

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1981

The House met at 3.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR.STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr.Collins) dealing with the answer that he gave me in the House the last day we sat, having to do with the Budget. The Premier has released some information to the Institute of Chartered Accountants.Would the Minister of Finance indicate whether or not the Budget will be brought down before the April 10th by-election?

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

Dr.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the last day I think I answered the question for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and I said that about mid-week or thereabouts I hoped to be in a position to give a firm date and I am afraid that still stands.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR.STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the Premier in speaking to the Chartered Accountants Association indicated that the Department of Health budget was being cut back, I think, from \$20 million to \$30 million more than was requested. Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) confirm that figure?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen that quote described to the hon. Premier and possibly it would be best if the hon. Leader of the Opposition directed that question to the Premier when he is available in the House.

DR. COLLINS: At this point in time I think it would be inappropriate for me to mention anything that is in the Budget or will be in the Budget.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is what I thought, it would be inappropriate for anyone to be discussing figures in the Budget certainly before a firm of chartered accountants or an association of chartered accountants. Would the minister indicate whether or not the figure of \$30 million cut in the education budget was a figure that has been discussed and agreed to? And that was also a figure released by the Premier in speaking to the firm of chartered accountants.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, of course I am not in a position to say exactly where the hon. Leader of the Opposition got his information but my response to the last question applies to this one also. I would just like to suggest that quite possibly the hon. the Premier mentioned certain ball park figures but I would doubt very, very much indeed whether he was dealing with any precise figures that will be in the Budget.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: A final supplementary. Do I understand from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) then that the Budget has been prepared and the Premier would have access to the figures that are in the Budget?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition understands that the budgetary process is a fairly prolonged one and that as we get near the end of the process the hon. the Premier is directly involved. But the figures that go into the budget change from week to week, and towards the end almost from day to day as various matters are considered and various requests are one compared with the other and related to the revenues available to government.

So in answer to the question all I can say is that the Premier certainly does have current information regarding the budget available to him. But the budgetary process is not yet completed, and it is not finalized. The budget has not been finalized at this date.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. House). The Minister of Health has indicated to the people in the Come By Chance area that it is his recommendation that the Come By Chance Hospital be closed when the Clarenville Hospital is opened. Would the Minister of Health confirm that that is his understanding?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, a group of mayors from the area around Come By Chance, and including Come By Chance, met in my office and they asked me if there had been a decision and would the Come By Chance Hospital be closing when the Clarenville Hospital came on stream. And I advised them that there had been no decision, government had made no decision as to whether the hospital would close or not.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: As I understand it, the people who attended that meeting were given a very specific reply by the Minister of Health (Mr. House) that it was the recommendation of his department - the political decision had not been made - but the recommendation of his department was that the Come By Chance Hospital would be closed when the Clarendville Hospital opened.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the members who came there told me that it was the recommendation of my department that it would be closed. I did not tell them that it was a recommendation of the department. As a matter of fact, they were referring to a letter from a director of hospital services to a doctor in the Come By Chance area, who wrote sometime in January asking what would be the future. The fellow wrote back and said from his personal point of view that he would see the hospital phasing out as an in-patient facility. And that was not the specific recommendation from the department at all, it was a personal point of view because the specific recommendation had not been made and it is still not made. And besides that, they asked him for his point of view, and he said, 'I will give you my personal point of view,' but, he said, 'that could change.' Of course, I can get a copy of that letter.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is now saying that a responsible person in his department is given the authority to make personal comments? Is that person now still in the employ of the department and does he speak for the department?

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, you do not go around just firing everybody who is asked for a personal opinion and gives a personal opinion. As a matter of fact, the fellow is a very well respected member of the Department of Health and I see no reason in the world for saying anything to him about this particular thing. He was asked for a personal opinion and he gave it.

MR. STIRLING: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Would the Minister of Health indicate that if what the Premier says is true, that the Health Budget is going to be cut back by \$30 million, will this affect the minister's plans for the building of the Clarendville Hospital? And if that is so, would he indicate to the people of Come By Chance what the position of the Department of Health is relative to the Come By Chance Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the questions in his preamble takes into consideration a lot of 'ifs' and, of course, these are all rhetorical questions and, you know, I do not like answering these kinds of questions. The fact is we have made an announcement, we made an announcement earlier this year, again at a number of press conferences around the Province and again there was reference to it in the Throne

MR. HOUSE: Speech debate that the hospital will go on. The plan that we outlined, the five year plan, will go on as we scheduled it, that is, of course, that the hospital in Port aux Basques will be continuing on this year and that planning for Clarendville continue this year.

With respect to giving the people of the Come By Chance an answer, I do not see any necessity for giving an answer to a problem that is going to come up five years down the road.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr, Speaker, I want to come back to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in connection with the Budget. But just as a preamble, I might say it must be awfully embarrassing to the ministers to hear the Premier make these statements at public functions without prior consultations with his ministers; they obviously do not know what is going on.

Could the Minister of Finance, because of the lateness of the Budget this year, indicate what the construction workers can expect in this Province in the way of construction this year because, as the hon. gentleman knows, a late Budget means that no plans can be made for the construction industry that employs so many Newfoundlanders? Could the hon. gentleman tell us what they can expect in the construction industry this year?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the time the Budget will come down will have any significant impact on the construction industry. I think the hon. member is probably referring mainly to road construction, and in that respect I would think that the hon. the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) could answer more precisely, but I do not anticipate that there will be any difficulty in putting in place the programme, the road construction programme that the department has in mind.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I wonder would the Minister of Transportation care to take the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) up on his invitation? The question I asked was that because of the lateness of the Budget and because the construction industry has to prepare for the construction season and because workers, so many Newfoundlanders depend on the construction of highways and public buildings and so forth for employment in order to get enough stamps to get their unemployment for the Winter, what can we expect in the construction industry this year? Will there be any contracts called and tenders called and contracts let before the Budget is brought down? Can the minister identify the projects that will be undertaken in the construction industry this year?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that is something that has been of great concern to the Department of Transportation for a number of years, that we have not been able to call tenders and award contracts in the Winter or real early in the Spring. There is an act - I do not know which one it is - which states that we cannot, in fact, call tenders and award tenders until such time as the money has been approved, that the Budget has been approved in the House. And it is a matter of great concern because as the Department of Transportation we would very much like to know right now, or we would have liked to have known a month or more ago, what money is available. And then our engineers could have all the planning done and the tenders out and have them let so that as soon as the frost went out of the ground we could start work. But unfortunately we cannot do that. We have to wait until the Budget is brought in the House and approved by the House before we can even call tenders, and the end result - this happens year after year after year and we are not allowed to do anything else - you know, what it means is that it is up in June or July before we actually know who has the jobs and they start work, and that means that half the year is gone.

So, we would like very much, Mr. Speaker, to know now or a month before now, what work is going to be done because if we did we could get more work done and spend more money, because almost every year invariably we end up with money on our books that is not spent because the frost has come and the contractors cannot work, the snow has come, the work has to be carried over from year to year. So we would very much like to be able to do that but we are not permitted because the law will not permit it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

March 23, 1981

Tape NO. 550

EL - 3

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe
what I just heard from the hon. gentleman, that money is left
on the table. The minister is unable to spend the money.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Yes, I would like to see that,
Mr. Speaker. And here you have contractors in this Province
ready to go bankrupt.

MR. HANCOCK: Gone.

MR. NEARY: And they are going every day and
all of them will go bankrupt unless -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised
by the hon. the President of the Council.

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 551

DW - 1

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: The Question Period -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order.

MR. W. MARSHALL: - is for the purpose of asking questions, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is capable of asking incisive questions; he is also capable of making speeches as well. Right now he is making a speech. He could reserve his for the Address in Reply and get on to asking questions.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, I had allowed some leeway because I had assumed the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was giving a little bit of a preamble, and I think it is tradition that we allow a little bit of a preamble, but I must caution him not to get into debate and to ask his supplementary question.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that so many construction companies and businesses in this Province are on the brink of bankruptcy, in view of the fact that so many Newfoundlanders are being forced on welfare because of lack of work in the construction industry -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: - and being forced out of business because of lack of work in the construction industry, would the hon. minister indicate to the House the number of projects, what kind of projects he is talking about, identify some of the projects that are being delayed until June or July which is too late, as the hon. gentleman just indicated, for the construction season? Can the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what kind of - could he identify some of these projects that are being delayed awaiting the Budget? And why can tenders not be called pending the approval of the Budget in the House? I mean, that seems silly to me that the hon. gentleman cannot call tenders

MR. S. NEARY: pending the - because the Budget is going to be approved anyway. The majority are on the government side of the House -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. member is now debating.

Could he please ask his question?

MR. S. NEARY: -the majority are over there.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the Act is the Financial Administration Act which will not permit us to call tenders until, in fact, the money is in place -

MR. NEARY: Or award contracts.

MR. C. BRETT: Or award contracts.

MR. NEARY: Call tenders.

MR. C. BRETT: Call tenders - well, what is the difference? You can call tenders, I mean you can call tenders anytime, but you cannot award the contract until the money is there. So you can call tenders in January but you cannot award the contract until the money has been approved by the House of Assembly. So calling the tenders is not going to improve the situation. So that is the simple answer to the first part of the question, that the Financial Administration Act will not permit us to call tenders and award contracts until such time as the money has been voted by the House of Assembly.

And secondly, a list of contracts or a list of jobs, the answer to that is all jobs, you know, no matter -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. C. BRETT: Just a minute now. No matter what we have planned for next year, no matter what the government has approved for next year or no matter what the govern-

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 551

DW - 3

MR. C. BRETT: ment approves, what the Cabinet
approves for next year, tenders cannot be called until such
time as the money has been approved by the House of Assembly.

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

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

MR. NEARY: I understand that,
Mr. Speaker, that the government cannot award contracts,
but at least the government could call tenders now, identify
the work and have the bids in and have the contracts ready
to be let when the budget goes through, and obviously the
budget is going to go through because the majority are on
that side of the House -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - and they are going to
force the budget through. Why cannot the minister call
tenders now? At least let the construction industry, and
the construction workers know what they can look forward
to this year and when the budget is approved, let the contract.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of
Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, number one,
I do not think we are allowed to call tenders. But number
two, how can you call tenders until you know what money is
approved? Now it would be very presumptuous of the government
to call tenders -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: - it would be very presumptuous
of the government to call tenders for jobs when we did not
know if the House was going to approve the money or not. And
that is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: No. No. Come on now.
There is no politics in that. How can I tomorrow instruct
Mr. White to go out and call tenders - my Deputy Minister,
Mr. White - to go out and call tenders on a job when I do not
know how much money the Cabinet or the House, which has the
final word, is going to approve? I mean there is no way.

MR. BRETT:

We can suggest -

MR. NEARY:

How did you approve (inaudible).

MR. BRETT:

We can suggest to the Cabinet or to the House or whatever a certain number of dollars, but until such time as that has actually been approved then I cannot call public tenders. There is no way.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRETT:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Is the hon. gentleman telling the House then that he does not know at this moment, he cannot identify the work that is going to be done this year, that he does not know at this moment what the government is going to do this year - and here it is the 23rd. of March - is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is right. That is absolutely right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

No wonder they are calling for your resignation.

MR. BRETT:

No, Mr. Speaker, the budget has not been finalized. It has not been approved by the House and therefore there is no way for anyone to know what is going to be done next year.

MR. NEARY:

You do not know?

MR. BRETT:

But, you know, in spite of the fact that the hon. member is questioning me and I am trying to answer, we are both on the same wave length because I agree with him 100 per cent, there is no question about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: I think that I should know probably in December -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: In December I should know what money I will have to spend -

MR. TULK: Are you on Treasury Board?

MR. BRETT: - this year? But the law will not permit us to do it. It is as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member yield?

MR. HISCOCK: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member yields.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Do I understand the hon.

gentleman correctly, he is talking about Treasury Board approval, is the hon. gentleman not a member of Treasury Board?

MR. BRETT: I never mentioned Treasury Board.

MR. NEARY: Never mentioned Treasury

Board. The hon. gentleman is a member of Treasury Board?

MR. BRETT: Yes.

MR. NEARY: And it is Treasury Board that approves the projects, and here it is now the 23rd. of March and the projects are not approved yet. What kind of a shambles, what kind of a disaster are we going to have in the construction industry this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have been

MR. BRETT: a member of Treasury Board for a long time, four or five years. Treasury Board does not run the government. And I am sure the hon. member, who was at one time a Cabinet minister, is quite aware of that.

MR. NEARY: I was a member of Treasury Board too.

MR. BRETT: Treasury Board may suggest, may make recommendations and so on and so on, but the hon. member knows that the final decision does not rest with Treasury Board and the final decision is the bottom line, the Budget. You know, that is the bottom line and of course even then it still has to come before the House for final approval.

MR. NEARY: What an incredible mess.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: My question is also to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett), with regard to the community of Cartwright. Cartwright is rather concerned that last year because of a small population they had trouble meeting their budget. They have a plow and they have a truck and various other municipal equipment. In this community the snow clearing operation for last year was given to Headland Construction, which is owned by Mel Woodward Limited. There were no tenders called whatsoever, it was just given to Mr. Woodward's company. Could the minister inform this House why was not the community council in Cartwright notified about this so that they could have at least bid on this tender? And number two, could the minister also inform this House how much was this contract - because there was no tender called - how much was this contract given to Mr. Woodward as blatant political patronage?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 23,1981

Tape No. 553

AH-2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, this is a real twist this is after what we have heard in the last three or four days. I am sorry, I have to advise the hon. member that I certainly do not have the information at my fingertips as to why Mr. Woodward was given the job of clearing the snow in that particular community. I have no idea in the world why public tenders were not called and I have no idea what the cost was, but I am certain, I am absolutely certain that there was a good reason for it and I will certainly get the information for the hon. member. I would love to get the information.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary. The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) but seeing he is not in his seat then I will pass and pick up along the way.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and it has to do again with the construction industry. Could the hon. gentleman indicate why work has been curtailed on the Upper Salmon? All the workers were sent home a week or ten days ago and were told they would be recalled today and today they were notified that they would not be recalled for an indefinite period. What is the problem? Is it a financial problem with Newfoundland Hydro? What is the problem with the work proceeding on the Upper Salmon?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that information may be available to the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), who I expect will be in the House hopefully before Question Period is over and he may be able to give the information the hon. member requests. At this point in time I certainly have no information on that. If the hon. minister does not come back, I will undertake to make the information available.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett). Could the minister advise what time roughly he would expect to know how much road will be paved this year? How much highway in the Province will be upgraded and paved this year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say as much as possible—that would be very arrogant, you know, that is ridiculous.

