

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the hon. House that my department has received further results from the analysis of the samples taken from the area of the emergency discharge of matacil from a spray plane on June 25th. These samples were taken on June 27th.

The suspected trace quantity of aminocarb in one water sample, as I reported to this House yesterday, still remains to be confirmed. The remaining twenty water samples contain no measurable quantity of aminocarb.

Results from ten soil samples that have now been analyzed also show no measurable aminocarb. Twelve more soil samples are now being analyzed, as are twenty-two vegetation samples from the area.

As indicated to the House yesterday, my department is proceeding immediately with further sampling in the spill area and will continue this sampling programme throughout the Summer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about thirty seconds.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, and if they continue to do samples, say, in Waterford River they will not find any results of that spill area. The minister has still not tabled, Mr. Speaker, in this House any documentation. A copy of the map that shows the spill area, he has not identified the spill area and he is continuing to bring in information saying that in some kind of an area that they think that the pilot might have passed over they still cannot find any

MR. STIRLING: matacil. Well, Mr. Speaker, they can continue to report for the next ten years, because if the pilot dumped that in another area they are not going to find matacil spray in this so-called area they are looking in. And I would ask the minister again if he would table the information in this House showing on a diagram where it is they are using as the suspected spill area, and will he tell the House the next time what other checking they have done to see if it was actually spilled anywhere else in the area?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Premier does not have the face or the gall to come into this House today after saying yesterday that Corner Brook is not a viable municipality and then sending a tape -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - out to Corner Brook that said "I did not say that Corner Brook was not a viable municipality."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a question?

MR. STIRLING: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Directed to?

MR. STIRLING: In view of the fact that the Premier is afraid to appear in the House, I have to ask the question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs now indicate whether or not it has been brought to her attention, in addition to the Premier saying to ignore the memorandum that you sent out to Deer Lake, has it now been brought to your attention that there are indeed other municipalities who have not accepted the

MR. STIRLING: directive that you sent out to Deer Lake that you do these specific streets and you use this specific consultant? Have you heard from other municipalities that they do not accept that kind of dictation?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to correct the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The correspondence that we sent out to all the municipalities did not state that they had to do certain streets that we listed, that they had to hire whatever consultant that we suggested. What happened was that when we got a request from a municipality, they listed the names of the streets that they are going to pave. When the full amount requested is not approved and we approve a partial amount, what our department does we take the names from the top because we assume these are priority, and we say to the council this amount now will pave these many streets. If the council does not agree or if the council does not want to do these streets that are listed, then they have to come back and get the approval of the minister. And my department has always been very, very flexible with our municipal councils. Anytime they come back and they say that 'we are displeased' or 'we do not want to use a certain consultant,' well then we will go along with them provided that consultant can do the job that is required.

When we say that we presume he will use a certain consultant because that consultant has done work in that municipality, there again it is also stated that 'if you do not agree with using this consultant, you come back to our department and let us know about it.' And that is the way -

July 2, 1981

Tape 2967

PK - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK:

- we handle things.

Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Do I understand that the minister has now changed her mind since she sent out the memo on June 19 to the town of Deer Lake and that she is now prepared to say that she will approve the list of streets which are a priority for that specific town, the town of Deer Lake can now select the streets that are, its priority?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, the town of Deer Lake could have done that from the minute they received my letter. The letter stated that if they wanted to change the streets all they had to do was come back to my department and let us know. And so there is no need to go back and change the original correspondence.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook). Some time ago the town of Stephenville let a tender for the ten year review of their municipal plan and the tenders were let and four companies responded to the tenders. However, under instructions from the Department of Municipal Affairs, the council was told not to accept the lowest bidder. Could the minister explain why this happened?

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

MRS NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, when my department will go back to a community and say not to accept the lowest bidder then there has to be a reason for that, and I guess there has been some performance by that particular consultant perhaps that does not meet with the approval of our department. Certainly we always try to get the low bids and we go normally for the low bidder, so if the low bidder was not recommended by our department I am sure that there is some very good reason for it.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary.

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

MR. HODDER: The company who was the lowest bidder was Proctor and Redford. But my question to the minister is that council was understandably upset by the Province's actions and they sent a letter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) asking her to put in writing her objections to this particular company. What was the minister's response to this letter in which they expressed their displeasure by the fact that they could not accept the lowest bidder, Proctor and Redford?

July 2, 1981

Tape No. 2968

ah-2

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

MRS NEWHOOK: I wonder what time that letter did come in? I write so many letters to different municipalities that right now I would have to take note of this and to see. Was it last year sometime? It could have been before I was minister.

MR. MORGAN: Take the question under advisement.

MP. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the minister. Could the minister advise why sometime in October of 1980 that the Nain town council had an engineering company hired to do the survey for the water and sewerage project and the minister's office advised that they should not use Terpstra Engineering Limited but they should go ahead and use Project Management and Design Limited? Why would the minister's office advise the Nain town council to change from one consulting firm, from Terpstra Engineering, to Project Management and Design?

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

MRS NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I attended the meeting with the Nain town council and at that meeting I think the council did agree that perhaps they should not go with the original consultant because

MRS. NEWHOOK:

there was evidence that the work previously designed or done in another community was not really the best kind of work that they would like to have in their community. And I think they did agree at that meeting that perhaps the other firm would do a better job for them.

MR. WARREN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, to preamble in response to the minister's answer, it says here, 'Council has met with Project Management and Design but they still wish for Terpstra Engineering to do the project.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister did meet with the town council at Nain; in fact, I attended the same meeting. That was on February 5th, at the same time that the town council demanded to give the minister a letter indicating that they would leave the appointment of the consulting firm to the minister's discretion in order to get the government to guarantee this loan.

MR. MARSHALL:

What was that? Was that a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

I remember all the details of that particular meeting and it was my impression at that meeting that the council itself had second thoughts on using the original consulting firm and they were quite willing and quite prepared to accept our recommendation.



MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: The minister has stated that with regard to Stephenville and Nain that it is possible that the engineering or the consultant firm was not up to standard. By saying this publicly, it could possibly ruin these companies financially because other private firms would not have them because of the quality of work. Can the Minister of Municipal Affairs outline what standards they have in checking these companies to find out if they are not up to standard and what corrective measures will be taken so that they can be brought back up to standard and become viable consulting firms?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I have not mentioned the name of either consulting firm, I only said the original firm and the one that was recommended. I have not mentioned any particular names.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. Back in April when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) read the Budget Speech, he told the people of this Province that people on long-term social assistance as of the 1st of July would be given their eyeglasses free. Now, yesterday was the 1st of July, so would the hon. gentleman tell the House and these people on long-term social assistance in this Province and sick people that they are now entitled to free eyeglasses?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the budget called for that particular programme to come into effect.

I do not know exactly if we can get it into effect right now because the budget is just recently finished, but it certainly will be put into effect as soon as possible.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman is aware that  
on page 25 -

MR. HANCOCK: You cannot see what you are looking  
at. The Codfather!

MR. MORGAN: Why do you not cover up your face and  
then we will not have to see you.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - is the hon. minister aware that  
in April when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) read his  
Budget Speech, on page 25 of that Budget Speech under the heading  
Social Services that a commitment was made that "in addition  
government will be extending Social Assistance coverage for  
longterm assistance recipients to include the provision of  
eyeglasses for those in need"? Why was that not done yesterday?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that is in the process  
of being done. That is a budgetary measure that we announced  
and anything we announced in that Budget is going to be into  
effect. And if it states on the first of July, it will be  
retroactive to the first of July.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the hon.  
Minister of Health (Mr. House) to say in the last answer that  
he gave me that when the programme is implemented it will be  
retroactive to July 1, that those on longterm social assistance,  
who are entitled to eyeglasses since yesterday even though the  
programme is not in effect, that they would be covered under  
the new programme? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

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

MR. HOUSE: As of the first of July, that is what I  
stated, Mr. Speaker. They could not get it done the day before

MR. HOUSE: yesterday, but anything done after that would be done retroactive under the conditions that will be laid down in the programme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: I wish to yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: He yields.

The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (W. House) just made the most unusual statement I think I have ever heard a minister make in response to an answer to a question. He said the eyeglasses will be made free in, I think, under the terms and conditions laid down in the regulations. The terms and conditions of the regulations are not made yet. So how do people know, when they go to get their eyeglasses as of yesterday, which was day one for the new programme, July 1, how will they know if they fit under the guidelines of regulations that are not even made yet?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there are regulations governing the distribution of glasses to indigent people now in certain classes. We have in the past been providing glasses to parents, for instance, parents who are in need and on longterm welfare who have children in school. We have been providing glasses to these and there are conditions laid down under which the price, the quality of the frame and the amount of the cost of the frame up to a certain amount, so that is why I say there are conditions already there now, and I would presume that the same kind of conditions will apply in terms of the quality of the kind of frame and the frequency with which glasses will be supplied.

July 2, 1981

Tape No. 2971

RA - 1

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: I yield to my colleague here.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious

matter and it seems to get more confusing as we go on here.

Is the minister now saying that eyeglasses will be based solely on need for those people who are entitled to eyeglasses, will be based on need and the need will be established by the Department of Social Services? But can the hon. minister assure these people, who will buy eyeglasses as of yesterday, that they will be reimbursed for any money that they spend on eyeglasses? Or alternatively, they do not have to pay for the eyeglasses, wait until the new programme comes into effect, whenever that is supposed to be - it was supposed to be July 1st according to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - wait until the programme comes into effect, send in their bill endorsed by the Department of Social Services, and it will be paid: Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

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

MR. NEARY: What I am saying is what pertains to the people of social services now will pertain to all people on long-term social assistance who are in need of glasses. First of all, they do have to go through the Social Services Department and, of course, get the recommendation to go to an optometrist for glasses. And, as I said, it will be, as we stated, as of yesterday, retroactive. Retroactivity does not mean anything now because there are not many who have done it at this point in time for sure. But we are looking at every individual case. It will be done on a total basis now rather than a selective basis as before.

MR. NEARY: But when will the programme come into effect?

MR. HOUSE: July 1st.

MR. NEARY:

Okay. Fair enough!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for

St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is directed to the Minister of Health. I understand surgery time has been cut in half at the Health Science Complex. Would the minister confirm this? And, indeed, what reasons might there be for such an action for the health of the people of this Province to have surgery time cut in half at the Health Science Complex? What corrective measures are being taken at this time to activate, to make sure that the health and the needs of the people of this Province are taken care of?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, the last report that I have from the Health Science Complex was the beginning of last week, and what surgery was cut back then, of course, was the Intensive Care Unit. That was cut back because there was a shortage of nurses in the Intensive Care Units and they -

MR. STIRLING:

But you say there is no shortage of nurses.

MR. HOUSE:

Pardon?

MR. STIRLING:

(Inaudible) shortage of nurses.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) knows that I have said from the first question that was asked regarding a shortage of nurses that there was a shortage in the Intensive Care Units in the Province.

MR. HOUSE: Not only that, I stated that, of course, we were doing everything possible, we are even training them at full salary - we have been training these people at full salary.

MR. STIRLING: But there is a shortage.

MR. HOUSE: There is a shortage of intensive care nurses as well.

At the Health Sciences Complex they were expecting to be twelve short, but there were only nine short as of last week.

Most of the elective surgery is dispensed with in the Summer anyway, but what they are doing basically in most hospitals now is only the emergency or the very necessary surgery.

MR. BENNETT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: I have had communication with a goodly number of people in my district who are not of intensive care, people who are still with the work force, who have basically emergency operations but it is awaiting, and they are trying to get into the Health Sciences Complex to be taken care of. And these people find themselves on a waiting list with no hope, Mr. Speaker, of being accommodated in the Health Sciences Complex before the end of September.

