut a bit of ice right now with the three political parties squaring off at the federal level where it might in fact - and the election, I understand, was going to be called a little while ago, I do not know if the members heard or not. But in any event I think it would go over really well if the Legislature could express a unanimous resolution to support for the position -

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman -
(inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the member for Grand Falls and that is where I will be now and that is where I will be after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: You had better resist that draft.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am going to resist that draft movement from the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

So I would feel, Mr. Chairman, that we should express a resolution on this particular topic sooner or later, perhaps introduced by the government, where we ask for unanimous support - maybe even debate it - to look at Term 29 as it relates to the inflow of funds and the service in our Province. The Patterson report was a waste of money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman from
Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to my hon. friend opposite and some of what he said I appreciate.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, maybe you could silence my colleague.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: I do not mish-mash words, I lay it on the line.

Now, my hon. friend opposite has taken a public stand some time ago where he made the noble sacrifice, but one of those days he is going to rise to his feet in this House and take some responsibility for him and his chums and some of the promises that they have made collectively as a provincial group; one of those days he is going to try to be able to do something on a provincial level without merely trying to twist and turn everything on to the federal scene. He must take some responsibility for something. It cannot all be Ottawa's fault. Why does the minister continue to have the Opposition mentality that he demonstrated so avidly for so long in Ottawa? He is now, being a member of government, he is supposed to produce. You were going to bring the New Jerusalem to this Province, do you not remember?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: My hon. friend and I have had many discussions both private and public, and he knows very well that while I cannot say that he, personally, because I cannot remember the exact quote, but he has wittingly or unwittingly prior to 1971 associated himself with political colleagues who were saying the Province was bankrupt, that they were going to do this and do that.

MR. NOLAN: I mean, everything was going to be so wonderful. And now he stands continuously in this House and fires away that he is going to bring back Term 29. Now does not the hon. member remember Term 29 and the debate locally down in the old House of Assembly when his own party split asunder because of Term 29 and the actions of the Right Honourable Mr. Diefenbaker in those days?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. NOLAN: Perhaps the hon. member did, I am certainly not going to dispute him. If the hon. member says so, it is so.

The Department of Municipal Affairs is perhaps one of the most sensitive in all of the government of the Province and one of the most difficult to administer. I am quite prepared to state that, Mr. Chairman, but there is something wrong in the Department of Municipal Affairs, radically wrong. You have councils who are expressing publicly and privately - and they have not only expressed it, by the way, to members on this side of the House, they have told members, I know for a fact, on the opposite side -

MR. NOLAN:

of their disenchantment, their frustration, the anguish that they are up against because often times the pressure is coming from the citizen unto the local council and they are the ones who feel the pressure. In the Department of Municipal Affairs you have, I suppose, some of the finest civil servants that have ever served this or any other Province, men who have served there for years and they have done a good job, or tried to do a good job. But they can only work with what they have got. They can only work if they are provided with the leadership. It is all very well to talk about a Capital Works Committee but let us not con the public or attempt to con the members of this House. If the capital works committee are the ones who make the final decision on where the dollars are spent, fine, but they do not. And the hon. minister certainly knows that.

Now, I do not know. There is something wrong with Municipal Affairs in a number of areas. Maybe the Treasury Board - I do not know if the hon. minister is a member of Treasury Board - you are. Well therefore I do not know if he is getting the shaft in Treasury Board. I do not know if he needs more staff. I do not know if he needs more expertise in various areas to handle the numerous requests I am sure that are funnelled at his desk daily, but there is something lacking. Now mind you, perhaps there is a very serious communication problem between the minister or his officials on the one hand and the three hundred-odd municipalities on the other. But there is something seriously wrong. And I think the minister is certainly going to bear the brunt of the criticism and so on and it cannot be avoided because it is to the minister in the first instance that mayors, councillors and so on look to for guidance. You see what happens, councillors are no different than many of us when we first ran to be elected as members of the House of Assembly. They strike out boldly as citizens, not for any pay or any reward in most instances. There is only, I suppose, the City of St. John's, maybe Corner Brook, are the only mayors and councillors that are paid. Is

MR. NOLAN:

that correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is correct.

MR. NOLAN: Just St. John's? I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: And Corner Brook.

MR. NOLAN: And Corner Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NOLAN: Yes. And also I think maybe the Metro Board members are paid something.

MR. WHITE: Quite a bit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are they?

MR. NOLAN: Sure they are.

MR. SIMMONS: They are not elected.