MR. STIRLING: When will you know?

MR. BRETT: When will I know?

MR. STIRLING: When the Budget comes down, I guess.

MR. BRETT: Yes, that is the answer, Mr.

Speaker, I will know when the Budget comes down because right now I do not, I am serious, I do not know. See, I do not think the hon. members on the other side understand the way the system works.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: No, really -

AN HON. MEMBER: And they do not understand.

MR. BRETT: As the Department of Transportation, we see 2,000 miles of road in this Province that need to be upgraded and paved and there is nothing, absolutely nothing in the world, that we would like better than to see every inch

MR. BRETT: of that upgraded and paved as quickly as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BRETT: That is not for political reasons. The reason is this, that it is so much easier for us to maintain a paved road than a gravel road, much, much easier. So what we want, we would dearly love to see the whole thing done in the next year or two years or whenever it is physically possible to do it. And because of that, Mr. Speaker, we send up our programme every year, and I can assure you right now that our programme is ten times as much as the government is ever going to approve for the simple reason that the money is not there. So there is no way that I can tell the hon. member what roads or how much is going to be paved. I will know when the Budget comes down. When we know what dollars we have, then we will decide what roads are going to be done.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I understand there are some forty-six miles of gravel road in the Bellevue district. Could the minister answer if any of those roads will be paved this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that every single inch of that forty-six miles of gravel road in Bellevue will be paved this year.

MR. MORGAN: By a PC member for the area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance and the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins). I wonder if the minister can indicate whether there has been any change in status of the two strikes within the Public Service, namely, the one involving the workers

MR. LUSH: at the College of Trades and Technology and the one involving the workers at the Workers' Compensation Board, whether there has been any change in the status of these strikes the last few days or whether the government have taken any steps to get both sides back to the bargaining table?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there has been no change. Because of other activities, I did not have an opportunity of checking with the Secretary of Treasury Board this morning if he had heard of any

DR. J. COLLINS: change there, but I feel pretty certain that if there had been any significant change he would have been chasing me. I did not hear from him so I assume, and I am pretty certain this is so, that there has not been any change since the situation last week.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware that the bargaining unit, with respect to the workers at the College of Trades and Technology, were rejected a conciliation board. I am wondering if the minister is aware of any other steps taken within the normal procedures for resolution of a labour dispute, whether the minister is aware of any steps taken outside of this step by the union to seek a conciliation board, whether there have been any other steps taken by this bargaining unit or any other steps taken by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have a conciliation officer in place and a conciliation officer is available to both sides any hour of the day. And the conciliation officer himself on a regular basis checks with one side or the other to see if there is any new point coming up that needs to be looked into or any avenue that looks in any way hopeful is being thought of. And we ourselves have suggested to the conciliation officer certain points that he may bring to the attention of the union to get their reaction, and I am sure he has done that. To date there has not been anything come out of that, but that mechanism is still in place. It is a very useful mechanism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the

hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, can the

minister indicate whether or not the bargaining unit

for the support staff of the College of Trades and Technology,

can the minister indicate whether or not that unit asked for

a mediation officer?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

I am not sure whether they

asked for a mediation officer. They did ask at one time that

the question of mediation be considered. Now I think the hon.

Minister for Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) has pointed out

to hon. members that the act does not contain such a provision.

In other words, the act really does not say anything about

mediation as such. Conciliation, arbitration, yes. Mediation,

no. This is a mechanism, but as I say it is not in the act.

It has been brought up. It has not been given to anyone

to my knowledge in any very definitive form, what is

considered by that. But I think it would be fair to say

that we have indicated that we do not think

DR. COLLINS: that this would be a useful mechanism, be it in the act or not, that this would be a useful mechanism in regard to this labour dispute.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The time for Oral Question has expired.

Hon. members, I am sure, would like to join with me in welcoming to the Gallery today Council Chairman W. A. Rideout and Councillor Paul Corwin from the Council of Lushes Bight, Beaumont in the district of Green Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: On a point of privilege,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of privilege, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that I have to bring a point of privilege to the House before the House at the quickest possible opportunity and this is the quickest possible opportunity. And, Mr. Speaker, I will leave myself in your hands to decide whether or not I have a bona fide point of privilege but I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Prima facie.

MR. FLIGHT: - prima facie or whatever term we use, Mr. Speaker. But I believe that my rights in this House, Mr. Speaker, in this House of Assembly have been breached and I would put myself in your hands to decide whether or not they have indeed, and if you would give me a minute I will give you the basis of my point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I have represented the district of Windsor - Buchans for in excess of five years. Every member in this House will know that in that five years, four to five years prior to that, the town of Buchans lived with a five-year life expectancy kind of thing,

MR. FLIGHT: never more than five years. This past five years have been crises situations in that town. We went from an in excess of 500 man payroll to 333. For months in the recent past, a year or so ago, there was only a month's life expectancy left, a total shutdown was facing the people of Buchans. And one of the problems has always been never being kept informed as to what exactly is happening with regards to the mining operation. The government of the day, Mr. Speaker, undertook, at the recommendation of a task force report, to get monthly projections from the company as to what their projections were with the ongoing operation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last year the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) stood in this House and made a statement that was given to him by Abitibi-Price indicating that a new ore body had been found and that it looked promising and that they believed that it would go into production. The people of Buchans got what they thought was a reprieve but, Sir, these past months there have been indications that that ore body may not be developed in time to stop a shutdown. The ore itself is not consistent. They are not sure the quantity is there, they are not sure of the method they were used to mine and the question now, Sir, Buchans is rife, Buchans is rife with the question as to just exactly what is going to happen. There are indications that the company has indicated officially -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I believe the hon. member may be going a little further than he should be allowed. I assume he is making a preamble leading up to his point of privilege?

MR. FLIGHT: There is an indication, Sir, that the work force in Buchans will be

MR. G. FLIGHT: work force in Buchans will be drastically reduced by June of this year, in three months now. And as I say the town itself is rife with questions and nobody seems to be able to get the answers.

I stood in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) a non-provocative, Mr. Speaker. The questions are here, any fair-minded person can judge the questions that I asked the minister. And the minister, Mr. Speaker, in answering accused me of using scare tactics in questioning the situation in Buchans. I asked a responsible question that I have a right to ask. I asked, based on the facts and based on the concerns that I know to be in Buchans and based on information that I was given a day before I asked the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be ashamed if I wittingly or unwittingly used scare tactics in this House. If I played on the sense of insecurities in this town, if I played on the anxieties of the people of that town I would be ashamed if any other member representing any other district who had a town in the situation that Buchans is in it would be below contempt for him to use the situation as scare tactics or in political terms. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe - I want that remark withdrawn. The damage may be done, Mr. Speaker. The press correctly reported the minister in saying that I was using scare tactics on the Buchans situation. That damage is done. I may be able to deal with that myself in my own way outside of this House but, I believe, Sir, that I am entitled to and I ask now for a retraction of that statement by the minister that I used the Buchans situation - used scare tactics in phrasing my question to the Minister of Mines and Energy on the Buchans situation. I want that statement retracted.

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 557

DW - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, yes, that was the phrase that I used and, yes, the press correctly reported it. I said that the hon. member opposite was using scare tactics. I repeat that again today, Mr. Speaker; that is exactly what the hon. member has done in this spurious point of privilege which he has raised. "Indications are the ore body will not be developed this year," "Indications are the work force will be reduced this year" - incidentally, the press incorrectly quoted the response in the House on that point. I will refer to that correction in a moment, Mr. Speaker. "Indications are that the work force will be reduced." "Indications are that the ore body will not be developed". Indications from whom, Mr. Speaker? Indications from the hon. member opposite and nobody else including the company.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY:

Indications are, Mr. Speaker, received by me, as I indicated in response to the member's question, on information received from the company two days before I gave the hon. member the answer, further indications received from the company since, when I double checked just in case the hon. member for once in his life knew what he was talking about, and, Mr. Speaker, it is confirmed again that there is nothing in what the hon. member opposite is saying as far as the company is concerned. And the quote in the press that I indicated that there would be some reduction in the work force is incorrect. And it just goes to show the affect, Mr. Speaker, of the tactics used by the hon. member opposite when he creates the very confusion by the muddying of the water by his quotes of "indications are." Indications from whom, Mr. Speaker? Let the hon. member get up and say who the indications are from. I did not say there would be any reduction

MR. L. BARRY: in the work force and if things go as they should there will not be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I believe we are entering more into the area of a debate at the present time rather than discussion on the point of privilege. I will reserve my ruling on the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and give a ruling at a later time.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A further point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A further point of privilege, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, for the hon. minister's information, I had no intention of releasing this information to the House of Assembly, but since the hon. minister has asked me to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. member has a point of privilege.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A point of privilege, yes, Sir. And the point of privilege is that the minister has accused me again today of scare tactics. Well, my information came from the federal Minister of Mines (J.Erola) that Asarco and Abitibi-Price reports to. I have documentation not only saying that the work force will go in June from 333 employees, but naming the number of employees and designated the skills that will be used and the kind of work they will be doing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Withdraw.

MR. G. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Speaker, there is certain circumstances that that will not happen. And for anyone who knows the Buchans mining operation right now it is practically impossible for those circumstances to take place. So Buchans is

MR. FLIGHT: facing a curtailment from -
MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
MR. FLIGHT: - 333 to 90.
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
MR. FLIGHT: And the minister is not getting
the information he is supposed to get from ASARCO.
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think I can rule on that particular point of privilege at the present time. There is not a prima facie case of privilege but the hon. member has taken the opportunity to dispute or argue facts that may or may not have been attributed to him and that is not a point of privilege, certainly not a prima facie case point of privilege.

The original point of privilege related to the comments "scare tactics". I would like to review Hansard and I will give a ruling on that at a later time.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.
DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to subsection (2) of section 28 of The Financial Administration Act, I wish to table special warrants related to the Departments of Social Services, Transportation and Justice.
MR. SPEAKER: Further reports?

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.
DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the granting of interim supply to Her Majesty.
MR. SPEAKER: Further notices?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I understand before I arrived in the House today the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked a question concerning the Upper Salmon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes.

MR. BARRY: Well I just had the question briefly reported to me. It is my understanding that the fine weather that the rest of us have been enjoying has created problems for contractors on the Upper Salmon, and presumably for contractors elsewhere in the Province, in that the roads have become soft. I am not sure whether this is actually what has happened today. I will check and make sure but I had received information last week that there was a possibility of a shutdown because the roads were turing into a bit of a mess because of the balmy weather and the softness that resulted.

MR. SPEAKER: Further answers to questions?
The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question number 15, asked by the member for St. Barbe to myself and it appeared on the Order Paper of March 4th. The question must be 15A I guess, 15A, B, C, and D. The first, 15A is that \$22,328,000 was budgeted for snow clearing for the year 1980-81 and the next part of the question, at last reporting date, which was March 10th., 1981, a total of \$19,567,000 has been spent. So that is a saving of between \$2 million and \$3 million. The next part of the question, the answer is the budget for 1979-80 was \$19,483,000 as compared to \$22,328,00 for 1980-81. And then the last part of the question with respect to private contractors, payments to private contractors totalled \$963,217 to March 10th., 1981. And this amount covers a total of fifty individual

MR. BRETT: contracts all arranged by public tender.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I also want to table the answers to questions by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) with respect to the transportation of my private yacht - a question mark - from Harbour Breton to Clarenville. I have the total correspondence, whatever correspondence was on it. I have enough for all members of the House. Just a few brief remarks in tabling this information to say that had I known, had I known that it was going to cost this much I would not have touched it with a ten foot pole, because I had a boat, a much larger boat than the one that I have now, moved from Bonavista to Clarenville last Spring at a fraction of this cost. Unfortunately I got stuck and had to use the department equipment and when I got the list of expenses in February I went snakey and even to this minute I question whether I should have paid it or not. But anyway I guess I did not have much choice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you pay it?

MR. BRETT: Oh yes, it has been paid. Yes. But, you know, I question whether I should have paid such an exorbitant amount. Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, the correspondence is here between the staff, there were three people involved, my deputy minister, my executive assistant and myself, and they are the only people who were involved as far as written correspondence are concerned. But the total cost, which I think is exorbitant, and I am stuck with it now and there is not very much I can do about it except be angry,

MR. BRETT: The total cost was \$1,887.66. I am sure had I got a private float, which I got last Spring to move, as I said, a much larger boat, the cost was about - well, in comparison, I suppose, less than one third of what I paid. But I think that the order that I gave was misunderstood. But anyway, the float for twenty-six hours at \$21.35 an hour was \$555.10. The pick-up - I do not know what they wanted the pick-up for - for twenty-three hours at \$5.50 was \$126.50. Float operator for thirty-two hours at \$7.05 was \$225.60. Float operator overtime - I do not know why there was any overtime - \$2.05 an hour and then \$7.05 times one and a half gave me \$216.78. Carpenters - I still do not know why they wanted carpenters but anyway they had them - forty hours at \$7.62 for \$304.80. And carpenters overtime - they must have been at this for a week - nineteen hours, \$217.70. And the superintendent - I do not know why he had to be on the job but he was - \$84.80.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: I guess they knew it was the minister, so they said we might as well get what we can out of him and then, on top of all that - I never dreamt that all this would come up - a fifteen per cent payroll burden. What is that, I wonder? One hundred and fifty-seven dollars and thirty one cents for a total of \$1887.66.