Now in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there must be something drastically wrong -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: - and I would wonder if the minister would try to clarify it for the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it is correct that there is a number of people on waiting lists for surgery; most of it is elective, of course, because any emergency is attended to. And some cases where there is a -

MR. BENNETT: (Inaudible) department, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, elective surgery is determined by a surgeon, of course. The fact is that in a lot of cases we have problems with getting monograms from Workers' Compensation, the back problems and so on and coming here for that particular operation or procedure. In that case we are, of course, constructing beds at the Health Sciences Complex now with the assistance of the Workers' Compensation Board to try to speed up that particular process. But as far as I can gather from the hospital you are talking about and, of course, the Janeway, which I was in contact with this morning, that most of these hospitals have already recruited enough people for it to be of full staff as of September.

As I stated to the House on a number of occasions a couple of weeks ago, the nursing situation is acute at this particular time of year because there are a lot of people who take holidays in the Summer and particularly a lot of the part time regulars, they call them, who take Summer holidays off when children are on vacation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: So what happens, they are prepared, and each hospital I have talked to said they are prepared to deal with any emergency. What some of them have cut back on is the elective surgery as the Janeway has in the cardiovascular division,



MR. HOUSE: but they are able to handle the emergencies. And beside that, Mr. Speaker, it is the time of year, too, when doctors take vacations also, and, as I said, the elective surgery is suspended to a large degree.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe, followed by the hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the minister touched on Workers' Compensation and this sort of reminds me of the old chicken or egg adage, which comes first. I have constituents in my district who have to get to see a doctor in the Health Science Complex before they are accommodated by the Workers' Compensation. Workers' Compensation is asking these people for a doctor's report. These people have to wait until after September before they can get that doctor's report because they cannot get into the Health Science Complex, apparently because of a cut-back or a shortage of staff. Whatever is the reason, Mr. Minister, I hope you will explain it.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that is always the case and ever the case but it is working. They are working in co-operation - the Workers' Compensation asks certain people to have certain procedures done, they get in contract with the doctor and they get notes back and forth. The people are still maintained on Workers' Compensation until they get the procedure done. And, as I said, we are trying and aiming to speed up these procedures by making more beds available. As a matter of fact, what we are going to make available are eight beds specifically for the Workers' Compensation Board. We are building twenty-two -

MR. FLIGHT: several years ago  
you made a statement that they were going to have twenty  
beds.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, a year ago  
there were twenty-two beds - it was announced by the  
Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), by the way -  
that there would be twenty-two rooms constructed. Now,  
that takes some time. You do not wave a wand and get  
these twenty-two beds. The rooms are under construction  
now and, of course, they will be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HOUSE: That is the procedure.

People will be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: People will be kept on  
Workers' Compensation until the procedures are completed.  
And that is the way it has always been, and that is the  
way it has to be.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for  
Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr.  
Speaker. I am going to ask a question of the Minister of  
Fisheries now that his dark glasses are off and I can see  
that he is in the House.

Mr. Speaker, before I am  
accused now of asking a question arising out of a news  
story which appeared in the paper, I would like to point  
out, and the minister can confirm, that this matter was  
first brought to the attention of the Department of  
Fisheries by myself when I spoke with his Deputy Minister,  
Mr. Slade, and I am referring to the question of the buyers

July 2, 1981, Tape 2973, Page 3 -- apb

MR. THOMS: from St. Pierre  
purchasing lobster on the South coast without complying  
with the unemployment insurance regulations.

My question to the  
minister this time

MR. THOMS: is what happens in a situation that we now have? They have been told to comply, but will the fishermen on the Burin Peninsula now or on the South Coast, wherever these people were buying lobsters, will these fishermen now receive unemployment insurance stamps so they can receive unemployment insurance this coming season?

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

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that problem was brought to the attention of our department by the hon. gentleman who asked the question. And upon receiving representation from the hon. gentleman, we then made contact by telegram or telex to the three companies concerned who were buying lobsters with their companies stationed in St. Pierre, Miquelon. And we knew of three so we contacted these by telegram and asked them to comply with the unemployment insurance regulations whereby the buyers of fish are deemed to be the employers of fishermen for the purpose of administering the act, and if they did not comply with that that we would immediately cancel any buyers licences they have in the Province for buying other species and we would not renew their licences for the buying of lobsters next year on the Burin Peninsula, despite the fact they did pay good prices to the fishermen. But the fact is the fishermen will suffer the consequences of them not complying with the unemployment insurance act because it means that they will not have the contributions they would normally have acquired by means of selling lobsters.

To date we have not received any official response from the companies. I think one company did telephone to indicate that it was going to reply in the next couple of days or so in an official way. Now because

MR. MORGAN: of the mail problems etc. we do not know if they will be complying with the requests or not, but hopefully they will for the benefit of the fishermen on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: I do not think - you did not deal directly with my question. Will they now be directed to provide the fishermen with the unemployment insurance stamps in order for them to get the benefit of the lobsters they have already sold to the St. Pierre buyers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course that was the intent of the correspondence with the companies, that they would comply with the unemployment insurance regulations and make the contributions available to them for this year's purchase, not merely to comply for next year when they buy but to comply this year so that the fishermen who sold the lobsters would get the necessary contributions or at least they would include it with other contributions and qualify for unemployment insurance. So we have been in contact with the unemployment insurance people and we have asked them to make representations or express their concerns to the companies concerned as well and hopefully by the Department of Fisheries provincially and the federal department responsible that the companies will comply and the fishermen will get the contribution.

MR. THOMS: A final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

July 2, 1981

Tape 2974

PK - 3

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering  
Mr. Minister why it is necessary to licence foreign buyers  
of lobster and salmon on the Burin Peninsula, on the South Coast

MR. THOMS: where we have several - as a matter of fact, as I understand it we have plenty of local Newfoundland buyers, for example, Petites and others, and why it is necessary to license foreign companies to purchase lobster and fish and why are they not required to buy from the local companies that are licensed to purchase lobster and salmon?

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

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, primarily because we firmly believe in the free enterprise system and the more competition, of course, hopefully the better price to the fishermen. But the point is well taken because some of the companies this year who bought lobsters, and they were not really Newfoundland companies, they were from outside the Province, did not pay the fishermen the price that we thought they should have paid to the fishermen in many cases. Now in this case the companies came from St. Pierre and Miquelon. As I mentioned, believing in the free enterprise system as we do we think that the more companies buying in the area from the fishermen will mean more competition and hopefully better prices to the fishermen. But if they do not comply -

MR. HODDER: (Inaudible) out of work  
(inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Port Au Port (Mr. Hodder) as usual is interrupting again. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that lobster is a species not processed, as we all know, in the Province; it is not being processed.

MR. HODDER: Any local preference?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I could have quiet so I can answer the hon. gentleman's questions.

July 2, 1981

Tape No. 2975

ah-2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. minister has about ten seconds.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in answering the question to the hon. gentleman who asked it in a sincere way, we will look at the overall situation as regards to buyers licenses and make sure they all comply with our regulations, etc. in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on March 3rd the hon member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) asked of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) about a shooting incident which occurred in the Avondale area on February 27th and about a judicial enquiry. At that time the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) indicated that a judicial enquiry was to take place into the incident and I now rise, Mr. Speaker, to inform the House that the enquiry has been completed and I will in accordance with the undertaking by the Minister of Justice now table the report of that judicial enquiry. I should just indicate, and I think it only fair to indicate, Mr. Speaker, because I have no intention of reading the report, of course, it is nine pages long, but I think I should quote the second last paragraph appearing on page 6 wherein the chief



MR. MARSHALL: provincial judge, the hon. Clement Scott, indicated that 'As to Constable Jesty's actions, I find no breach of law committed by him, either criminal or civil. He acted with reasonable foresight and prudence under the circumstances.'

I think it is worthwhile,

Mr. Speaker, to point that out as I file the report. There are adequate copies for the House and for the press.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further answers?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile, on a point of -

MR. NEARY: Information.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not sure there is provision for that, but we will call it a point of order.

MR. NEARY: A point of order then, Mr. Speaker. If Your Honour is concerned about whether a point of information is legitimate, we will make it a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) was going to get me an answer to a question yesterday. Now, does he have the answer today or will I have to wait for a week or a month or a year? Will the House be closed before I get the answer?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is not here, as a matter of fact, but -

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the Minister of Forestry.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, Forestry, I am sorry. Anyway, it is not a point of order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

We are discussing Bill No. 78,  
 "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act,  
 1957."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the President of the  
 Council.

MR. MARSHALL: When we closed yesterday with the  
 hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, we closed  
 with a question being asked as to why we do not include  
 the amounts for this year, and that is a question that,  
 you know, is certainly very well worthwhile considering  
 and government certainly will consider it. We will be  
 having a Fall session and very likely we will be bringing  
 it in then. However, I must point out that as it has  
 been this government's bent and intent, we brought it in.  
 And Municipal Works for this year has already been  
 announced; there has been a Budget Debate to do it.  
 As I say, the observation was very well made and we will  
 certainly take it into consideration.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: "The Loan and Guarantee" is  
 that what we are doing here?

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) Municipal  
 Loan.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well that is the Local  
 Authority Guarantee, the municipal borrowing.

July 2, 1981

Tape 2976

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, now, Mr. Chairman, before we pass this act I have to have a few words on behalf of all those communities, these municipalities in Newfoundland who were left off the list this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: There has been no justification as to why these communities were left off the list. The one in - what was the name of the community in Bay of Islands?

AN HON. MEMBER: Summerside.

MR. NEARY: Summerside. The Summerside council resigned and I understand today the minister - if I could only get the minister's attention for a moment.

MR. NEARY: I understand today the Minister of Municipal Affairs (H.Newhook) appointed a commission to operate the municipality in Summerside. They are no longer going to have the privilege of having an elected council. I presume the reason the minister did it was because there is an election coming up in November and from now until November the minister decided that it would be a bit of a nuisance, a bit of a pain in the neck to have an election now and go to the expense of having another one in November, so the minister decided to take away their democratic right.

MRS. NEWHOOK: There will be a by-election.

MR. NEARY: There will not be a by-election. There will be no by-election. The minister has appointed a commission, a commission to run.

MRS. NEWHOOK: That is an interim body to run the affairs of the community.

MR. NEARY: An interim body Mr. Chairman. the -

MRS. NEWHOOK: And one of the (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: - minister has appointed a commission to run the community of Summerside -

MRS. NEWHOOK: There is one councillor who did not resign. He is still there.

MR. NEARY: He has been appointed to the commission, has he?

MRS. NEWHOOK: No, he is still a councillor.

MR. NEARY: He is still a councillor and how many have been appointed on the commission?

MRS. NEWHOOK: Three.

MR. NEARY: Three have been appointed -

MRS. NEWHOOK: To act with him.

MR. NEARY: To act with the - well, is that undeomcratic? That is what I am saying.

July 2, 1981

Tape No. 2977

EL - 2

MRS. NEWHOOK: You have to appoint a body to administer until the election is held.

MR. NEARY: Well, what did you do in the case of Burnt Islands?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!  
Everybody should address the Chair, please.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What did the hon. minister do in the case of Burnt Islands?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Burnt Islands is an appointed council anyway, and the councillors all indicated they want to go back.

MR. NEARY: They have all indicated they want to go back? Have they gone back?

MRS. NEWHOOK: Three of them indicated -

MR. NEARY: Have they gone back, Mr. Chairman?

MRS. NEWHOOK: They are supposed to have been, yes.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MRS. NEWHOOK: I think so.

MR. NEARY: What does the minister do in that case? Then three go back, seven on the council, you need four for a majority: What does the minister do then? Appoint a commission?

MRS. NEWHOOK: There is one in Burnt Islands. The Deputy Mayor did not resign.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me go back over what I started to say again when I was so rudely interrupted by the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: In Summerside, the minister has appointed a commission. That commission will be there until November when a new council is elected. Am I right or wrong, Mr. Chairman? Am I right or am I wrong?

MRS. NEWHOOK: That is not my understanding, Sir.

MR. NEARY: The minister says that is not her understanding. You are the minister. Mr. Chairman, the minister makes the rules. The minister has the last word. The minister should not give me an answer, 'it is her understanding.' I mean, who gave her the understanding? The civil servants? Was it the civil servants?

MRS. NEWHOOK: A notice has been posted or will be posted about a by-election and if the four councillors are elected in a by-election-or five or six or whatever-well then they will stay in until the next election.