MR. NOLAN: They are not elected. That is a good point and I will come to that. But the fact is, what I was trying to get at is, you know, I can go into a long harangue about all the councils and councillors should be paid and so on but the fact is that they do run, whether it is in Grand Bank, Green Bay or St. John's or anywhere else for the most part -- not St. John's, but they run to serve the citizens of the community. And I know we have all done this one time or another when we first ran. We strike out boldly because we feel in our guts that we are going to be able to do more than the economy or our own ability or whatever it is permits us to do. We all run up against some of our own inadequacies, some of the real problems that we do not see, that we are not familiar with because we do not have the expertise and the inside knowledge that can only come with experience. That is why when someone stalls about running for public office the only advice you can give them is run. That is the only way you are going to learn. You are not going to read about it in a book. It is as simple as that.

So here we have these men and women who are in various communities throughout the Province, Newfoundland and in Labrador, who have taken it upon themselves and taken some substantial

MR. NOLAN:

abuse in many instances, as I am sure the hon. minister knows. And I am sure their families and their friends say to them, why are you in it? What are you doing it for? Are you out of your skull? I have heard it said. I have heard an official some years ago in the Department of Municipal Affairs take the kind of abuse that I would take from no man and stood there and took it. Unbelievable! A very fine civil servant. No need of it at all. I mean, sometimes we have no idea what civil servants or perhaps even sometimes politicians - it is all right for us to behave in this way but unfortunately what happens sometimes in this House, and I think I have discussed this with the hon. House leader opposite and others from time to time, there seems to be sometimes a loss of convention in this House.

MR. NOLAN: I am sure my hon. friend opposite will know what I am talking about since he served in the House of Commons in Ottawa. And I am sure for those of you who know that those who have served, say, in the United Kingdom and so on, but sometimes I have the feeling, and I may be wrong, that if I were to stand now and make the most vicious, diabolical charge against the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) there are some people who would come up and slap me on the back and say, Well done, boy, that is showing them! That is the stuff! That is the kind of a member to have!

It makes you wonder though, because there are some - you have to make some allowances for those who have not been involved in public life for some time. They have to learn, as we all do. It is always a continual learning process, but I worry in here very much when I find that I am representing the third largest municipality in Newfoundland, and I might say, the largest provincial district in this Province in terms of population. I mean, it is one horrendous problem from day to day. I like to go to ministers either here in the House or somewhere else and sit down and lay it on the line and tell them, Look boy, I have this problem. This woman in Upper Gullies, or the people in St. Thomas or St. Phillips have a problem. They do not know where to turn so they have called me. Where else would they go? Where else would the citizens of Bay of Islands go but to the hon. member opposite? That is what he is there for.

Sometimes I cannot handle, obviously, oftentimes, all the problems that are thrown my way, nor can any member opposite, I would suggest, but I have found that there are certain members and certain ministers who are good members of the P.C. Party - there is nothing wrong with that - good members in their districts, but there are some who seem to give you the feeling that,

MR. NOLAN: my God! if you see a Liberal being keelhauled, it must be justice, it must be. There is something wrong -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not right.

MR. NOLAN: This is right. I have dealt, for example, over the years, both as a broadcaster and as a member of the House with the hon. Minister of Manpower, as an example. I do not think I have ever said anything publicly in any way of a derogatory nature against the hon. member. I think I have always said, both as a reporter, as a broadcaster when I have had call to call him on the spot oftentimes, or here in the House on different projects, but there are other ministers who seem to be - it is all in mannerisms oftentimes, I am afraid, and in Municipal Affairs right now there is something wrong. The minister has to take some responsibility, he has to.

It is not all his fault.

It may be that the Treasury Board will not provide him with the additional bodies he requested, he may not have the funds he is looking for, but it is not just 'John Nolan' here saying this, it is the members of councils around this Province who are expressing disgust. There are people who are refusing to run for office. Just refusing. And there are some who just give up and slink off back home disillusioned, discouraged, fed up, feeling that they are failures, that they have struck out in the community in which they live because they wanted to make some kind of a contribution, hoping to maybe bring water and sewer, to get a recreation committee going, to get a stadium, to get so many things that are needed in communities. Somebody has to do it. If it were not for the volunteers in this Province it would be just as well for us to pack it up and get out anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: The volunteers in this Province, in my own district - I can only speak of that particularly but I am sure it is true in every district, the Lion's Clubs, the young people - we hear so much ill about young people but my golly! out in my own district they have senior citizens out on Saturday, for example. I am thinking about the Leo Club, for example, which are the junior Lions, as you probably know, and so many others.. Minor hockey; my hon. friend from Grand Falls is as familiar with many of the recreations and so on in my district as I am because he is a resident there.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The fire brigade.