MR. NEARY: Is there a receipt there?

MR. BRETT: No, I have not got the cancelled cheque. I have wired my bank manager. I instructed my executive assistant to pay this on the seventeenth.

MR. NEARY: What about a receipt?

MR. BRETT: I do not have a receipt for it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! This is Answers to Questions and not Question Period.

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 559

AH-2

MR. BRETT: The cheque has been written and I realize that the House would want something so I phoned my bank manager this morning and asked him if the cheque was in. He said no. The cheque was made out on the seventeenth, and I wired him and I said, "Please advise by telex" -

MR. NEARY: The seventeenth of March?

MR. BRETT: Right.

MR. NEARY: Aha!

MR. BRETT: No, no. So I wired my bank manager, one of my bank managers -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) that cheque was not made out until we raised it in the House.

MR. BRETT: - at the Scotia Bank in Clarendville and the telex reads, "Please advise by telex when you receive -

MR. NEARY: Resign, resign.

MR. BRETT: - for payment cheque No. 25 drawn on my account and payable to the Department of Transportation." And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) payment.

MR. BRETT: I wish I did not have to. Mr. Speaker, if the House requires that the cancelled cheque be tabled, then certainly I have no objection in this world. The only thing I can say about all this, Mr. Speaker, is that there were two rides in this whole thing.

MR. NEARY: You thought you were going to get away with it.

MR. BRETT: One was a boat. The boat got a ride, there is no question about that. And the second person that got the ride was the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), because had I know, had I had any indication in this world that I would have had to cough up \$2,000, then I can

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 559

AH-3

MR. BRETT: assure you I would not have touched it with a fifty foot pole.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further Answers to Question?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1. Address in Reply.
At last date debate on the amendment moved by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to the Address in Reply was adjourned by the hon. the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow).

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) not to be too much upset because it is costing me \$1500 to get the transmission fixed in my car. It is being done by City Motors of Corner Brook and not by the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and delighted to have the privilege to stand in this hon. House today and say a few words. I would like first of all to congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition, the member for Bonavista North district (Mr. Stirling) and wish him well in his new position.

Mr. Speaker, virtually all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have voiced their support and approval at our Premier's diligent stand on the constitutional issue and his untiring effort to put forward our Province's case on this vital issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, West Coast parties of all affiliations have expressed admiration on our Premier's continuing efforts to protect and enhance our basic rights. Mr. Speaker, I am also proud to be associated with our present leader, and I can assure this hon. House that we shall continue to press ahead until we have secured an equal place within the Canadian family.

Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to touch on a number of basic issues that no doubt we will be dealing with in the weeks ahead, and as we are dealing with now. Mr. Speaker, I have entitled the first topic education. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to support the reorganization of the high school academic programme with the institution of Grade XII. At first I must confess that I was somewhat sceptical of giving it my full support.

AN HON. MEMBER: You still are?

MR. WOODROW: However, after discussing the various assets of the programme with many learned people in the field of education, and having discussed it with my colleagues, particularly the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), I feel that it will prove to be an exciting and beneficial programme for our high school students.

A great failure in the past has been an inability to provide a sound foundation for building a well-rounded education. This was due in most part through the lack of professionally qualified teachers and facilities. All hon. members would agree that we have come a long way in the field of education, as virtually every community is blessed with the most modern schools and equipment and within 99 per cent of the cases a qualified teaching staff.

MR. WOODROW: I am hopeful that there will be sufficient funding allocated to ensure an effective reorganized programme and to allow for an availability of teachers where needed. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) is not here, and hardly any members left around at all, but I would just like in reply to him to state a few facts on what has been done for education over the past ten years.

In the past ten years, Mr. Speaker, government has provided \$200 million worth of new school construction. Operating grants to school boards have been increased, redesigned, and redesigned to provide extra to districts with above average heat and light costs, above average bus transportation costs as the above average enrollments incline.

In the past ten years, Mr. Speaker, from 1971-1972 to 1981-1982, student enrollment will decline, unfortunately it is going to decline by 16,000. And the number of teachers will increase by 1,300. Teachers' salaries have increased from \$46 million to \$200 million. Grade XII will not be offered until three years from now, so I do hope that the programme, when it is on the road, will be all right.

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, and perhaps the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will be glad to hear this, in the Monitor, which is a paper published by the Catholic Church in Newfoundland, Brother Brennan, who is one of the most if not the most outstanding educator in this Province has expressed some concerns about maybe what I would call the viability of Grade XII, if that is the term. And I would be less than honest, Mr. Speaker, if I did not mention his concerns because I think they are certainly legitimate.

I will just outline the headings: number one, reason for present inadequacy; present per capita expenditure; standing facilities still lacking. And by the way, I will table this for every member to see. The fourth concern, libraries; the fifth concern, cafeterias; the sixth concern, science facilities; the seventh concern, instrumental music; the eighth concern, servicing the handicapped; the ninth, those who will not benefit from Grade XII; number ten, new programmes or services; number eleven, arts education; number twelve, industrial arts and home economics; number thirteen, present capital needs; number fourteen, let us do our present task better; and finally, why the rush.

MR. TULK: Maybe you will define education.

MR. WOODROW: Well, these are certainly - the whole thing should be read and I feel when I table it all hon. members will be able to see it.

But we certainly have, no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, a terrific job ahead but I feel sure that the educators of our day and the government of our day, the intelligent members in Cabinet, I am sure they must have thought out this thing very painfully and furthermore that with the prosperity that they hope is ahead for this Province there will not be any great difficulty in getting what perhaps

MR. WOODROW: is the most underlying thing and that is the money to provide those facilities, the money to provide whatever is needed to put Grade XII in this Province. I do not know what the amount is, I suppose it is very difficult to say what the amount is with the high cost of inflation and the like.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue on with education. When I became a councillor with the City of Corner Brook in February, 1972, I was the city's representative on the Library Board, and since that time the board and city residents have endeavoured to provide a library for Corner Brook. Mr. Speaker, at the moment, books are scattered throughout a number of locations including Sir Richard Squires Building and book depots here and there in the city and needless to say this is a most undesirable arrangement. The matter has been under serious consideration for some time, the need having been addressed to the former administration. In fact, I have here a whole lot of correspondence on what has been done to try to provide Corner Brook with a library. Indeed I have several pieces of correspondence dating back to 1974, including letters from former Premier Moores, Dr. Tom Farrell, M.O. Morgan and others in which

MR. WOODROW: interest and support were indicated. More recently I have discussed the matter with my colleagues from Humber East(L.Verge) and Humber West (R. Baird) and I feel sure that they both feel my interest in providing a proper library facility for the City of Corner Brook, which would, of course, serve a wide area in and around the city.

Mr. Speaker, Corner Brook and the adjoining areas are rapidly growing and the growth means that construction of a public library is becoming all the more urgent and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that - I doubt if we have a quorum, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): No, we do not have a quorum. Call in the members. Order, please!

We have a quorum. The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I know and everybody knows that at the present time there is a great library being built here in the city of St. John's, and I hope

the buck for the libraries will not stop at the overpass. I think that we as members - there are four of us here from the Corner Brook, Bay of Islands area - and I hope that our voices will not go unheeded in trying to get a place, to get a library for the great second city of this Province, the city of Corner Brook.

I simply wish to draw attention to this worthwhile and pressing project and I am very hopeful that government will provide the necessary assistance so that the library in Corner Brook can become a reality.

My next item, Mr. Speaker, is the fishery. As it was in the past, the fishery continues to be the mainstay of our Provincial economy. As indicated in the

MR. WOODROW: gracious Speech from the Throne, government believes strongly that the long-term future of this Province must rest on our renewable resources, the most important of these being our fishing industry. This being the case, it follows, Mr. Speaker, that our provincial government and our local fishermen be involved on a daily basis in the industry. They should have a significant say in how our fishery develops. Already while a Royal Commission on the fishery is in progress, the Federal Government has begun to institute far-reaching policies which affect every fishermen operating in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure this House that as a result, bona fide fishermen, in the Bay of Islands district are having difficulty in securing a basic living from the fishery due to radical changes in fishery regulations.

Mr. Speaker, the inshore fishery must always remain our full priority in development since it has and will continue to be the primary economic base for the continued existence and prosperity of rural Newfoundland. Therefore offshore efforts must be curtailed until it is proven that offshore operations do not jeopardize a healthy inshore fishery.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to impress upon the Federal Government the need to share responsibility for the management of this Province's greatest resource. We cannot continue to accept arbitrary, unilateral policy decisions undertaken by the Federal Minister of Fisheries (R. LeBlanc) without consultation with the Provincial Government and those fishermen directly involved.

MR. L. WOODROW: Without shared jurisdiction in the fisheries, we shall continue to be mere spectators witnessing the gradual erosion and final destruction of the in-shore fishery on which depends the rural fabric of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time in the Bay of Islands district there are several fishermen who are panicking. And thinking of one, for example, there is one gentleman alone, relatively speaking a young man, forty-four years of age, he has a boat, thirty-five foot boat and he does not owe a cent on it - the only thing he got from the government was the bounty and the boat - and that man, in fact, will be forced next year, come 1982, he will be forced to give up the fishery. And, in fact, there are several other fishermen as well. Only just today I had a call from a fisherman in one of the communities in my district looking for a crab license. And it seems, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get critical, but he cannot hold to the federal member. He is not getting back, he is not getting back to me. I do not know what in the name of goodness is wrong - a young, energetic man, the federal member for Humber - St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) not getting back. I do not mind, in fact, trying to help out all I can, but I feel that every member has an obligation to get back to the people who elected him. In fact, I fear for the fisheries in our Province although we, as a Province, are working desperately hard. It is no joke! It is very serious! And fishermen in your own district as in many other districts, in fact, they will be starved. They will have to go on social assistance unless, in fact, Trudeau is stopped from what he is doing to the fishermen of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, the next item I have here on my list is hydro. Hydro transmission has also been a source of growing frustration and concern as it appears that the federal government seems unwilling to exercise its authority through the National Energy Board to allow for the transmission of hydro power through neighbouring provinces in the same manner as oil and gas transmission is now permitted. The question must be posed again and again: how can it be that a Province with massive, cheap, undeveloped hydro power must find in excess of 30 per cent of the Island's electrical requirements from expensive imported oil?

Such a situation, Mr. Speaker, is simply incredible and it is symptomatic of the current attitude of Ottawa which fails to address our legitimate concerns.

Offshore oil and gas. Much has been said and written about the issue of offshore oil and gas for resource ownership. As in the case of hydro transmission, the federal government continues to refuse to treat our oil and our gas resources in the same manner as those found in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. Mr. Speaker, why are we to be singled out among our sister provinces because our oil and gas reserves happen to be underwater? Why do not the rules applied in B.C. apply in Newfoundland and Labrador?

Mr. Speaker, when we entered Canada in 1949 at Confederation, we did so believing that equality of treatment was a fundamental right and this government has indicated in no uncertain terms that this belief will prevail. It is unfortunate that the Liberal Opposition of this Province, for the most part, has placed political expedience ahead of our provincial interests. Mr. Speaker, seeking equality of treatment for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador does not make us separatists or any less Canadian. Indeed, a strong, vibrant Alberta and Nova Scotia make a strong and united Canada, a

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 563

DW - 3

MR. L. WOODROW: place where people can grow and develop as they wish to do so. Just as a strict authoritarian family will inevitably rebel and fall apart at the seams so will a country disintegrate through the narrow vision of one man who seems determined to sacrifice national unity to ensure his place in history.

Mr. Speaker, we will have our day in the sun. Our people are looking

MR. WOODROW:

more than ever before to a bright and secure future, to our Province becoming a viable, contributing member of the Canadian family.

History has also placed our Premier in the forefront and history will show that he is the one man who lifted us from the doldrums, ensuring that our present optimism does not simply become another faded dream.

Forestry: Mr. Speaker, representing a district where the forest resource plays such an integral role in our economy, I would like to express my full support of the recent announcement that government will carry out a spray programme to combat the spruce budworm infestation. Having closely watched the devastation of our forest resources over the past number of years, I feel that we have no other practical alternative but to institute an all-out attack on the budworm.

As the Royal Commission's findings point out, to do otherwise would effectually result in the complete destruction of our forest resource with the loss of countless thousands of jobs. While the decision was a difficult one, I think all hon. members would agree that it was a necessary step and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) has indicated it is but one step, one component in a planned integrated approach to forest management and development.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the member agree with Cardinal Newman's observation, 'one step enough for me'?

MR. WOODROW: I always admired Cardinal Newman and I always will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, there was one thing that struck me forcefully in the -

MR. ROBERTS: Quit while you are ahead, 'Luke'.

MR. WOODROW: One thing that struck me forcefully in the Throne Speech was the mention of the family. As mentioned in the Throne Speech, one of the strong traditional features of the Newfoundland society has been the importance attached to the family, the family must be protected and nurtured. 'In the development of social programmes, therefore, steps will be taken to ensure that the needs of the family are met and every individual in this Province is able to enjoy a minimum acceptable standard of living'.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have something here to bring up which is, I think, really eating at the very heart of our family, and that is the question of abortion in Canada and in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, in 1979, there were 65,000 abortions in Canada and they are on the increase. And according to the best legal advice there is no protection in the Charter of Rights for the unborn child. This here, Mr. Speaker, is a brief copy of the Charter of Rights from the hon. member for Humber - St. Barbe.