MR. NEARY: Alright, let me get this straight now. Why then would the minister go to the trouble to appoint a commission if there is going to be a by-election? Why would the minister appoint a commission?

MRS. NEWHOOK: Because you have to have someone in the meantime to administer the town.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is hogwash and garbage and the minister knows it. The town clerk could have been delegated to operate the affairs of the town council under the act until such time as a new council was elected. And why, instead of appointing a commission, why did not the minister call a by-election right away?

MRS. NEWHOOK: It has been called as far as I know.

MR. NEARY: Because the minister wanted to put in people who would kowtow to the government, who would not kick up a fuss over the fact that the member for Bay of Islands (L.Woodrow) had not been successful in getting money for their project out there, for their water project.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) is a good member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: The member for Bay of Islands is one of the better members of this House. He is a hard working member for his constituents. He is a man who relates, he is a man who can identify with the ordinary people in his district. Unlike the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge), the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the member for Humber Valley (Mr. House) -

MR. HOUSE: And the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - unlike these three members who only hobnob with the big shots and the aristocrats, who turn up their nose at ordinary people, the member for Bay of Islands is a member who keeps in touch with the grass roots. But, Mr. Chairman, I have a word of warning for the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman has sat back now long enough and has been walked on by the Leader of that Party. First, he is overlooked when vacancies occur in the Cabinet, the hon. gentleman is overlooked. They do not think the hon. gentleman is Cabinet material, they do not think he is heavy enough for the Cabinet so they overlook him, not once but I suppose a dozen times in the last few years. The hon. gentleman has been overlooked for the likes of the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor). I would suspect the hon. gentleman is better Cabinet material than the hon. member for the Deer Park on the Salmonier Line.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

I think we are discussing Bill No. 78.

MR. NEARY: Yes we are, right.

So I have a word of warning to the hon. gentleman that if he does not watch it - he could not even, by the way, get that extra salary in the Premier's office, they would not even give him that little privilege, that benefit. My word of warning to the hon. gentleman is

MR. NEARY: that if he does not watch it, he has been overlooked so often, he has not even been invited to be taken in as a special assistant or an executive assistant, if he does not watch it that hon. crowd - as good as he is for his working for his constituents - the Premier and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) will scuttle him in his district.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is just a friendly word of advice to the hon. member because nothing can do a member in, Mr. Chairman, more than to support a government that would betray his constituents. The hon. gentleman has been a loyal and faithful supporter of the government but he is being betrayed and if he does not watch it his colleagues, in the Cabinet, will scuttle him.

But, Mr. Chairman, so far the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) or none of the ministers have been able to tell us how the list was determined; how the list of highways and roads, Capital Works projects, was determined; how the water and sewer projects are determined; how the cost shared paving for municipalities, how the list is determined.



MR. NEARY:

The Deputy Minister of Highways came pretty close to it recently when he was summoned before the Public Accounts Committee, when he told us that the list is handed down from the Cabinet, the list is decided in the Cabinet Room; the list is not based on priorities, the list is not based on the fact that people do not have good drinking water in their towns and in their municipalities, the list is not based on the fact that people have to carry water in buckets and in barrels in the backs of their cars, the lists are not based on the fact that if you hold a glass of water up to the light that it is crawling with insects of all kinds, the list is not based on the fact that if you hold a glass of water up to the light that it looks like it is rusty water, bog water, the list is not based on the fact that little children are going to school with no water and sewerage, the children are going to school without a clean drop of drinking water to put in the kettle to get a cup of tea before they are sent off to school, the lists are not based on any of these facts, Mr. Chairman.

The priority list is not based on need, because if it was, Mr. Chairman, it would be a completely different list. The list is a political list. All the municipalities, all the names of the municipalities are put on a list, they are taken to the eighth floor of Confederation Building in the Cabinet Room, they are gone over at a Cabinet meeting, they are assessed strictly along political lines. Once in a while here is what they do, here is the name of the game, the Newfoundland race, the Newfoundland game the way it is played: Fling in the odd one into an Opposition district, fling it in so it will not look too bad, put the occasional one in here or there so it will not look too bad because when we are defending this in the House we got to have a few projects and a few dollars that we can point to say that we are not

MR. NEARY: politically biased or partisan. That is the way the game is played, Mr. Chairman.

And to add insult to injury, when projects are approved, before the town council is notified, before the telegram reaches the mayor of that town, the Tory members are on the television and radio announcing the projects.

MR. DOYLE: They are not. (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The member for Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle) is a past master at it. No wonder he sucked his way in to the Premier's office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: It is shocking.

MR. NEARY: A past master at it, but it will do him no good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I can tell the hon. gentleman right now I was on Bell Island on Saturday and they are laying for the hon. gentleman's scalp over there.

MR. DOYLE: You pulled out.

MR. YOUNG: You are going back, are you? Going back to run?

MR. NEARY: They are gunning for the hon. gentleman over there. And so they think this is great, they think it is smart, they think the one-upmanship,

MR. NEARY: upstaging the council, the mayor and the councillors and upstaging the Opposition, they think this is wonderful, it is grand. And I saw the day in this House when the Tories were sitting over here and that was one of the big criticisms they had of Mr. Smallwood, making announcements for political purposes, trying to get a little few political Brownie points for themselves. It is not working, Mr. Chairman, because hon. members should realize that if they have thirty or forty communities in their district they may make friends, they may make a handful of friends in one, but they will make more enemies than they will friends.

MR. AYLWARD: I am not worried about that.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the hon. gentleman is worried about that, the hon. gentleman should worry about the word being out that the Premier instructed him to go down and stop the cameras and stop the microphones from being brought in to the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. gentleman should worry about that, that the hon. gentleman's colleagues in caucus are not very pleased about that.

MR. AYLWARD: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should not get so cocky because the hon. gentleman is one of the ones that the skids are going to be put under in the next election. There were fourteen, but that has gone up to sixteen. The latest poll shows that sixteen Tories now sitting on the government side of the House will be annihilated in the next election and if hon. members want me to I will name them one by one, sixteen of them according to the latest poll. The latest polls that I have seen show the Premier is running ahead of his party, and that was the same situation that Mr. Diefenbaker had, the late Mr. Diefenbaker. He was running ahead of

MR. NEARY: his party and what happened to him? He had the biggest majority in Canadian history in one general election, in 1958, and in 1962 - in 1958 he got elected with the largest majority and in 1962 he was defeated. He was running ahead of his party just the same as the Premier is running ahead of his party, and that is a bad situation.

MR. YOUNG: Why do you not run out there, hoy?

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Chairman, I could tell the hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) a few things about what the polls show today, what the polls show and what they show about Harbour Grace. If I were the hon. undertaker, if I were the hon. Diggin' 'em Dillon. I would not get too cocky according to the polls.

According to the polls that I have seen one of the possibilities, one of the districts that can be picked up by the Liberals is Harbour Grace. But, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go up and down the roads one by one, I am not going to do that because it would take too long.

MR. STIRLING: Humber West is weak.

MR. NEARY: Humber West is gone and Humber East is gone and Humber Valley is gone. The whole West Coast is gone. The whole Western part of this Province is gone from the Tories in the next election. Mr. Chairman, the latest polls indicate that the Premier is running slightly ahead of his party but that the party is in trouble. The party and the individual members are in serious trouble. They are. In St. John's and in the rural parts of this Province they are in bad shape. That is what the latest polls indicate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there has never been so much discontent in Newfoundland as there is at the present time over the high cost of living, the high cost of electricity, the high cost of gasoline, record unemployment, no Capital Works spending by the government, confrontation politics, fighting with Ottawa, fighting with this one, fighting with that one, tripling the public debt and nothing to show for it - ten years of Toryism. The public debt went up in ten years by \$2.4 billion. It was only \$750 million when Joey left and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) used to say that Joey bankrupted the Province. And he is over there nodding 'yes'. He should be ashamed of it now. The government that he supports brought the public debt up to \$3.2 billion. Joey left \$750 million - ten years of Toryism increased by \$2.4 billion or \$2,400,000,000 and nothing to show for it - at least Joey had something to show for it - except extravagance and waste.

So, Mr. Chairman, their policy, their philosophy is not working. And they can make all the little announcements they want about there is going to be a road paved here - like the hon. the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) listed on his list. Just listen to this, Mr. Chairman, to show you how political they can get. On his list is marked 'Sundry Roads'. I got the map and I have checked it and I have looked for Sundry Roads to see where it is. Is Sundry Roads on Bell Island? Is it in Harbour Main, Avondale, Conception Harbour? Where is Sundry Roads? I have heard of Sunday Roads. Where are Sundry Roads? What district is Sundry Roads in?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) right  
next to the monument.

MR. NEARY:

It is a little slush fund.

I said to the Deputy Minister of Highways (Mr. L. White) recently down at the Public Accounts hearings, 'Would you please explain to me - this is the deputy minister now, the highest civil servant in the department - 'Would you explain to me,' I said, 'how you arrive at the decision to pick the roads that are marked 'Sundry Roads'? 'Oh,' he said, 'the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) will come in and the two of us will sit down,' he said, 'and we will go over the list and that is the roads we will do.' Now, I thought this was the crowd who were going to do away with all that nonsense. I thought Joey was the only one who did that. I thought that after all the condemnation and criticism they flung at Joey because he used to do that, that when the Tories took over you would not get this silly political game playing of ministers and members being slipped the information under the table and then going out and announcing it before the Mayor and town councillors got their telegram. I did not think that was going to happen anymore. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is not working now.

MR. DOYLE:

The council does not try to

(inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

It is a strange thing,

Mr. Chairman, that when there is bad news to be announced as far as a town council is concerned, when the property tax has to be implemented, when there is bad news, the government leaves it up to the Mayor and the town councillors to announce the bad news, but when there is good news they upstage the poor old

MR. S. NEARY: mayor and town councillors who are volunteers, who are not paid, because they want to get the little political brownie points themselves. And I can tell hon. members that every mayor and every town councillor savagely resents that, that all he is is the bearer of bad news -

MR. BARRETT: You never saw that used by the Liberal government,

MR. S. NEARY: No, it certainly was not. Mayors and town councillors can be the bearer of bad news and bad tidings but the members, the Tory members and the ministers, want to get the little brownie points, political brownie points for themselves when there is good news to be announced. And that is a shameful procedure, that is a shameful procedure, it is a terrible attitude. No wonder so many councillors are resigning. No wonder we are having trouble to get people to run for mayor and run for the town councils. They are in the front line, they are in the line of fire, they are the volunteers, they are not paid. And they are the ones that should get credit where credit is due. They are the ones that should get credit for the municipal paving programmes and they are the ones that should get the credit for the water and sewer projects when they are announced.

MR. HANCOCK: And they are the ones that punch in the hours.

MR. S. NEARY: And they are the ones that punch in the hours and the time, at tremendous inconvenience to themselves, and take the abuse. They are in the front line, they are in the line of fire, and it is shameful the way they are treated by this administration. The member for Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle) thinks it is real funny that he should upstage the mayor of Bell Island, he thinks that is real funny.

MR. DOYLE: We work hand in hand.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they work hand in hand alright: They did not even know the announcements were going to be made until they heard them on the radio. Mr. Chairman, as far as municipal council in my own district is concerned, Burnt Island, why that one, I mean I could spend the whole afternoon on that. Back in 1979 when the Premier sent out his hatchetman, the original separatist in this Province, Mr. Cabot Martin, who I presume is now late departed - or if he is still clinging on to the milch cow that he found in the public treasury and he still got his hooks into the public treasury?

AN HON. MEMBER: We cannot find him.

MR. S. NEARY: He told us he was going to quit the government after June 1st.

AN HON. MEMBER: Part time.

MR. NEARY: Is he still getting a few goodies from the public treasury or is he gone now to Clarendville or wherever he was going? But the Premier sent him out the heaviest candidate he could find he sent him out to LaPoile to tackle me in the last election.

MR. STIRLING: He did not have the nerve to go himself.

