

VOL. 1

NO. 7

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
MONDAY, JULY 23, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. I understand from news reports over the weekend that he had some meetings, I believe it was on Friday, with representatives of Canadian National. Could the hon. the Premier indicate to the House whether or not he received any words of assurance or reassurance with regard to the now confirmed report that certain branch lines are contemplated for closing and that certain positions are contemplated to be declared redundant?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, I met with Mr. Messenger and his public relations man on Friday and it was sort of a wide sweeping meeting in which I wanted to do two things on behalf of government, Mr. Speaker. One was to indicate to CN or its representative in the Province that we were not at all happy with the proposed lay offs which were put into effect. Number two, we are not happy with our communications system between the provincial government and CN. The Advisory Board that was supposed to be established has not been established on which the Province could have permanent representation and they were waiting for word back from a number of other agencies around the Province with nominees, so that permanent relationship is really not there the way it should be, but Mr. Messenger informed us that he would move on that and try to have it in place by September.

And I wanted to also indicate to Mr. Messenger that we would be asking for additional meetings with him

July 23, 1979

Tape No. 190

SD - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: and his group over the next number of weeks and months because we wanted to get as much information as we could and develop a policy as it relates

PREMIER PECKFORD: to CN and to also indicate to him and to his company that we would be preparing a position which we would put on the table before CN and also before the Federal Government.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that complimentary news reports over the weekend have also indicated that Mr. Bandeen, in terms of his national responsibilities as President of Canadian National Railways, has made it emphatically clear that in so far as he is concerned CN must operate like an ordinary corporation and has no particular responsibilities other than those assigned to it by the Government of Canada, and in view of an earlier statement that in fact this is strictly an Advisory Committee, I am very much concerned and, if I could, would like to ask the Premier whether in fact any negotiations or talks have gone between the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Canada because as, I understand Mr. Bandeen's position, it is that he is prepared to do whatever he is instructed to do with regard to the Newfoundland operation provided all deficits are absorbed by, presumably, some level of government? In other words, he does not take any responsibility for the recommendations made to him by the Advisory Committee. If I have not been clear in that question I will be glad to amplify it, but I wonder if the hon. the Premier could reflect the Messenger response to that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I understand the Leader of the Opposition's question very well. In talking to Mr. Messenger the outward aim, it seems, of CN in Newfoundland is to continue to operate but everything else they do disqualifies that statement, if you will, almost. I think it is very important for the Province to talk directly to the Federal Government and not just to CN, because the ultimate responsibility for policy along these lines will be that that comes from the Federal Government and if the Federal Government is willing. I not only want to see the CN rail continue in the Province but I want to see the subsidy reduced by having an innovative and creative policy

PREMIER PECKFORD: towards trying to make it work, albeit
in the short term, and perhaps medium term, there will be a subsidy on
it. And, therefore, I think the Province will have to talk to the
Federal Government and try to change the policy that now it is articulated
by Mr. Bandeen and obviously Mr. Messenger.

MR. D. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: There was a very distinguished former
Minister of Finance, Industrial Relations and sundry other capacities
gracing the gallery.

 Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in view
of the fact that the Premier and I

MR. JAMIESON:

seem to have the same understanding and interpretation, and in view of my known doubts about CN's commitment to this whole project, I am curious as to whether or not the Advisory Committee, for instance, is going to report to Canadian National or what is the mechanism through which the Government of Newfoundland, speaking for the people of Newfoundland, for the employees of Canadian National, is going to say in effect to the Government of Canada, "This simply is not good enough what the CN has come up with and we want some other kind of arrangement." In other words, what is the alternative to simply sitting around and advising and CN saying, "Well, we have heard your advice but we are proposing to proceed in this direction anyway?"

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we are not satisfied.

The Advisory Board is not set up yet and Mr. Messenger says it is really a board of directors, but when I indicated to him, "Well, yes, it might be a board of directors. The only problem is it really does not have any power, it really only advises, and a board of directors does have some power. So it is really not the same as a board of directors." It is supposed to meet regularly and this is supposed to be the permanent input that the Province could have. Well, I am obviously not satisfied with that. I have indicated that to Mr. Messenger and I want to be able to sit down with him and his group over the next few weeks on this matter. Now what we intend to do, Mr. Speaker, as I have announced, is to develop over the next short while, as quickly as we can, a policy on the railway, which we will not only present to CN but we will also present to the federal government, which will outline in detail how we want this thing to be handled, the kind of permanent relationships in communication and so on that should be established. I think it is big. I think the Leader of the Opposition has in his questions indicated that this is what is necessary, that the present arrangement

PREMIER PECKFORD: is just not sufficient to protect the interests of Newfoundland and ensure that we have a rail mode system in this Province ten years from now, that something more has to be done and the government will do that now over the next few weeks and months, through the Railway Committee which we have established which will get from CN as much information as it can and then we will go outside. We are now in the process of talking to a number of railway consultants in Canada who can give us some outside information and who knows CN pretty well.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I apologize for taking so much time but I think the subject is sufficiently important that we get the ground work laid now so that we understand exactly what it is we are talking about here. The hon. the Premier has spoken about, in a sense, creating a Newfoundland Government concept of the rail mode and its continuation in this Province. We on this side, certainly I and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in particular, and all of our colleagues share that view. So that makes sense

Mr. Jamieson: to do it. What concerns me is this question, Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the correlation between the group which the hon. the Premier announced last week, the input it will have into the Advisory Committee, and also on top of that the relationship between those groups and what I understand to be another organization which is set up which involves employees of the railway with regard to redundancies, layoffs, things of that kind?

If I may be permitted to elaborate just slightly more, as I understand it this report which now has been confirmed with regard to close-downs and layoffs is inconsistent with what was undertaken, that is, that there would be no such thing happen until the Advisory Committee had an opportunity to look at it. Now the hon. the Premier advises that CN has not even gone ahead with the Advisory Committee. There are many elements there. May I add one more and that is, is his Committee, or the group within government looking at this matter, also going to examine the future of the rail mode in relation to various harbour developments being proposed around the Island?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer to all the many points just raised by the Leader of the Opposition - and may I say I thank him for his questions. I do not think he needs to apologize to this House for the questions he is asking on this very important matter, because I am prepared to stay here all night, if necessary, or for months to just to discuss CN because it is a very important thing for the future of this Province. So therefore I am very happy to respond as fully as I can on this very important question.

What we are going to try to do through this Committee and through establishing some kind of a policy as it relates to the railway is to develop also the mechanisms that we got and put in place for information flow, so that this Internal Committee is one which will advise the Cabinet and myself on how we should proceed and we will develop a policy based upon the research that they do over the next number of weeks, not only as it relates to

Premier Peckford CN down the road, down the rail, but also how our communication system between CN and the federal government should be established. Should they be different than the Advisory Boards for example? So the whole thing is up for review because I am not satisfied that the Advisory Board is sufficient enough communications channel with CN. Meanwhile, Mr. Messenger has assured me that he will be willing to sit down any day in the next several weeks as we start to ask questions and we get the kind of information we want, and hopefully if we can get a consultant onstream in the next week or two that that consultant can also get all the information necessary to develop that kind of a policy.

But the fact of the matter is we are not satisfied with the communication system now, that even when the Advisory Board is set up it is not sufficient, and also I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we are interested in looking at harbour developments around the Province, container services and so on that can be put in place to make the rail system far more efficient and to use the freight service far more than it is right now is one way to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member for

LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my question

is for the minister responsible for housing. I am sure since the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) delivered his Budget in the House that every member has been swamped with telephone calls about the special assistance for those purchasing houses for the first time. I wonder if the minister can unravel the doubts that have been created in people's minds, the questions that have arisen in the last couple of days in connection with this \$1,500 grant for those purchasing or building houses for the first time? Could the minister straighten us out on the criteria that is going to be used in allocating this \$1,500 grant?

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Minister of

Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I thank

the hon. member for the opportunity, in fact, of telling the hon. members of the House some of the details of the programme. It is designed as was indicated to stimulate housing starts and to aid persons to get into a first-time home. So people who have not previously owned a home would be eligible. The salary requirements or salary restrictions on it would be basically for a family unit with a total income of less than \$20,000 per annum. Persons making \$10,000 per annum or less would get the total grant for \$1,500; persons making above that basically would decrease by \$100 for every \$1,000 of income above \$10,000. So at \$20,000 the amount of grant for which you would be eligible would be \$500.

It is a flexible programme in that it can be paid in one of two methods at the discretion of the applicant. They can take it as a lump sum payment up front to aid them with the down payment on their home, or they can take payments spread over two years on monthly payment; that is if the person is eligible for \$1,000 or more. If a person is eligible for \$1,000 or less, we say that it should go in a lump sum

MR. WINDSOR: payment because the administrative costs would be too great dealing with the smaller amount. But if a person is eligible for \$1,000 to \$1,500, they can take the option of taking it on a monthly payment and that monthly payment would be decreased every six months. So that it is a downward sort of sliding scale to assist people with mortgage payments for the first two years that they are in their home and to ease them into the burden of having to pay their mortgage payments in total themselves thereafter.

Any other questions, Mr.

Speaker?

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

A supplementary. The hon.

member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, just to make

sure that we understand the hon. gentleman correctly, is the hon. gentleman now saying that the \$1,500 will be given to applicants who are building a home for the first time, who are purchasing a home for the first time whether it be an old home? This is the question, Mr. Speaker. This is not the same as the

MR. NEARY: programme was previously. Those who qualified before under the old programme were purchasing a home for the first time, but my understanding of this programme is that you have to be building a home in order to qualify for the \$1,500. Is that the distinction between this programme and the programme that was in effect previously?

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: No, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of the programme is to stimulate housing starts and to create jobs in the housing sector, and it therefore applies to new homes, whether a person is building it himself or buying it from a contractor, but the home must not have been occupied and it is a home that the construction should start after August 1st. That is the intent of the programme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman then has confirmed the doubts in people's minds that this \$1,500 is not for young couples who are buying or building a home for the first time, it is only for those who are building a home, a new home.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Or buying.

MR. NEARY: Yes, or buying from a contractor, but not buying a home that was previously occupied. Well, that is the difference in this programme and the old programme.

MR. N. WINDSOR: No, no.

MR. NEARY: Oh, there is a difference, yes,

Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) make a difference.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman another question, Sir. When the hon. gentleman refers to \$20,000 income,

MR. NEARY: is he talking about \$20,000 income or a salary of \$20,000 or wages up to \$20,000? Could the hon. gentleman clarify that situation, the \$20,000 income bracket?

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a formula that basically it accounts for the salary, of course, of the husband, the salary of a spouse less \$900 so that a wife could make up the \$900 and that would not be counted income. Family allowance payments and this sort of thing are not counted as income for the purpose of this. It is basically the same criteria as used for other federal/provincial programmes.

MR. F. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. WHITE: I am not quite clear from what the minister has said, Mr. Speaker, on when people who are building or buying new homes become eligible for this programme. The minister said after the 1st of August. Does this mean that somebody who started a house, say, today or yesterday will not be eligible for this programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. N. WINDSOR: No, Mr. Speaker, it does not mean that. The start of the programme is August 1st, as I said; however, we have had a number of calls from people who have started, they may have a basement dug or even a basement poured to try to start a home on their own, to do a little work as money became available to them. So what we have said and we have done - obviously we cannot make it retroactive so anybody who is three-quarters through a home it would apply to them. The purpose of the programme is to stimulate housing, not to allow a subsidy, although it would be desirable to somebody who was already started a home and obviously has found some means, as difficult as it may have been, but some means to start their home on their own. But what we have said to be as flexible as possible is that it should not have proceeded past the first floor stage by August 1st. In other words, they can have their basement dug out, they can have their basement poured and their first floor on, the joists on and the floor

MR. N. WINDSOR: floored over. We have to pick a cut-off point somewhere and this is the one that we have found seems to be acceptable to most people in view of the fact that in some cases you are not putting a basement in, so you cannot say, 'You should not have started.' So some people may have a basement in and if we said, 'You should not have anything done,' they would not be eligible, whereas somebody who is not putting a basement in would be eligible.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to ask the hon. member a question which relates to the RRAP programme as well as to this one. I fear, on knowing the problems of identifying who is eligible and

MR. D. JAMIESON:

who is not, that you are getting or the House is getting or the government is getting into an enormous amount of judgemental work here which is going to, I suspect, create many, many problems-whether you have a basement under the house or whether you do not, etc. and so on. Can I ask the hon. minister if there is some way that the kinds of representations which we are getting, and I suspect all members are getting, with regards to the application of RRAP can also be refined and clarified and made tidier for that programme as well as for this one regardless of the merits of the programme or not?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I point out that the RRAP programme is basically a federal programme which is being administered by the Housing Corporation on behalf of the Federal Government. But the guidelines are very similar; there may be some areas where clarification is needed. Certainly, if the hon. gentleman would like to make those available to me or any complaints that he has had I certainly will look into them and see what we can do to clarify them, but up to this point in time it is operating fairly well. We do not anticipate any major problem with this one. I might, while I am on my feet, point out, and as I anticipate there may be questions coming in a moment, what about somebody who is living in a very substandard house at the moment, the house that is really not fit to live in, is he considered as owing a home and, therefore, not be eligible? The answer to that is no, that person will be eligible. If that home is in such a state of repair that it will be demolished when a person moves into a new home, they will not be disqualified because they are living in that type of accommodations.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Supplementary, one final supplementary; then the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. R. SIMMONS:
can of worms programme.

This may well become known as the

Mr. Speaker, the minister in answering the initial question made some reference to - I thought he did and perhaps you can correct me - to an amount under \$1,000, would he just clarify that point for the House, perhaps?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs

and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the programme, as I

thought, was quite clear on it. It starts off with a person making \$10,000 or less is eligible for the full amount of \$1,500, a person making more than that actually it decreases by \$100 for each \$1,000 of income above \$10,000. So when you get to \$20,000 the lower limit is \$500 at \$20,000. And I said at \$1,000 level we are saying that \$1,000 or less should be paid in a lump sum, anything over \$1,000 could be spread over a two year period. And, in fact, by

MR. N. WINDSOR: spreading it over a two year period, a person who was eligible for the full amount of \$1,500 would in effect actually get \$1,800 as a subsidy because there is a little extra in there as an incentive for people to spread out the payment over two years.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), Sir, and it arises out of the fact that a number of people are expressing some deep concern about the fisheries symposium which I believe is being sponsored by the Federal Government and which I believe further is going to be held in late August or sometime in September to deal with the quotas on the Hamilton Banks. Now what I would like to ask the minister is whether there is any truth to the concern expressed by a number of people that the purpose of the symposium really is to increase the quota, possibly double the quota on the Hamilton Banks as a trade-off for the closing of the fisheries on the Grand Banks; increase the quotas on the Hamilton Banks because of the fact that they are closing off the fisheries on the Grand Banks. And would the minister also indicate whether there is any truth to that deep concern and whether the minister agrees with that particular objective or intention?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of there being any truth to that statement and furthermore if that is the intent of the seminar, well, then certainly the Province would object to any such move on the part of Ottawa or indeed any other party, company or government. We view the northern cod stocks, certainly we view that we do have an historical right to these stocks and we certainly would not condone or be party to any attempt by anyone to do anything that would lessen their chances of replenishing and anything that would have the affect of affecting the inshore fishery as in fact it would if these stocks are

July 23, 1979

Tape No. 197

DW - 2

MR. W. CARTER:

over-exploited as they were in the

past.