Mr. Speaker, to quote figures for this Province: 1977, total 475; 1978, total 531; 1979, total 630, 1980, approximately 500. Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a drop of 16,000 children in our schools over the next decade or so and certainly this situation is not doing any good. I cannot, as a member, go along with what is happening regarding abortions and I

MR. WOODROW:

certainly deplore what is happening in this Province. Mr. Speaker, -

MR. THOMS: How many of those were natural occurrences, do you know?

MR. WOODROW: I thought it was therapeutic abortions.

MR. THOMS: These were (inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that generally there is a price tag on our so-called progress. Modern day stresses are greater than they have ever been, stresses on marriage and family life. The times in which we live are infinitely more complex, infinitely more demanding. Thus we must keep our progress in its perspective and focus. Change can be good, change is necessary, but we must ensure that society, that unique lifestyle is not destroyed for all time.

Mr. Speaker, I at least feel here as a member - I was elected here by the people. There are fifty-two of us and I have had, thank God, a lot of experience in other fields of life and I want in fact to put all I can into the energy that the Lord has given me to help the people in my district, to help the people in the Bay of Islands. They are depending upon me as they are depending upon the other fifty-one members. Sometimes there are things perhaps we do not like to say, but there comes a time in all our lives when we have to say it and we have to stand up for principles. And I think that is what this legislature is all about.

The degree that we as a people control our economic development will determine whether we will survive as a distinct culture. This is why the struggle with Ottawa is on-going and why we must have a say in how our

MR. WOODROW: Province is to evolve in the decade ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am really glad to have had the opportunity to express my views in the Address in Reply and I congratulate all other members who have spoken and I wish all others who will speak, I wish them well.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to compliment the member for the Bay of Islands (L. Woodrow) on his fine speech and his delivery. I may not agree with all the contents in it but I never question the member's motives in serving his district, and his sincerity.

Mr. Speaker, in replying to the Throne Speech I would like to make certain comments as is customary with regards to one's district. I have spoken on them many times before but I would just like to go over a few of them again. One of the main concerns now in the coast of Labrador, Torngat district as well as Eagle River, is with regard to airstrips. If something is not done shortly with construction of airstrips on the Labrador coast, then we are going to see another repeat of the EPA financial trouble by way of Labrador Airways, and if something is not done then drastic action will have to be taken somewhere down the line and I hope that this Provincial Government will start

March 23, 1981

Tape No.565

EL - 3

MR. HISCOCK: getting involved in constructing more airstrips.

Roads; Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Coastal Labrador DREE Agreement, I have been informed by officials in Ottawa that work will begin on the road this Spring. But I want to point out that the maintenance of that road and the maintenance of all other community roads in my district is the responsibility of this Provincial Government and, Mr. Speaker, I can say without hesitation that this government has not carried out its responsibility to the residents of Eagle River in this Province.

MR. E. HISCOCK: They ended up constructing a road in Charlottetown and because, Mr. Speaker, of wanting to get out quicker than they wanted to stay there, as well as problems with culverts, we now have a situation where a man is living in another house in the community because his house is flooded with water because of poor planning by the Department of Highways

With regards, Mr. Speaker, to CBC reception, I will be presenting petitions in the next few days with regard to TV reception in the district, particularly in the communities of Black Tickle and Charlottetown. Also, Mr. Speaker, with regard to housing, I, through my influence with the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) and then through the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Cosgrove, the hon. member ended up getting the District of Eagle River, from Red Bay to Paradise River designated as a RRAP area. We still do not have this in operation after a full year, Mr. Speaker. And I ask the question, why is it that we do not have more correspondence between Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and Canada Mortgage? Why is it that it is getting down to that level that we are having confrontation not only during political matters but also being carried on in departmental matters?

With regard to jobs, Mr. Speaker, in my district, my district itself depends totally on the fisheries, half on the Gulf stock and half on the Northern cod. I am rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, by this government's reaction on a few of the things relating to my district and one is with regard to hydro rates. We see in part of our Province we have the Upper Churchill, Lower Churchill probably coming on stream and Muskrat Falls, and yet on the Labrador Coast, as well as other areas of Northern and Southern Newfoundland, the highest rates of electricity in Canada - not only in Newfoundland and Labrador but in Canada, we have the

MR. HISCOCK: highest rates and this is because you have to have diesel electricity. Mr. Speaker, if you use electricity by the way of hydro, the more electricity you consume the cheaper your bill becomes, but with regard to diesel, the more energy you burn, consume, the higher the rates. So therefore not only have we the highest rates of electricity in this Province of Canada, the more the people in that area consume, they have to pay more and more all the time - it escalates instead of de-escalating. And these people, Mr. Speaker, the reason why - and I spoke before and I will speak many times again - the Premier brought up the question of the Labrador boundary and that under the new Constitution probably the boundary could be changed. Mr. Speaker, if we have any danger with regard to changing the boundary it will not come from outside, it will come from inside and within Labrador itself, and that is the idea of equality, the idea of fairness, the idea of justice.

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) is probably recognized in this House as rather famous for his saying, 'Justice not only has to be done but it has to appear to be done.' There is no sense, Mr. Speaker, in Labrador, if we developed the hydro in the Lower Churchill and in the Muskrat Falls that we are developing that area of our Province, justice might be done in the sense that these are being developed through the taxpayers but, Mr. Speaker, justice has to appear to be done.

These were the original inhabitants of Labrador, they are living on the South Coast of Labrador of our Province, and even Quebec, when we went to court in 1927, even Quebec recognized that this belonged to Newfoundland. And what have we, as a Province, done towards these people living on the South Coast of Labrador of our Province, what have we done to them? They still only have one telephone in some of their communities, they still have no TV reception, they

MR. HISCOCK: still do not even have roads within their communities, they still have to maintain two homes, they still have one room schools, they still have teachers who are supposed to be teaching in Pinsent's Arm and William's Arm but because of lack of accommodations these teachers are now teaching over in St. Anthony. We still have the highest rates of electricity, we still have not one bit of pavement.

Mr. Speaker, the frustration and the alienation that the people in my district feel is not with the threat

MR. HISCOCK:

of Quebec taking it. Even though you hear in the upper part of my district of wanting to join Quebec, it is done from the point of frustration. How do we get the ministers from St. John's and the Premier to recognize the alienation, the feeling of abandonment in the Northern part of our Province.

Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, the North -the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) said about a library being built in St. John's, hopefully the money will not stop, he said, at the overpass. This is not only said by members outside of the overpass, but all members of this House - but time and time again, whether it was with regard to building the pulp mill, with regard to the building Come By Chance, whether it was with regard to building the Trans-Canada Highway, and we hear the same thing now with regard to getting the infrastructure ready for the oil and gas, places outside of the overpass will have to wait until for the golden rainbow, the Pot of Gold.

Mr. Speaker, we have been living in this Province, in Southern Labrador, and still find we have to wait. 'Oh, you will get your schools when the oil and gas comes on stream. You will get your health clinic. You will get better communications. You will get postal service, TV reception, you will get your airstrips. But in the meantime we have to build a synchrolift here in St. John's. In the meantime we have to do the cross arterial road here in St. John's. In the meantime we have to do another overpass up by the Avalon Mall. In the meantime, we have to turn around and get into some other research project with regard to oil and gas.'

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, if this Province, and I say this with a great amount of sincerity, if this Province does not realize that Labrador is becoming more and more alienation, all of the time, and if this Province does not address these problems on a day to day basis, then the threat will not come from without, it will come from within. And I say, Mr. Speaker, this is not fanning the flames of separatism, this is not using scare tactics, this is from a member who grew up and lived on the Island and studied here at the University and travelled and, for whatever reason, taught in Labrador in charge of youth projects and then finally a member.

It is my concern, Mr. Speaker, as being a member for that area and also being a resident of this Province that we are not addressing the day to day needs of Labrador. We have a Premier now, Mr. Speaker, for the past two years we have what from the present administration? Nothing. I would ask any minister here to stand up and outline any programme that has created jobs in the past two years. Is it Abitibi-Price? Surely not. The federal government turned around and gave a tax right-off which was the result of most of these jobs. The DREE agreements, the forestry agreements, the roads agreements and any other projects always goes back to the federal government.

We have an administration, Mr. Speaker, who turned around and said, "Elect us because we have the fish and chips in Ottawa." We found out while they were in Ottawa for nine months they put a freeze on everything for six months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: Even in those three months when we had two ministers from this Province we still did not get anything. All the great co-operation we had with the fish

MR. HISCOCK: and chips, we never got anything.

But, Mr. Speaker, we know what the Premier did with the former Prime Minister, Mr. Clark, on the steps of Confederation Building during the election. We also know what he did with the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. McGrath. I really ask the question, if Mr. Clark had continued, would we have seen this confrontational issue between Ottawa and St. John's? And you know my answer is - the answer would be yes. The answer would be yes, Mr. Speaker. Because it is the tactics, it is the style, it is the make-up of our Premier. You only see him when his hands are going and taking somebody on and fighting for some rights.

Mr. Speaker, when I was teaching down in Bonavista before the election, I decided to get into freelance writing, that I would try my hand at writing; where I had a degree in Political Science, I decided around this time of the year when the Premier ended up running for the leadership along with Mr. Carter and along with Senator Doody,

MR. HISCOCK: I ended up doing an article, Mr. Speaker, on the PC Leadership Convention and I wrote the article, which I sent to The Evening Telegram, which I am not sure was ever published, but I said in that article that the Premier, Mr. Peckford, should become the Premier and should become Leader of the PC Party. I said it for various reasons. I said, number one, he was young. Number two, I said he was aggressive. Number three, I said he was a new style of politician, and I said a style of a politician that this Province needed. He was a young, educated man, that the guts reaction he gave, and in most cases that he gives all the time, is that he is a fighter for the Province. So I looked at the various candidates that were running, the three candidates, and I figured the best one would be Mr. Peckford, and I gave my reasons why in that.

I can tell you now, Mr. Speaker, as a person writing such words I have not had the opportunity in my short life span to regret anything that I have ever written, but I can honestly say that is one thing that I have totally regretted. Because since I have gotten to know the man in a political context, whether that be in the district of St. Mary's-the Capes where he basically says, "Everything stops there, I am the king of the mountain," or whether it is in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir where he does not promise anything anymore - the people in this Province are fed up with promises so therefore the Premier does not promise them - what does he do? He brings down blueprints and shows the fishermen in the district, "This is your bait depot, this is the blueprint." So the fishermen scratch their head and they say, "Well surely, you know, it is not a promise, here are the blueprints. It must be fact." So I can warn the people in Bellevue now,

MR. HISCOCK: you are not going to get promises from the Premier of this administration. You are going to have bureaucrats that the government is going to be using, provincial government bureaucrats that are going to be going out to the district with plans, and with blueprints, telling the people. But I would ask the people now down in Conne River, where is their bridge? I ask the people down in Ramea -

MR. ANDREWS: They got the bridge.

MR. STEWART: They got the bridge.

MR. HISCOCK: - where is their bait depot?

So, Mr. Speaker, promises are quite easily known in this administration.

MR. STEWART: They got the bridge.

MR. HISCOCK: Some other areas, Mr. Speaker,

I would like to deal with in particular, and this is the Premier's stand on the Northern cod. I do not know why but I cannot understand his stand on the Northern cod. He claims that there should be 85 per cent for the inshore, 15 per cent for the offshore. He also has another point -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Five minutes.

MR. HISCOCK: - that there should be a three year freeze on the Northern cod. I do not know if that is for the inshore, the offshore, or for the mid fleet, but a three year freeze would mean to me a freeze. He also gives financial backing to CN so that CN can build a synchrolift here in St. John's, And Mr. Speaker, I am not against a synchrolift here in St. John's by any means whatsoever, but I have to ask the one question without getting redundant of this debate, that if one of the main reasons why this synchrolift is being built is to service the Russian fleet, and the Premier wants to have a freeze on the Northern cod for three years, and the Russian trawlers are coming to the Northern cod area to catch cod and thereby needing their fleet

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 568

NM - 3

MR. HISCOCK: serviced, I wonder why we are going to have Russian ships in this harbour or in St. John's being looked after. So, Mr. Speaker, I find a contradiction: that it is great publicity for the Conservatives of St. John's, it is great publicity of giving money to CN, a federal Crown corporation, and yet we cannot get roads, we cannot get clinics, we cannot get schools, we cannot get housing - and yet we have money for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK: So I would say, Mr. Speaker, if the media really questioned the Premier on the Northern cod - it is an emotional again and the Premier does not really know where he stands on the Northern cod. One day he wants eighty-five per cent, another day he wants it frozen altogether for three years and another part he is saying to the Russians, "Okay, you can come here in St. John's and use the synchrolift." But in the meantime, the Russians say it is okay, if we are coming we need 10,000 metric tons! Is the Premier suggesting that we should give 10,000 metric tons to the Russians and not give 10,000 metric tons to our sister province, Nova Scotia? Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is what he is saying as long as the Russians can use the St. John's synchrolift.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Labrador boundary. As I said, it is no question with the boundary in this Province. You went in in 1927 and went to court and won that case. Quebec never did contest that case. When we entered into Confederation by our terms Confederation accepted our boundary. So, Mr. Speaker, let us not get into the emotional issues about boundaries.

MR. NEARY: It is a good way to distract from the cost of living and the record unemployment and all that stuff we have.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to, Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) saying distracting - and that is basically what we have had for two years. Two years -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HISCOCK: - of total distraction.

MR. NEARY: Red herrings.