MR. NOLAN: The volunteer fire brigade. I mean, it is great to have a debate as some people do about whether you should have water and sewer here, there or somewhere else, but during that storm on the weekend when you could not move from here across this House, I lived in dread of a serious fire in some of those homes

MR. NOLAN:

up there. I was frightened to death. Make no mistake about it. And I am sure the hon. minister was as well. I notice my friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) as he glances over at me, I am sure that, I believe it was last year he said, "Come on boy, can you not get me bit of road paved for me up there?" I mean so we all suffer equally. The rain falls on the just -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I did not get my road paved. The only road not paved in Conception Bay South is my road.

MR. NOLAN: Well, I assume you are talking about the municipality.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is your constituent is he?

MR. NOLAN: Yes, we all have our cross.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: Don Jamieson is my constituent.

MR. NOLAN: There are many things. People have to realize, and I do not think it is generally understood, that in the district of Conception Bay South, the Central Mortgage and Housing, as I am sure the minister knows, will not loan money to the people up there. No one. Right? No one, because certain areas are polluted. But all of Conception Bay South, I am talking about the provincial district as opposed to the municipal boundary now, all of it is not polluted. Although I do hope that because of certain evidence that has come to light, and I think from time to time the minister is in sometimes a bit of an embarrassing position, because I believe it time that the minister, and this is not a jaded crack at him at all, I am saying to the minister now, that he should demand from the Department of the Environment, provincial, or if he can get some federal assistance, or from the Department of Health, all the facts, all the figures, any danger that may lie there that can be harmful to the citizens of that community, and we have heard enough talk about it from time to time, it is time all

MR. NOLAN: the information was laid on the line and then some people have got to start making decisions.

It is easy enough for me, I can take some cheap shots at the minister if I want to do it. But that is not going to help the person who ends up with some kind of a fever or some kind of a disease as a result of a pollution in Conception Bay South. It will not be enough for me to make any cheap shots at anyone then, it will be too darn late.

So I am hoping that the minister will demand from his colleagues and any expertise that he might have available to him, a clear and concise report on what exactly is the situation. I have seen things and I have described things on the airways and the press that I am sure the minister has heard about. But I know from time to time that some of the things maybe I have said, or the minister said, have been questioned. Well now it is time to get it out of the realm of politics completely and get the information and say, "Here citizens, here is the way it is. Here are the ways we can attempt to cure it. Here are the alternatives. Now which way are we going to go?" You have to involve the people in the process. You must do that. This is where I think the minister ran into some problems with Foxtrap with respect.

In the next little while there will be a first election ever for the people of St. Thomas on the one hand and for St. Phillips on the other, Portugal Cove of course but that is not within my purview at the moment, unless you decide to expand my boundaries too.

But I hope that all the residents there, and I notice by the way there has been more than enough I believe, people who have offered themselves for nomination, which is a good thing, a healthy thing, I hope that the people will get out and vote and become active and take part in this.

MR. NOLAN: Now I do not know how much time I have and I do not want to delay the Committee unduly, Mr. Chairman, but on regional government and I hope we have an opportunity to get into this in more depth, this is another matter that cannot be rushed into and yet I can almost hear the minister saying, "Well you know maybe we should have done it forty-five years ago." But the fact is we did not and you can blame who you like. We have to have regional co-operation. We no longer live in a world where I, because I am in this community, can do what I like and say the devil with the rest of them. It cannot be done. But let me suggest to the minister now that if there is any suggestion, in any way, by any one in public office, whether he be PC, Liberal, NDP or anything else, that will threaten the autonomy, the heritage, and the history of the people in the communities in the region, in the urban regions, that they are being governed from the city of St. John's, and I do not care who is doing the governing,

MR. MOLAN: you are going to have one woeful row on your hands. It will all come down around your ears, I can guarantee you that, Mr. Chairman. The Battle of Foxtrap will only be a joke.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lawrence's Pond.

MR. MOLAN: Lawrence's Pond. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have heard considerable discussion from time to time on the Henley Commission and I am suggesting now to the minister to be very careful about him or his officials or whoever interpret the Henley Commission because the Henley Commission makes certain recommendations quite clear. Some of them, for example, recommend that Mount Pearl become a part of St. John's, and that has not happened. Some suggest that part of Paradise go in with St. John's also, and that has not happened or if it had you would have had a hell of a lot of trouble in Paradise, I will guarantee you. And yet you have a community in Conception Bay South, say Topsail and Island Pond, who from the Department of Municipal Affairs back in 1975 had a petition drawn up by the officials there circulated for a local improvement district or a council and it has been ignored completely, Topsail and Island Pond area in Conception Bay South, and yet the minister has seen fit to go ahead with St. Thomas and St. Philips. Fine, no argument about that. But you cannot go making chalk of one and cheese of the other. You have to be able to justify these things.