MR. F. ROWE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

A supplementary, the hon. member for

Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to

hear what the minister has to say. Well, could the minister indicate therefore what exactly is the purpose - I would assume that being the Provincial Minister of Fisheries he is in day-by-day consultation with his counterpart in Ottawa that he would know the objective of the particular symposium and would he further give some indication to the House that he would undertake to find out whether in fact one of the purposes of this symposium is to increase the quotas off the Grand Banks? Both the minister and myself are in total agreement that they should not be increased but that does not mean that it is not the purpose of this particular symposium to set up as an objective to increase the quotas on the Hamilton Banks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER:

I have enough faith in my good friend

and my fellow Newfoundlander, Jim McGrath, who is now the Federal Minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

- that he is not going to do anything for

or consent to anything

MR. W. CARTER:

or be party to anything that will jeopardize the Northern cod stocks and that any increase in the quotas will be consistent with proper scientific and biological data. Certainly I do not think he would even give a second thought to doubling the quota or to trading off part of our Northern cod stocks in return for a closure of the Grand Banks and in fact if that is the intent of the seminar, well, then certainly we will oppose it. But I have enough faith in my friend to know that he will not do that.

MR. F. ROWE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary. The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has such great faith in his counterpart in Ottawa, Mr. James McGrath, I am wondering why and whether the minister agrees to the timing of this particular symposium. The symposium, I understand, and the minister nodded in agreement, that the symposium will be held sometime late in August or in early September and as I understand it there is quite a considerable amount of fishing activity during that part of the year and obviously a lot of fishermen will not be able to be represented at that particular symposium if indeed that symposium is being held in late August or early September. Also whether he has made any representation to the minister's faithful partner in Ottawa with respect to changing the timing of this particular symposium?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that these questions would more appropriately be and should be directed to the minister in Ottawa. But certainly the right to establish the seminar and to set a date is that of the federal minister. Fishermen's interests, I presume, will be represented by their union, I understand the union will be present, but again as to the date of the seminar and in fact the purpose and the intent of it is something that I think we had better ask the minister in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): One final supplementary then the
hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, you know I can have fun
with the Minister of Fisheries now that we have a PC Government in
Ottawa -

MR. LUSH: Quite a change, is it not?

MR. F. ROWE: - and I will not be doing so. I am
going to continue to ask questions because of a deep concern asked by
a number of people in this Province concerning the symposium. I simply
ask the minister whether he would make some representation and have some
consultation with his counterpart in Ottawa with a view to getting the
timing -

MR. LUSH: A better time.

MR. F. ROWE: - a better time, and changing the time
of this particular symposium. I do not want to hear any smart cracks from
the minister indicating that the questions are better being addressed to
Ottawa and this kind of a thing. I asked the hon. minister a question
and he consults with his counterpart in Ottawa, you have a nice flow
of information back and forth; this cozy relationship now exists. I
cannot see why I should go over the head of the hon. minister and I just
ask the question once again; will the minister, in all sincerity, make
some representation to his counterpart in Ottawa with a view to changing
the timing of this particular symposium?

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, on the basis of information I have concerning the seminar, I have no objection to the date or to the place where it is being held. I would strongly urge the hon. member, if people are objecting to the location of the meeting and the time, that I think the people concerned, Mr. Speaker, know very well that this is a prerogative of the federal minister, and if they have any objections to the date or the place of the meeting that they should contact the federal minister, and I would give the hon. member the same advice.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: A question to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) representing one of the districts that is of concern on the Northeast Coast: Would the minister very specifically not say whether or not he agrees that the timing of this to get the average fishermen out of his boat is a very bad time? That is a personal question to the Minister of Fisheries who is a knowledgeable person, that we are not talking about union representation. The question is, is this not, in the minister's opinion, is this not very bad timing to hold a conference to get fishermen from their boats to attend should an important conference? Very specific.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Sir, I think the question is basically the same as that asked by the other hon. member, and I think my answer will have to be the same.

MR. WHITE: Shame.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not getting very far with the hon. minister. I wonder if the hon. gentleman could tell us if there has been any prior consultation about this symposium that is going to be held in Corner Brook? - a good fishing community! - and if there has been prior consultation, will the hon.

Mr. Neary: gentleman tell the House if the provinces, including this Province, will be allowed to have any input in the symposium? And has the hon. gentleman suggested any item for the agenda of that symposium on behalf of the fishermen in this Province who have so many problems?

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

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, there has been prior consultation. I should point out by the way to hon. members opposite, I did not want to say this, but I think I should point out to them that the seminar was announced and was arranged by the former minister, Mr. LeBlanc, while he was Minister of Fisheries. My good friend and former colleague, Jim McGrath, is just now carrying out, following through on plans that were made by his predecessor in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: What items are you putting on the agenda?

MR. W. CARTER: Items on the agenda, Mr. Speaker? We will be putting items on the agenda. We will want to be having some input into the seminar.

MR. NEARY: What are the items?

MR. W. CARTER: My deputy minister will be invited. As to what items, I cannot disclose that at this present time, but I will be glad -

MR. NEARY: Is it top secret or what?

MR. W. CARTER: - at a later date.

MR. MORGAN: No more so than (inaudible).

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, may I in a supplementary return to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor)? This is a matter for clarification. In his explanation, and my colleague I believe from Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) pointed out the same thing, there was a reference to an amount of \$500 at the top end of the scale. In the highlights of the Budget, at the beginning,

July 23, 1979

Tape 199

PK - 3

Mr. Jamieson: it refers to grants ranging from \$1,000 to \$1,500
dependent on income etc. Presumably

MR. JAMIESON:

we have now had a departure from what the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) announced in the Budget Speech.

MR. NEARY:

A change of heart.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. minister.

MR. WINDSOR:

A slight departure,

I suppose, if you want to call it that, Mr. Speaker. I would also point out -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, order!

MR. WINDSOR:

If the gentleman does

not want the answer - as I pointed out a moment ago whereas the bottom end of the scale is really \$500, the upper end of the scale is also \$1,800 which was not in the Budget Speech. We said the upper end of the scale was \$1,500. But a person who is eligible for the maximum of \$1,500 and who takes that over a two year period in fact receives \$1,800. So there is flexibility. I mean, how many details can you put in a Budget Speech? Now in giving you the details you can see exactly where it is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired. I am sure all members would like to join me in welcoming to the gallery a delegation from the local improvement district of Labrador City, included in which is the former MHA for Labrador South, Mr. Mike Martin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

And as well on your

behalf I would like to issue a warm welcome to former ministers and former MHAs. The former member for Harbour Main-Bell Island, Mr. William Doody, and the former member for St. John's Center, Mr. Ank Murphy, are in the gallery with us today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONSMR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present

a petition from 194 residents of Stag Harbour and Little Seldom. The prayer of the petition is that the road from Seldom to Stag Harbour be paved during the 1979 construction season. Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons, I believe, why both sides of this hon. House should support the petition. First of all, the prayer of the petition is not for paving and upgrading. This road from Stag Harbour to Seldom was upgraded in 1972; however the paving, the people of Stag Harbour point out to us, must be done now otherwise reconstruction will soon have to be done again at double expense. Over the past few years, Mr. Speaker, as everybody in Newfoundland and indeed in Canada knows, the prosperity of Fogo Island has increased constantly. The result is a large increase in the amount of vehicles using Fogo Island roads and as a result the dust problem is unbearable. Furthermore, the people of Stag Harbour and Little Seldom point out to us that the equipment to do such a job is now on the Island. As I am sure most people will recognize, moving equipment by ferry to Fogo Island is very expensive. I therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) will support the prayer of this petition and that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it is related.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for

Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to

support the petition presented by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). Knowing the area quite well, I am sure the people in the Stag Harbour area would like to have their road paved particularly since, as the member has pointed out, the road is already upgraded. I think, Mr. Speaker, what we have in the situation as outlined by the hon. member, is where a town is progressing faster economically than it is socially, and this is a very significant point. This government-

MR. WHITE: not only this government but the previous government, has made the point that they wanted to spend money for social programmes that would have a benefit economically, and I think that is the key point with respect to this and why I support the petition. Mr. Speaker, the point that equipment is already on Fogo Island and must be moved back and forth if another paving programme is to be started there is also a very valid point.

MR. F. WHITE: You know, all of us in all our districts, we make the point that since the equipment is in the area the roads should be paved now. Well, that is not a very good excuse for most of us since the equipment could be on the mainland and moved around. But on an island it is a different situation and I think it is something the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) who is from Fogo Island, himself, should give serious consideration to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege to rise in support of petitions for reconstruction and paving of roads on Fogo Island on two or three occasions when Capt. Winsor was the member for Fogo District. As indicated by the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) I was born on Fogo Island and therefore I feel a little bit different, I suppose, or feel rather close to the area.

In supporting the petition, I would like to point out to the House that the government is spending approximately \$1.2 million in a paving programme on the island this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: That is a fair chunk of money, Mr. Speaker, and I want to assure the House and the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that not only will the remaining roads in Fogo be paved, but in due course other roads on the island will be paved.

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

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of ninety-three residents of the Placentia - Long Harbour area, and the petition reads: "The undersigned wish to vigorously protest the provincial government's intention to prohibit the use of all-terrain vehicles in this Province of Newfoundland. While some people enjoy flying over the Island to get to its lakes and streams for fishing or to get further inland for the purpose of hunting or other recreational purposes, the thought of depriving Newfoundlanders of this privilege at this point in time is

MR. PATTERSON: certainly a demoralizing one to say the least. If this decision were to come about we could only look at it as an act of discrimination against Newfoundlanders who love this type of outdoor life as a means of recreation." I would ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1, the Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order 1, the Address in Reply.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I notice the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is not in his seat, Sir. I think he had three or four minutes to go in his speech, in which he said very little, by the way. There was really nothing in his remarks to answer, so I am told by my colleagues. I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman spoke, so I have to take my colleagues' word for it, that the hon. gentleman really said nothing in support of the government programmes that needs to be answered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen realize that we are doing two speeches here now practically at the same time. Although we have not started the Budget Speech, the Budget has been brought down and we are now into the throes of speaking in the Throne Speech Debate, the Address in Reply.

I am going to concentrate most of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, on my own district of LaPoile, but I do have a few preliminary opening remarks that I want to make in connection with the administration generally and the Throne Speech generally. And I want to say, Sir, that my first impression of this government during the election campaign just ended on June 18th and the Throne Speech that was read in this House, that it would appear, Sir, to anybody who has any political sense at all that the new Premier and the government are trying to leave the impression with the people of this Province that they are a new administration, that we have a new Premier and that everything about the past has to be forgotten.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. the Premier especially is going out of his way to make some distance between him and the most corrupt administration that we have ever had in Newfoundland over its 400 year history. The hon. gentleman seems to want to create quite a bit of mileage, quite a bit of distance between him and the former Premier of this Province, Mr. Frank Moores and his administration. The hon. gentleman is trying to leave the impression that this is a born-again government, that the ministers who are now sitting on the government benches and the hon. Premier being one of these ministers who was a senior minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the hon. gentleman -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. I apologize.

MR. NEARY: I cannot listen and talk at the same time. I have the same problem Mr. Smallwood used to have in the House, Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak and

MR. S. NEARY: listen to a conversation at the same time. I have been able to master everything else in the House except that. So the hon. gentleman is trying to leave the impression that this is a born-again government, that they have been saved, they have all been saved. Ministers who were in the former administration and the hon. the Premier was a senior minister in the Moores' administration, they want to forget everything they did. They want to start off with a clean slate and even though they lived in sin for seven years they have all been saved, they are born again and we have to forget all about the past.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I say that the hon. gentleman may try to leave the impression that they are a born-again government but unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to deal with some of the outstanding items, some of the unfinished business of the previous administration, the Moores' administration, unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to come to grips with some of the outstanding business, the items that were left outstanding from the last session of the House and from the last government, then the hon. gentleman is not going to be able to start off with a clean slate. And the hon. gentleman can try all he wants to create distance between him and Mr. Moores but it will not work unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to come to grips, to face up to some of the problems that were created by the Moores' administration that will haunt the hon. gentleman who now occupies that chair unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to do something about it. And one of the items I refer to, Mr. Speaker, is the scandal in connection with Labrador Linerboard. Unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to appoint a fullfledged inquiry to look into the various and sundry scandals in connection with Labrador Linerboard, then the hon. gentleman can not start off with a clean slate. And evidence has been presented in this House that triggered a RCMP investigation that is still continuing, still going on in

MR. S. NEARY: connection with Labrador Linerboard but they are only dealing with one case and that is the case of Sterling International and Egret where money was put in a secret account in Bermuda, a secret commission was paid to a dummy company in Bermuda by Sterling International who bought a shipment Linerboard from Stephenville and that case is under active investigation by the RCMP commercial and crime section. And I understand, as of today, that one of the RCMP gentlemen is leaving today, this very day, to go to San Francisco to interrogate one of the people who were involved, the gentleman, as a matter of fact, who handled the shipment. And so the hon. gentleman may think that the Labrador Linerboard scandal and mismanagement is going to evaporate and disappear but I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is not and evidence is going to keep unfolding in connection with Labrador Linerboard that will make the hon. gentleman, as it did his predecessor, regret that he did not appoint a Royal Committee of Inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act to look into the affairs of Labrador Linerboard from the time the government took it over up to the time that the government closed it down.

I am not referring to the present company that is out there although I have my own views on that, too. It is rather a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, it is too much of a coincidence, as a matter of fact, that the EPA takeover that was announced in this House by the hon. gentleman's predecessor, the Abitibi give-away of the Labrador Linerboard Mill and the renting of office space down here in Atlantic Place from the former owner of EPA, it is too much of a coincidence, Sir, that these three events took place at the same time, in the same month on practically the same day. And I will have more to say about that later. And if I were the hon. gentleman I would be - I would feel very uncomfortable in that seat, very uncomfortable in the seat that he occupies now that was occupied by his predecessor, Mr. Moores. I would feel

Mr. Neary: read out a communique, read out a public statement saying—well, leaving the impression that it was all done through buying of stock. It was a private transaction, a private transaction done either in the board rooms in this Province or in Toronto. A private transaction! There was some stock for two or three weeks before the EPA takeover, there was a lot of stock, a lot of activity on the stock market, but the actual takeover was a private transaction, Mr. Speaker, that had to be approved by this government because EPA is into this government for \$6 million. At least that is what we were told last year in The Loan and Guarantee Act. And this government had to approve the takeover. And who was sitting in the Chair? Mr. F. D. Moores. And who was negotiating for the renting of office space in that white elephant building downtown?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And who was negotiating the Abitibi takeover? As I say, Mr. Speaker, there may not be a thing in this world to it. There may not be a thing to it, but it is too much of a coincidence. And then I heard the hon. gentleman after he retired saying he does not know what he is going to do. The poor fellow does not know what he is going to do. They might form a company, a local company called Torngat Investments. They might.