MR. HISCOCK: Total - hands going up in the air and shouting and viens almost coming through their forehead and their eyes almost popping out, basically saying that Ottawa

MR. HISCOCK: is taking this from us, Ottawa is doing this. It gets away, Mr. Speaker, from the fact of the day to day operations of this Province, it gets away from the fact that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) is taking his boat and moving it down, taking away from the fact that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) gives a contract down in Cartwright without even calling tenders. And not only that one, also, but other things. The Premier lauds himself on the new Auditor General's Report. There is enough in that Auditor General's Report, Mr. Speaker to turn around and find out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have the worst rating we ever had.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker with regard to this administration one of the things I am rather surprised-and I do not think it really befits the intelligence of some of the private members, who get up and laud the Premier, who laud the Premier in his great oratory and give him all the praises. I say and I said it before, if this administration continues to let the Premier become so boastful and caught up with himself that it is going to be dangerous for this party. And I would say the same thing also if we were in government and we had a person who had an ego as large as this Premier. It is not good for the Province. It is not good for the Premier and the members should be putting more restraints on it. With regard to the cost of living, Mr. Speaker, we have not seen anything to address the cost of living. We asked for a Select Committee of this House and what happened? Nothing. We have seen a government do away completely with the Department of Consumer Affairs, the watchdog of the consumers of this Province. And what happened to it? The Premier decided that he wanted to take it on personally and have these baskets each week stating the cost

MR. HISCOCK: of a basket here in St. John's and then throughout the Province. Very, very good, Mr. Speaker. But when, Mr. Speaker, a study of the two departments there recommended a further study into the high cost of oil and gas on the Labrador Coast and recommended it for a further study, did the Premier have this study? Did the Premier try to find out what was the cause of this problem? No, Mr. Speaker. Great high publicity and getting on television with his food baskets, that was what the Premier was concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, another area I am sure I would like to deal with is the constitution. The Premier turns around and fights the constitution and I am quite pleased to say that the Prime Minister of Canada is now speaking on this issue and I am quite pleased also to be identified with this party, the federal Liberals as well as the provincial Liberals and liberalism in general. I am sure the former Prime Minister Diefenbaker also must have his thoughts on Mr. Trudeau today, for finally entrenching

MR. HISCOCK: the Bill of Rights into the Constitution. We find, Mr. Speaker, we have very narrow-minded provinces. We find provinces saying that the country is made up of parts. We would find, Mr. Speaker, if it was left up to the provinces, the multi-nationals running us left, right and centre. So, Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased that there is a Liberal Government that is bringing in the Constitution and is bringing it back.

We are not going to Westminster and asking Westminster to repatriate the Constitution or to give a Bill of Rights or a Charter of Rights or give an amending formula. Mr. Speaker, this is being done by Canadians in Canada, in committee and in the parliament of Canada and in the Senate of Canada.

Over 160 or 170 or 180 groups have appealed before this committee and out of those main recommendations, the majority of them have been implemented. We do not hear from the media that they were implemented, we only hear the criticisms. And, Mr. Speaker, the PC administration, federally and provincially, are trying to hang their hat on two things. Number one, God is not mentioned in the Constitution. And we hear now - we hear the heads rising like seals, bobbing up, shame, shame!

Mr. Speaker, the reason why God is not mentioned in the Constitution is because we have no preamble to the Constitution, and the reason why we have no preamble to the Constitution is that the provinces could not agree on what should be in the Constitution thereby giving a preamble. So therefore the Federal Parliament of Canada, not the Liberal Government but the Federal Parliament of Canada, put in a basic package, a basic package. Also, the

MR. HISCOCK: member for the Bay of Islands (L. Woodrow) said that unborn children do not have their rights protected in the Constitution. A lot of other groups and other organizations do not have their rights protected in the Constitution.

Hopefully, when the Conservative administration gets in power in Ottawa that will probably be one of the first things that they will do. But, Mr. Speaker, from a personally studied theology, it is not up to the parliament or the governments of the countries of the world to legislate morality, it is up to the individual and to the churches to use their influence on their people in the congregation to practice morality. You can have any law whatever enacted in this country or in this world. We have had the Ten Commandments, Mr. Speaker, since Abraham and they are still being broken. We can turn around and put the Ten Commandments in the Constitution and they will still be broken.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us not get on with this piousness, this greater than thou, this holiness that somehow or another now that the Liberals are - the parliament of Canada is bringing back the Constitution and they are being damned to hell because they are not recognizing the rights of the unborn or God. Surely, we are not going to be going to infinity of the unknown and surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not up to the government to legislate morality. It is up to the churches to recommend to their people the way that they should go and it is up to the congregation to practice that.

MR. HISCOCK: So those two issues, Mr. Speaker, are rather weak to hang your hat upon. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, time will tell and the government will say, Mr. Speaker, that this administration is going to be rather sad that they are not on the side of the Constitution. I think it is a great day for Canada, it is a great day for our country to be able to finally get our Constitution and Charter of Rights and get an amending formula. This amending formula will not come into effect for two years. The Premier of Newfoundland is admitting himself that it is so hard to get along with the other premiers that even in two years from now they still will not be able to get along, they still will not be able to come up with an amending formula. Two years they have and, Mr. Speaker, they still will not come up with it.

So, Mr. Speaker, by looking at this Throne Speech and by looking at ones that have gone before, in the tradition of the Throne Speech, I have never seen such a waste of time, energy, money and paper - turning around and quoting a philosophy as to the direction we should go. Mr. Speaker, if we had to be led by this administration and by this Premier, I am sad to say that time will show and history will show that we are being led down the garden path.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Province and the direction that we are going, I only hope that the member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (H. Andrews) has influence upon the Premier and that when the Premier, he gets in one of his stubborn moods after two years of not sitting down with the Minister of National Revenue (W. Rompkey) and not sitting down with the Prime Minister of Canada - why is it that Premier Blakeney can go and have supper with him almost anytime? Or Premier Lougheed? Why is it that our Premier has not had a meeting with the Prime Minister or with the Minister of National Revenue,

MR. HISCOCK: and, yet, during the debate on the referendum, the Premier can fly up to Ottawa to be available to the press so he can turn around and give his comments on the Quebec referendum?

So, Mr. Speaker, we find we have here in this Province now a Premier who is more concerned with style, more concerned with tactics than

MR. HISCOCK: what we are going to have. And I will tell you the people in Bellevue will show the Premier what this government, and what this administration is. There is no question about it, Mr. Speaker, when you have a Premier who has such a big ego that he even scuttles his own candidate and says if we get two more or three more votes for the P.C. candidate this time than we did against Mr. Jamieson, it will be a moral victory. Well, I will say to him, Mr. Speaker, when we went into St. Mary's - The Capes, which was a strong P.C. district, we did not scuttle our candidate, we did not go in and say that we were going to lose. We did not know what we were going to be doing, but, Mr. Speaker, we put our shoulders to the helm and we pushed onward and we got the end result. And I say, Mr. Speaker, when you have a Premier who has such a large ego as to scuttle his own candidate, I would like to see what he is going to do with his Minister of Transportation on this issue of transporting a boat. And I would like to see what he is going to do with the Minister of Labour and Manpower for signing the petition. And I would like to see what he is going to be doing with the Minister of Education when other people beside the superintendent of the Roman Catholic School Board in St. John's get on about Grade XII.

Mr. Speaker, this Province is being led in a reckless direction. It has no direction. And, Mr. Speaker, we depend on the elected representatives in this House. The Opposition, I think, for its part is doing it, but surely, we do not have to have the private members and the ministers turning around and patting him on the back. We need constructive criticism, we need the ability to be able to listen to constructive criticism. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we now have an administration and a Premier -

MR. HISCOCK: - not only the dangerous thing about it - not only knows what is right but always does right.

Mr. Speaker, we know through time and history that man is mortal and he makes mistakes, so there are bigger men than he who have made mistakes in the past and there will be bigger ones in the future. And to turn around and say that this Premier now is one of the best men in Newfoundland, or ever was, I would like to ask a question about Whiteway, Squires and Bond and Smallwood and Moores.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): I would like to remind the hon. member that his time is up. Is he cluing up his remarks?

MR. HISCOCK: By leave, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, 'boy'.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a half minute.

MR. HISCOCK: Okay. Seeing, Mr. Speaker, that again the government not only snuffles the Opposition, but when a person wants to go on and finish a thought, or finish a train, no, you cannot do it. But, Mr. Speaker, there is always time in this House, not only for this speech but other ones. Again I would say to the government that they have a greater responsibility than the Opposition, they have a responsibility to make sure that the ministers and the Premier administer this Province for the betterment of all. Not for Conservative people in the Province, not for Liberals, nor for NDP, but for all our Province. Mr. Speaker, I find now that we are getting an administration that has put so much distance between the past administration, and they are becoming so cocky, that they are falling into their own trap.

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Bellevue and other directions in this Province,

MR. HISCOCK: I think time will tell how the people in this Province feel toward this administration. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would

like to start my few brief comments by reading a paragraph from page 2 of the Speech from the Throne: 'The people of this Province have built up over time a level of expectation which demands economic and social parity with other Canadians. It is surely a right of all Canadians to make such demands and to expect that they will be realized, especially where the wealth to sustain them is present in abundance'.

The argument, Mr. Speaker, between the federal government and most of Canada's ten Provinces is not just over a division of power,

MR. D. STEWART:

it is a battle over resources and money, This is particularly so in Newfoundland where the dispute centers on the benefits from oil, fish and hydro power. Also, Mr. Speaker, you probably wish, like many Canadians, that we stopped talking about the proposed new Constitution. I wish we could, too, However, Mr. Speaker, under the proposed Constitution our boarder could be changed without our consent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STEWART: We could even be abolished -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. STEWART: - Mr. Speaker, as a province and absorbed into an Eastern Province comprising of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. The proposed Constitution does not guarantee Newfoundland its historic right to have its hydro power cross Quebec to markets elsewhere. Hon. members opposite question why the Throne Speech contains reference to the Constitution. How blind, Mr. Speaker? We have no reason to trust the federal Liberals, they gave us price and wage control in 1975 when they campaigned against it in 1974. They promised a just society in 1968 and, yet, the gap has widened since that time because of their lack of political will to tackle the problems of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STEWART: This government has pointed out in the Speech from the Throne 'provide a new direction in resource development which led to: one, a new power agreement with ERCO; two, new legislation to gain greater benefits from the Upper Churchill; three, a local preference policy which has created hundreds of new jobs and stimulated local industry; four, workers' compensation for fishermen; five, a re-organized Fisheries Loan Board; and six, a Royal Commission to inquire into all aspects of the inshore fishery.'

Mr. Speaker, fishing is this Province's most important industry -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

1019

MR. STEWART: - with as much as one half of the population in Newfoundland depending directly or indirectly on it for economic well-being.

MR. NEARY: But the oil is going to be our salvation.

MR. STEWART: Maybe so. For the moment though, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has jurisdiction in the fishery yet we, as provincial MHAs, are constantly approached by our fishermen. Why? Because we are the most visible and accessible political figures around. Much emphasis has been placed on the fishery and it is expected, Mr. Speaker, that fish landings will increase from 637,000 tons this year to just over one million tons by the middle of the decade. At the same time the landed value of that fish, which is really the amount of money our fishermen will receive, will increase from \$180 million to \$295 million.

MR. NEARY: That is more than we will get out of the oil.

MR. STEWART: The expected value of that fish will increase from \$495 million to \$885 million by 1985. The real employment gains, Mr. Speaker, in the fishery will come in the form of shore-based jobs in the processing plants. However, Mr. Speaker, essential matters such as the signing of quotas, the licencing of fishermen and management and supervision of the fish stocks all remain within the control of the federal government. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if the current licencing programme is not handled with extreme caution, an unpleasant comparison with the resettlement programme of a few years ago will surely follow. Indeed, it is possible that a licencing policy could do more damage than resettlement if care is not taken.

This Province has the highest taxes, the highest unemployment rate and the lowest standard of living in Canada. This, Mr. Speaker, after more than thirty years in Confederation. And then, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 572

SD - 3

MR. STEWART: and the federal government question why Newfoundlanders claim ownership of any offshore minerals.

Under the provincial proposal from offshore development Newfoundland would get 40 per cent of any oil and gas revenues, the federal government 25 per cent and the oil companies 35 per cent. Under the federal proposal Newfoundland would get 20 per cent, the federal government 45 per cent and the oil companies

MR. STEWART:

35 per cent. This, Mr. Speaker, could amount to billions of dollars in future years. We as a Province desperately need the revenues from oil and gas to pay off our provincial debt, to invest in long-term natural resources like the fisheries and the forestry, and to provide, Mr. Speaker, many badly needed public services still lacking in many Newfoundland and Labrador communities. This government has always maintained that our fishery, our hydro power, and our offshore resources be developed in line with provincial priorities and that this Province be the recipient of the largest share of revenues from these resources.

Mr. Speaker, as pointed out in the Speech from the Throne, this government is ahead of schedule in its efforts to create jobs for our people. Since June 1979, 19,000 have been created.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART: At this rate government's commitment of 40,000 new jobs will be reached long before the original target date. This has been made possible, Mr. Speaker, in large measure, because of this government's policy of hiring for offshore development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART: -and more importantly, our recent local preference policy for goods and services which stimulate local industry and local businesses and hence create new jobs. Our employment rate has dropped 2 per cent since this government assumed office.

Mr. Speaker, as pointed out in the major document last Fall entitled Managing All Of Resources the main aim and ultimate goal of this government

MR. STEWART: is really a social one, to improve the lot of all our people. This government was willing to outline its plans and objectives for the future, for the next five years, in the document produced last Fall. Newfoundlanders can judge in the next few years our progress and compare our achievements with our aims. Government expects that this report will encourage public participation in policy development and broaden public understanding of our development issues.

Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to plan and balance development, and to revitalization of our renewable resource base, particularly, our fishing industry, Provincial oil and gas control, and development will be an important means of building up the different economic strengths of this Province, and as a means of improving living standards and social services from provincial revenues. We seek, Mr. Speaker, an equal place in the Canadian family, a contributing province where we as a people will determine our future and lifestyle, and we will shape where we are going in the next decade. We are on the threshold and we finally have the will and determination to ensure that our enthusiasm and our expectations become a reality for the benefit of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Baird): Order, please!