MR. S. NEARY: No, the Premier did not have the courage, did not have the intestinal fortitude to come out and take me on himself. He sent out his mouthpiece, he sent out his flunkey to take me on. And he was humiliated, he went down to resounding defeat, but he was only there a few days as the Tory candidate when trouble broke out in Burnt Island. Where the people of Burnt Island threatened to shut off the water to the fish plant if they did not get water in their community, and they are one of the



July 2, 1981

Tape No. 2982

RA - 3

MR. S. NEARY:

communities right now where people are carrying water in buckets, carrying water in barrels in the backs of their cars, and so Mr. Cabot Martin, speaking for the Premier, went down to Burnt Island and told the people that he was speaking on behalf of the Premier and the government of this Province,

MR. NEARY: that the government had made a commitment that they were going to put water and sewerage into the community of Burnt Island, and that was confirmed in a telegram from the Premier to the people of Burnt Island in 1979, in the middle of a provincial general election.

And it was also confirmed by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), who also wired the people, the mayor and council, and confirmed that water and sewerage would be put in Burnt Island. They were not told that it was going to be put in in phases. They were not told that. The telegrams stated - I have them here on my desk - that water and sewerage would be completed.

MR. WINDSOR: Have you got the telegram?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WINDSOR: Read it.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is there in this pile of stuff.

MR. WINDSOR: Read it out now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Read it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will bring it up.

As a matter of fact, go and ask my secretary to get me a copy of these two telegrams, 'Rod', will you, from the minister to the people of Burnt Island, and from the Premier? Completed! They said water and sewerage would be completed in the town of Burnt Island. No talk of phasing it in.

Well, last year \$300,000 was made available for phase one and the people were led to believe that this year they would get the other \$200,000 they needed to complete phase two, to complete water and sewerage in the town of Burnt Island.

MR. WINDSOR:

You were misled.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I was not misled. The people who were there when Mr. Martin, the Tory candidate, went down to Burnt Island and the people surrounded him there, he said we will complete a water and sewer project in Burnt Island. Not 'if I am elected,' there were no strings attached. The people would see through that, if the government used the old argument, Well, you know, if you elect our member - as they did in Bellevue - we will put water and sewerage in. No, they said we understand the need, the need is there and so we will complete water and sewerage in Burnt Island.

And this year, the Premier and the minister who made that commitment on behalf of the Newfoundland government, double-crossed the people of Burnt Island. There was one of the worse double-crosses in political history in this Province. They were double-crossed, they were let down. There was no allocation of funds for the second phase of the water supply in Burnt Island and, as a consequence, people will still continue to bring their water in buckets and in barrels in the backs of their cars. And not only that, Mr. Chairman, when the women of Burnt Island went out to picket, to stop the first phase of the developemnt from being completed unless and until they got a commitment from the government, the government sent in the RCMP and three ladies were hauled off to Port aux Basques where they had to stand before a magistrate in Port aux Basques on some kind of a trumped-up charge and were put on a suspended sentence for fighting for their rights, for fighting against this political double-cross on behalf of the

MR. NEARY: Premier and the minister who was the Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time, The women were trying to fight that, that letdown. And for their efforts three of them were carted off, hauled off to court, and were put on a suspended sentence. But, Mr. Chairman, if hon. members think that the people of Burnt Island are going to surrender; that they are going to give up, well, they had better think again. The people of Burnt Island are fighting Newfoundlanders and they are not going to knuckle under. I can tell hon. members right now, they are not going to knuckle under to political pressure, they are not going to knuckle under because they voted Liberal. Mr. Chairman, that is like waving a red flag in front of a bull to say to these people 'Vote Tory and you will get your \$200,000 for your water supply', because that is what the government is saying, that is the message they are trying to convey. Well, the people of Burnt Island will not knuckle under, they will vote by secret ballot according to the dictates of their conscience in a democratic way and they are not going to be dictated to by this administration. They are not going to be told how they are going to vote. They are going to be proud Newfoundlanders but they are going to fight for that water that they feel they are entitled to. They are primary producers, they are all working in Burnt Island, they are all fish plant workers or fishermen. The best fishermen in Newfoundland are on that coast and some of them are in Burnt Island, primary producers creating new dollars in this Province in our most basic industry, creating new dollars, not recycling the old dollars, they are creating new dollars. They are all hard working people who pay their taxes and that is the treatment they get from this government. They are not going to surrender and they are not going to knuckle under, they are going to continue to fight for their rights and as primary producers in this Province they are the first who should be looked after, not the others, the people who generate the new dollars, who

MR. NEARY: are the backbone of the economy of this Province are the people who should get the preferential treatment, the priority but in this particular case it so happens that the need is there, they are carrying their water in buckets and in the backs of their cars in barrels, Mr. Chairman, and in this day and age that is not good enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, just a very brief interjection here. The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) yesterday asked a number of questions. I am afraid that usually when he does ask these questions and, of course, they were questions that one did not have the information at hand at the time because they related to specific amounts and so on, when he does ask these questions I do wish he would make himself available to hear the answers; however, one can only do what one can do.

He requested information as the amount of loan outstanding at the present time.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, I use the point of order to bring to the minister's attention, he may not be aware of it, and the Chairman may not be aware of

MR. STIRLING:

it, the member who asked the questions yesterday is presently in the building with a delegation. I am sure that if he gives the answers the member will either hear them or get them right afterwards. But he is here with a delegation from his district.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird): To the point of order, there is no point of order. It is a point of information.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked for information as to the amounts of outstanding in regard to the municipalities. This is all to the end of the last fiscal year, March 31, 1981. The amount of guaranteed bank loans outstanding to the various communities around the Province was just over \$20 million. There are some old bonds that go back many years that were issued by the municipalities themselves. That amounts to just under \$4 million. And then there are bonds, NMFC bonds outstanding in regard to the projects that went forward in the various municipalities which are currently at \$190 million. So that all adds up to just short of \$215 million. That is the total amount of money outstanding in regard to projects that had gone on in the various municipalities around the Province. That is the total amount right from the beginning up to the end of March, 1981.

Now, there are some non-guaranteed amounts outstanding to the city of St. John's that are not included in that because they can raise money on their own credit. And there is \$41 million in that amount. So that total amount including also the city of St. John's is \$255,049,118. That is the exact amount of monies or credit outstanding.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member also asked what were the terms. In regard to the bank loans, usually it is prime plus one per cent; in other words, that interim bridge financing that the municipalities do, they usually get that one per cent over prime from the various banks. When that is converted into long-term debt through NMFC, of course, it is the rate that the Province borrows at plus a certain amount. Now, our last issue under NMFC was thirteen and three eighths per cent and there was a small amount. There was about a half per cent added on to that just to cover the handling costs and so on and so forth that was the municipalities ultimately will have to repay to the extent that they do repay their indebtedness to NMFC and I will come to that in just a moment.

The projects that municipalities finance in this way are two sources; a water and sewer project, these are usually over a term of twenty years, and then there are paving projects within communities, these are usually financed over a period of ten years. Now, the hon. member also asked what proportion does the Province ultimately have to pick up and what proportion is repaid by the municipalities. In regard to water and sewerage, that varies quite heavily. For instance, some large communities like Gander and so on and so forth, and Corner Brook and Grand Falls and so on, they really repay the total amount to NMFC. A certain number of smaller communities may not pay any. They may not actually have the financial resources to repay any of their indebtedness to NMFC and therefore that goes back to the Province ultimately. That was for water and sewer.

In terms of paving, there is a firm arrangement there. The arrangement is sixty-forty. The municipalities must have forty per cent of the cost available over the total term that the repayment is required and the Province will pick up sixty per cent. So it is difficult to give an actual breakdown in total.

July 2, 1981

Tape NO. 2985

EL - 3

DR. COLLINS:  
any loans outstanding

The final thing was, were there



DR. J. COLLINS: in regard to Newfoundland Housing. No, there are no indebtedness to N and H, to Newfoundland and Labrador Housing in regard to municipalities.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Shall the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I was expecting that by this time—and I am glad the Premier is back—because by this time I would have expected that the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge) would have jumped into this debate to protect the city of Corner Brook against the information which the rules of this House will not allow me to say was misleading, but I presume the rules of this House will allow me to say was incorrect and unfair in the extreme.

First of all, the Premier stated in his opinion, and he certainly is entitled to his opinion, and I have no argument with his opinion, that in his opinion the city of Corner Brook is not a viable municipality. That is a question of opinion and he certainly is entitled to that opinion.

But, Mr. Chairman, when he goes on to say, 'When he talks about approval to borrow, is the hon. the Leader of the Opposition aware that there is an ongoing subsidy to the City Council of Corner Brook every year -

MR. NEARY: You would not know but that was something terrible.

MR. STIRLING: - is the hon. member aware of that that there is \$2 million subsidy, outright grant to the city of Corner Brook?'

MR. NEARY: As if it was something dirty.

MR. STIRLING: 'We subsidize the city of Corner Brook every year.'

Mr. Chairman, the people in Corner Brook know, the councillors in Corner Brook know, I presume that the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) knows, and I presume that the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge) knows that that is a complete and utter misstatement of the facts, that Corner Brook in this context is given the impression that they receive a subsidy, and, Mr. Chairman, that is not true.

MR. NEARY: Aha!

MR. STIRLING: That is absolutely not true.

MR. NEARY: Aha!

MR. STIRLING: When the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) brought in the Municipalities Bill last year, he was talking about the autonomy that councils were going to be given and he was talking about the great grants programme based on property tax. Well, I hope then that the member for Mount Pearl, the Minister now for Development, will stand in his seat and say it is untrue for the Premier to be saying that Corner Brook is getting a nickel or not \$2 million of subsidy, that what Corner Brook is getting is the same grant that the city of St. John's is given, the same per capita grant as Gander is given, -

MR. NEARY: Aha!

MR. STIRLING: - as Springdale is given, as Lewisporte is given, as every other municipality with property tax in this Province is given.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. STIRLING: Not only permit a question, I invite you to get in and to clear the reputation of Corner Brook, clear the reputation of Corner Brook.

MR. N. WINDSOR: What has The Municipal Grants Act got to do with it? Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (inaudible) . The hon. gentleman talks about The Municipalities Act, and he talks about The Municipal Grants Act. What does that have to do with the funds that are paid municipalities to help retire capital debt? The Municipal Grants Act, for the information to the hon. gentleman, is an operating grant, which is, as he says quite correctly, given to every municipality in the Province. And The Municipal Grants Act rationalized that because previously it was not rationalized on any basis; it was given out on the basis of need and in many cases on an emergency basis. That has nothing to do with helping to retire capital debt for funds allocated for water and sewer systems, that is for operating purposes, Mr. Chairman. And there are still many in fact, by far the majority of municipalities in this Province, do now and will for sometime to come require grants from the Province to help retire that capital debt.

MR. NEARY: That is what the Leader of the Opposition is saying.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, it appears that the minister does not understand what the Premier said yesterday.

MR. WINDSOR: Yes I do.

MR. STIRLING: What the

MR. STIRLING: Premier said yesterday then, is not true, they are not getting a single nickel to retire water and sewer grants, not a single nickel. The \$2 million that they are getting, they are getting out of these operating grants. And that is what the Premier said yesterday in trying to paint Corner Brook as somehow one of the bad boys in municipalities. Corner Brook was one of the bad boys that when I asked the question of the Premier, 'Is this now going to be the Premier's approach to dictate to the City of Corner Brook as to what money they can spend?' He was the one who came back and said, 'Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition does not realize that the City of Corner Brook is not a viable municipality.' He is entitled to that opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot say that the Premier lied in this House and I will not say that the Premier lied in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Could you?

MR. STIRLING: Where I say that he lied was on a radio station in Corner Brook. What he said in this House was 'The Opposition does not realize that the City of Corner Brook is not a viable municipality.' What he said on a tape sent out by his own public relations department that phoned Corner Brook this morning with a tape with the Premier's own voice on it was a lie. He said, 'I did not say Corner Brook was not a viable community.' Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday here in this House he said, and I quote: 'Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition does not realize that the City of Corner Brook is not a viable municipality.'