The hon. gentleman forgot to tell us about the company that he formed while he was Premier of this Province, the holding company incorporated, federally, a company that is registered in Ottawa by the hon. gentleman, incorporated on January 25, 1979 while he was still Premier of this Province, which is being supported by contributions from EPA. If I were the hon. gentleman I would not yet say, we are born again, until all of the mess, all of the scandals are cleaned up.

The other day I put a question on the Order Paper. I asked about the number of scandals in this Province that are still outstanding. One of the ones I mentioned was the Labrador Linerboard one. That will not rest, I have four years or five years ahead of me,

Mr. Neary: Sir, and I will find out eventually, and the hon. gentleman may as well face the facts right now that I have no intention of giving up on Labrador Linerboard, that I am still collecting data and information and invoices and facts on Labrador Linerboard when the government operated it, when Mr. Crosbie was President of the Board of Directors. And I am still going to continue to do it and the hon. gentleman may as well realize that and now appoint a commission of enquiry. What is the hon. gentleman afraid of? What is the administration afraid of? What are they worried about? They have nothing to hide, they tell us, they are born again, although some of them were sitting in the Cabinet when these decisions were made, when the decision was made to set up that marketing company down in Massachusetts, And the records of that company have never been audited by this government, by the Auditor General, by Peat, Marwick or nobody else because nobody in Canada or in Newfoundland has access to the records of the company that marketed the linerboard, registered, incorporated down in Nova Scotia. And God only knows what they did.

Mr. Crosbie was the man who engineered that, who cancelled the original contract to market Labrador linerboard. And the hon. gentleman can sit there all he likes and tell us that this is a new government. You are talking about \$30 million or \$40 million or \$50 million of taxpayers' money and I do not care whether you are old or new, but that is a lot of do ra me, that is a lot of loot, Mr. Speaker, that has to be accounted for in this House.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman may as well face up to it, there has to be an enquiry into the operations of Labrador Linerboard when it was operated by the government. That is no reflection on Abitibi or the company that is operating it now and trying to get it back into operation, none at all. The auditors tell us, Peat, Marwick tell us, that they could not audit the records of Labrador Linerboard because they did not have sufficient information. Every year, Mr. Speaker, every year, year in and year out, Peat, Marwick, who are world renowned, who are amongst the top in their field, top accounting firm in the world, told this government, "Look, we cannot audit the accounts of Labrador Linerboard. Sure, we can try to carry them out in line with general practices and procedures but we cannot audit the accounts because you will not give us the information." And every year this government ignored it and every year refused to give us information here in the House on how that \$308 million of taxpayers' money was spent and what happened to the revenue on the marketing of linerboard? What happened to it? And how much they got for linerboard. What their total production was. How much they got for it. Did they get the market price? Why did they, for instance, Mr. Speaker, why did they choose to ignore - when the previous Minister of Finance took over, why did they kick out Mr. Kraft, kick him out and get a company in Hamburg, Germany to market the linerboard? And that I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am also in communication with now to find out why that company is withholding \$2.5 million to \$3 million belonging to the taxpayers of this Province. Why the government has not made any attempt to recover - Mr. Speaker, the hon. President of the Council seems to be terribly interested in what I am saying. The hon. gentleman probably never heard of Schofield in Hamburg, Germany, a company that was commissioned by Labrador Linerboard to sell Labrador linerboard in Europe. And this company, Mr. Speaker, had an agreement with Labrador Linerboard and in that agreement in case of dispute between the government,

MR. NEARY: between Labrador Linerboard and the company was a clause that it would go to arbitration, any dispute would go to arbitration.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that company that I do not have time to deal with at any great length now, which I will deal with later, that company did market Labrador Linerboard and as I understand it, while the government was telling us in this House that they could not find a market for Labrador Linerboard they had an agreement with this company to sell the total production of the mill, Schofield in Hamburg, Germany. And when they shut down the mill Schofield said, "Well you broke your contract. You broke your contract and now we have to go to arbitration." This government, as I understand it, barely lifted a finger. They said to Schofield, "Keep the \$2.5 million to \$3 million that you got for the linerboard you sold and we will forget the whole thing." What a sloppy way to do business, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the taxpayers of this Province. "Keep the \$2.5 million and we will forget the whole thing." Because if we enter into a law suit you might get more.

Well, it is not over yet, Sir. I am told by Messrs. Schofield of Hamburg. The case is not closed yet. Another example of mismanagement on the part of the former administration and ministers in that government. And the hon. gentleman was there sitting around the table when that agreement was made with Messrs. Schofield in Hamburg in Germany. And so, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may feel that the people are going to be conned into thinking that the government is born again. They may be born again but they have to deal with the unfinished business, the outstanding items. They also have to deal, Sir, with the, as I say, the Egret situation, they have to deal with the situation in Stephenville where three businessmen have already been charged with fraud, with defrauding the Linerboard mill. And we are told by the previous Minister of Justice that other

July 23, 1979

Tape No. 204

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: charges are pending although we have not heard of the other charges yet. They are going to have to deal with the Health Sciences Complex scandal and the scandal in connection with the Carbonear Hospital. That is still outstanding. They are going to have to deal with wrongdoing in connection with purchases

MR. NEARY: made by the St. John's Housing Authority, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Authority both in St. John's and down in Happy Valley in Goose Bay, Labrador. They are going to have to deal with the Mahoney Royal Commission in this House when it is presented this Fall, and they are going to have to deal with all kinds of other items of unfinished business, Sir. And what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is before the hon. gentleman can stand before this House and testify and say, 'I am saved; I have committed mortal sin for the last seven years and we are sorry that we did that and we are born again, and you have to forget all the millions of dollars that went down the tube, that went down the drain when I was sitting around that table with Mr. Moores - you have to forget all that,' - well, maybe the hon. gentleman is smarter than I think he is, maybe he can con the Newfoundland people into forgetting all about these millions of dollars, but I will be here for the next four years to remind the hon. gentleman and I can tell the hon. gentleman right now that I am about - well, I will not say that I am about - but I am digging, and I hope if I dig hard enough that I can produce other invoices and other bits and pieces of evidence to this House to show that there was a gigantic, a colossal international scandal involved in the marketing of Newfoundland linerboard. And if the hon. gentleman has nothing to hide, nothing to fear, why does he not set up a commission of inquiry? Why not? Is that not the fairest thing to do? Or send the Auditor General in, that is fair enough. You are talking about \$308 million of taxpayers' money to complete the mill and operate it for five or six years. And you are also talking about millions piled upon millions of dollars collected by Labrador Linerboard for the sale of its products that we can get no accounting for, no accounting. And that word seems yet, Mr. Speaker, to have not filtered through to the boys and ladies who sit up over my head. We have no accounting for the marketing of that product. We have a concrete case in front of us. What further proof do you want than the Stirling International case where the comptroller of that company gave instructions to deposit \$55 into a dummy company, a secret commission, in a dummy company in Bermuda, \$55 that International Forests' Mr. Bobby Kraft told us was a guarantee against shipping, which was a lot of malarkey, Mr. Speaker, because this shipment of linerboard was F.O.B. Stephenville, I understand from the gentleman who sold it.

MR. LUSH:

You said fifty-five dollars.

MR. NEARY:

Fifty-five dollars deposited into a secret account.

MR. SIMMONS:

Per ton?

MR. NEARY:

Per ton - \$55 a ton - \$110,000 of taxpayers' money put in a dummy account in a company called Egret in Bermuda. And I know this sounds like old hat and I know the press will say, 'Oh, Neary, had nothing new to add, no new information.' Well, what kind of new information do you want? If they were doing their job they would dig themselves and find out a little bit about this scandal.

MR. MORGAN:

The press are all gone.

MR. NEARY:

I do not care. They are listening. Do not worry, they are listening. If they do not do their job, I will do mine in this House. I know there was a scandal of great magnitude involved in the marketing of this product and I intend to get to the bottom of it. And the hon. gentleman would be well advised to set up a commission of inquiry. Why would the hon. gentleman not do that? Why would he not do it? The hon. gentleman does not see fit to answer me. Why would the hon. gentleman not set up a commission of inquiry? What is wrong with that? If there is no wrongdoing well and good, fine, we have settled the matter once and for all, but if there is wrongdoing that will be found out too.

Mr. Speaker, with these new rules it is going to be a problem to get down to a half hour. I could go on for another hour on these scandals, but I am hoping the hon. gentleman got the message. The hon. gentleman will not have the gall to say to the people of this Province, 'We have new policies for the future,' and I appreciate and I understand that, Sir, 'We have a new flag, we have a new administration and we have a new

MR. NEARY: 'Premier and we have all been, as they say, 'sove', so let us forget the past. Forget it! Forget that you were ripped off for literally millions piled upon millions of dollars. Forget all that, because now we are born again.' The hon. gentleman, Sir, will not be born again until the hon. gentleman comes face to face and deals with these matters because the hon. gentleman was a senior minister in that administration that mismanaged so badly the affairs of this Province, that had so many failures and that was so corrupt, the most corrupt, Sir, and I say that without fear of contradiction. Without any hesitation I would say, Mr. Speaker, it was the most corrupt administration, Sir, in the whole history of this Province.

MR. MORGAN: And the same old Opposition.

MR. NEARY: The same old Opposition yes, Sir, and it will be the same as long as I am here. Mr. Speaker, I will not sit in this House as the hon. gentleman has done and see literally millions of taxpayers' dollars milked by the scavengers South of the border and maybe some people in this Province, I am not so sure about that.

Secret commissions are against the criminal code, in case the hon. gentleman does not know it. Anyway, Sir, I will be dealing with it again in due course. I want to switch now for a moment to my own district of LaPoile.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, as I said the other day, I must be doing something right, I have six general elections under my belt and I will be here a long time after some of these gentlemen that are here now are gone. I want to express my appreciation, Sir, to the people of

MR. NEARY: LaPoile for re-electing me down in that district for the second time. And I want to also, Mr. Speaker, apart from thanking my own constituents, thank the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) for the favour he did me in Isle aux Mort during the election campaign.

In 1975, in Isle aux Mort, I got nine votes. The hon. gentleman went down during the campaign and put on a big show, and a big demonstration and as a result, Sir, this time I got 109 votes in Isle aux Mort. I want to personally thank the hon. gentleman.

Now, I did not win Isle aux mort, Sir. I did not win it but I am working on it. I went from nine to 109, thanks to the hon. gentleman and the next time, Sir, I hope - only five minutes left?

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to, in that five minutes, thank the people. And I want to, if I can, just run over some of the problems in LaPoile district, in five minutes. But I believe I should have a little more time, Sir. I was watching the clock. I believe I should have close to ten minutes left, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour had better check. I was watching the clock myself when I started.

MR. SIMMONS: May we have a recount, please?

MR. NEARY: The people of Channel - Port aux Basques are extremely disappointed that there is no provision in this fiscal year to start construction of a district hospital in Channel - Port aux Basques. The administration have already admitted that this is a top priority item and certainly, Mr. Speaker, if it is a top priority item

MR. NEARY: and I agree that the health of our people should come before anything else in this Province, I am surprised that they would, in the Budget Speech, emphasize art councils and make no reference at all to the fact that they are not going to build any hospitals. I would think that the construction of a hospital in Channel - Port aux Basques should come before sending the Norma and Gladys up to Montreal or Toronto on one of these binges or setting up a Newfoundland Arts Council, as much as I am interested in the arts. I like the fiddle and I like the accordion and I like a little tap dancing and I am like the former Premier, I like a scuff, but, Sir, I believe the health of our people comes before everything else in this Province.

I believe the people in Clarenville, according to what I saw in The Morning News, and the people on the Burin Peninsula are equally as disappointed, if not more so, than the people in Channel - Port aux Basques and on the Southwest corner of the Province who were promised a hospital but obviously now, Sir, are not going to get it and they will have to wait for another year.

In the meantime, the area is growing, growing considerably, Sir. T.J. Hardy this year, hon. gentlemen may be interested, for the first time in the history of the Southwest coast is working three shifts in his fish plant, not two. He went from one in one season up to three shifts, working twenty-four hours a day around the clock processing fish in Port aux Basques. And Rose Blanche was never as prosperous as it is at the present time. But we still have that nagging problem in Isle aux Mort where Connors Brothers rowed in on

MR. NEARY: had gone down to Burnt Island where they demonstrated and shut off the water to the fish plant in Burnt Island. And the hon. gentleman sent a telegram down saying that if he won the government, that \$375,000 would be allocated to put drinking water in Burnt Islands. I wrote the hon. gentleman and reminded him of his commitment and the hon. gentleman wrote me back and told me that the commitment made on behalf of his candidate and the government, in Burnt Island, would be kept. I am looking forward to tenders being called for that project. Also, Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the ministers, the Minister of Mines and Energy, (Mr. Barry) when he is speaking in this debate can tell me about the gold in Burnt Island. We hear quite a few rumours, Sir, but we have never been able to get anything concrete, anything definite about the gold at Burnt Island Pond. There is quite a bit of activity going on down there this year, Sir, and there has been quite a bit of activity for the past several years. A drilling company from Quebec has been in there for the last few years drilling away and this year I understand, Mr. Speaker, they have helicopters bringing in brick and cement and sand. They are putting up a temporary building. I do not know what for but it certainly looks very good. And from the little information that I have been able to get on the side, I am told, Sir, that it is the best gold strike on the North American continent in thirty years. I would like for somebody if they have the information - perhaps the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) can tell us, if he speaks in this debate, just what is happening in connection with the discovery of gold in Burnt Island Pond which is near Isle aux Mort, by the way, it is not up in the Codroy Valley as we were told by the minister, I believe, before he went over to Dalhousie. When he was telling us about this gold strike he had a map, on television, and he was showing the gold strike as being up in the Codroy Valley. The strike is actually over in Burnt Island Pond near Isle aux Mort and it looks to be pretty good. I am most encouraged myself by what is going on there. Gold and Silver - and I believe it is only a matter of time. I am hoping this year an announcement will be made that a mine will start

MR. NEARY:

in that area. All the greater need, by the way, for a hospital in that area. With all the activity that is going on in connection with the fishery, CN, the gulf service, the possibility of a gold mine opening up and all the other things that are happening, then you need a hospital in the worst kind of a way. One of the most desperate needs in that area right now is a hospital. Hon. gentleman should see what the staff have to work out off in Port Aux Basques at the present time. It is unbelievable. You have men and women, sometimes on the same ward.