Before I recognize the hon. member I am sure the House would like for me to welcome the Mayor of Pasadena, and the Town Manager, in the district of Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Baird): The hon. member for St. Mary's-the Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Like the old saying goes,
Mr. Speaker, 'The worse thing you can have in your head is nar a tooth,' and that is what I am like today. I will try to do the best I can, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: You lost them playing hockey.

MR. HANCOCK: I never lost them yesterday playing hockey, no, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) could not catch me.

I would like to make a few brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, on the not so gracious Speech from the Throne . I would like to , first of all, congratulate - and it is something that has not been done by too many members speaking, I do know if they felt they have not done a good job, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I think one guy has been here for two terms, and the other, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), it is his first and his last. And the seconder, the same can be said for him -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HANCOCK: - and several other members on the opposite side as well.

MR. NEARY: He has not made his maiden speech , he will make his farewell speech.

MR. HANCOCK: I would say , Mr. Speaker, that the two of them will be combined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few remarks I would like to make, first of all, about the district which I represent. Representing a district that has been neglected in the past like the district of

MR. HANCOCK: St. Mary's-the Capes has been -
hon. members will laugh, yes, Mr. Speaker, - \$17 million
went in there since this Tory administration took office
and we need about \$700 million to complete the road work
and upgrade existing facilities that we have in that
district. And I find it very offending that members
should laugh, Mr. Speaker, at the way that that district
has been treated in the past, especially since the Tory

MR. HANCOCK: administration took power some -
what? - eleven years ago.

MR. NEARY: He has more miles of unpaved -

MR. HANCOCK: Unpaved - yes, Mr. Speaker, it
is the only district in this Province that has in excess of
one hundred miles of dirt road and I was very disappointed,
Mr. Speaker. One of the major disappointments since I got
elected to the House of Assembly is when I tried some weeks
ago to have the Minister of Transportation
(Mr. Brett) include a section of that road under a cost-
sharing program with the federal government. I would like
to remind the minister at this time that if he does not feel
that that road is a major loop road to the people of that
area, then I would like for the minister to explain to me
what is or why should that road be treated any differently
than the roads that were done under a cost-sharing programme;
the Baie Verte road, the Bonavista North road, the Burgeo road,
the Bay d'Espoir highway -

MR. NEARY: The road to resources.

MR. HANCOCK: - roads to resources, Mr. Speaker.

And we have resources in that area. And the Minister of
Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) does not seem to give a damn what
happens to the quality of fish that comes out of plants in
Trepassey, St. Shott's, Riverhead, St. Mary's, Admiral's
Beach, Branch, St. Bride's, and we have six or seven major
fish plants in that area, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: How many million pounds?

MR. HANCOCK: In 1978, as Mr. Smallwood
would go on to say - and I want to take (inaudible) the House
in this matter, Mr. Speaker - he would say not one thousand,
not two thousand but, in this case, not one million, not two
million, but 2.1 million pounds of fish were landed at
Branch in 1978, Mr. Speaker, one community alone, and trucked

MR. HANCOCK: over dirt roads. The only way to get out of that community is over sections of dirt road, Mr. Speaker.

In 1979 there were two million pounds landed in Branch. There were 2.2 million pounds landed in 1980. In 1980, Mr. Speaker, 2.2 million pounds of fish trucked over sections of dirt road. In Trepassey last year alone, Mr. Speaker, there were approximately 8.6 million pounds of fish trucked out of that community, and I might add that that fish plant only operated for an eight-month period last year and the manager of that fish plant informed me that all of the fish trucked out of Trepassey came over a sixteen mile section of dirt road. And the same applies for St. Shott's, a small community on the Southern tip of the Avalon, Mr. Speaker, where - 2.6 million pounds of fish were trucked out of that community last year all over dirt roads. If that is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to include sections of that road on a cost-sharing program with the federal government, then I do not think the minister is doing his job by saying it is not a major trunk road in the Province. It is a major trunk road, Mr. Speaker. It is the only access that the people of that area have to get to the resource, to get the resource landed and then to get the resource trucked to sections of the United States and other parts of Canada.

MR. NEARY: Do you have any indication if Ottawa will look at on that favourably?

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have and I might add at this time, also, that I have found Ottawa, quite contrary to what the government officials have been saying, very helpful to me. Everything I have requested, and I have made several trips to Ottawa looking for funds for my district, and I must say I have

MR. HANCOCK: every indication that they will co-operate and they have co-operated in the past.

MR. NEARY: 'Crosbie' does not like that.

MR. HANCOCK: No, he does not like it, Mr. Speaker. He does not like it when somebody goes over his head no matter what it is for, whether it is to get something for a section of his riding that he thinks is Liberal or Liberal workers around that worked on my campaign. He does not like it. No, Mr. Speaker, he does not like for anybody to go over his head, but he is going to have to come down in the next couple of years, Mr. Speaker, because everything I intend to go after in that district will go over Mr. Crosbie's head to try and bring improvements to whatever part or section of that district that I feel needs improvement, Mr. Speaker. And if Mr. Crosbie does not like it, like I said to him some time ago, I said that is tough for Mr. Crosbie, but I will work with the man, Mr. Speaker, in any way, shape or form that I can to try and bring improvements to that district. I think that is my first obligation to the people of that district and I will work with anyone that I can work with to try and bring improvements. It is quite the contrary on the other hand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: There is every indication that Ottawa could help on the road probably.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is every indication that they will help. They have informed me that they would get involved but, first of all, they cannot get involved until this bunch of - I must not call them 'idiots', Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be an appropriate word - but this -

MR. NEARY: Incompetent.

MR. HANCOCK: - incompetent government over here requests funds from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. That is an unwritten rule, that the federal government will not get involved in any trunk roads or any major roads in this Province until first of all the provincial government requests funds for the roads. And if any member over there cannot get funding for his district, cannot negotiate with Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, that is his problem. My first priority lies with the district of St. Mary's - The Capes and I will try and get what I can out of the provincial government and out of Ottawa to bring improvements that are needed to that district. But for some reason, Mr. Speaker, whether it

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, whether it be political or otherwise - if they told me it was political I would resign my seat tomorrow and they could have another by-election so another member could try and bring the necessary improvements to that district. That is how much I am committed, Mr. Speaker, to seeing improvements come to that district. It is not for money that I got into this racket, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you.

MR. NEARY: So Ottawa might be prepared to put some money in but the Province will not make the application.

MR. HANCOCK: The Province will not request funding. Mr. Speaker, I pity the candidate that runs against me in the next election -

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: - if I ever decide to run again, Mr. Speaker. Politics is not exactly what I am cut out for, I do not think, because I am not the type of individual who likes criticizing just for the sake of criticizing, Mr. Speaker, I like constructive criticism. Probably I do not criticize enough, but I do not think you get things that way, I just call the shots the way I see them. If the people in my district do not like it then, the next time around, Mr. Speaker, they know what they can do. But I have more confidence in my district than some hon. members will give me credit for. As a matter of fact, I am not afraid of anybody running. I think the number one man in the Tories' eyes in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier of this Province. The Premier came down the last time I ran and he ordered his candidate home. He took over the election for the last nine days and he could not defeat me, Mr. Speaker, so who in the heck are they going to put down there who is going to defeat me? Could you tell me, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: Even though he said he was sitting on the chest.

MR. HANCOCK: But that does not work anymore, Mr. Speaker, you can sit on what chest you like but you cannot bribe people. Newfoundlanders are not as green as they used to be one time, they are more mature, they are more outspoken, more outgoing people, and the minute that the Premier said that he was sitting on the chest -

MR. NEARY: That was a challenge to them then.

MR. HANCOCK: - and that they would not get any funds South of the Trans-Canada Highway if they did not vote Tory, Mr. Speaker, that was it. Up she goes! Hancock had her won. I could have, from that day on, Mr. Speaker, sat down in my office and made a few phone calls and relaxed, but no I went out, I wanted to meet as many people as I could.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: I am not afraid of the next election, Mr. Speaker. Unlike certain members opposite, I would challenge anybody to come down and try to take that seat away from me, as I say, if I decide to run again. I do not know what I am going to do in two years time -

MR. NEARY: You will run again, 'boy'.

MR. HANCOCK: - but it all depends, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: You would make a good minister in the new government (inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand - I was looking up something here in the 333. I am surely disappointed. Mr. Smallwood assured me sometime ago that he would have the 666 ready sometime early in the year, but I guess it is not the time yet -

MR. HANCOCK: - I cannot understand -
MR. NEARY: He is working on it, by
the way.
MR. HANCOCK: He is working on it, yes.
There is a section here under Transportation, Mr. Speaker,
Transportation and Communications where the Liberal
Government - and then there are hard times, Mr. Speaker,
from '49 until Mr. Smallwood, I would not say resigned,
until the people asked him to resign - built 6,000 miles
of dirt road. They built their share of St. Mary's - The
Capes.
MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).
MR. HANCOCK: There goes the hoof and
mouth disease, Mr. Speaker. He is getting as bad as Mr.
Crosbie, he only opens his mouth long enough to change feet.
MR. MORGAN: St. Mary's - The Capes
(inaudible).
MR. HANCOCK: St. Mary's - The Capes
had its share of road work done, yes, Mr. Speaker.
MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).
MR. NEARY: We built them, now it is
up to you to pave them.
MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).
MR. HANCOCK: The roads were built, Mr.
Speaker. The fact of the matter is -
MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).
MR. NEARY: We built them all, now
you pick them up.
MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!
MR. HANCOCK: If we could have the hon.
Maw Mouth shut up, Mr. Speaker, I might get through this.
MR. MORGAN: A fact is a fact. You
are afraid of the facts.
MR. HANCOCK: I am not afraid of no
facts, Mr. Speaker, including the minister, if he considers

MR. HANCOCK: himself a fact.
He is not a very big factor in any organization, especially in this government.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HANCOCK: It just goes to show what respect the Premier and this Province had for the fishing industry when they put the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) head of it.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: It makes you wonder, Mr. Speaker, what we are headed for.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, in the hardest times this Province has ever seen, the Liberal Government built 6,000 miles of dirt road and paved 3,000 miles of road. Now, I would like to see the hon. members opposite stand up and place the Tory record against that. I would venture to say they have not built 300 miles of dirt road since they took office.

MR. MORGAN: Is St. Mary's - The Capes done?

MR. HANCOCK: No, Mr. Speaker, St. Mary's - The Capes -

MR. NEARY: We built the roads. If we had been in office we would have had them paved.

MR. HANCOCK: The Tory administration built about eighteen or twenty miles of dirt road in that district, Mr. Speaker, the rest of the road was there.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: And we cannot even get them to pave it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right on! We will finish the job, one of these days.

MR. HANCOCK: And we will get it paved

MR. HANCOCK: one of those days, I
expect -

MR. NEARY: Like old times in
Burnt Island there a couple of weeks ago.

MR. HANCOCK: - as soon as Ottawa starts
saying to this Province, 'We are going to spend money here
and if you do not like it, then that is tough', Mr. Speaker,
and I hope to God it happens tomorrow. Then we will see
that road is going to be done. We have school children,
Mr. Speaker, being bused from North Harbour - this is a
thirty-six mile round trip - over some of the worse road -
the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would not
drive his dog over it and we are expected to haul children
back and forth to school over that section of road.

MR. WARREN: I bet Bellevue gets
paved now, this Summer.

MR. HANCOCK: No, Bellevue will not
get paved, Mr. Speaker, because this government cannot get
along with Ottawa long enough to get any financial help.
We need help now like we never needed help in the past

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: - and we have a bunch over
there who cannot even

MR. D. HANCOCK:

negotiate, they do not know what the word 'negotiation' means, Mr. Speaker, they cannot sit down and talk. And that is fact, Mr. Speaker. Every other Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, could go to Ottawa -

MR. S. NEARY: Shot-gun politics.

MR. D. HANCOCK: - he could go and he could have his meetings with ministers, except this administration over here, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) is looking for road programmes for next year and Ottawa has to come down here to have a meeting with him. I find that offensive, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand Ottawa has the cash that we are looking for, yet we cannot get our local Department of Transportation to go up and negotiate on what deals are going to be worked out this year, Mr. Speaker, in road programmes.

MR. S. NEARY: Ottawa has the money and they do not know how to spend it over there.

MR. D. HANCOCK: No. It is like going to a bank, Mr. Speaker, and you do not need the money then why in the hell do you go in the first place. It makes you wonder why you went there.

But, Mr. Speaker. 6,000 miles of dirt road was a lot of road to build in those days and to pave 3,000 miles was a credit. Mr. Speaker, that is why I can stand here today as a Liberal and be proud of the record that the Liberal Government has got going for them.

But this administration has failed, Mr. Speaker, to look after the needs of the Province, the people of this Province in the last ten or twelve years.

MR. S. NEARY: Put them all on unemployment insurance and welfare.

MR. D. HANCOCK: My good friend here a couple of weeks ago put forth a resolution calling for an investigation into the high cost of living. What happened to it, Mr. Speaker? Every member opposite voted it down. And these are some of the real problems facing the people of this Province. I would say number one today is the high cost of living, the unemployment and number two is roads, Mr. Speaker. And what is this government doing about it? We will soon see what they are doing about it when the Budget comes down, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: They are waiting for the oil bubble to bust.

MR. D. HANCOCK: There was very little mention of it in the Speech from the Throne.

MR. HISCOCK: I would say that (inaudible).

MR. D. HANCOCK: Time will tell, Mr. Speaker. The people of Newfoundland are starting to wise up. They will soon realize what is going on, why we are not getting money out of Ottawa. And I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that if Ottawa was holding back any money from talks that I have had with the minister up there that I would criticize Ottawa just as quickly as I would criticize the Tories here. But I do not think that is the case. I find them very reasonable people, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa.