MR. NEARY: Is that Hansard you are quoting there?

MR. STIRLING: That is Hansard I am quoting from, yesterday here in the House, the official record.

MR. STIRLING: So I am not saying that he lied in this House, that was his opinion in this House. I am saying that he - and I categorically say that on the tape in Corner Brook with his own voice was a lie when he said, 'I did not say Corner Brook was not a viable community; I said there were communities in Newfoundland who do not pay their own way and Corner Brook was one of them.' Mr. Chairman, that is not the truth. Corner Brook does not get a nickel that Gander does not get or that St. John's does not get or Grand Falls does not get. Corner Brook this year is paying its way under their operating grants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A shocking thing to be said about the City of Corner Brook! And I can understand the Chairman now cannot say anything, but I am sure that he is going to send out notes for somebody to get back in the Chair so he can defend Corner Brook against this attack by the Premier, because he was upset and attacked by the Premier.

Is the hon. member aware that there is over \$2 million subsidy outright grants to the City of Corner Brook? That is not true, Mr. Chairman. We subsidize the City of Corner Brook every year - that is not true, Mr. Chairman. They get no more from the City of Corner Brook than every other town gets under this new Municipalities Plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: So what is the attack, Mr. Chairman, on the City of Corner Brook, that they are somehow not as good as some other municipalities? - and he named three.

I hope the minister will go check this now because it should have been checked yesterday by

MR. STIRLING: the Premier who was still back in the 1940s.

MR. FLIGHT: It was (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: Yes, it was true. I mean, in the old Municipalities Act they did bail out Corner Brook once or twice when they had a desperate situation. But as of now, Mr. Chairman, under the present council, that council is paying their way. The people of Corner Brook are not looking for handouts from anybody.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. STIRLING: The people of Corner Brook, Mr. Chairman, are the people who have paid their way. And if they are not a viable community - now, Mr. Chairman, if you put it into context, let us put it in context.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): On a point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of

MR. NEARY: the Opposition is making a good speech and making very valid points -

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: - and he continues to be interrupted by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). Now I ask Your Honour to direct -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. NEARY: - the Minister of Education to restrain herself or you ought to have her removed from the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

DR. COLLINS: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, that is a most ridiculous waste of the House. If any member in this House interrupts more than any other member, if any other member takes up the time of the House by these interjections, if any member in this House tries to interrupt when good speeches are being given it is the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). So it is totally out of order for him to say that 'I can do certain things and it is perfectly within the rules' and the hon. Minister of Education, who does about 10 per cent of that, and says that she is outside the rules. It is totally outside the credibility to think that that is a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, let it be noted that I have no objection, I have absolutely no objection, and I thank my colleague for wanting to protect me against the -

MR. NEARY: Wicked onslaught.

MR. STIRLING: - member for Humber East (Ms. Verge). As a matter of fact, I would like to see the member get on

MR. STIRLING: her feet and not just make a few jibes. I have never asked for the protection of the Chair. Part of the give and take of debate is this kind of thing back and forth across, Mr. Chairman. I would live to see, you see, as a former resident of Corner Brook, I have to defend Corner Brook and I defended Corner Brook yesterday and I thought by this time that the minister, the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge), would be defending Corner Brook.

I know that the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) has defended Corner Brook from time to time and he forced the minister to get on radio out there and say, 'Look, we are changing all of that, we are going to accept your priorities'. The minister got out and spoke for her two colleagues this morning and said: 'Look, hold it, the Premier did not mean what he said, it was just a slip. The poor old Premier was being badgered by the Opposition, he was tired, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MS. VERGE: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): A point of order, the hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Chairman, I have to take issue with what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) just said. The remarks he attributed to me are quite false and wrong. I said nothing about the Premier whatsoever. The Premier spoke only correct things about the City of Corner Brook and I had no reason, nor did I in fact take issue with anything the Premier said about Corner Brook.

MR. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order; that is just the minister wasting the time of this hon. House. The minister merely took advantage of the



MR. NEARY: procedure of raising a point of order to express her point of view. It is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members and I am sure that Your Honour will rule that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): To the point of order, there is no point of order, merely just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. STIRLING: I can understand why the minister would have to rush on radio and be pushed by the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) to get on and say, 'Look, do you want to take on all of Corner Brook, no we will re-examine the priorities we will not have a situation in which everything has to be dictated to. That was a mistake, we did not mean to dictate'.

What we have now is a situation in which the minister, being a Corner Brook resident, is as upset as I am, as the member for Humber West is upset as I am, and the member for Bay of Islands is really upset that you have a Premier who in response, by the way, to a very simple question - I did not introduce the subject; I said: 'Is it now government policy for you to dictate to a municipality?', And then he was the one who gave me the lecture on Corner Brook - I guess he forgot that I was from Corner Brook - gave me the lecture that the Leader of the Opposition does not realize that the city of

MR. STIRLING: Corner Brook is not a viable municipality. This morning on a tape that he sent out from here he said, 'I did not say Corner Brook was not a viable community or municipality.'

MR. WARREN: What is the correct saying?

MR. STIRLING: Who knows what is correct when the Premier says it? He said both things.

MR. WARREN: But he was tired yesterday, was he not?

MR. STIRLING: Well, I do not know. That was the impression that the minister had. She had to rush to his defence and say, Oh, it is nothing that the Premier did that was wrong, it is the Leader of the Opposition taking it out of context. Now let us keep it in context. Mr. Speaker, apparently the Leader of the Opposition does not realize that the city of Corner Brook is not a viable municipality. When he talks about approval to borrow, is the hon. the Leader of the Opposition aware there is an ongoing subsidy to the city council of Corner Brook every year?" Not in 1982, Mr. Chairman. Not in 1981. Not true. "When he talks about approval to borrow, is the hon. member aware that there is over a \$2 million subsidy, outright grant to the city of Corner Brook?" That is not true, Mr. Chairman. I expected the members for Corner Brook to dash into the debate and correct it. "We subsidize the city of Corner Brook every year. It is not in the same position" and he goes on to name some good municipalities, what he calls "top communities," making a distinction between types of communities.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Premier of this Province owes the people of this Province an apology for denying on a tape what he said here in the House yesterday because you cannot get away with that in the House. You can get away with it where it is not

MR. STIRLING: recorded but in the House you cannot get away with it. And then to try to gloss over it and to try to paint the city of Corner Brook province-wide as if they somehow did not pay their bills and they needed to be bailed out! And I would hope that we will now get into this debate, we will now get into this debate, the member for Humber East (Ms Verge) defending Corner Brook, either that or, as she said during her point of order, she agrees with the Premier.

Now, Mr. Chairman, someone has to defend the city of Corner Brook and on this side we will defend the people of Corner Brook as we will defend them in other municipalities that have been treated by absolute arrogance by this government. And we will be bringing in case after case. You now have the city of Corner Brook, the town of Deer Lake, the town of Nain, Stephenville, all of these towns have been dictated to by the government saying "you will use this consultant," every one of them. They have been told, "you will use this consultant."

MR. WARREN: That was true.

MR. STIRLING: Even today, Mr. Chairman, the minister herself admitted that if they do not like what we said they can come back and discuss it. Well, why should they have to come back and discuss it? Why should they have to come back and discuss it? It is their money. I invite you, get into the debate. Sure, get into the debate. The Minister of Health (Mr. House) used to be a municipal councillor and mayor and he would not tolerate this kind of treatment. He was never treated like this and he would not tolerate this kind of treatment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to use this opportunity on this debate dealing with the grants to municipalities to say that the people in this municipality,

July 2, 1981

Tape No. 2989

ah-3

MR. STIRLING: in the town of Corner Brook and throughout municipalities are being given very shoddy treatment by the people in this government. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope that they can be whipped into shape. I hope that the Premier will apologize, will go to the people of Corner Brook and apologize and say, "I am sorry, I was not well informed."

MR. STIRLING: "That is the way it used to be, I take it all back. The City of Corner Brook is paying its way, the people are paying their way," and then he will apologize for the embarrassment that he has caused the Minister from Humber East (Ms. Verge) and the member who is the Chairman of this debate, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird). I hope that he will apologize to them. And he has already really embarrassed the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow).

And, Mr. Chairman, I would challenge these ministers to now get into this debate and challenge them to defend the City of Corner Brook.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Shall the resolution carry?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have now in front of me the two telegrams that I referred to earlier.

MR. STIRLING: What? She is not even going to get into the debate.

MR. NEARY: I am amazed that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) -

MR. STIRLING: They will not let her get in.

MR. NEARY: - would sit there like a dummy -

MR. STIRLING: They will not let her get into it.

MR. NEARY: - while the Premier attacks her district.

MR. WINDSOR: What bill are we on?

MR. NEARY: We are on the Local Loan And Guarantee. Loans to municipalities. And yesterday this matter came up in connection with the city of Corner Brook.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, is it any wonder that the whole Western part of this Province, today, are anti-government and anti-Tory? Is it any wonder, when we see two ministers and two members sit there mute, completely mute, like dummies? They will not get up and defend their alma mater. They will not defend their alma mater.

And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) got up there a few minutes ago and I thought he made the biggest fool of himself that I have ever seen in this House. Just listen, Mr. Chairman, just listen to what flows off the lips of members on the other side when they get involved in points of order and procedural points. Let us see what happens. They get up and they make statements they cannot back up.

The Minister of Finance, for instance, a few moments ago said, 'Who interrupts or interjects more often than anybody else in this House?' - looking over at me. Now, did he give any facts to back that up? Does he provide any facts and figures?

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now he is apologizing. Does he produce any evidence? No. He just makes the statement as if that was gospel. The press report members of this House. I have seen them and heard them reporting the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). He will make a statement and they will treat that as gospel. And the headline is treated as if The Telegram was saying it themselves, The Evening Telegram.

The Premier will make a statement. Nobody dares question it or research it to find out if it is factual, just accept it, fill up space

MR. NEARY: with it, shove it in, put a headline on it and that is supposed to be the gospel, that is supposed to be factual. The kind of stuff that we are getting is propoganda.

I mean, does the press ever stop to realize that the propoganda is being pumped at them every day by this administration?

MR. STIRLING: Like the lie in Corner Brook.

MR. NEARY: Like the big lie about the Upper Churchill, the big lie about Corner Brook, the big lie about the aluminum plant.

Mr. Chairman, I am getting sick and tired and fed up with ministers making statements that are left to go unquestioned like the one the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) made today when he said, 'Does anybody know who interrupts more often than anybody else?' - a question - looking across at me as if I were

MR. NEARY:

the culprit. No facts to back it up, no research, fling it out, try to undermine a member's credibility. Try to destroy him and smear him, try to lower the decorum of the House and no facts, nothing to back it up, just off-the-cuff. Well, we are hearing too many off-the-cuff statements in this House of late from the Premier of this Province, who has picked a fight now with everybody he can in Canada. He has picked a fight with Ottawa. He picked a fight with the oil companies. He has picked a fight with Nova Scotia. He has picked a fight with the premier of Ontario, who approves of the constitution. He has picked a fight with the Labour Movement. He cannot resist the temptation to pick a fight. He always has to be fighting with somebody. He reminds me of the little fellow in school who would go around flicking everybody, flicking them on the back of the ear, kicking them in the shins, flicking them on the back of the head, trying to pick a fight. And then all of a sudden somebody gives him the back of the hand and then he goes away crying and bawling. Well, that is like the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman did not have the courage to come into the House today.

People of this Province are fed up with confrontation politics. The people are fed up with confrontation politics. Mr. Chairman, the people are fed up with the hatred and the bitterness of the President of the Council (W. Marshall). I only wish we could get him on television more often. If we could only get the President of the Council on television more often, we would have her made in the next election. He is such a skinfull of hatred. He is a bitter little man. He has a narrow mind.

MR. TULK:

He got beat up in Toronto, see.