MR. MORGAN:

The same as Bonavista.

MR. NEARY:

No, Mr. Speaker, Bonavista is like Buckingham Palace compared to Port Aux Basques.

AN HON MEMBER:

(Inaudible) is even worse.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, I beg your pardon, Sir. And, Mr. Speaker, - how am I fixed for time, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member has one minute remaining.

MR. NEARY:

One minute, Sir. Well, in that minute I would like to get in a plug for a good many communities in my district and I would like to get in a plug for Cape Ray where they need - my district by the way, Mr. Speaker, goes from Cape Ray to Grand Bruit. The communities are isolated but Cape Ray needs drinking water in the worst kind of a way. And just to show you how penny-wise and pound-foolish this administration is, my hon. friend, when he was in Ottawa, arranged to get a Canada Works grant for Cape Ray, I believe, for \$90,000 but they needed another \$50,000, they needed another \$50,000 of provincial money. They came to the Province to put in a water supply in Cape Ray and the Province said, no, and now, Mr. Speaker, the Province has to put up \$150,000. They could have got away with \$50,000 but now they are going to have to put up \$150,000 because they refused to come to the aid of the

MR. NEARY: water committee in Cape Ray and give them the difference that they needed to put in that water system in Cape Ray. There is a desperate need there for drinking water.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will talk about the other communities and about the other problems maybe in some other debate. But I do again, Sir, want to thank the people of LaPoile for re-electing me. It was a hard fought campaign. I enjoyed it very much. I commend the hon. gentleman for sending down the pride and joy of the Tory Party. I did not take great pride in defeating the gentleman. I thought he was a very fine gentleman. He fought a hard campaign. He made a few mistakes. He must learn that you do not attack a candidate

MR. S. NEARY: personally, that is one thing he has to learn, when you are fighting a campaign. I had to turn the other cheek on a couple of occasions. But he did put up a good battle and I hope that he will not be discouraged because I think we need more people like him in public life in this Province. I was glad to be able to take him out of the play because my hon. friend the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Power) reminded me before the election was called that I was afraid to go back to LaPoile because of Mr. Martin who he thought was the saviour of the Southwest corner of the Province. But, anyway, I did manage to get back in the House again and as long as I am here and as long as I have an ounce of breath and the energy, I am going to keep harping on these things that I mentioned to the hon. gentleman. And he may as well get it through his head now, that there is no way that that Labrador Linerboard scandal is going to be swept under the carpet. I hope the hon. gentleman will take my advice and set up a Commission of Inquiry to look into the operation of that mill from the time the government took it over until they closed it down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Kilbride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. ALYWARD: Mr. Speaker; because this is my first opportunity to speak in this House of Assembly of Newfoundland I would like to begin my remarks by offering my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Speaker of this House and I would also like to congratulate my colleague the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) on his appointment as Deputy Speaker. Because you are both new members in this hon. House, as I am, these prestigious positions are certainly a credit to your past reputations and abilities. I also would like to congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), a gentleman for whom I have a great deal of respect. I would like to congratulate all the elected members on both sides of the House on their election or re-election as the case may be. I look forward to a

MR. R. ALYWARD: productive four years where we, as elected representatives of the people, can show every Newfoundlander that we have their best interests at heart. And even though we all know that everything will not be a bed of roses, we must let the people in each of our districts know that they are being represented well. But most of all, we must be honest with all Newfoundlanders and no matter what the circumstances, we have to keep our people fully informed. My deepest thanks and appreciation has to go to the electorate of the district of Kilbride who have expressed a deep confidence in me and our leader, the hon. Premier, to represent them for the next several years. My attitude, while member for the district of Kilbride, will not be governed solely by my ambitions to become re-elected in the next provincial election but I will be giving my constituents direct answers and I will be working very hard on their behalf.

I would like to extend a special word of thanks to all the volunteer workers who helped me during my first ever political campaign. It is interesting to note that approximately 80 per cent of these volunteer workers were first-time campaigners and they have showed me that there is a renewed interest in political life in our Province and in our district especially. I would like to thank all of them for their time and their support. I have been asked by many of the electorate of the district of Kilbride, also, to thank the former M.H.A. for our district, Robert Wells, for his excellent representation while he was representative of our district. And the people of the district of Kilbride have expressed a deep regret that Mr. Wells has left political life because during his years as our representative, he was an asset to the Government of Newfoundland. The people of Kilbride and I am sure the people of the Province, will miss Mr. Wells very much.

Most of all, I wish to congratulate the hon. Premier, the leader of our Province, the man who convinced rather than conned, as the hon. gentlemen opposite did say, the people of Newfoundland that it is time to change, it is time to look forward, time for the

July 23, 1979

Tape No. 208

DW - 3

MR. R. ALYWARD: elected representatives to show,
through our example, that only by hard work and perserverance can
we prosper. The people of the district of Kilbride have shown

Mr. Aylward: through the great majority which they have given me, that they wish to have a new brand of politics and government which we know the hon. Premier will bring to our Province. Because I am the fourth generation of my family to live in the district of Kilbride, I am familiar with the district and with the people throughout our district. I would imagine that I am the first person to be elected to this hon. House who was born and raised in the district of Kilbride. The main reason that I did seek political life at this time, was my deep confidence in the Leader of our party, and that I believed the time was right for our district to have local representation. I promised only during my campaign that I would work as hard as possible for the district of Kilbride and that I would represent each area and each person in our district equally.

I can assure you that I am here to represent the district of Kilbride. I have no special interest groups to represent, I have no big business backing, I have no labour union to answer to now that I am elected, I owe my loyalty only to the people of the district of Kilbride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. AYLWARD: This district is made up of a mixture of urban and rural communities and the district, like many districts in the Province of Newfoundland, does have many needs for which I will be fighting.

I would like to familiarize some of you with some of the needs that I will be looking forward to attempting to solve within the next four or five years. An area of my district, which is included in the city of St. John's, that part being South of Topsail Road, has unbearable traffic problems in the morning and evening rush hours, and we are hoping that the opening of the downtown arterial road and the crosstown arterial will alleviate some of these problems.

In this area of the district we also have the most beautiful recreational park in Eastern Canada, being Bowring Park, which is a great expense on the city of St. John's, but is now

Mr. Aylward: being used by the total region around this area.

The Southside Road area of my district, which is generally a residential area, for the past number of years has seen its traffic problems increase as it is being used as an alternative downtown route because the Waterford Bridge area, Waterford Bridge Road and Topsail Road are virtually at a standstill now. There are not any playgrounds in this immediate area and we will be looking to see if we can solve this problem.

The Shea Heights-Blackhead Road area of our district needs more and improved recreational facilities and a public transportation system among other things. In this area there are still residents who are being served by night soil trucks and water wagons and we will be fighting to have this remedied.

In Blackhead we have a church which can be proven to be at least 140 years old, and I will be working to have this historic church restored and preserved. Maddocks Cove area is in for some major development, yet some of the area outside of Petty Harbour-Maddocks Cove Town Council has been zoned as the scenic route and some of the long-time landowners and residents are unable to develop their own land.

In the Goulds we have need of an extension to water and sewer projects, some which have already been started under this administration, we need them finished and extended. And the farmers and landowners in this area wish to have more progress in some recommendations being made to settle the agricultural land freeze which affects the Goulds and Kilbride area.

In the community of Kilbride there is to be a third phase of the water and sewer project which has not yet been started, and I will be seeking information on the prospects of having this project finished. Because the West End of the city of St. John's, the Kilbride and Goulds area, have been developing at such a rapid rate,

Mr. Aylward: we do have problems with recreational facilities, traffic problems, school overcrowding, inadequate water and sewer facilities. But we also realize to correct these situations it will cost a great deal of money and the people who receive these services will have to pay for them. There has to be some sensible tax structure adopted throughout the Island so that the services can be offered to all of our districts

MR. AYLWARD: and when these services are offered, the people who expect the services will know exactly what they will have to pay.

Another issue which will affect the whole of my district will be regional government and I would hope that this will be discussed at length at a later date.

As a Newfoundland land surveyor I have travelled throughout Newfoundland and Labrador and I am familiar with the Province as a whole. I have developed a deep affection and interest in the Province and I wish that my children should know and love this Province as I do and that they will have the opportunity to work in our Province rather than have to move like some of our past generations had to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the reference in the Speech from the Throne that this government has pledged its attention to the preservation of our heritage and culture. I am sure that each member of this hon. House will agree that no matter what the development in our Province, we must protect our individuality, our unique culture and our unpolluted environment.

As suggested in the Speech from the Throne and brought through in the Budget Speech, this government has established a Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council which will be a major step in the preservation of our culture which we all cherish so much.

I realize that there are very many topics which can be covered in reply to the Speech from the Throne and I am sure they will all be covered as each hon. member has his or her opportunity to express their views.

My final comment is a wish that each of the hon. members of this House conduct his or her affairs and comments as if their children were looking on, as were the children of the hon. member opposite. And if we conduct our activities as if our children were listening to our every word, I am sure that this hon. House will be conducted in the dignified manner in which it was intended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for Burgeo -
Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do want to offer my sincere congratulations to the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) for a very excellent first speech. I shall look forward very much to listening to him on other occasions. I have not heard many of the maiden speeches in this session because I have been away a couple of days myself, but I do want to extend my very best to him and to all members elected for the first time to the House, and to you, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Speaker. I always said that if I could not get the job myself, I would put one of my relatives there. And it is probably a little known fact, which will now become better known, that you and I, Mr. Speaker, are related to each other despite the different last names and I will leave it to the House to decide to whose credit that is.

But on a more serious note, I could not help but reflect, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) not your fault.

MR. SIMMONS: - that is my own side saying it, imagine what the other side is thinking!

MR. MORGAN: It has to be his fault.

MR. SIMMONS: It is too nice a day 'Jimmy', too nice a day!
I am not even going to take the bait, boy!

On a more serious note, though, in reference to your appointment, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but reflect on just how very proud your father, Mr. Max Simms, would be could he be here today and see you occupy that position as you did your other position as head of a large national organization to which he gave -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - as many members of the House will know, Mr. Speaker's father, Mr. Max Simms, gave many valuable years to another similar organization, the Lions International, indeed, became, I believe, the first native Newfoundlander to be an international director of the

MR. SIMMONS: International Lions Club. And I am very proud to say that that gentleman is my mother's uncle, my great-uncle, a man whom I have the most tremendous admiration for. I am particularly delighted that one of his descendants is able to, in a way, represent what he stood for here in the House of Assembly.

To your associate, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Speaker from Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), my very best wishes as well.

I would particularly want to just say a word in reference to the former Speaker (Mr. Ottenheimer). It was really

MR. R. SIMMONS: during his tenure in the office that I got accustomed to the House and I am indebted particularly to him for helping me get oriented without getting flung out too often. There were one or two occasions but for neither of these do I blame Mr. Speaker, indeed, I admire him for doing so well what he had to do and so gently. But I believe this House was served particularly well by Mr. Speaker Ottenheimer, the present Minister of Justice, and he did much during the last session of the House to make the House as productive as it turned out to be.

Mr. Speaker, I want to, also, by way of preliminary remarks, just extend publicly a word of congratulations to the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson), the member for Bellevue, and I want to say that I am especially delighted and proud to be serving under his leadership and I am looking forward to a very productive Opposition, I believe a very different styled Opposition than perhaps the House has witnessed in many years. And, as I say, I am looking forward to working with the Leader of the Opposition and with the members of caucus, both those who have returned and those who have been elected for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out with new rules, we do not have a lot of time for long-winded preambles so I shall try a little more quickly to get to the point and that is to debate for a few moments the matters contained in the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Just before doing so I am reminded that another one of my former constituents has seen fit to come here and represent himself and I am especially delighted to see the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. D. Stewart). He and his predecessor, Mr. Jack Winsor, were both once constituents of mine. I think it says something. I believe they got represented so badly that they decided to come and do it themselves. But he is here anyway and I am especially delighted to see him.

MR. R. SIMMONS: On the matters contained in the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would like to highlight just two or three today, Mr. Speaker, there being a shortage of time insofar as my own time allotment is concerned. I am a little at a loss to understand what it is the government is proposing insofar as job creation is concerned. A lot by way of preamble could be said about the Throne Speech. It is a very general document. We ought to bear that always in mind, that it is a very general document, it is not the kind of thing that is going to itemize in any particular detail the steps which a government would, or an administration of government would propose to take and in its vagueness is its virtue really. A Throne Speech has to be somewhat vague, somewhat general, not too specific. And so when I look at the statement about creating 40,000 new jobs over the next five years, while I realize it is a generality, it is very specific in one aspect, it does place a number rate in black and white print, it does say 40,000 new jobs, and so I look at the government's record. Now I am not going to get bogged down for today, I have some things I would like to say at the appropriate time about how new this administration is. I wish my colleague from Lapoile (Mr. S. Neary) were here because I was rather gratified with the comfort, the ease with which he uses the term 'born again'. It goes to show that we, who represent the evangelical causes in society, have had some effect on the man from Lapoile. He is beginning to, at least, understand the terminology and I thought he expounded very well today. I am sure my father friend from Bay of Islands (Mr. L. Woodrow) would agree with me that he is half-way there, there is hope for him yet. But I myself

MR. S. NEARY: That is right. If I go to a few more charismatic meetings I will have it made.

MR. R. SIMMONS: You will have him give his testimony in no time at all.

I thought he handled that subject

July 23, 1979

Tape No. 211

SD - 3

MR. R. SIMMONS: very well of past and present administrations and the difference that exist if any. But I want to say that from the government's brief record, even if you talk about this present administration, and define this present administration as having lasted from March 17th, or whenever that famous Irish day was, when they rejected the Irishman and took the other fellow.