MR. S. NEARY: Put everybody on welfare and unemployment.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, talking about welfare. I have some rates here that are astonishing, Mr. Speaker. These are the rates of pay for people on welfare, our own Newfoundlanders. These are not foreigners who came in here, or boat people who came in here some time ago, these are our own true-blooded Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker. Now, let me just run them down - this is over a thirty day period, Mr. Speaker, what one child and two adults get if they are on welfare - they

MR. D. HANCOCK: receive \$345 a month, a minimal \$3.50 per day per person to live on, Mr. Speaker. It gets worse as it goes along. I will go down now to three children and two adults where a family receives \$393 per month, \$2.60 per day per person, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: The larger the family the lower the daily rate.

MR. D. HANCOCK: A family of seven, Mr. Speaker, five children and two adults receive \$448 per month, a rate of \$2.00 per day per person. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how anybody can expect anybody to live on \$2.00 a day. You cannot buy a half dozen apples for \$2.00 a day, Mr. Speaker. If there are seven in a family you cannot expect them to live on a half dozen apples a day. A family of nine, Mr. Speaker, seven children and two adults, \$513 per month, \$1.90 per day per person.

MR. S. NEARY: The bigger the family the lower the daily rate.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, there is nobody who can expect anybody - you are not even surviving, Mr. Speaker, on \$1.90 a day.

MR. G. FLIGHT: You cannot even buy a dozen eggs, North.

MR. D. HANCOCK: There is no member of this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, could, if they wanted to, live on a \$1.90 a day. They would have to do without one scotch, Mr. Speaker, that is \$1.90 a day, and I do not think any member here can do without that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. HANCOCK: If there are, their actions sure do not describe it in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Speak for yourself.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I do not drink Mr. Speaker, I gave it up.

But, Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. They came right from the minister's office. I had a case last week - was it last week? -

MR. S. NEARY: Yes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: -last week, Mr. Speaker, where this mother and her daughter are living on social assistance, getting in the vicinity of \$260 per month. The little girl got accepted for trades school, Mr. Speaker, and as all members know, they cannot apply for a loan to go to trades school or - what do you call it, a grant?

MR. S. NEARY: A student loan.

MR. D. HANCOCK: - a student loan until they get accepted for trades college, Mr. Speaker. So I guess like most people around the bays do, they contact their member, first of all, to see what could be done. But they went to the Social Services Department, first of all, and were told that there was nothing that they could do for them. I found that hard to believe, Mr. Speaker. Here is a young girl, eighteen years of age, who wants to better herself by going to trades school and

MR. HANCOCK: getting a trade for herself so she can upgrade herself to fit into the work force in this Province or other provinces and she was denied that right, Mr. Speaker, because she was on social services.

MR. NEARY: No books, no board, no nothing.

MR. HANCOCK: So I automatically contacted the social worker in that area, and I am not ashamed to say who it was, Mr. Speaker, it was in St. Mary's, and all that that man could do for her was give her a note to take to the Trades School and see if the Trades School would give her some secondhand books so she could attend Trades School, no mention of paying her board in town or trying to get her in town to find a boarding house so that young girl could upgrade herself. I find that very offending, Mr. Speaker, that a policy should be in place such as that. You would not do it to an animal, Mr. Speaker.

So what the Department of Social Services is saying to that girl is that, "We cannot help you, you just have to stay on social services, you and your mother, until such time as you get married and, hopefully, you will get a husband who has lots of money so you can go to Trades School then. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. I think that the government has to change its policy so that something can be done for those people, Mr. Speaker. I am sure a young girl, eighteen years of age anywhere around this Province does not want to be on social services until she can find a husband who can take her off, Mr. Speaker. Well, I would encourage the minister - I do not know why we speak in this House at all, Mr. Speaker. We have about three ministers over there now and the rest of them are gone off berry picking or something,

MR. NEARY: Moose hunting and rabbits, a lot of them.

MR. HANCOCK: I do not know why we speak here at all, because I am sure anything any member says - I am getting

MR. HANCOCK: as bad as my hon. friend from Carbonear (Mr. Moores), that you just speak in the House to kill time, Mr. Speaker, because nobody listens to you. You can say what you like, you can write what letters you like, you may get an answer or you may not. If you do something wrong, then you will get an answer.

But jobs, Mr. Speaker; we speak about jobs that this administration talks about that they have created in the past. Well, I can assure hon. members that I am not saying they have not created any jobs, but some members opposite say they created somewhere around 900 jobs in the offshore this year - I stand to be corrected, but somewhere around 900 - but this Winter alone, Mr. Speaker, there were over 800 men with the Department of Highways who were not hired on.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HANCOCK: Well, the men who were not hired on with the Department of Highways only replace the number of jobs on the offshore, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: So it is a half a dozen of one and six of the other, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: That is what they call their figures.

MR. HANCOCK: These are the figures, that they have created 19,000 jobs, but there is nothing about the 800 jobs in there that were not created this year. And to make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, I find out from the Department of Highways - I do not know if this applies to all the Departments of Highways right across the Province, but this third shift, as they are called, the Department of Highways never even had the courtesy, Mr. Speaker, to call those men and let them know that they would not be hired on this year.

MR. NEARY: Right on! That is right!

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. HANCOCK: That is true.

MR. NEARY: That is true.

MR. HANCOCK: In my district that happened, Mr. Speaker. They are still waiting for a call from the Department of Highways saying that they will be hired on this year. They never even notified them, Mr. Speaker, that they would not be hired this year. A lot of those men did not go up North this year because, the same as in the past, they figured that they would get on eventually with the Department of Highways. They announced January 3rd. as a late date because of the type of weather we were having this year, but never even had the courtesy, Mr. Speaker, to notify those people that they would not be hired on.

MR. NEARY: Arrogance and contempt.

MR. HANCOCK: And pasture lands; Well, I have three or four in my district, Mr. Speaker, but there were 120 or 130 jobs last year, lost because of the close down or the giveaway of those pasture lands, or the turnover to private enterprise, and some worked out and some did not, Mr. Speaker. So those are another 130 jobs that went down the drain, Mr. Speaker. So it makes one wonder where are all the jobs coming from that this administration is going to create or has created. Are they jobs over and above the number of employees in the work force or are they just jobs that are being created on one hand and being terminated on another?

MR. NEARY: Sheer fantasy.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, it is fantasy. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker; the road programmes this year that are coming up, is any of the money that was cut out for, or would have been in the budget for road programmes, is any of that money going into the Sychrolift in St. John's? Mr. Speaker, how much is it, \$13 million?

MR. NEARY: You know it is.

MR. HANCOCK: \$13 million that was taken out of the budget this year so that the St. John's district - the Premier never had patience enough to wait for Ottawa to give him the go ahead or give him the money to build the sychrolift. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is money that would have been used in my district and other districts around the Province. I would like to be optimistic about this year's budget, Mr. Speaker, but I am afraid that this is going to be one of the worst budgets brought in by any administration since Confederation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: And one of the worst years in our history.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, one of the worst years. Mr. Speaker, the construction industry this year, as my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said earlier, is at a standstill.

MR. NEARY: A disaster.

MR. HANCOCK: I have three or four major construction companies in the district that I represent and they have not started a motor this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: And I have an awful feeling this year is going to be worse than last year, if it is at all possible, Mr. Speaker, because that budget, if it lives up to the expectation of what I think it

MR. D. HANCOCK:

is going to be, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a bad, bad Budget, it is going to be a bad, bad year all over for Newfoundlanders in general, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Calamity. Get on your stadiums, now.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I was planning on bringing it up earlier, the stadium in Trepassey. There was \$350,000 cut out for a stadium in 1976 in Trepassey, and that was a lot of money in 1976, Mr. Speaker, and the Town Council in Trepassey receives \$70,000 a year for a five year period but out of that \$350,000 there is only \$290,000 working capital, the other \$60,000 is interest. And I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, that this administration cannot come up with the funding to put an ice surface on what was originally cut out for an arena. Mr. Moores gave the Town of Trepassey \$350,000 to get them started.

MR. NEARY: What is it being used for?

MR. HANCOCK: Right now it is being used, I think, for bingos. The Lions Club uses it occasionally and it may be used three or four days a month.

MR. NEARY: In other words, they put up a bingo hall, \$350,000 for a bingo hall.

MR. HANCOCK: We have a floor hockey league there this year, this is their second year in operation now and they have four or five teams there. But, Mr. Speaker, it would not cost too much money to put an ice surface on that. Here we go - and just look around St. John's. You talk about what St. John's has and what the outports have. I think this government is subsidizing the Aquarena in the amount of -

MR. NEARY: \$500,000 a year.

MR. HANCOCK: - \$500,000 a year yet they cannot come up with \$100,000 or \$120,000 to look after the needs and the recreational facilities in that area, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mount Pearl gets subsidized.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, and Mount Pearl. They all get subsidized. You go outside of St. John's, Mr. Speaker, and see how many are getting subsidized - because the public press are in here. That leads me to another point, Mr. Speaker. I did a survey a couple of weeks ago - you talk about members, members representing their districts and doing a good job - I did a survey in St. John's, Mr. Speaker, I made twenty-six calls just to find out - the first question I asked the people was, 'Could you tell me who your member is?' They said, 'What do you mean, federal or provincial?' They all knew Mr. Crosbie and Mr. McGrath but half of them did not know which riding they were in. They were not sure if they were in St. John's West or St. John's East. I said, 'I mean provincially' Mr. Speaker, there were nineteen out of twenty-six who did not know who their provincial member was.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HANCOCK: So then you tell me that we need twelve seats in St. John's, Mr. Speaker. I venture to say that members from St. John's get as minimal a number of calls as is at all possible. They may get ten calls a month, Mr. Speaker, I get that many before breakfast.

MR. NEARY: We get them all and then we -

MR. HANCOCK: We do not need twelve seats in St. John's, Mr. Speaker, we have a council here which looks after the needs of the people in St. John's.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HANCOCK: Because I was talking to a councillor - a couple of weeks ago and he said, 'Huh, I do not know why we need twelve seats either'. I will not mention his name, Mr. Speaker, because I did not get permission.

MR. NEARY: But all the calls we get, we ask them if they contacted their member and they do not know who their member is.

MR. HANCOCK: That is right, yes.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, we talk about ownership of the offshore; I do not know if we have to write letters to members opposite but I, for one, Mr. Speaker, and I think I speak for every member on this side, support ownership of the offshore oil and gas. But, Mr. Speaker, as sure as heck we are not going to get it, we are not going to get it, Mr. Speaker, with the attitude that this government has, when you cannot sit down and negotiate. I venture to say one of those days that, yes, Mr. Speaker, the Premier will gull enough to cancel all permits. But the Premier, himself knows what is going to happen when he cancels all the permits, Mr. Speaker; Mobil Oil, who has invested so much money in the offshore, is not going to stand by and say, yes, Mr. Peckford, well, we are going to haul all our oil rigs down South now, we do not need your money anymore.

That is not the way the system works, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite know that that is not the way the system works. The federal government will issue permits to Mobil to keep them out there because this country needs the oil, Mr. Speaker, and Newfoundland needs the oil. And the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) said they would sit on it until hell freezes over, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure you that the people of this Province will not let the hon. member opposite sit on it until hell freezes over if they do not get complete ownership and their way in the offshore oil and gas.

MR. BARRY: They are right behind us on the issue, they are right behind us.

MR. NEARY: Who is behind you? Are you kidding?

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, there are rumours going around - I wish the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was in his seat - there are rumours going around my district now, and I have heard several constituents of mine talking about it,

March 23, 1981

Tape No. 578

SD - 4

MR. HANCOCK: the fact that Mr. Moores, when he was Premier back in 1976-77, cut out money for the road from Trepassey through to St. Vincent's. The same delegation met with Mr. Moores some six or seven months later with the understanding that that money was cut out for that road. I have been informed - this is only rumour, Mr. Speaker, and I will find out the facts sooner or later - that the then Minister of Transportation

MR. HANCOCK: and Communications, the hon. James Morgan, cancelled that road work and put the money in his own district and in other districts around.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. HANCOCK: That is only a rumour now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I thought this was an honest government, a government of integrity.

MR. HANCOCK: I was talking to a gentleman today - no, this is the government of Mr. Moores now, this is not the honest and -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. HANCOCK: This is a good rumour. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker. I will guarantee the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) will eat his words before I am finished with him. If he were here I am sure he would make some comment, Mr. Speaker, because he has not got sense enough to keep his mouth closed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Another thing, Mr. Speaker, if fumes came in, from the tanks over on the Southside, came in through the windows here, if they were open, I am sure the federal government would get the blame.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HANCOCK: There is nothing that goes on in this Province, Mr. Speaker, whether it be fisheries, forestry that is not blamed on the federal government. Mr. Speaker, is that the attitude that Newfoundlanders want to display to the rest of the Canadians? I say, no, Mr. Speaker. And in the few days ahead, and the months ahead, and the years ahead, Mr. Speaker, I will try and urge this government to - we do not have to give away our resources, Mr. Speaker, no, but we do have to negotiate. That is

MR. HANCOCK: the way the system works. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to get 100 per cent ownership of the offshore oil and gas. Neither is Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. There are going to have to be compromises made for the benefit of Newfoundlanders and for Canadians in general, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right on. Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: Because we are, Mr. Speaker, and the federal government is the Federal Government of Canada. And we do need a strong federal government but we also need a strong provincial government, Mr. Speaker, but the two should learn to work hand in hand.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HANCOCK: Because if they do not do that I am afraid that Newfoundland will be a worse place to live in the future and so will Canada.