There is another little matter and I am skipping very quickly over some of these things but the thing is that if you do not no longer believe in local improvement districts and in view of the fact that you had municipal elections in November past I did not see the minister or his officials hasten to purge and change and democratize Hogan's Pond and their local improvement district. I mean are they the great untouchables? We are owed an explanation on that if this is the policy. Also I believe Hogan's Pond according to the Henley Commission was to go in with St. Philips and St. Thomas and maybe some additional area there, but I just forget the exact boundaries at the moment. But we have to explain why it is you will do this

MR. NOLAN: because Henley recommends it and you will not do that and be careful that the minister is not charged or his pressure from his colleagues that he is making partisan political decisions and this is what is being kicked around. I am not saying anything here that I am sure the minister has not considered very avidly.

Now on the regional board that the minister is looking at setting up - By the way maybe the minister might although the water is over the dam now while we talk about the regional water supply in providing water for the City of St. John's and all the surrounding areas, if I am not mistaken there was a study some years ago which indicated that Conception Bay South or most of it could have been supplied with water from North of the shore and just gravity fed down into the communities along the shore. Now we find we are going to be locked into the Bay Bulls water supply. That is fine but I hope the people of Conception Bay South are not going to end up paying the shot just to service other areas. You have a very dense population in many areas of Conception Bay South. The thing has grown in many ways too fast, sometimes unplanned and no matter where you have this, no matter where it is we have seen countless cases of this in this province where people want to build here, they want to build there, they want to build the other where and I know what happens to the minister because I was there. That is someone comes in, one of your officials and says, "Listen here bucko, one of those days someone is going to have to service that and this is what it is going to cost."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I have to point out that the member's time has elapsed.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DAVE: Mr. Chairman, before you rise the committee would Your Honour tell us how much time is left in these estimates so that I can leave my remarks till later?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! This head will not finish till fifty minutes into Thursday.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, I will say my few remarks in the time that is left here tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I do have two hon. members on their feet and it does present a little difficulty to the Chair. In the normal course of events I would recognize the hon. member to my left in going back and forth unless the hon. member to my left wishes to sit.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to answer some of the questions but I will yield to the hon. member because obviously he will have some more and I will have more time to get the answers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to address my remarks to the hon. minister and I am reminded here by his statement of the former member for Twillingate, the former Premier of this province, who remarked in this House on the day that he resigned that he did not want to be in Opposition because he found it difficult to criticize the government because he knew the problems they

MR. DAWE: had to try to provide the public services of this Province. And I can almost say the same thing, Mr. Chairman. I was in the hon. minister's department for almost two years and I have some idea of the problems associated with that department.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: And I do not have to come here and defend myself for the remarks of the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: And I will vote in this House as I see fit.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: And there have been other remarks made to me that I am supporting this government here on some occasions for more personal reasons than my district, but I will not describe them here - said to me many times.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say that for these last five years municipal government has continued to progress in my district. In 1972 the water and sewerage system was started in Bay Roberts and last year was completed. The cost was \$6 million.

The town of Brigus last year completed the partial water and sewerage system costing some \$500,000. They are now looking for an extension for their part of the community known as the Riverhead, and it is my understanding that a preliminary design is now being undertaken and it is hopeful that some funds can be provided in this coming year to finish this project for the town of Brigus. And I would say to the hon. minister that if there is any priority given for municipal capital expenditure, I would suggest to him that this system which is required in Brigus would be given first preference.

MR. DAWE:

The town of Bay Roberts have a further application in to extend the water and sewerage system to sections of Bay Roberts East and Coley's Point. In our original design the people of Coley's Point at the time when the plebiscite was circulated voted against the extension of the water and sewerage system at that time and it was not included in the original design. Since that time they have seen the benefits of what this water and sewerage system means to the rest of the community and they have requested their local council and subsequently request has been made to the government to extension of water and sewerage. The cost is astronomical - \$2,100,000. There is a further capital expenditure needed for a sewerage installation treatment plant costing some \$400,000. And last year we were pleased to receive an allocation from the minister in which \$600,000 was allocated under the 60 - 40 per cent paving programme. Tenders have been called, partial work has been completed and the paving is going to be completed this Spring. But for the minister's information there is a further requirement of \$343,000 and naturally I have to bring this to his attention. We all live in the various communities and once one section of a community receives a benefit it is incumbent on the member or the council to provide all the services to all other parts of the community.

MR. HICKMAN:

I think that the hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. DAWE:

Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 P.M. Those in favour "Aye". Contrary "Nay". Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 P.M.