I will start, post March 17th so that there is no doubt about whether I am talking about the past or the past administration and I will deal strickly with things present, things post March 17th. I hold before me a document entitled The Economy 1979. It is dated

MR. SIMMONS:

March 1979, so one could argue, well perhaps it was under the old soon-to-be-forgotten regime of Frank Disraeli, or Frank D. Moore, But, no, I looked on the bottom and it is issued under the authority of the hon. W. Marshall and, of course, he was not in the old regime. Well, he was in the old regime, Mr. Speaker, but he got flung out of the old regime and in the latter days he was in outer darkness, if you like, and it was only after March 17th that he was reclaimed for the benefit he is. So this document is post March 17th, I think you will all agree. This document tells me about jobs too. This document tells me about jobs as well. This one tells me about 40,000 jobs over five years. And I heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) say that already they have had 8300 of those jobs produced in the last year. Well, that aside, let us stick with the Throne Speech. The Throne Speech talks about 40,000 jobs over five years. That means on an average of 8,000 jobs a year and yet I read The Economy put out by the Cabinet Secretariat of this government, March 1979, and I read on page 16 of this document put out under the authority of the minister, the President of the Council, I read that employment as measured by the labour force survey increased by 5,000 in 1978 and then I read that employment generation in 1979 is not expected to match that of 1978. Now, let us understand who the authorities are here, Mr. Speaker. These are the highly paid mandarins, the highest paid civil servants of government who sit down on the seventh and eighth floors and advise the government on financial and economic matters. The Speech from the Throne, it must be admitted, is essentially a political document. This is what the politician wants the public to hear. Whether it is the truth or the varnished truth or the half truth is another issue, but this is the political document, this is what the politician wants the public to hear. This, I would assume, should be the unvarnished truth, what the technocrat is paid to tell his bosses. And he had better be paid to tell the truth or else he is going to get his bosses in

MR. SIMMONS: a lot of trouble. This is the private document which I happened to get my hands on today. This is the private document. This is what the technocrat tells his boss privately. This is what his boss peddles to the public publicly. The difference? I am talking about the same document. The same document. This document, the private document, Mr. Speaker, says on page 17, employment generation in 1979 is not expected to match that of 1978. In 1978 we had 5,000 jobs. And if you are not good at deduction, forget it, just follow me to the bottom of the page. It says the expected rise in employment for 1979 is going to 4,000 jobs. Four thousand jobs, Mr. Speaker, not the 8,000 that is projected here, 4,000. Now you say, well, they are allowed one mistake. They are allowed one mistake. Eight thousand but they meant 4,000. Alright, let us put that mistake aside for the moment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They made a mistake on housing - thinking -

MR. SIMMONS: Let us put that mistake aside for the moment, Mr. Speaker, since that might be the only mistake. Perhaps that is the only one they have made, where they said 8,000 jobs a year they really meant 4,000 a year. But then you hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) as my friends reminds me today. The quote, "\$1,500" housing grants, the \$1,500 housing grant. I think after what you heard from the minister today you will see that I am justified in putting \$1,500 in quotation marks. Now, I heard a little giggle from the other side when I asked the supplementary question. Some of the people over there may not have realized what I was getting at in terms of the minister's contradiction with what was in the Budget. First of all, the Premier's promise before the election is \$1,500, no ifs, ands or buts. No, if you are building a new house. No, if you are living in it for the first time, none of that. No, but you cannot have it if you get over \$20,000 but you can only get some of it if you are

July 23,1979

Tape No. 212

AH-3

MR. SIMMONS:

getting \$15,000, but you can
only get something less if you are earning \$10,000. Oh, no, none of
the ifs, ands and buts then,

MR. SIMMONS: just \$15,000, vote for us - sorry, \$1,500 - vote for us, fifteen hundred bucks. So every homeowner who is building a house or who has recently built a house, whether the first or second house, reasonably expected - because the Premier is a man whom we have learned to take at his word - reasonably expected that \$1,500 meant \$1,500, until we read the Budget, and then we find the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) saying, 'Well, not \$1,500 - not quite, no - \$1,000 to \$1,500.' But then again, to the credit of my member - I live in St. John's South, he is my member in the House of Assembly, the Minister of Finance, and then during the Summer I move out to Kona Beach and I have no less a personage than the Premier as my member in the House of Assembly; so I am doing very well, I am well situated - I have the Premier and the Minister of Finance representing me here in the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: They are both from the (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, they do their very best. I must say, I get the most adequate representation here.

I read in the Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister of Finance, that grants will range from \$1,000 - and I am sure the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) must have been disturbed by this contradiction, his Premier out on platforms during the election promising \$1,500, and he is going to have to answer to a number of people in Harbour Main and Bell Island for this untruth, that what the Premier called \$1,500 the Minister of Finance has since called \$1,000 to \$1,500. But on the other hand, I say to my friend from Harbour Main - Bell Island, at least he can be grateful that the Minister of Finance was specific, he did not weasel on it. He was very specific, he said, 'will range from \$1,000 to \$1,500.' Now my understanding of that is that it will not go below \$1,000 - that is my understanding -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: - when \$1,000 to \$1,500 means exactly that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too bad.

MR. SIMMONS: That was my understanding until 3:15 this afternoon.

MR. SIMMONS: And then the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor) got up and at one point I heard him say the phrase 'less than \$1,000' and I thought he had made a slip. So as a friend, I got up to draw it to his attention. Less than \$1,000? This has never been mentioned before. Now they are going to give less than \$1,000 to the same people that the Premier promised \$1,500 to, to the same people that the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) promised at least \$1,000 to? Now it is going to be something less than \$1,000? I asked, How much less? Five hundred dollars? The Premier's promise of \$1,500 becomes the government proposal of \$1,000. The minister's performance gets it down to \$500. And the homeowner's predicament will be such that he will probably find he has none. Does he qualify? What does he qualify for? - \$1,500? \$1,000? \$500? Anything at all? What does he qualify for? Well, there are a few ifs there yet. They are not all ironed out yet. You might get \$500 if your house is sub-standard. Well, mine is, Mr. Speaker. I qualify. Mine has the eaves dropping off, it needs to be painted, storm door blown off. My house is sub-standard. I almost said I am sub-standard, but there is no grant for me, I suppose. But I certainly qualify if the rules that the minister gave today apply. Or the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) qualifies, there is no question about that -

MR. NEARY: He has termites in his savoury patch.

MR. SIMMONS: - that is if the salary is different from the income. If it is a salary of \$20,000 that determines it, then he will qualify, but if it is an income he will be paying money into the programme. There are still a few ifs there about this homeowner programme or this homeowner grant. If it is sub-standard, well, like I said, it is going to be quite a can of worms writing rules to satisfy that one. You know, if you live next to me and your house is sub-standard enough to get a grant, well, I will prove pretty fast that my house is just as sub-standard. Where do you draw the line between not as sub-standard as the next sub-standard house? But the big if, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that if the house is not above floor level. Well, I hope the press do a good job

July 23, 1979

Tape 213

RT - 3

MR. SIMMONS:

on one thing today because they will do

a service to every -

MR. SIMMONS:

guy out there who is building a house today. Will the press see to it that everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador knows that if you have the house built above the floor, you do not get 'not nary a nickel', and let the word go out that all those fellows who have their framing stuck up, knock it down tonight because it is worth \$1,500 to you to knock down your frame. If you have her framed up today, knock it down and do not drive another nail until the first of August. Do not drive another nail until the first of August, because if you have one stud stuck -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Unstick it.

MR. SIMMONS:

- unstick it, unstick it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to

say it is not -

MR. F. WHITE:

Some inconsistency.

MR. SIMMONS:

- it is not nearly as light a subject

as I make it sound. There is, at the very least, some inconsistency. There is some unfairness here too and that is the point I am trying to make. There is some unfairness in this program. I do not mind a party going around during an election. My party promised a freeze on electrical rates, and we fully intended to keep that commitment, and I would have fully expected that, had the positions been reversed and we were there in government and men and women who now sit on the government side were in opposition and we were renegeing on the electricity freeze and only implementing certain parts of it, I would have fully expected that these people would have pointed out the difference between our promise and our performance. So I am doing today what those would have done to me and should do under the circumstances, that a promise of \$1,500 to people who need \$1,500, people who are having increasing difficulty putting the dollars and cents together to build a home had false hopes raised on June 18th. There were no ifs, ands and buts. There was no 'if you are not earning so much money', or 'if you have not got the house above floor level' or 'if you are not earning so much money, you will get this and you will get that'. Nothing like that - it was \$1,500, and I would say without fear of contradiction that not one member on the

MR. SIMMONS: government side in his political rallies, in her political rallies, made that qualification that is now contained in the program. Not one member got up and said, "Now look, it might only be \$500, it might only be a thousand". I would venture a guess that everyone who mentioned it by way of trying to get elected mentioned one figure and one figure only \$1,500, and I say to those members, if you did that you were dishonest albeit unwittingly, not knowing because your party let you down, but you were being dishonest because where you went out and promised \$1,500, I say, Mr. Speaker, where that member went out and promised \$1,500 as a candidate, he can now only deliver \$500. He can now only deliver \$1,000, \$1,100 or \$1,200, and I say to new members, "Do you find that shattering? Brace yourself." Brace yourself. You will be let down more times than this one. You will be let down more times than this one if you let this one slip by, but there is another way out. Members in the government caucus should go in caucus tomorrow or tonight and say, "I have had enough. We have been let down on this one and let us not let it happen again." I appeal to private members in the government caucus, particularly new members, to go back and say, "Look, we misled the people on this. That is not what the program promised." The program promised \$1,500 for every new homeowner. That is what the program promised. There were no ifs in it. There were no \$500's for some and \$1,000 for some others.

MR. NEARY: And nothing about that you had to build the home. It was buying a home for the first time.

MR. SIMMONS: Misled, Mr. Speaker, misled nothing about it being a first time homeowner - very misled on the amount and on a lot of the conditions. Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, I understand that people get carried away in the heat of an election and that you cannot write all the conditions in there. I am not asking that that be done, but I am asking that people in public life keep the faith, I am asking that people who promise something that is clearly understood and to me \$1,500 is different from \$500, I am asking that people who make clear, definable, definitive promises be obliged to keep them, and we have a number of levers to see that they do keep them.

MR. SIMMONS: One of the levers is this House, but an equally good lever in this context is the government caucus - not here, do not wash your linen in public, I am not asking that. I know what every member on the government side will do when he gets up. He will sing the government song. He will dance the party tune and I will be surprised if he did not. I would be surprised if he did not. Well, do that if you feel you have to do it. Do that if you have to do it.

MR. NEARY: And as a diversionary tactic talk about the decorum of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. I have had every lecture, Mr. Speaker, I want to have

MR. SIMMONS:

about the decorum of the House, particularly by those who were never here to see what it was like.

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is right.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: I have had every lecture I want to hear. And let me just say this about the decorum of the last House.

MR. NEARY: Which is the same as now, by the way, exactly the same as now.

MR. SIMMONS: Let me say this about this House and the last House. Those who have been here they have been watching the press. Take today, for example - and this is no reflection in any adverse way on the press, it is just a comment of how things are - you watch what will happen today. And I say to any new member here see if you can predict the press that will be on tonight on television or tomorrow in the papers and I bet my bottom dollar you will not because what appeared to you in the House to be just a passing comment becomes a headline in tonight's news, in tomorrow's paper. What was happening in the last House can happen in this House, Mr. Speaker. It has not had a chance to happen yet. If you have some fun and games and some work, chances are the press will write up some of the fun and games and some of the work. If all you have is fun and games all the press is going to write up is the fun and games. And all we had in the last House was fun and games as the government brought no legislation in here. The government gave us nothing to talk about.

MR. NEARY: We forgot all about that, the government brings the programme in.

MR. SIMMONS: That is what you have to remember, that it is the government that decides what goes on in this House. If the government calls an order of business that ought to be debated we will debate the order of business as we are doing now.

MR. NEARY: Right. Right on.

MR. SIMMONS: If there were times last year, Mr. Speaker, when that ethereal thing called the decorum of the House, whatever it is, did not

MR. SIMMONS:

satisfy the pallets of the St. John's cocktail circuit, well my humble apologies. If it was not the kind of thing they wanted to talk about, well I am sorry we hurt them. I am sorry. But, Mr. Speaker, the times we frittered away the time and there were times we frittered away the time here, Mr. Speaker, the times we frittered away the time were those times when there was no agenda, no effective order of business for the House of Assembly. And when we are making all our grand appeals about decorum, include in it an appeal to the government to do its job in the House.

MR. NEARY: Right. Right on.

MR. SIMMONS: Include in it an appeal that the government give us the business, the government give us the tools so we can do the job. It was not a pleasant House, Mr. Speaker. The last House was not a pleasant House, not a very pleasant House. We had some very unpleasant things had to be talked about and have still to be talked about and will be talked about.

MR. NEARY: Right on. It will not be covered up.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe in light of what has happened today, insofar as this homeowner's grant is concerned, I would really like to see politics aside now, let us look at the homeowner out there who has got a place half erected, who wants to start a house next month and he probably voted for the party who made the promise, on the basis of that promise and he heard in June - \$1,500 is what he heard. Tonight he hears the radio and it is down to \$500. But he has the west side of her stuck up already, he is above the floor. His sin is efficiency. His sin is getting on with the job. His sin is that on June 18th he believed what he heard and so he took the hammer in hand for the last five weeks and rushed ahead with the job and he got her not only floored over, he got her framed up today. That is his sin. And do you know what he is going to get for that? Not a cent. Why? Because the party which made the promise is not prepared to keep the promise. And I say to this House, politics aside, I appeal

MR. SIMMONS:

to government members in particular to sort this one out. I ask you not to wash your linen in public. Do it privately. Go in the government caucus and say to the Premier (Mr. Peckford), That is not what you promised. Say to the Minister of Housing (Mr. N. Windsor) get your pencil out and sharpen it a bit and find the money to keep the promise that I made as a candidate for that particular party. That needs to be done, Mr. Speaker. If honour means anything in this day and age, that needs to be done.

I have a number of constituents in my own jurisdiction who are acting in good faith on the basis of that promise,

MR. SIMMONS: who are planning their budgets on the basis of \$1,500. And I say to all hon. members here that the difference between \$1,500 and \$500 - \$1,000, in many cases will decide whether my constituents can build a house or not. That \$1,000 difference will make the difference. And I would suggest to hon. members that that statement applies equally to constituents in all parts of this Province. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I make a particular appeal to government members that I believe this is where it has to be sorted out, in the government caucus. The message has to go through privately. Now they will hear some lectures in their caucus about not being stampeded by Simmons or by the Opposition and they will be told to see this as a partisan thing. And they probably will. But I ask them something else. I ask them not to see it as a partisan thing, I ask them to see it as a matter of honour, as a matter of commitment. I ask them to realize that \$500 if not \$1,500 and the \$1,000 difference will decide, Mr. Speaker, for many people whether or not they can build that house or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
St. John's Center.