MR. NEARY:

He got beat up - no, that is the Premier, got beat up in Toronto. The President of the Council is an embittered man. His mind is warped and small and he is so



MR. NEARY: narrow-minded, Mr. Chairman, that you could hardly describe him. Now, the member for St. John's North (J. Carter), he is a different kettle of fish. He is over there now having a little snooze for himself. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the House this. Talking about going to school again, I have to tell the House this. That we always had a saying in school that where you saw a young fellow with big feet, he usually had no brains. Big feet indicate no brains. Well, just take a look at the hon. gentleman's feet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The member for St. John's North has got the biggest set of pontoons I have ever seen on a man.

MR. HANCOCK: He has a head big enough to hold the brains (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: So, if there is any foundation to the fact that big feet mean small brains, no brains, then the cat-scanner, the new catscanner would not be able to find the hon. gentleman's brain.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please.

I think we are straying from Bill number 78.

MR. NEARY: And so, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier has had a confrontation now, has had a fight, has had an argument. The hon. the Premier has blasphemed everybody from coast to coast, from Newfoundland to British Columbia. Now, there is nobody else left in Canada for him to blaspheme or criticize, so who does he tackle? He tackles the city of Corner Brook. The city of Corner Brook is next on his hit list. The Premier has now put Ottawa on the back burner, put Ottawa on the shelf for the time being. The Premier has laid off Nova Scotia, laid off the Premier of Ontario, laid off the oil companies, laid off the Labour Movement,

MR. NEARY: and he has now put the city of Corner Brook on his hit list. Yesterday in this House he made false and misleading statements about the financial condition of the city of Corner Brook. And that statement, Mr. Chairman, could be very detrimental to Corner Brook in its future borrowings and its future plans. It could be very detrimental indeed. I was hoping today that the Premier would take his place in this hon. House and be man enough, have the courage to stand up and apologize to the Mayor and the councillors and the people of Corner Brook for making false and misleading statements about the financial condition of that town. That would be the honourable and decent thing for the Premier of this Province to do. If he does not do it, Mr. Chairman, then he is just a little man; he is almost as small-minded, as narrow-minded and as bitter as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) who is the biggest skinful of hate in this House and in this Province, who once got a punch in the side of the gob by a member sitting on that side of the House for attacking the member's mother.

MR. HANCOCK: Who was that?

MR. NEARY: The hon. the President of the Council attacked - he was the only man - I have been here nineteen years and it is the only time that I have ever seen a member attack another member's mother.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who did that?

MR. NEARY: The hon. the President of the Council did that, attacked a member's mother, and the member got up - and I believe if I were in his place I would do the same thing - walked across the House and gave it to him, and he did not have the courage to stand up and defend himself.

MR. NEARY: And now the Premier is doing the same thing, taking advantage of people who are not members of this House, attacking the Mayor and the council in Corner Brook who are not here to defend themselves. And they are not going to be defended by their own member. So there is the situation now, Mr. Chairman. If he does not apologize, then he is just as small-minded and just as bitter as the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), a skinful of hate. The Premier should be big enough - I know the Premier is well-intentioned. I know people will say, 'Well, you know, he has got some fight in him, he is well-intentioned.' But he does not have the stamina, he does not have the strength for the job. He has no class. He is waving his arms continuously, he is wild-eyed and making off-the-cuff statements about just about everything and everybody. He gets himself in hot water from coast to coast. He is the most hated Premier in Canada. And now they have him tied down to prepared statements. He has a group of - the real bosses in this Province right now are the ones who write his speeches, the ones who write his press releases, the ones who tell him what to say. Once he departs from the script that is prepared for him, he gets in trouble, like he did in the House yesterday over the situation in Corner Brook. It is a sad commentary, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman - I would have to agree his heart is in the right place, he means well, he is well-intentioned, but is that enough to be Premier of this Province? I ask hon. gentlemen, is that enough to be Premier of this Province? What else do you need? You need common sense, you need strength, you need courage and you need skill; you need to be able to negotiate, you have to be flexible. You just cannot sit there stiff and straight.

MR. STIRLING: A good track record.

MR. NEARY: Yes. The hon. gentleman has no track record, all he has is that abortion, that flag. That is the only thing he can point to, that abortion. And I might say that is an abortion that is not on demand. That is all he has, a new wing on the penitentiary, a couple of incinerators and that abortion that he calls a flag.

AN HON. MEMBER: That what?

MR. NEARY: It is not abortion on demand either. Surely, it takes a little more to be Premier of this Province. Surely, it takes a man with vision and imagination, a man who can get things done, a man who can get projects started,

MR. NEARY: a man who can put people to work, a man who can create an economic and political atmosphere that will attract business and industry instead of driving it away, as they have done. Is that not what we need, Mr. Chairman? Not a man to attack Corner Brook, attack Ottawa, attack the oil companies, attack the Federation of Labour, attack the Board of Trade, attack Halifax, Nova Scotia, attack the fishing industry.

MR. TULK: Do not forget the Mummers Troupe now (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, we looked after the Mummers Troupe, we gave them \$18,000 for 'Some Slick'. I happen to have seen 'Some Slick', and if the Premier had seen 'Some Slick' down at the LSPU Hall before he gave them the grant and seen what they were calling him - it was not Peckford, they put an 'R' into it - then they might not have gotten their \$18,000.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are all disgusted. The people of this Province are fed up with the confrontation politics, they are fed up with nothing being done only fighting all the time, continuously battling with Ottawa and battling with this one and fighting with that one and arguing with this one and, in the meantime, doing nothing. People are fed up with that right from Cape Spear to Cape Chidley in the North. Wherever you go in this Province today, people are fed up to the teeth with this bickering and this blaspheming that has been going on by this Premier and by his henchmen, his colleagues, some of the Cabinet ministers. They are fed up with it and they want to see it come to an end. I do know whether it is too late for the hon. gentleman to change his image, he had a chance to do it yesterday. I do not think he can change.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) down to earth.

MR. NEARY: I do not think he can come down to earth.

MR. STIRLING: He has to come off the ego trip he was on.

MR. NEARY: I do not think he can get off that ego trip.

MR. TULK: He might be (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The polls indicate that he and his party are finished in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is what the polls indicate.

MR. WARREN: And you know that too.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman knows that.

MR. WARREN: I know that. That is right, he told me the other evening.

MR. NEARY: And now he is down - what he tells - Mr. Chairman, here is how he props up his caucus, here is how he props up the caucus and tries to -

MR. STIRLING: You are earning your salary.

MR. NEARY: - here is how he tries to boost their morale. He goes to the caucus and he says 'Look, gentlemen and ladies, look' -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) 100 Huntley Street later on.

MR. NEARY: - yes, I will talk about 100 Huntley Street later on, during the Late Show this afternoon. But what the Premier tells his caucus is this, 'We are down in a valley now but that is the way politics function; you are up on a hill one minute and you are down in a valley the next. We are down in a valley now', he is telling his caucus, 'but we will come out of that, we will start making prepared ministerial statements, we will start creating red herrings, we will start setting up smoke screens. We are not going to do anything, but we will pretend we are. We will get the press secretaries

MR. NEARY: to write news releases for us and pump out the propaganda and if that does not work, we will dump 2600 American gallons of matacil on them - do away with them, if that does not work.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Do not be edging me on there, now. And so, Mr. Chairman, that is not good enough. Now, I started out, when I stood in my place the second time around, to read a couple of telegrams and I happened to get sidetracked because the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) motivated me there and I believe he is on to a good thing. And it is nice to see the Premier (Mr. Peckford) humble himself. It is not nice to see him lie in public, now mind you, I think that is shocking, that is a poor example. But I am sure they wrote that song that Mac Davis sings -

AN HON. MEMBER: The silent partner.

MR. NEARY: Who?

AN HON. MEMBER: The silent partner.

MR. NEARY: - they wrote it for the Premier of this Province - Oh Lord It Is Hard To Be Humble. Every time I hear it I think of the hon. gentleman. He is so perfect in every way, that it is hard for him to be humble. So, we would not expect him to come in to the House and stand up and be man enough and have the courage to apologize to the people of Corner Brook for making a fool of himself in this House yesterday. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me deal with the matter of Burnt Island. I want to come back to that for a moment because the then Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor), the present Minister of Development,

MR. NEARY: told me that the word 'completed' was not in the telegram sent out by the Premier. Well, I have a copy of the telegram in front of me.

MR. WINDSOR: You said it was in the telegram I sent out.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe the hon. gentleman may have misunderstood me. But is he prepared to admit now that completed was in it?

MR. WINDSOR: I do not know what the Premier said. I said the word 'completed' was not in my telegram.

MR. FLIGHT: One never knows what the Premier said. He does not know. That is the problem. The Premier should consult.

MR. NEARY: Here is what he said, "This is to confirm an understanding given by Mr. Cabot Martin-who is the Tory candidate, I described him a half an hour ago - given by Mr. Cabot Martin on behalf of myself to the effect that \$350,000 will be included in this year's budget"- and listen to this, Mr. Chairman - "to complete the water system for your community." Now, the hon. gentleman says the word 'complete' was not in the telegram.

MR. WINDSOR: No, I did not.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman did, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman now can try to weasel his way out of it all he wants to.

MR. WINDSOR: Well, let us get Hansard and see who is weaseling now. Where is my telegram?

MR. TULK: Read his telegram.  
Read his telegram.

MR. NEARY: Oh, you are saying your telegram and not the Premier's now.

MR. WINDSOR: I only said that was not in my telegram.

MR. NEARY: In other words, the hon. gentleman says it is all right for the Premier to double-cross and lie, but he is not going to have any part of that.



MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman happened to be Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time.

MR. WINDSOR: (Inaudible) that said that I said it.

MR. NEARY: And listen to this, Mr. Chairman, just pay attention to this, the last paragraph of the Premier's telegram: "This commitment is being given in recognition of the needs of the people of Burnt Island." And listen, Mr. Chairman, just listen to the last line.

Remember now, he is saying, Mr. Cabot Martin, we are backing him up! The last line: "You are quite at liberty to make the contents of this message public". Of course, because we were in the middle of a provincial general election. "Yours sincerely, Brian Peckford, Premier".

Now, Mr. Chairman, what did the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs tell the people of Burnt Island? I wish he would come back in his seat because I have to have a little dart at him now, again. I wish he would come back. He told the people that the funding was \$300,000. The Premier says \$350,000. The Minister of Municipal Affairs at the time, the present Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) says, \$300,000, a difference of \$50,000. Maybe not very much, Mr. Chairman. But, Mr. Chairman, this \$350,000 that the Premier committed was for water only. But then the department decides to put in water and sewerage, so the \$300,000 was used for water and sewerage and not as indicated in the Premier's telegram, for water. And that is what used up the money. But the people were led to believe if they accepted the \$300,000 for water and sewerage, that phase two would begin in this fiscal year. And that is where the dirty politics came in. Because, Mr. Chairman, obviously, when they took the matter to Cabinet, the needs of the people of Burnt Island must have changed between 1979 and 1981.

MR. NEARY: Remember in 1979 what the Premier said in his telegram? He is saying this is not politics. We are in the middle of a provincial election but, of course, you understand that we would not play politics with you. So this commitment, he says, is being given in recognition of the needs of the people of Burnt Island. The need was there in 1979 and in 1981, when they drew up their budget and discussed this matter in Cabinet, the need was not there. Now, what changed the need? The people are still carrying their water in buckets. They are still carrying water in barrels in the backs of their cars. They are out slipping and sliding in the Winter-time on ice, climbing over cliffs to get at the hydrant. Mr. Chairman, could you tell me what has changed between 1979 and 1981 apart from the fact that the gentleman who was mentioned in this telegram, Mr. Cabot Martin, is late departed?