With those few remarks I would like to wind up what I have to say, Mr. Speaker. There are other things that I will say in the future, but I know my time is just about up. So I thank the House, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak in the Address in Reply to the gracious Speech, or the not so gracious Speech from the Throne, and I just hope, Mr. Speaker, the budget that is about to be introduced by this administration, will live up to the expectations and the needs, Mr. Speaker, that this government made to the people when they were elected some two years ago, and that is, Mr. Speaker, to try and do something about the high cost of living, the unemployment situation that we have, and the road work.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): The hon. member for Kilbride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would first like to start off by following the lead of the hon. member for St. Mary's-the Capes (Mr. Hancock) in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the gracious Throne Speech who did admirable jobs. I personally envy their ability to do such a great job on this, Not being one of the great debaters in this House, I find it very difficult to get up and express my views quite often. I have been trained as a surveyor. Surveyors are the types of people who like to get out in the woods and pretty well stay to themselves and do their work -

AN HON. MEMBER: And get away from things.

MR. AYLWARD: - and get it over with. But I find it very difficult standing in the House and expressing my views, but being associated with a government such as this government right here, makes it a lot easier to be able to stand and speak on Throne Speeches such as this one.

I see the main effort of this government, and it is mentioned on the very first page of our Throne Speech, as the management of all our resources. This very point, to my mind, shows the difference between the administration which is now in effect and some past administrations, one, in particular, whose policy was develop regardless of the cost. Boom or bust. As long as we have a few short-term jobs, let us go ahead with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that if we do not manage our resources, and all of our resources, so that one can benefit the other, this Province

March 23, 1981

Tape 579

PK - 4

MR. AYLWARD: will not move ahead, it will stay the same, behind most other provinces in Canada. We will not get our standard of living equal to or near most other provinces of Canada. Before I started to get some topics for this speech, I went over some of the material that is in Hansard to see what members opposite were saying and

MR. R. AYLWARD: all I could find from all the speeches that came so far, the only thing of any relevance, I guess, was two attacks on the media from people opposite. Two members opposite suggest that the media are not doing their job. Now, I guess I am probably one of the members in this House who does not get headlines every day, who does not get headlines very often, but I do not blame that on the media. If I had something to say and it was not reported it was because of the way that conveyed my message. So, I would suggest that the members opposite, rather than blaming the media, would come up with some pointed questions for the ministers to make the media listen to them. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the media if I am not being reported, so I do not see how the people opposite could continuously blame the media for not getting their message across, Maybe their message is not worth getting across.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. AYLWARD: - that is the best I can get out of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I did go over the speech that the hon. Leader of the Opposition made and quite a few members over there keep saying that 'yes, we own the offshore, we own it! I do not hear them saying too much that we could control it, which is as important, if not more important, as ownership, who is going to control it. But, as the Leader of the Opposition kept saying that we own the offshore we own the offshore, that is our policy, he also said in the same context that Mr. Trudeau says he will give us 100 per cent of the offshore. Now, if we own it, how can Mr. Trudeau

MR. AYLWARD: give us 100 per cent of anything? If it is ours, we should be giving him, as we have offered to give the federal government and the rest of Canada, a share of our offshore. But I do not see that - if the policy of the members Opposite is that we own the offshore, I do not know how they can agree with Mr. Trudeau's proposal that he will give us 100 per cent of the offshore. I cannot rationalize this. . . But this government also has been criticized by some members Opposite for the new rule that was introduced in this House this year, where we have two days debate on the Throne Speech and two days debate on legislation. But, in my mind this new rule gives every member in the House the opportunity to hear debate on the legislation that is coming. We can have debate on the Throne Speech, which is a wide-ranging debate, no doubt, and people can get different points of view across, but the fact that the new rules allow us to debate more of the legislation which comes before the House, would see that we would pass more legislation and more members can be aware of what legislation is coming rather than the last two or three days, or the last week of the House trying to ram, shove through ten, fifteen, twenty bills that have not even been debated. Mr. Speaker, I think the new rules of the House right now are very good for the legislation and I am glad that they are in effect right now. We have also been criticized very often by local members Opposite and by Federal Liberals, of not being able to negotiate. We have a confrontational attitude, I believe is how it is expressed, but, Mr. Speaker, one of the best observations of the negotiating ability of the members on this side, particularly the government, on this side, is the ERCO contract which was renegotiated last year and that certainly shows that when two people are willing to sit down and negotiate we can accomplish things.

MR. WARREN:

Not the Premier.

MR. AYLWARD: The Premier is the head of this government and when negotiations are undertaken on behalf of this government, the Premier is represented, and certainly the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy is a very capable man who does negotiate on our behalf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the negotiations which we had to undertake for ERCO should never have had to happen. If the agreements were made better in the beginning -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) negotiate only for us.

MR. AYLWARD: We would not have ever had to negotiate it if the agreements were reasonable in the first place, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, we have been criticized by - I think the word is government by media. This one really astonishes me. Because of the fact that the government is trying to get his policies before the people, certainly I cannot see why we could be criticized for this. The more

MR. AYLWARD: this government can gets its policies before the people the more the people can judge us and they are certainly judging us on constitutional issues, which the polls show that we are way ahead in. The people in the Province fully support the Premier on the constitution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That does not mean (inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Some of the policies of this government, Mr. Speaker, are setting up royal commissions so that -

MR. NEARY Wasting the taxpayers' money.
We know a royal commission is a stall set up by government, a stall.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members says that the royal commissions are wasting taxpayers' money. I suggest that the intention of a royal commission is to get public input into a certain issue and that is why they are set up by this government so we can get the feelings of the public.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago, when the spray programme was used before, there was a lot of public outcry because people did not understand the issue. And while there was a royal commission set up this year into the spray programme, into the forestry generally, the issues came out during the meetings. Even though some people might still not agree with the spray programme, they know that it has to be or we do not have a forest industry; within the next fifteen or so years we will not have a supply.

So, Mr. Speaker, the royal commissions, then, and the fact that this government does express its views through the media, are only of benefit to the people of this Province.

MR. NEARY: The fact that you do not do anything (inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not do anything but when we try to do something, like our local preference policy which is a very, very good step forward for this Province we are criticized by members opposite. When we create 900 jobs, and if we had 800 jobs - the hon. member just mentioned that a third shift was not hired on at Highways this year. It would have been quite a waste of money to have them hired on this year because as we can see there was no need of it.

MR. NEARY: They could have informed them.

MR. AYLWARD: They probably were not informed that they were not to be hired on because the government had the intentions of hiring them on when it was necessary.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) boat on a low bed?

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, this government has brought in Workers' Compensation for fishermen, a very progressive step.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman knows it was the Liberals (inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, to compare practices of this government with Liberal policies, be they provincial or federal; This government has shown on many occasions that they are well on their way to creating the 4,000 jobs which were mentioned in the provincial campaign the last time. But the Liberal policies on jobs stand this way, in my mind, and quite a few of the people in my district feel the same, provincial and federal would not have a local preference policy, so that would be almost 1,000 jobs gone right out the window. There would probably be some Texas oil company that would have these crews out there servicing them, and that would be 900 jobs gone. The members opposite are dead against the provincial government helping a synchrolift in St. John's. Probably another

MR. AYLWARD: 500 jobs shot. when that thing would close up in the next couple of years. The spray programme they are against, as a couple of members said they were against it, another 20,000 jobs shot. So the policies of the Liberal Government would negate at least 30,000, 32,000 or 33,000 jobs in a couple of years alone. So rather than create jobs, all they wish to do -

MR. NEARY: Make no wonder you are not in the Cabinet my son. Make no wonder.

MR. AYLWARD: - is to destroy what jobs this government has worked very hard to create, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government's position on constitutional issues, which has been described by members opposite as being greedy, is certainly not that. All I hear this government asking is an equal opportunity with the rest of Canada. We do not want any more. We do not want any less. If we can manage our resources, we are certain that we can bring the standard of living here in our Province up to and equal to any province in Canada. In my mind we have the potential here to have one of the better, most productive provinces anywhere in Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: If you had a leader.

MR. AYLWARD: We have quite a good leader right now, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this government has reaffirmed its position on rural Newfoundland, the policy of keeping this Province with the same type of culture and society that we have always had.

Mr. Speaker, if -

MR. NEARY: Property tax. That is what they are doing with rural Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: - if this government, Mr.

Speaker, was to follow the policies of the federal government, or the centralization policies of one Liberal government locally ruled by Ottawa, there is nobody who would have a

MR. AYLWARD: concern for the rural area of Newfoundland. People do not understand it unless you live in such a setting. There is no one in Ottawa who could understand the rural setting of Newfoundland. Fisheries policies such as sixty/forty and 40 per cent going to offshore are going to destroy our rural type of living. If we do not have an inshore fishery we do not have the type of society that we have right now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What about the property taxes of rural Newfoundland, tell us about that.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker,

MR. AYLWARD: property tax right now is being paid in my district by a vast majority of people, and they agree that they are paying for services that they receive and they are quite happy to pay their way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one other constitutional issue that has come up quite often: we have been accused that we have gotten away from the bread and butter issues but, Mr. Speaker, if we had some kind of an agreement on these constitutional issues, or even the constitution that stands right now, if we had an agreement from the federal government that we could transport our hydro, just one small agreement which they have the power to do already, this, certainly, is a bread and butter issue, we could develop our hydro resources in Labrador, probably one of the best areas left in the world to be developed, but we cannot do it because of an obstinate federal government and they will not -

MR. NEARY: That is not true, that is not true.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that just about every issue within that Constitution is a bread and butter issue, Mr. Speaker, particularly fisheries where we are only asking for a shared jurisdiction, we do not want complete control. Offshore resources, certainly, will be bread and butter in the future for this Province. If we can create some new revenues from this offshore we can develop our renewable resources, Mr. Speaker. The new forestry program which is being instituted, Mr. Speaker, to create eighteen to twenty-three hundred jobs, and I will certainly congratulate the federal government's efforts for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. AYLWARD: They have, they have, Mr. Speaker, allotted \$24 million for this program and I am glad that they did do it. Mr. Speaker, they do some minor things because

MR. AYLWARD: it is embarrassing for them, I guess, to see that they are being negligent in their duties. Such things as the Southern Labrador, the road into Southern Labrador - I can remember before I was involved in politics ever, it must be five years ago at least, that our firm of surveyors was asked to give a quote on the survey of that road. As far as I was concerned five years ago, the surveys were finished and the plans were done and now the provincial government has said we are ready, let us go with it, and no one wants to sign it in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Ottawa wants to sign but the Province will not (inaudible):

MR. AYLWARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the hon. member will not listen but -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: - they do not want to listen to anything good, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing about the Constitution, when it is set up. I am very concerned about the role of the smaller province such as ours, Atlantic Provinces in particular, is that we will not be equal provinces with the rest of Canada. It is obvious that we are not going to have a veto on anything that comes up. Anything that comes up we will be outvoted in it. Quebec and Ontario have an automatic veto, period. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we are not going to be treated as an equal province. We will be reduced to a second-class province of Canada. We will not have the say that the two bigger provinces do have.

Mr. Speaker, the social policies which were mentioned by the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock), the monies for

MR. AYLWARD: social services, I certainly would love to see these increased tenfold, and it is necessary. Certainly it is necessary. If we can develop our resources, if we are allowed to go ahead with the plans that this government have made, we certainly will be putting more emphasis into the social programs of this Province which are definitely needed. And I do not hide the fact that people are living on very meager wages, although they are much better since this government came in. There is much more of a social conscience with this government than there has been with any governments before, Mr. Speaker. The federal government, I understand, now is trying to cut back, and the areas that they are cutting back - Medicare, I believe, is one of the things. Now, this is certainly wrong. They should not cut back in social projects. They should cut back on some of those foolish ad programs they put on television, \$6 million ad programs, that are not necessary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there was also criticism of the federal PC government when they were in, to put a freeze on everything in the Atlantic area. Now, I do not know for sure if there was a freeze or not but things, in my mind, if a government takes over after twenty years of another administration, certainly they have to hold back and review the situation to see where they get their priorities straight and then move on it. They started to move and they were turfed out by a party which said that eighteen cents a gallon on gasoline was ridiculous and we have more than that already, without even a full year of a Liberal government. The same as the wage and price controls, we cannot just sit back and trust and take the word of the federal government anymore, Mr. Speaker. They will bring in wage and price controls. They will put gas prices up much more than the

MR. AYLWARD: PC federal government had planned to do, Mr. Speaker. And as for our employment figures here in the Province, Mr. Speaker, some jobs have to be created somewhere. If our employment rate is dropping 2 per cent - it has dropped 2 per cent which is the biggest drop, I would imagine, anywhere across Canada. Mr. Speaker, jobs are being created. No matter how the hon. members opposite look at it, jobs are being created in this Province and they are being created because of good government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one other comment I have to make about the fact that this government does listen to the public and they do listen to people's concerns: an incident which happened in my very own district when a by-pass road, which is very drastically needed, was planned for an area - and approved on municipal plans, may I add - which would affect some of the prime agricultural land in my district. And this agricultural land is some of the best agricultural land left on the Avalon Peninsula. It is a very sensitive area and planning had to be made around it. Mr. Speaker, the residents of the area and the councils of the area consulted the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) and through the efforts of himself and his department, this road has been moved on two different occasions, the planning has been moved on two different occasions, so that the least possible effect on this agricultural area will occur. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a government that listens to the people and I am very proud of it. I am also very proud of the statement that the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) made just a short time ago, to show

MR. AYLWARD: that agricultural products are increasing in this area in the Province, Mr. Speaker, and that is because of the policies of this government to protect farm land and to help farmers and, generally, to help our renewable resources and to try to make them -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) sleep.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, with those few words I will wrap up seeing that the hon. member is - I am putting him to sleep the same as he puts me to sleep daily in this House, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down and thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I hope I do not put you all to sleep. It is getting kind of late. I would, indeed, Mr. Speaker, move the adjournment if it were accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. Debate adjourned by the hon. member for St. Barbe.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.