The hon. member for

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. McNICHOLAS:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members, my first duty and a very pleasant one is to thank the people of St. John's Center for electing me to this hon. House. And I would like to assure them, those who voted for me, those who voted against me and those who did not vote and also their children, that I will look after their interests to the best of my ability as long as I am a member here. I want to congratulate all hon. members and hope that we can work in harmony and if not in harmony, at least not in too much discord. I want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, and the Deputy Speaker. I particularly want to congratulate the hon. the Premier. It was his vision of not the difficulties of Newfoundland but of the opportunities in Newfoundland, in the fisheries, in the

DR. McNICHOLAS: field of oil exploration and in so many other fields, it was that that was instrumental in getting me involved in politics this time round. I am very proud and honoured to be part of his team. I would like also to congratulate the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I think any fair-minded Newfoundlander would say that he brought great distinction not only to Newfoundland but to all of Canada while he was in Ottawa. I might also add a personal note. I remember in the past how kind he always was to me. When I was President of the Newfoundland Division of the Canadian Red Cross Society, I was interviewed by him on a number of occasions and he always went out of his way to ask me the right questions, to cover up my mistakes and to project me in a very good light, and I am very grateful to him for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in Newfoundland for over twenty years. The first house I bought was in the district that I now have the honour to represent and I have lived in that district ever since except for one year that I spent out in British Columbia and one year I spent working among my black friends in Africa. During that time I do not think there was any nook or cranny in Newfoundland in which I did not have a patient and many also from Labrador. I think that over that period of time I began to see some of the problems,

DR. MCNICHOLAS: some of the difficulties facing Newfoundland and I hope over the next few years that I will be able to make some contribution towards solving these problems.

Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign, my ambition was to visit every house in my district and I did succeed in visiting over 90 percent of them. There are two main problems in the district of St. John's Centre; the first certainly not unique to St. John's Centre but that is unemployment. I felt particularly sorry for what I would call the middle-aged unemployed, mostly heads of households, men in their 45's-50's-55's, and I realize only too well that it is extremely difficult to get work for them. Oh, do not let anybody tell me that they are not looking for work. The other group that I am particularly concerned about are the young people just leaving school with their Grade 11, and I would like to suggest to the hon. the minister directly in front of me here (Ms. Verge) that she makes sure that there are enough places in our Fisheries College, in our College of Trades and Technology, in the new departments that are starting in Memorial University in marine biology, that there will be enough places there so that our young people will be able to take the jobs that we all see are beginning to unfold and will unfold over the next few years. It may be selfish but I would like to direct another thing to her, also, and that is that I have noticed that there are quite a number of foreign students from Nigeria, from India and other places, and they are taking the places that rightfully, I think, belong to our own Newfoundland children.

Mr. Speaker, the other big problem I noticed in my district was housing. Or should I say the lack of housing? I have had a number of constituents phone me about subsidized rental units anywhere in St. John's, and I phoned the authority that looks after these units and I find that there is a waiting list of between 450 and 500 people waiting for these units. Mr. Speaker, right in the centre of my district there is one of the choicest pieces of real estate anywhere in Canada, beautiful land looking directly across to the Narrows, looking directly on St. John's Harbour, looking on the Southside Hills.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: There is one block of land there immediately West of City Hall, six and a half acres. This, Mr. Speaker, is serviced land with water and sewer laid on, with electric light poles all over the place. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how long that land has been left idle? Not five years nor ten years, it has been empty, growing weeds for the last fourteen years and people are crying out for housing, crying out for employment. I am not suggesting that we should fill that with subsidized rental units. I am not at all sure that we should not have a hotel and convention floor plus housing, but one thing for sure we do not want it empty when the city is complaining that they do not have enough tax dollars, when people do not have employment. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we could have a committee of city people, provincial government and federal people and develop that land, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to be a member of that committee.

DR. McNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, I had a traumatic experience in getting the nomination for St. John's Centre. and I do not want to have to go through that experience again. And I will make sure that I will not go through that experience again because I am determined to look after the people of St. John's Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. McNICHOLAS: I find it very hard to end my speech without being emotional because over the years Newfoundland has been very good to me. It has been very good to my wife and it has been very good to my six children. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I have your permission and that of the House, to end on a much lighter note. I have here an Irish song that I adapted slightly to Newfoundland conditions. I have two verses of it. And if I have your permission I would like to end on that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

DR. McNICHOLAS: When I was a young man I had not a penny/
When should we marry? my Molly would say/ But I was a wise man and said to me darlin'/ Love that is true love will not fade away/ Oh the youth of the heart and the dew in the morning/ You wake and they have left you without any warning/ I came out to Newfoundland looking for money/ I worked all the day and I slept all alone/ The sweet silver dollars I saved for me darlin'/ To dress her in satins and make her my own/ Oh the youth of the heart and the dew in the morning/ You wake and they have left you without any warning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, over the years that I have been fortunate enough to be a member of the House I have listened with a great deal of interest to many performances, to use that word in its truest sense, I do not think I have every heard one quite as effective as the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas). I know I speak

MR. ROBERTS: for all of the House on this, I would give him our compliments, our envious compliments if he has ever heard some of us or had the misfortune to hear some of us who have, at best, Methodist voices, and could not carry a tune in a basket. I thought he sang exceptionally well. When he launched into what he told us was an Irish tune I thought perhaps he might have been using that line from Galway Bay about a language that the strangers do not know. I would compliment him and I think it was a noteworthy ending to his maiden speech. I can not refrain nor should I refrain from expressing the hope that his example will be infectious. And if some of his colleagues would sing because, Sir, they will doubtless sing better than they speak and that, Sir, would be something we would all welcome. But I compliment the hon. gentleman. There are precedents. I do not know if there are precedents in this because I think Mr. 'Ank' Murphy, who was a unique character and added considerably to the stature of this House over the years - I think he once was prompted, or irked as the case may be, into breaking forth into song. And, of course, there is a famous precedent in the House of Commons in Ottawa where another Newfoundlander with Irish blood flowing in his veins, the late Senator Jack Higgins, once sang, The Shooting Of The Buck, and that was to protest -

MR. W. CARTER: Gordon Higgins.

MR. ROBERTS: Gordon Higgins, I am sorry. I thank my hon. friend from St. Mary's - The Capes, the Minister of Fisheries, (Mr. W. Carter). Both Mr. Higgins contributed mightily

MR. ROBERTS:

Parliament of Canada but the late Gordon Higgins who was then, I guess, the member for St. John's East, sang The Shooting Of The Buck in what I believe was a successful protest against some rules which the then Government of Canada wanted to adopt to limit the Newfoundlander's right to shoot the buck. That was sung to the tune of The Wearing Of The Green, Oh Paddy dear, and if I go any further the gentleman for St. John's Center (Dr. McNicholas) will either be embarrassed or the House will be embarrassed. But I would compliment him. I must say though there was one part of that speech with which I would take exception. I think I heard him correctly. I may be doing him a disservice. Some of my colleagues heard a different sentiment but I thought I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he felt that students at the university who come from outside Newfoundland or perhaps from outside Canada were taking places that were rightfully the property, to use that phrase generally, the property of Newfoundlanders. Was that -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: So I did hear him. It was my colleagues from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) who misheard it. I would take issue with that. I do not feel that we should run a university for the benefit of the rest of the world but I think at the same time that if we in Newfoundland and Labrador ever come to the point where we exclude the people from outside, I think that first of all we are denying ourselves a great part of our educational experience. I think the hon. gentleman himself would be the very first to testify to the fact that the life of this Province, the communal life of this Province, the society of this Province, is immensely improved by people who come from across the seas. As he himself said - and I marked his words down - Newfoundland has been very good to him. Well I would say that in turn, Sir, the hon. gentleman for St. John's Center, with whom I may have political differences but I hope no personal differences, that he has made a contribution to this Province, to this world, to the new world to which he came many years ago but came to make his life and his career. I do not think

MR. ROBERTS:

we in this Province, Sir, should ever turn our back on the rest of the world both for our own sake and for the sake of the world. We are all citizens of the world. And in an age when we have seen evoked in Canada an incredible and a heartening response to the plight of the boat people in South Eastern Asia, I think we should remember we are all citizens of the world. And we in North America while we may have our problems and we in Newfoundland and Labrador feel that we do have problems and all of us dealing with constituents are very much aware of some of the problems, I would say from what little I know, from the opportunities I have had to travel and from what I am told by others who have travelled, that there is nobody in Newfoundland and Labrador who faces anything like the problems that most of the people of this world face today in just even living let alone in enjoying life or in developing their potential. I think within reason we should certainly ensure that our university is open.

Knowledge, I would add as well, Sir, knowledge knows no province. University by its very definition is universal and knowledge is not limited to the physical boundaries of this Province or the territorial boundaries of this country of ours. I think it would be very much a smaller and very much a poorer place. So with all respect to my friend from St. John's Center (Dr. McNicholas), I would take issue with him on that point. I think it is something perhaps he might want to reflect upon. I appreciate what he was saying. I would not want to see our own Newfoundlanders denied entrance to the university because the places were being taken by others but there is no evidence of that.

MR. NEARY: No there is not.

MR. ROBERTS: If any Newfoundlanders - my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who heavens knows is willing to criticize the university when he thinks it is wrong - he thinks at times, I believe, that it is a sacred cow and he is willing to take a slice or two of steak off the sacred cow. But he makes the point. I do not believe any Newfoundlanders are being denied a university education because of the policy of admitting people from other lands. If they are being denied it,

MR. ROBERTS:

it is because of the policies of administration in this Province of which the Hon. gentleman is a supporter -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: - that puts economic hardship or economic roadblocks in the way.

Mr. Speaker, that was just by way of a digression. We will all have to become very much less prone to digress given the fact that under the new rules which we adopted there last week we have only half an hour. However, I would point out to Your Honour that we can move amendments. So I figure I am good for ninety minutes on the no confidence amendment. So we all have thirty minutes now and then sixty minutes on the amendment and then, of course, we have another full round of debate.

MR. NEARY: I can finish my district speech.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from LaPoile can finish. When I left to go to make a phone call or two to my district he was well into a district speech, taking that he is now representing the constituency of Hamilton in Bermuda, because he was quite properly pointing out some very interesting and significant developments that

MR. E. ROBERTS: have not been fully brought out and that in his opinion and I think it is one that is shared by us, it should be brought out.

MR. NEARY: Right, right on.

MR. E. ROBERTS: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, be that as it may, there are one or two points that I would like to make. I will not make what we all refer to as a district speech. I could, I assure hon. gentlemen that not only are there enough needs in my district to justify the time of half an hour of the House of Assembly at any time to speak of the defects in public services but I could equally, I think, with some certainty say that I am sufficiently aware of some of the problems at least to begin to sketch them. and from time to time, perhaps, I will have occasion to do so. There are certainly very real needs in the Strait of Belle Isle and they are needs which require and, in my view, demand attention from Her Majesty's government but I will have ample opportunities to speak on those both in the House and outside.

I wanted to talk today about one or two larger themes that grow out of the Throne Speech and after all, although the rules of this debate are very open and are very relaxed when it comes to the relevancy question, we should not forget that, in theory at least, we are debating the Address in Reply. A committee was appointed, a committee prepared an address, we are now debating that address and while, as I said, the debate is completely wide-open, a catholic with a small 'c', a wide-ranging debate, nonetheless, we should pay some attention to this document, the Throne Speech which is presumably and hopefully a statement of the government's legislative intentions of what this government, this administration, to use it correctly, because it is the Queen's government, the government does not change, it is still the same government that we have always had, it is the Queen's government, but the administration

MR. E. ROBERTS: has changed. We now have one led by the Premier as opposed to one led by the former Premier, the hon. Mr. Moores, and in turn that succeeded the one led by the first Premier of this Province, the hon. Mr. Smallwood.

Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne is the first public declaration in solemn form - I do not always count election speeches as being in the most solemn of forms - but the first public declaration of this administration's philosophy, of their approach, of the kind of progress that the government, under the leadership of the present Premier, intends to bring before this House and to bring before this Province. And I think it is only fair of me to say that this Throne Speech, to a much greater degree than many that we have seen in this Chamber, and I have not counted up how many I have heard but I suppose I have heard ten or eleven or twelve.

MR. S. NEARY: You have heard about sixteen.

MR. E. ROBERTS: My friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) who is the dean of the House, sort of the old man of the House as it were, a very vigorous old man has heard, I think he told us about sixteen or seventeen. There have been a number of years there has been more than one session, There were two in 1972 and there were a couple of other times that we had more than one session in a year but, at any length be that as it may, it was twelve to thirteen and there were one or two before that in which I had a hand to some degree in helping to prepare them, working for the then Premier as an assistant, and I think it is fair to say that more so than most this Throne Speech, this document, sets forth what amounts to a coherent and philosophical approach. Looking at it in that sense, it very much bears the handiwork of the present Premier and I take that as being a very fine thing. I think it is the right way to go. I like the idea of a statement of what an administration is going to do. I do disagree and I mentioned it the other day in another debate but let me mention it again, I disagree violently, in a parliamentary sense,

MR. E. ROBERTS with the, I have known violence in other senses I may add in the House as outside, I do disagree quite strongly with the Amurlee Report. The Premier holds himself out, as a number of us do, as a historian of sort or as one who is more interested in our history than most. I know he believes as Santayanna said, 'that those who forget their history are condemned to repeat it!', but I would point out that I feel very strongly and I think that I reflect the best of the modern historiography on the point, that the Amurlee Report was anything but a judicious or a fair or a sensible and intelligent comment on the condition of this Province or the Dominion, as we then were in 1933 when the document was written.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was a sell-out.

MR. E. ROBERTS: It was a sell-out, it was a hatchet job, it was set up to justify what had to be done. The Government of Canada came to the rescue of Alberta and the rescue of Saskatchewan when they were about to default on their bonds without any requirement that

MR. ROBERTS: there be a mea culpa. The government of the United Kingdom for their own reasons felt they had to have justification. I venture to submit that Lord Amurlee, well, doubtless was a man of integrity and wrote what he believed but the government in the U.K. were not at all displeased or not at all surprised when they read that document. I do not know how many hon. gentleman have ever read the Amurlee Report. I am sure the Premier has and I have, and I would wager, Sir, there are not too many others who have ever read the Amurlee Report. I think it is a very bad document and I am not so much interested in condemning it. There have been many bad reports over the years, but I think we are making a mistake if we let ourselves be sucked into the dillusion either that the state or the present day condition of the Province is in any way comparable to that which existed in 1933 immediately prior to the suspension of Responsible Government or that the remedies are the sort that was put forth by the Amurlee Report. Perhaps the best proof of the latter statement that the Amurlee remedies were of no value even in the 1933 situation, is that we had a government which came in, the Commission of Government in 1934 in February and adopted the Amurlee recommendations and four or five years later the financial state of this dominion, or whatever we were, dominion in suspension, the financial state was exactly the same as it had been in 1933. The failure of Newfoundland, the reason why we got in the economic difficulties, not the political difficulties, the reason we got into difficulties was the failure of the economy, the failure of our natural resources to provide enough in the form of money for the people of the Province or in the form of revenues to the government of the Province or dominion, whatever we were, we are now a province, the failure to provide the monies necessary to run the public service and to do what had to be done. I think that is a lesson to draw from history, not the lesson that was drawn by the Throne Speech. That is not a minor quibble. It is, I think, an important point, but given the short time I do not want to go on at any length. I do say that I will welcome the new Elections Act. I hope we see it, and I know I can be

MR. ROBERTS:

I do not know what happened when Mr. Moores was the leader of their party - and I had the responsibility in our party for two or three general elections and knew a little of what went on before and since, you know, I think he will testify that it is money which is the source and root, as has been said many times, of the evil in the political process. I think if we could limit the amount of money that is spent and if we limit it, we could limit it to a dollar each as long as it was done equally. We do not need to spend very much money on elections and if we could provide some public funding. I would do it in part and just ban

MR. ROBERTS: all contributions but the government may have a different view, they may wish to fund in part and allow contributions above and beyond that. Be that as it may, I believe the limit on expenditures and the public funding are essential.