MR. NEARY:

Is that what brought about the change, Mr. Chairman? I have my suspicions. I cannot make any charges or accusations, that would be unparliamentary. I have my suspicions and the people of Burnt Island have their suspicions of why they did not get the second phase of their water and sewerage in this year which would have cost a paltry \$200,000. I hope, Mr. Chairman, I hope it is not because of politics. I hope it is not because they elected a member who sits on the Opposition side of the House. I hope it is not because they elected a Liberal, because that is the dirtiest, rottenest, filthiest kind of politics that you can play. It is rotten and filthy. And they used to accuse 'Joey' of playing politics that way. It is low, sneaky, rotten and filthy, And any minister who would base his decisions along partisan political lines, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion could put on a top hat, a silk hat, and crawl under a snake's belly; any man or any woman who would do that and not base the water and sewer projects and the roads projects on need and put things in their right perspective and base them on need and priority, instead of along partisan political lines.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have said what I have had to say and I am glad I said it. I hope to get some response from the government benches. I hope that the old skinful of hatred over there will get up and squirt some more of his poison across the House and then, Mr. Chairman, it will give me an opportunity, probably, if the hon. gentleman intervenes, to have a few more words on this very important subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Shall Clause 1 carry?

MR. MOORES: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Carbonear. Rather than interrupt the hon. member, I would like to announce it being 5:00 o'clock I can inform the House that I have received notice of one motion for debate at 5:30 when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House. The notice is given by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked the Premier. The subject matter is 100 Huntley Street.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to provide a few words of wisdom on the bill before the House, on what the House is attempting to do here today. As I understand it, we are now agreeing in principle to allow the various municipalities in the Province that have been named in Bill No. 78 to further place themselves into debt for water and sewerage and sundry items, various and sundry items in the municipalities in our Province. Well, Mr. Chairman, in principle there certainly is not anything wrong with that. The only way that the municipalities within this Province can acquire funding for these types of projects, other than the City of St. John's I might add, is to come cap in hand, down on one knee to the Provincial Department of Municipal Affairs and request from the Province, from the government, the funding that they need. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that in itself, that procedure in itself, leaves something to be desired. I have not yet understood why the other municipalities in this Province, in addition to St. John's, cannot arrange some type of financing on their own other than having to come to the Province in the type of procedure that we have seen for the last twenty or twenty-five years, and get money from

MR. MOORES: the Province almost as if the Province is doling it out bit by bit to whatever municipalities they deem fit. And my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who placed it so eloquently I thought, hit the nail right on the head when he said that because of the procedure that we are following, the method by which we fund town councils in this Province, then the government, the administration, chooses, picks and chooses, and invariably they select those communities that are on the government side of the House, and they pick and choose these communities to which they want to give money. That is why, for instance, some of the larger communities in this Province, such as

MR. R. MOORES: Carbonear with a population of 7,000 people, in the last six years, since it has had a Liberal member, has managed only \$1.1 million, far, far less than it needs to upgrade its present water and sewerage system. And we have seen that, Mr. Chairman, on numerous other occasions not only in relation to municipal affairs and water and sewerage but transportation in this Province, roads. It is no understatement to say that the highway system in this Province right now, that portion of the highway system that is being travelled by most of the population, is in desperate condition. It has never been worse, in the last twenty-five years, since the concept of paving roads came into proliferation by governments throughout Newfoundland, particularly, and in North America in general. Never have main arteries of travel, for the transportation of goods and services and people, been allowed to deteriorate to such a condition as it has today, namely, the Conception Bay highway, the Trinity Bay highway, roads on the West Coast of the Province, including the Trans-Canada, just in desperate condition. And, primarily, the reason for that is a lack of planning on the part of the government. But more importantly, or at least just as importantly, is the idea that any section of highway, it does not matter whether it is the Trans-Canada or a secondary road, any portion of highway that happens to be in a district that is represented by someone on the Opposition side, well, that portion of highway does not get maintenance or upgrading in a given year or in a given term of that member's office. Pathetic. My friend from LaPoile used a number of adjectives rather harshly and, I think, rather rightfully, in this case, to describe just what it is that this policy where a government, any government, it does not matter whether it was the

July 2, 1981

Tape No. 2996

RA - 2

MR. R. MOORES: Liberal Government of Smallwood or the Liberal Government of Squires or the PC Government of Alderdice, it does not matter if it was the PC. Government of Frank Moores or Peckford, that is not the point, the point is that the concept, the concept which imbodyes the attitude of a government that punishes people for exercising their democratic right in a way that is in opposition to the government thinking, that concept and that attitude is principally, basically, fundamentally wrong. And for it to be protracted, encouraged or actually practised

MR. MOORES: by any government anywhere in the free world is wrong, unquestionably, unequivocally wrong. That is why it is my personal belief that government in this Province right now, this present PC administration, has gone back, has allowed government in this Province to get back to the days, that even I, even I have to agree, were unacceptable days of the Smallwood administration. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is the policy of this particular administration. A road which it has taken has been formulated by one or two individuals in the government, namely, the Premier, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), and one or two others who have not yet been able to realize that in the late 1960s, particularly, and all through the 1970s, politics in general, governments in particular, have learned the hard way, by rebellion, some of it peaceful demonstration, some of it not so peaceful and violent. They have learned, however, that people want to be equal, are equal, and should be treated equally by governments. And I mean this perception of equality only in a political sense, I do not believe in the substantive sense of equality, that it does or ever has existed in society.

But as far as politics are concerned and the treatment of individual taxpayers, all of us should be viewed as equal. And when any government, or any member of a government, takes it upon itself to arbitrarily decide to the contrary, then that is wrong. But more importantly, and this perhaps is the crux of my few words today, more importantly, when that government is allowed to get away with it, when that government is permitted to continue this type of inequality, this type of favouritism, this manipulation of our political system and the attitudes within it, when it is permitted to get



July 2, 1981

Tape 2997

PK - 2

MR. MOORES:       away with it by the media, by the written  
press or the electronic press, when the media turns its eyes  
from what is an obvious contradiction of terms in a political  
sense, then that is worse than the government and what it is  
doing.   Because we rely as legislators upon a medium.

MR. MOORES: In this case the medium is communications and the people who control communications, either electronically or writtenly, is what has become described generally as the media. And if they do not take upon themselves the responsibility of conveying to the general population what is going wrong in this Province, then they are, in fact, worse than the government. Because we as individuals can only get up here and speak as we see, and it is only an opinion, but once a great number of people have that opinion then a consensus is formed. And consensus, I urge you, ladies and gentlemen - consensus is what, in fact, most governments, most Legislatures, most of anything, administers itself by.

I read in the Evening Torygram yesterday -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) a good boy.

MR. MOORES: Actually, I initiated that word first.

I read yesterday in the Torygram - and the headline went like this: 'Opposition continues its stalling tactics', that was the headline. Now, if you take that headline in itself there is no question as to what it means. There is no question as to what the writer meant. The writer arrived at a value judgement of what is going on in this House and he concluded that the Opposition was stalling - was using and continuing tactics to stall the business of this House, a value judgement, a conclusion that left no doubt at all as to where that writer's mind was and to what idea and what opinion he adhered to. And what is wrong with that? Well, there is nothing wrong with it if it is an editorial. All papers, all mediums, all media have the right to editorialize to

MR. MOORES: a certain degree, but when it is not an editorial or not meant to be an editorial, then that writer has taken a stand that is biased and is partial and once having taken a stand that is biased and partial, he no longer has the credibility, or no longer should have the credibility of that portion - in this case, the half of the Legislature which he has attacked and accused of using stalling tactics to delay the business of this House.

Now, I have asked the Leader of my party, the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), on a number of occasions to meet the media of this Province head on, that deliberately and with malice aforethought they have been castrating the Opposition of this Province by refusing outright - premeditatedly and abusively they have been

MR. MOORES: refusing to cover what we are saying in the House in the light that it is being said. Time and time again I see it, where a member of this Opposition stands in his place and asks a series of questions, very pointed questions in Question Period, very good questions, solid, founded questions, only to find after the Question Period that a host, an array of little green slips of paper come down to the Cabinet ministers' desks and these little green slips of paper, they say, 'Would you be kind enough to give us an interview or a few words on the topic of such and such?' And invariably, repeatedly, and almost embarrassingly, that topic has been brought up by a member of the Opposition in Question Period. Now, what coverage does a member of the Opposition get? None. And at best, very little. And that is only one example of what has been going on.

We saw the Leader of the Opposition today bring up in this House how the Premier of this Province, on a tape recorder recording in Corner Brook today, told a lie, an outright lie, a fact that was inconsistent with what he said yesterday in this House. We will wait and see now what coverage the Leader of the Opposition gets. Normally, normally a premier would be obliged to resign, normally he would be obliged to resign to -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: - commit such an atrocity on truth in this House.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. MOORES: We will see what happens.

Well, I will tell you what will happen. Never mind, we will not wait and see because I know.

MR. HODDER: He will brazen it out.

MR. MOORES: Because in the last nine

MR. MOORES: months particularly, nine or ten months, I have taken it upon myself personally, voluntarily, to study the press in this Province, to study the media, the electronic and written media and I have right now in my files at home, properly classified, at least a hundred different instances, at least one hundred different instances, where I can confirm a very clear unquestionable bias by the media in this Province toward the government, even, in some cases, to the point of concealing information. And I will be prepared in future sessions of this House, because I am going to be around for a while - there are some people in the press gallery who would like to think otherwise - but I am going to be around for a while and I am going to continue urging the confrontation that I want with the media in this Province before they usurp completely the role of the Opposition, where it will no longer matter that this House exists, where it

MR. MOORES: will no longer matter what we say as an Opposition or do, where our very role in society will be erased by a media that has closed its ears wrongfully and, I point out to you, unconstitutionally. And except for the development of constitutional rights of a media or the press, as it is called, it might even be illegal what they are doing. It has gotten now to the point where it is serious enough, where the member for the district of Carbonear, if he were to get up and get kicked out of the House for slugging someone on the opposite side, he would get front page coverage, but if he gets up and makes a sensible speech what do I get in the paper the next day? What I deserve, two or three lines. And I have seen that on numerous occasions; good speeches made in this House, factually researched supported by good data, and no coverage, none at all. I have seen, also, instances in this House, and one we saw last week was the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when he announced the new changes in the provincial subsidy program for bounties on boats, and we have been asking for that for five years on this side of the House. Finally, after five years the Minister of Fisheries comes in with a lousy increase in the provincial boat subsidy and he gets front page coverage on it.

Mr. Chairman, believe you me, unless the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) - as a matter of fact, I have, myself, been promoting the idea of cutting out Question Period altogether in this House. It has become a useless exercise for the Opposition. All we do -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) when he gets the minister gone, in the Question Period today he is ignored. Now (inaudible) just the opposite.

MR. MOORES: - all it does is get the little note sent down to the ministers, and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I tell you that my objections and overviews of the media in this Province have not fallen on deaf ears with my

MR. MOORES:                      colleagues, and I give fair warning to the boys in the press gallery that it will deteriorate to a point where we will have to confront them or just cease to exist.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those few words I would like to close by saying that - I can hardly say that I cannot support the bill, although I do not see why I am supporting a bill

MR. MOORES: that will give an extra burden of debt to the municipalities in this Province, the taxpayers in this Province who cannot afford what they have right now in many cases.

Reluctantly and begrudgingly, I support the legislation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Shall the resolution carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Not quite yet, Mr. Chairman.

I have only a few points I wish to make and I should be able to do them within the ten minutes that are left before we come to the Late Show.

First of all, I would like to thank the minister for his kindness in giving the information to the Committee earlier. I regret that I was not here, but as my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, told the minister, I was seeing a delegation of constituents who had come into town and who, the minister will be glad to hear for once, do not have a complaint with the provincial government, they have just given up on the Province entirely, but wish to have some dealings with the federal government and they sought my advice. So I am terribly sorry I was not here when the minister did something which he has not done very often, namely, give us some information, but if it will make him feel any better, I was seeing a number of my constituents and I trust they found the meeting as enjoyable and as profitable as I did.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, let me go on very quickly to make a couple of other points.