MR. NEARY: They are going for the Ontario Act.

MR. ROBERTS: They are going for the Ontario Act. Well, the Ontario Act is not as good as the Federal Act. The Federal Act still allows funding beyond the monies put up by the federal government. But in any event, the principle, I think, is what we should be most concerned with now and I would welcome it. I would simply say I have seen the same section in at least the last three Throne Speeches and I know and I believe, in fact, that the present Premier means what this says, the road to another place is paved with good intentions and I would say to him, I simply hope that this intention is carried into effect quickly and soon.

MR. SIMMONS: They are safe enough if Viking gets the contract.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not -

MR. SIMMONS: To pave the road to hell.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the question is will they get it on tender and if not my hon. friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) will certainly have some investigations. Or will they get it on an extension?

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal more I could talk about in the Throne Speech but I will hold off of that pleasure because most of the Throne Speech really is a statement of intent or a statement of philosophy and as such it is valid. I do not really quarrel the fact. As I have said, I think it is probably a step forward. We now have a yardstick against which we can and we will measure this administration in the years to come. We shall see. There will be time enough to tell or there will be time enough to see what has been done compared to what was held out as the

MR. ROBERTS:
done.

plan of what would be

I want to talk in the little time I have left about two specific things neither of which is really mentioned in the Throne Speech and both of which, I think, would contribute greatly to the - I do not want to use the reform because that has the wrong connotation, it connotes something is wrong, to the further enhancement of the political process in this Province. First of all, I would say to the government now that I would strongly urge them to bring into this House immediately and to have enacted as law a freedom of information act. I do not propose a detailed bill but I think I could if the hon. gentleman wished. I think it is the kind of legislation, the principles of which had been spelled out. If the hon. gentleman wants an expert on it perhaps the best man is the gentleman who represents the constituency of Peace River in Alberta in the House of Commons, Mr. Jed Baldwin who has done an immense amount of work on this.

MR. F. ROWE:
it done.

The United States have

MR. ROBERTS: The United States has quite an advanced Freedom of Information Act. We had a White Paper or maybe it was a Green Paper, we had some kind of a paper in Ottawa a few years ago which the Liberal administration, which I support, but supporting it does not mean I agree with everything that they do, the Liberal administration spelled out a policy which I think was very bad. I do not think it was a Freedom of Information I think it was more a means to enable information to be concealed. But be that as it may, I would say to the Premier that if he wants to make a significant advance, one which has the initial merit of not costing the treasury too much money - and that is important, we are not in an era when it is possible to contemplate vast new social programmes. In fact, I think it is probably going to be all we can do to carry on with what we have got in the next few years. If the Premier can avoid the pitfall

MR. ROBERTS: of a Medicare tax or the deterrent fee or whatever you have, then he will be doing well. But a freedom of information bill will not cost a great deal of money. In fact, other than a few dollars for a duplication of documents that are requested, he will not have to look to his colleague the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to find any great amount of money at all, I would suggest. But it is something that would go very much to the heart of the democratic process in two senses. First of all, it would enable every citizen to have access to all of the information that he properly may have. And when I say properly may have, I have in mind a very limited range of exceptions, very limited. When I was a minister of the Crown I had access, of course, to Cabinet documents and they all came in stamped, "secret". And you just shake your head, you know, resolved it- I have how many minutes left?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nine.

MR. ROBERTS: There would be a Cabinet paper from the hon. Doctor Fred Rowe, the father of my friend from Trinity Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), who was Minister of Education and he would put up, you know, that John Jones of Little Hearts Ease be appointed to a school board and this was just ratifying, rubber stamping what the relevant church had done. In those days

MR. ROBERTS:

before we reformed the educational system it was the church and marked confidential, secret.

MR. NEARY: Deeds for Crown lands.

MR. ROBERTS: Deeds for Crown lands. You know, an immense number of pieces of paper misclassified. I would venture to say, Sir, and I have had as much experience, really, as most members of this House in government in one way or another, here and at Ottawa, both sides of the House, in a number of capacities on either side of the House, that there is not very much at all, as a matter of fact, there is an infinitesimal amount of information that ought properly to be kept secret and most of that which ought to be kept secret needs to be kept secret only until some announcement of policy is made. I would say to the government that a freedom of information bill that anything more than allow a very small amount of information to be withheld, would be a bad bill.

I will tell you what information is withheld, Mr. Speaker, why it is marked secret by this administration and by their predecessor and by their predecessor, embarrassment. It would be embarrassing to have it come out. It would be inconvenient. It might cause ministers to look like the fools which ministers sometimes are. And I know full-well about that, I have been a minister, quite aware of the fact and, in fact, I could find a few perhaps in my own ministerial career and I can certainly find some in any of the ministers here now except the hon. member for Humber East (Ms. Verge) who has not had time as yet to make a fool of herself but doubtless in course will do as we all have done, sometimes on the advice of her officials, other times not, other times completely on her own hook. And the fact that it would be embarrassing to produce information is in a very real sense the best possible argument for producing it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that a freedom of information act is something which ought to be fairly high on the legislative agenda of this Province, it is something that we ought to do and ought to do quickly. And we could open up the governmental process.

MR. NEARY: I will tell you how crazy it is, that I have had to write Washington to get information from the SEC that is available in this Province but I cannot get it out and have had it sent to me.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) makes a good example and I have no doubt there are many, many others. There are some things we should restrict but very little, we should open up government. I believe the Premier (Mr. Peckford) is sincere when he talks of reforming the process and enhancing the whole state of government and the democratic art and the workings of politics in this Province. Well, I say to him now that this is probably the single, most significant piece of legislation which we could bring in. I think it could be approached in a non-partisan sense. I do not think there is a vote to be had in it, but I think it is a very meaningful contribution to be made to the public weal of this Province. And that for the benefit of the ladies from Hansard is w-e-a-l, not w-h-e-e-l.

MR. SIMMONS: You could have fooled me.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker - I do not find it hard to fool the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. NEARY: Do not spoil your speech.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry 'Rodger'. You know, when you set me up like that.

MR. SIMMONS: I like to hear you speak your mind (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I should say to my friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, at least I have a full mind to speak and we will leave it at that.

MR. NEARY: Whose side are you on, anyway?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is hard to tell.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, one thing about being in the House, as my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will agree over a period of years is one learns to defend one's self or else.

MR. NEARY: Feel free to.

MR. ROBERTS: And I think that the House would be very much a lesser place if we did not have some of these exchanges and interchanges. I think

MR. ROBERTS:

that if we ever got to the point where we had all the decorum of a tea party that Miss Neary poured and Miss Peckford crooked her pinky and drank I think that, unless it was a cup of hemlock - if my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) pours it may be a cup of hemlock that he is offering the Premier - but, you know, it would be very much a lesser place and would take away from the true dignity and from the effectiveness of this place.

Mr. Speaker, I have only got three or four minutes left although perhaps I may be granted a minute or two to go beyond because I do want to talk briefly about one other point. I mentioned there were two and one was the freedom of information act, the other is the constitutional review process. Now, that is touched upon in this Speech From The Throne. I do not need to read the words. They are familiar to the Premier and I have no doubt to the members of the administration. If they are not familiar to those of us in the House it is our own fault and I have no brief for that. The constitutional review process which is now under way in Canada, which has been ongoing for some time and may well be ongoing for many years after we are all long gone from public life, could very well, not necessarily will but could very well change radically the whole form, the whole substance of life in this Province. In particular, it could affect the provincial government's powers and roles. We are talking, are we not, of rewriting 91 and 92 of the British North America Act, of reworking the distribution of powers? I think there is a powerful argument for doing that. I do not intend to get into it in detail. At this stage I am more concerned with the process, the procedure.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope that I misread the Throne Speech when I read into it the thought that this government will develop proposals and present them to Ottawa as a fait accompli and the first that we in this House will know or the first that we in this Province will know will be when a White Paper is made public, or a statement by the Premier, or what have you. I think that is the wrong way to go at it. I would suggest to this government that the right way to go at, given a matter of such import - remember we are used to it in Newfoundland, we had a National Convention which sat for three months and debated exhaustively, but very helpfully. "

MR. BARRETT: It sat over two years.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) says it sat over two years. I am subject to correction but as I recall it sat for about three months. My friend from St. John's West may very well be right when he says more than that. It sat for a period of time over two years. And, really, the length of time is not important. What is important is that it exhaustively examined the state of the then country. We do not need to do that; we surely do that all the time if we are earning our keep.

But it also examined the constitutional options open to it. And I would say to the Premier that in my view the right course of action would be for the government to produce a White Paper, if they wish, as a policy. In the long run the government are going to have their way. They have thirty-three; we have nineteen. That was settled on June 18th. In the long run what the government wish to put forward to the government at Ottawa will go forward as the policy of this province. But I do say, Sir, that a great deal would be gained and absolutely nothing would be lost if the government were to produce a White Paper, make it public in the event there was any widespread public interest and there may not be. One of the things that struck me about - We had the Task Force on which Mr. Cashin was a member and we have had the Joint Standing Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons go across Canada. We have had a number of these and there has been a remarkable lack of public response and public involvement. But

MR. ROBERTS: that does not mean that we as legislators should not be involved. It does not mean that when the government of this Province brings in their thoughts on what should be the constitution of Canada or how power should be divided - Should we have full Fisheries jurisdiction in Newfoundland? Should we have full Offshore rights jurisdiction? Perhaps on those two there is a consensus. Should we have the power of Immigration to a greater extent than we have now? Should Ottawa have the power to overrule? Should there be a commitment in the constitution that there must be equality of public services across this country? What about an Alberta that has \$4,000,000,000 in a trust fund, taxes, and a level that we can not even dream of? Taxes, you know, no sales tax, I was in Alberta a couple of weeks ago. Gasoline, 17 cents a litre. What is it here? Twenty-five cents a litre? Half again as much. Income tax on a provincial basis is about one-half what ours is. Should that be allowed in Canada? Maybe it should. It is a fundamental change of the rules of the game.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that your clerk quite properly is telling - but may I have leave to go on for a few more minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Agreed.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir, and my thanks as well to hon. gentlemen for their courtesy. I do appreciate it.

You know there are any number of very vast issues. Now they are not going to be decided quickly. The present Premier may well -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) right now.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes, the Convention is deferred, Sure. The First Ministers Conference.

I was going to say the present Premier may very well plan to be in office a long time and may very well be there either on this side or on the side he now occupies. He may very well be leader of his party for a long time; we can not control that. But, Sir,

MR. ROBERTS:

I say to the Premier, he may very well be out of office no matter how long he is there, and his successor may have come and gone, and the successor's successor may have come and gone, and we may still be at this constitutional business. We have been at it now for nearly sixty years; we still have not agreed on the way to amend the constitution. The only way we can amend the constitution now is the same way as existed with Lord Thring, a marvellously British name. Lord Thring drafted what is now the British North America Act in 1866 and early in 1867. The way it was amended then is the way it is amended today. Off we go to Westminster and they whip it through in the same procedure as we whip it through here except that if we amend the British North America Act it is of no value; if they amend it, it becomes the law of this land.

So we have time. There is no urgency in that sense. There is an importance, there is a need for all deliberate speed, but I would say there is more than enough time for the administration to put together their thoughts in a White Paper or some similar document. It could be a statement by the Premier of the administration's policy. It could be probably one or two, or a position paper. I like the idea of a White Paper or a statement by the Premier of the administration's policy, the policy which he advocates, which he puts forward.

MR. ROBERTS: That process in itself would be useful to gather it together and put it down on paper, to think it through and to express it, always a useful discipline. I know the Premier is more than capable of that and with his colleagues, the learned gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the very learned Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the learned Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and others and I hope it would not be simply the lawyers. To leave it to us lawyers, Sir, it is not going to be anything like the document it should be, with all respect to my learned brethren in the law.

PREMIER PECKFORD: At arm's length.

MR. ROBERTS: Arm's length, Mr. Speaker, I would say that to most lawyers arm's length means only one hand in the pocket at a time. I have learned a fair bit in my year and a half at the commercial bar in this Province, Sir, and I have had some good teachers, my friend from St. John's East and I are engaged in one or two matters now. The former member for Kilbride, a very fine lawyer as well as a fine gentleman, has certainly been of help to me, but I mean I learn that among other things. The point I make is simply that I think the administration should commit itself to a process of bringing in a statement of their position. I do not care how they do it. I do not care what form the statement takes, and it does not have to be a draft commentary on every single clause of the British North America Act or of some - what was it they called it? - the Canada Act, the one which Mr. Trudeau introduced as Prime Minister. I am concerned with the larger concepts, the division of power. If we want to get off into the by-road or the role of the monarchy, let us, although I do not think that is terribly relevant. I think there is a consensus across Canada that we should not disturb what we now have. Then let us have either a select or a standing committee if the government wish to go there or let us have a debate in this House, but let us involve this House in the constitutional review process, and that is what I am saying. Let us take a day or two or three. It is at least as important as

MR. ROBERTS: anything else we are going to be doing. As a matter of fact, it is hard to think of anything more important than a commitment to a process that in due course will lead to what this Province says, what this Province says at the federal-provincial or what they now call the First Ministers' Conferences. We should realize, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming a cliché but it is a very real problem in Canadian law where in Canadian public policy these days that what goes on in this House and what goes on in the House in Ottawa, the elected House in Ottawa, the House of Commons, is not really the effective governing power. Effective governing power is more and more becoming the ministerial or the First Ministers' Conferences and when the eleven of them agree - and their agreement, of course, often comes not even at the conference itself but at one of those infamous dinners or luncheons at 24 Sussex which, I understand, are usually well fueled and lead to quite a lucid and loose and liquid discussion, that those discussions often, Sir, result in what is the true law of the land being made or the true exercise of power, the truly effective exercise of power. It is, of course, a premier commits his administration, the administration by definition have the legislature to their backs, else they would not be in the administration and, therefore, what is decided by eleven men in the very real sense replaces the deliberations of eleven legislators. Now, I am not so naive as to think, Mr. Speaker, that premiers, first ministers are going to give up their right to lead. That is why they are there. That is their job and that is their duty and they have the power to carry out their duty, but I do feel, Sir, that consultation and review and debate add to the leadership process, not denigrate from it. Therefore, I would say to the Premier that bringing in the kind of process I have talked about, it is entirely in his hands and those of his colleagues. We could put down a private members' motion but that is no good because it must begin with the government's position. We want to know where they stand. We know where they stand on some aspects of it, but perhaps the same kind of overview that the Throne Speech is.

MR. ROBERTS:

I think if the government chooses to do that, Sir, that it will be very much to the benefit of this Province and I believe very much to the benefit of this nation as a whole.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone on for a little more than my allotted time and I am grateful to hon. gentlemen. I shall conclude. Before I do, let me simply say that I realize not with a sinking heart but I do realize that I have managed to get through an entire speech without being critical of Her Majesty's government and I want to assure hon. gentleman opposite, less they have any illusions -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You have spoken long enough.

MR. ROBERTS:

- less they have any illusions, and you know I would say to the Premier that I do not think he has any illusions but I would point out to him that I have now seen all three premiers who have been Premier of this Province since we became a province and two of them had larger majorities than he now has to his back, and I will not go over history, he is quite familiar with what happened to them. The pendulum in politics does swing, Sir, the tide does come in and the tide does go out and I would simply say that the Premier, as I believe he does, must be very conscious of that, that where we are today is not where we

MR. ROBERTS:

may well be next year or the year after or even in those halcyon days four years yet to come. I was just going to say that, you know, this era of good feeling, I am not sure how long it will last. I do not think that strong debate takes away from the House; it should not take away from an era of good feeling. But I just want to enter a lawyer-like disclaimer that nothing I have said or the absence of any - I can think of a number of things in the administration's policy with which I am, you know, very much at odds including their refusal to admit their parentage. You know, is it the donkey that has no pride of ancestry and no hope of posterity? I may be down on genetics. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - I am sorry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The mule.

MR. ROBERTS: The mule. Well, the hon. gentlemen opposite are obviously closer to the subject than I am. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, you know, to the administration that if they have no pride of parentage, and I can assure them they have no hope of posterity, then, Sir, they should perhaps look to the animal kingdom for the analogy which the hon. gentlemen opposite were just kind enough to draw to my attention.

I would hope we will have some good debate, Sir. I intend to become involved in some of it. The suggestions I made today, I put forward, as I do all the things I say, in a very positive sense and I would say to the Premier (Mr. Peckford) and to his colleagues that these two things, the freedom of information bill and a commitment to a public debate on the constitutional position to be taken by the administration, would both very much enhance public life in this Province and I think would be a step forward. Having said that, Sir, I again thank hon. gentlemen for their courtesy and I guess that is the end of my thirty minutes - it has gone on for about thirty-one and a half or something - but it takes a while getting used to. When I started it was unlimited time. Then it was ninety. Then it was forty-five and thirty and I think there is a message in that somewhere. So having said that, I shall conclude. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: First of all I should like to congratulate you on your election to the very high office you now hold and also to congratulate the Deputy Speaker (Mr. J. Butt) on his appointment. I would like to congratulate all the new members. I could start out, I suppose, and launch into a political attack but I am not going to upset the atmosphere of the House at this present time. I suppose the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and I have been the longest around the political scene in Newfoundland. I started in 1947 with the Confederation movement and I have been through seven elections. And since then I have seen a lot of politicians and Premiers come and go. The hon. member for LaPoile was with the Liberals. He was with the new Democratic Party.

MR. NEARY: No, the New Democratic first.

MR. PATTERSON: The New Democratic first and the CCF and the Liberals. Anyhow, there is nothing wrong with that. It is not a religion. I could go on and on and delve into the past because no one studied the antics of the Smallwood Government more than your hon. member here. I recall back some years ago I was quite surprised to see in Time magazine there, it said, "The letter's most valuable contribution is in the Province where newspapers have largely abrogated their responsibilities as political critics and the official Opposition is weak". He was referring to Newfoundland. "Thus Joey Smallwood may rule Newfoundland as a tight little Island but he has still to contend with the uninhibited criticisms of newspaper readers. Typically W.G. Patterson in the St. John's Telegram warned that 'if Mr. Smallwood's judgement in hiring men for Churchill Falls is no better than in hiring government personnel, then all I can say is God help the contractors!'"

You might remember the Premier came out and he said that he was going to do all the hiring and all you had to do was come up to Confederation Building and there you had a job. But to get back to all the experiments and this and that and the juice tanker, orange

MR. PATTERSON:

juice that was being brought up to Placentia Bay and Holyrood, the hockey stick factories and the battery plants and the light bulbs and what have you, name it all, what good would that do the Placentia district? What good would that do to Newfoundland? So I am not going to dig into that. That is all over.

What I am concerned with, Mr. Speaker, is a report here that was compiled by the Canadian Public Health Association and I might say it was at

MR. PATTERSON:

the prodding and prompting of the CBC that we have this report here today, and I doubt if there are ten members in this House who have read it, either on the Liberal side or on the government side. But this is a very, very serious document and it is one that we all should study. It is a report on the task force on floride. The situation at Long Harbour is very serious, I may say. As you go through this book you will find out that all is not well there. I am just going to briefly touch on a few of the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that a federal government commissioned document?

MR. PATTERSON:

No. This report was paid by the provincial government; it cost of \$100,000. "Early in 1977, residents of the Long Harbour area in Newfoundland expressed concern regarding the announcement by Wildlife Division, Newfoundland Department of Tourism, that deformed wildlife had been found in the vicinity of the ERCO Industries plant, and the Wildlife Division reported that excessive levels of floride had been found in the bones of a deformed moose and at least two deformed rabbits." So this was the beginning of the report. It was quite well done, it was detailed and I would certainly like for members of this House to get a copy.

MR. NEARY:

Where do we get it?

MR. PATTERSON:

I think you can get it from the Department of Health. Now in one section here it mentions sulphur dioxide. That is SO₂, the chemical abbreviation. "It is most commonly discharged into the urban air by the burning of fossil fuels, smelting, sulphite and pulping operations. Oil refining and natural gas processing plants are other important sources of SO₂. The sulphur dioxide emissions also result from use of fuel oil with a high sulphur content. This is some evidence that the prolonged exposure to relatively low levels of SO₂ may cause chronic disease." Now I think this is the kind of fuel oil that they

MR. PATTERSON: are planning on using up at Come By Chance and I certainly commend the government for their stand on this Come By chance bit. We have to make sure that if we are going to give the green light to Come By Chance that there is to be no damage done to the environment. And this type of fuel, as spelled out here, is very, very dangerous .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Is that the First Urabian you are talking about?

MR. PATTERSON: Well, yes. That is the proposal they have in as far as I know, from what I read in the paper on it. So I do not think we should rush headlong into this Come By Chance thing. This ERCO here is one that was brought in here, it was to be an end-all, it was the cause of the re-settlement programme in Placentia which was a terrible, terrible thing. People were uprooted from their homes out in the Islands, herded into the ghettos where the railway was closing down, where the American Airforce was going out and they were setting up this phosphorus plant which in turn poisoned and polluted the bay. Now I am not so sure that at this present moment effluent from the ERCO plant is not going out into Placentia Bay. Then it says here, it says, "Silica is mined and crushed a few miles from the plant at a local silica mine. "It is a quartz, because I remember the night that Premier Smallwood announced that down in Placentia. He was up on the stage and he said quartz, quartz, quartz, and everyone thought that that meant there was forty ounces of Johnny Walker and Captain Morgan. So they were all calling out, "Where are the quarts? Where are the quarts?" But I was very sceptical of it and I made that know in a letter to the press at that time.

There are a few other things here that I would just like to mention pertaining to that and I have them marked off here. It says, "While consumption of

MR. PATTERSON: berries growing closer than four miles from the ERCO plant in a North and Northeasterly direction would not pose a significant health risk, the public should be advised that berries in this area may be contaminated. However, as most contaminants, including fluorides, are deposited externally on fruits and vegetables, they may be removed efficiently by thorough washing and discarding outer and older leaves." Now I do not think that either the Department of the Environment here in Newfoundland or the federal one has actually come out and said, "Look, you cannot eat these berries or cabbage."

MR. PATTERSON:

Cabbage is very dangerous because the fluorides get into the leaves and grow in, whereas with a turnip or a potato, you know, you may get away with it there. But I think we should make our position known. I think that the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment should see that the recommendations laid down here in this report are carried out to the letter of a 't'.

MR. NEARY:

Force the company to put up danger signs.

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes, this has to be done. There is no doubt at all about that. They came up with 28 recommendations, the company made. Now I do not know if ERCO has attempted to make any changes at all. "Number one is that front-end loader cabin atmosphere be regularly monitored by the personal air simplifiers and the filters be regularly checked and replaced as necessary; that replacement of air inlets for the roof fans be strategically placed in order to provide effective air exchanges throughout the pellet building; the monitoring atmospheric dust concentrations and an analysis of collected dust be carried out at quarterly intervals," So I am not going to bore you with reading this but I would suggest that you get this book, go through this recommendation by recommendation, and it is up to the hon. minister to make sure that these recommendations are carried out.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Some of them have been.

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, that is good. I am really glad to hear that, but for a while that place was running hither-skither.

"The effluent water system consists of four pipelines through the harbour. These lines remove all once-through cooling water from electrical and process equipment into the pellet and furnace building. The electrically treated process water from number two pond, treated and drainage from around the plant reported discharged to sea by these four outlets as given at 7,450 imperial gallons per minute," So you can imagine that. You multiply that now by 60 and then by 24 and most of the effluent water dumped into the harbour is,

MR. PATTERSON: therefore, once-through the cooling water system, but they are not quite sure. They cannot come out and say that we are not getting lead poisoning or mercury poisoning.

MR. NEARY: What about drinking water for Long Harbour? Does it say anything about that?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, there is mentioned the fluoride levels there. The thing is too complicated for me to go through but I think should get it and study it and then make a decision on what actions be taken.

MR. NEARY: I always thought the whole population of Long Harbour should be moved out.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, you notice when ERCO moved in there they did not build their houses. They went seven miles away- they went twenty miles away. So they did not build their houses under the stacks.

Now a few weeks, the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) made mention here that the railway was planning to phase out some of the branch lines. Well that is certainly not news to me because I think the approval for the abandonment of the branch lines was given by the Liberal government here in 1966, and if you go through a report on the Royal Commission on Transportation you will find that. Now I do know for certain that the Argentic branch line to Argentic, they had a commitment to abandon that and the procedure for abandonment is that CN must apply to the Board of Transport Commissioners in Ottawa who in turn will have a hearing and then they will recommend it. But in this particular case, Jack Pickersgill, who was minister of Transport at the time, in a paragraph of this letter he says, "Insofar as an application for abandonment is concerned", I think he was referring to the Argentic branch line, "it is being undertaken principally on an understanding reached with the Government of Newfoundland when the federal government undertook to pay the full cost of building a modern highway from Argentic to the Trans-Canada Highway".

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the date on that letter?

MR. PATTERSON: 1967.

AN HON. MEMBER: 1967?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. "At that time the provincial government agreed that it would offer no objection to the abandonment of the railway after the highway had been opened. Without such assurance the federal government would not have undertaken this very substantial expenditure which will result both in greatly improved transportation services and in smaller burden on the federal government."

MR. ROBERTS: That was the Access Road was it?

MR. PATTERSON: That was the Access Road, but the Access Road, it was not completed at that time and still there is a section of five miles to do.

MR. ROBERTS: Where is that, from Dunville to Freshwater?

MR. PATTERSON: That is from the eastern end of Dunville into the southern end of Dunville, so there is five miles to be completed there.

MR. NEARY: Does the Access Road not go right through to the ferry docks?

MR. PATTERSON: No, the highway Transport built goes from Whitbourne to the eastern end of Dunville and then it stops there and you pick up the old road and then -

MR. ROBERTS: It goes through the town of Dunville -

MR. PATTERSON: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: - but they planned to build it in behind Dunville at one time.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) - the downgrading of the railroad started there.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, the downgrading of the railroad

MR. PATTERSON: started then. Now for evidence of this all you have to do is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON: It says here, from the Royal Commission April 21, 1967:- "Transportation Commission favours scrapping coastal boats. Should use CN subsidy for roads." It may be right, it may be wrong, I do not know. "Build roads and scrap the coastal boats. That thought, not in such few words, is the substance of the thinking of the Royal Commission on Transportation about coastal services. The Royal Commission points out that the federal government is now putting \$5,000,000 a year to cover losses on CN coastal services. This money should be made available to provide paved roads, the Commission says."

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. PATTERSON: Now that is what it says here on file.

MR. NEARY: Is that from the Ministry of Transport?

MR. PATTERSON: No, that is from The Evening Telegram, of the 21st. But this book, is available at -

MR. ROBERTS: That is Phil Lewis.

MR. PATTERSON: Phil Lewis - The Report on the Royal Commission on Transportation in Newfoundland.

He also mentions here some advice on the idea of abandoning the railway at Argentia. He says: "The Commission has no official knowledge of the policy of government in relation to Argentia but it is widely understood that the foregoing will be the result of the construction of an up-to-date road system. It is quite within the realm of possibility that railway executives may have certain reservations as to the advisability or wisdom of abandoning entirely the Argentia branch line. One is reminded of the fact that unless facilities for the movement of bulk cargo or heavy traffic are retained by way of rails, then the port of Argentia will have to be bypassed if the movement of such commodities becomes necessary. Again, there is the important factor of ice conditions" -and this is interesting - "making the East Coast of

MR. PATTERSON: Newfoundland, including St. John's, unapproachable during the months of March and April if easterly winds prevail. The same applies to the Gulf ports, particularly on the North Sydney side. Argentia has always been available for approach and departure when ice conditions made navigation to other areas of Newfoundland an impossibility. Argentia to Halifax is an all-water route open all year and it might be wise for those responsible for making a policy to keep this important factor in mind."

Now immediately when I learned the application had been made, we had a brief prepared and presented to Ottawa. As a result, they decided to wait awhile. So that hearing has to come up in Ottawa. But the brief has already been prepared and -

AN HON. MEMBER: Adjourn the debate.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three o'clock and this House do now adjourn. But before we pass the motion of adjournment, I think, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should inform the House of the order of business for tomorrow. We hope to get the committees operational; I am pretty sure they will be on Thursday. We have to meet the Standing Orders Committee tomorrow, I think.

MR. ROBERTS: Not Standing Orders, Striking Committee.

MR. MARSHALL: Striking Committee. And we think it would be beneficial, particularly for new members of the House, if we went into a Committee of the Whole on Supply tomorrow for some of the departments that are not going to be referred which would be Legislative, Consolidated Fund, Legislative and the Premier's Executive Committee so that members can -

MR. ROBERTS: (inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL:

No, there is lots to dig in there.

MR. NEARY:

(inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. the digger would love to get -

MR. NEARY:

I will be here, do not worry.

MR. MARSHALL:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt the hon. member will be here. Oh, it will be so joyous to see the hon. members opposite.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, tomorrow we go into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour, "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

This House does now stand adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three of the clock in the afternoon.