First of all, as has been pointed out by a number of my colleagues and as I pointed out yesterday when we began to discuss this bill, this is a rather classic case of locking the barn door after the



MR. ROBERTS: horse has gone through it. I am not going to say 'after the horse has been stolen' because that is not correct, but after the horse has gone through it. And this is just a clear case of the House being asked to ratify a decision long after the decision has been done, long after there is any effective power left in the House to make the decision one way or the other. What we are really seeing is just a mockery of the whole principle of representative and responsible government. The government we now have, the present administration, prates piously about the regard in which they hold the House, and yet, by their every instance and their every act they make it quite clear that they regard the House as being, at best, a necessary rubber stamp. At worst, of course, I think they regard the House as being an intolerable nuisance, a burden upon the body politic. It is the government that is the burden upon the body politic and not the House. But I simply want to record that, that in this case again, the House is being asked to ratify a decision that has been taken for long. It has been taken a year and a half ago, a decision that has been implemented for over a year and it is a mockery of the whole process of responsible government. The ministers opposite could not care less about it; it is of no interest to them, no concern to them. If they even direct their minds to it, they think it is either partisan of us to raise this, in which case they are wrong, or they simply feel that the House is, at best, an administrative necessity, something that must be done, a step which must be taken in the process and, of course, in that they are as wrong as wrong could be. Because, as Your Honour realizes full well, the House is really the essential keystone in the whole

MR. ROBERTS: process and what we are doing now, in the dog days of July when everybody wants to be away from here, is really the very essence of this House's role in the whole democratic process.

I want to thank the Minister of Education (Ms Verge). I think she is the only person in the whole House who is listening to what I am saying. The Chairman, of course, is listening.

I was going to go on to say, and I will say about the minister and about her seat mate, her political bedfellow - they are adjacent; if John Crosbie were here he would say, 'heart to heart and cheek to cheek' and we will leave it at

MR. ROBERTS:           that out of deference to their respect spouses, to the Matrimonial Property act, other relevant legislation and so forth. I was going to say the minister is the only one capable of understanding it, but of course I include the Chairman. It goes without saying that the Chairman not only follows assiduously but is capable of understanding. Perhaps the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), now that she has rendered such distinguished service to the cause of education, ought to become the Minister of Finance and thereby adding considerably both to the educational aspects of the administration's policy and to the financial aspect. She will be doing a favour to both departments to move from Education to Finance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one other point, that is to reiterate a suggestion that has been made many times before by many groups. I believe the Whelan Royal Commission made the recommendation, certainly we have made it in the House. It ought to be made because it ought to be implemented. That is that the time has come in this Province when we ought to have a municipal projects assessment and approval board, whatever name we put on it. And I commend this particularly to my friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), because in a year or two he will be in a position to do something about this. And I want to say to him that I would think one of the reforms that ought to be made is to put into place an impartial and knowledgeable body that would be asked to assess and to recommend the projects which receive municipal development assistance.

Now, what would that do? It would take into account the inescapable fact that there is never going to be enough money available to the government of this Province either by cash or by credit, there is never going to be enough money available to enable the government,

MR. ROBERTS: even if they wanted to meet all of the requests put upon them by municipalities, to meet those requests. There just is not enough money. And that is not going to change. It is not going to change whether it is a Liberal administration or a Tory administration. There simply is not enough money. But what it will change is the kind of partisan, picayune, petulant politics which we are seeing played by this administration. It is the first time in the twenty-three years - I am sorry - in the thirty-two years we have been a Province that we have had a government, an administration, that has played this sort of game. The Smallwood administration, for whatever its faults may have been, never played the sort of game that the Peckford administration plays. The Moores administration, whatever its faults may have been - and we are only beginning to scratch the surface of the faults of the Moores administration - had never played the kind of petulant, petty politics that the hon. ministers opposite are now playing.

This bill reflects it and this year's allocation, which is not in this bill but which will come up in due course, a year or so from now, for debate makes it crystal clear. The administration has simply decided to send to Coventry any district which had the temerity to vote other than Liberal. Now, there is not argument with that. The facts are inescapable. The facts are crystal clear. The only priority admitted by the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who is sitting there

MR. ROBERTS: smirking as only he can - he is going to strangle one of these days on his self-righteousness and the loudest cheer will come from his own colleagues, not from us, we would not cheer at that. As I said yesterday in respect of his colleague and friend, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. gentleman has helped to create the mess, let him try to get out of it. But the only - speaking of rubbish, in comes the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), rubbish personified. But, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: I told him today about his big feet. Anybody who has big feet has no brains.

MR. ROBERTS: Anybody who has big feet has no brains, then the gentleman from St. John's North must have giant feet.

MR. NEARY: Pontoons.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have only a minute or two and I do want to make the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I would simply say that the only priority recognized by this administration in deciding where provincial assistance goes is the partisan political one. I will say that the facts make that inescapably clear and I will say, furthermore, that if they think for one moment that the people of this Province are going to be responsive to this in the way in which the administration want it - they think they are going to be able to bludgeon or terrorize people in districts throughout this Province to vote for them - then my answer is simply let us have the election, the quicker the better, and we will let the people choose. If anybody thinks the people in Exploits district are going to vote for the member from Exploits (Mr. Twomey) simply because they are being bludgeoned into it, they are wrong.

MR. ROBERTS: If they should vote for him again it will be because they believe he is the better candidate running his party is the best one to run the affairs of the Province.

MR. MARSHALL: They have good taste.

MR. ROBERTS: They have good taste? Perhaps they do have good taste, Sir. I have never faulted the people of a district for electing a member. They choose him of their own free choice and once they choose him it speaks for itself. The people in Exploits have good taste, it is the member who does not because of the associates he chooses. But the people themselves in that district have impeccable taste. They have chosen to elect the member for the district of Exploits and I accept their decision without any hesitation at all. But I will say that if the ministry think for one minute they can bludgeon people, then they have another think coming. And I will say it here and I will say it elsewhere throughout the Province, anywhere throughout the Province, and we will see what happens in the next election. The quicker that election comes the better, the quicker it comes the better. Only the Premier can hold it. I venture to say it is the last thing from his mind now in the state of panic which is setting in in the Peckford administration. And it is, the political panic is setting in, the political rot is setting in. It is setting in as surely now as it set in in the Clark administration, in the Smallwood administration, in the Trudeau administration, in the Moores administration. You could see it. There comes a point in the life of an administration when the political rot sets in. In the case of the Peckford administration it has taken just two years and it is there now. It is gangrenous. If I were to offer a medical opinion - and I know that the

MR. ROBERTS: gentleman from St. John's South, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), would concur with this - the only remedy for it is immediate amputation. And the immediate person to amputate, of course, politically would be the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: A very healthy organism.

MR. ROBERTS: A very healthy organism - the hon. gentleman's medical opinion in that case is just as valid as his fiscal opinion. But, Mr. Chairman, as the case may be we have come up now to 5:30, we on this side have said that voting for or against this bill is a complete waste of time because every nickel of this money has been spent and allocated, but let it be recorded that this administration has only one priority in deciding what ought to be done municipally or what ought not and that, of course, is the purely partisan one. The time has come in this Province for an independent assessment board that could weigh it, could give its advice and let the Cabinet decide. I would not take away from the Cabinet the power to decide because the Cabinet answers to the House and to the people. But I think the time has come for an independent assessment, and the need for that has been made glowingly obvious by the government's conduct as exemplified in this bill among other places.

Thank you, Sir.

On motion, resolution carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution and a bill consequent thereto, without amendment, carried.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Is has been agreed to stop the clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered the matters to them referred and has directed me to report that it has adopted a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that it has considered the matters to it referred, directs him to report that they have passed a certain resolution and recommends that a certain bill consequent thereto be introduced.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957 (Bill No. 78) read a first, second and third time, by leave, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It being five-thirty a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

The matter for debate raised by the hon. Member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is 100 Huntley Street.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable indeed that a matter of such a delicate nature should have to be raised in this hon. House, but it has to be raised, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if hon. members are aware that the sponsors of 100 Huntley Street, which no doubt members have viewed on television on many occasions,



MR. NEARY: decided some time ago to sponsor an hour and a half programme right across Canada, from coast to coast, as a Christian salute to Canada. It was non-denominational or inter-denominational, if you want to call it that, it was certainly non-denominational in the strict sense of the word and non-political. Now, in every Province of Canada the sponsors of 100 Huntley Street, who wanted to promote this Christian salute to Canada, wrote all the provincial governments right from coast to coast, from Newfoundland to British Columbia. In every other province, except Newfoundland, the sponsors of this Christian salute to Canada were given the privilege of using the Parliament building, in every other province in Canada, from Nova Scotia to British Columbia, except Newfoundland. In Newfoundland they were refused the use of the lobby of Confederation Building to carry out this Christian salute to Canada and to Canadians.

A Committee member in Newfoundland approached the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and after many delays the Minister of Public Works finally - he was approached, by the way, the minister was approached both orally and in writing. When they wrote they did not get a reply and they had to keep calling the minister until finally they received a reply. And the reply merely stated that the lobby of Confederation Building, the Parliament building was not available. That is all that was said.

MR. NEARY: There was no reference to having to call out additional staff, no reference to anything, just a simple message saying, 'It was not available.'

So then, Mr. Speaker, the Committee members in Newfoundland then approached the Premier's Office. Because they could not believe this, all the other provinces had agreed, so they approached the Premier's Office. Mr. Petten in the Premier's Office said, 'There must be some misunderstanding. He could not believe that the Minister of Public Works had refused to allow this non-interdenominational service to take place in the Lobby of Confederation, so he said he would look into it. And he was sure that the answer would be favourable. He came back and he was told to tell the committee men that he could not comment on it. He could not give any comment. Obviously, he had spoken to the Premier, or somebody in high places, and he was told he could make no further comment on it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the affair went ahead. It was held over in the Canada Games Park. And Mr. Speaker, there were representatives of every religious denomination in Newfoundland present at that special hour and a half, televised from coast to coast in the Canada Games Park, in the rain.

MR. HISCOCK: What was the weather like?

MR. NEARY: It was raining. They had to sit in the rain. They had to hold their service in the rain because the government here refused to let them use the Lobby of Confederation Building.

MR. HISCOCK: How long? How long?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is typical of what we have been getting from this government. It is shameful. It is disgusting, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely disgusting. There is no explanation for it. They were not told 100 Huntley Street was not told that staff would have to be called out, that it was a holiday, They were not told that. If they had been told that, no doubt they would have made arrangements. They were not told, Mr. Speaker. It is shameful. And the administration should be ashamed of themselves for refusing this Christian Salute To Canada to be televised from Newfoundland to British Columbia.

MR. NEARY: That is something to be proud of, the only Province in Canada to say no to the sponsors of this Christian Salute to Canadians and to Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Now, I could become political and say well maybe they are anti-Canadian, maybe it is because of the separatist movement. But I am not going to say that, Mr. Speaker, I am merely going to end up by saying that all of us in this Province deserve an explanation. If there is no explanation, then the Premier, who no doubt was the instigator, who issued the instructions, and his ministers should hang their heads in shame.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as usual the members of the Opposition wish to make political something which should be above and beyond politics, but it is their normal tout, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK: Why were they not given it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: When the Opposition find that on all the major issues that face this Province, important

PREMIER PECKFORD: issues like the cost of living, like unemployment, like jobs, like things which really matter to people, they find that they are in a vacuum, they are out in the cold because this government has got the right policies on these issues. They have to look far afield and try to find something on which they can try to place this government in some ill-repute, and they try to do it now through silly statements as it relates to municipalities which we co-operate with fully, and now they are trying to do it through some particular thing like this.

MR. HISCOCK: Be very careful now.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, I do not intend to make a political football out of something as important as Canada Day, as important as various incorporations who practice Christianity. And I do not intend

PREMIER PECKFORD: to embroil myself into that kind of political game. Now, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is renowned for that kind of tactic, very renowned for it, but he can pull all he likes, he can drag all he likes but he will not drag me or this side of the House into that kind of situation or into that kind of problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are not going to kowtow, we are not going to stoop to that kind of way, to that kind of tactic and the member for LaPoile can crawl all he likes, we will take the high ground and the member for LaPoile can stay on the low ground as long as he wants but we will not travel on it. We will take the high road, you can take the low road. On these kinds of issues they are above and beyond politics and the member for LaPoile will not embroil us in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 3, 1981 at 10:00 A.M.