



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 30

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
***(Hansard)***

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

28 April 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, although I believe most members of the hon. House will be aware of the statement I am about to make, I am, nevertheless, quite pleased today to announce that a settlement has been reached in the dispute between Iron Ore Company of Canada and Local 5795 of the United Steelworkers.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, this was a particularly difficult dispute. Many of us were concerned that it may have lasting, perhaps permanent, implications for the iron ore industry in Labrador West. I was particularly reluctant to say very much about it because unions have a tendency - and we do not blame them for this - at times to feel that we are trying to intimidate them or create too much pressure on them to get back to work. We were very concerned about this dispute and we are very pleased as a government to have this out of the way.

The new three year agreement which will expire on 28 February 1990 was ratified by the union membership on Monday, 27 April 1987 and employees started

returning to work today, Mr. Speaker.

I have to express my sincere appreciation to the senior officers of the company - we had the Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Carl Nichols, in here on Saturday, and we had the most senior representatives of the Steelworkers Union, Mr. Clement Godbout and others, and this was the process by which we brought this to an end.

I trust that the contract will give the parties three years of labour stability and will assist in the continued viability of the Labrador City community.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, we on this side are pleased, also, and we cheer the agreement. We do not cheer the rest of the problems we have with labour relations in the Province, but we do welcome news of this agreement in Labrador City because it means, of course, that the people of Labrador will now enjoy a measure of security that perhaps was not there last week or two weeks ago.

Also, we on this side, Mr. Speaker, hope that this shows a change in attitude on the part of government toward labour relations in the Province, and on that basis we welcome the statement by the minister and perhaps some other

good news that we may be hearing in the Province shortly. I hope we will hear that good news. I hope the minister will walk into this Legislature before it closes this year and tell us that Bill 59 is dead, that it has been killed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

That would be good news.

MR. TULK:

That would be real performance on the minister's part and would justify the name he came into this House with, 'one of the greatest labour relations people in the Province.' So, we welcome what the minister has said here and we look forward to greater and better things from the hon. gentleman. Otherwise, labour relations will not improve in this Province to the substantial degree that they need to improve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

For a number of reasons I, also, would like to commend the Department of Labour for what I know has been an exceptional job on their part. Both the minister, himself, and his deputy minister, I know, have taken a personal interest in trying to resolve what has been an extremely difficult dispute. I can only add to what has been said before, and I certainly appreciate seeing the work that was done by the department. I have been in very

close contact with the steelworkers who have been involved in the negotiations and I know that they found this a very difficult time, as well. So we appreciate the fact that not only the minister was able to play an active role in resolving the dispute, but that government played a remarkably sensitive role in trying to keep comments as low as possible during the dispute. Because in some instances an inadvertent comment can sometimes make things a lot worse than we would normally think. So I add my congratulations to the minister and the deputy minister for a job extremely well done.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like at this stage to welcome to welcome nineteen level two and level three students from Valmont Academy, Kings Point in Green Bay and they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr Lloyd Janes and Mr. David Rowsell, and their driver.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). Last year the minister announced that he was setting up a different system for the allocation of municipal grants to the municipalities in the Province. My question to the minister is why did he see fit to establish a Municipal Projects Board last year and what did he

see as its function?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

I thank the hon. gentleman for his question, Mr. Speaker. The Municipal Capital Projects Board was set up last year, at the urging of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities to begin with. We had absolutely no objection in setting up that board. We felt that we needed representation on that board from various departments of government that did not have representation on it at the time. It has made the system more expeditious. As the hon. gentleman knows, we have approved our projects this year three full months ahead of what we did last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Last year or previous years we did not have representation on there from the Department of Health, the Department of the Environment and the Department of Transportation, so we thought it necessary to put these people on in the interests of expediency, saving time, so that we could have our projects fully approved in time for the construction season. We saw that as a good exercise and it has worked out quite well.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I wonder if the minister could

elaborate further on the composition of that board as to who exactly the people were, what departments were represented and why were these particular individuals or departments selected?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

As I indicated to the hon. gentleman, we have representation on there from Environment, for obvious reasons because there is very often environmental concerns regarding water and sewer projects, number one. We have representation on there from the Health Department, again for obvious reasons, because there are sometimes health factors to be taken into consideration when approving projects. We have representation on there at the officials level, all these are officials, from the Department of Transportation, and we also have a number of engineering people from the Department of Municipal Affairs. We have the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs on there as well, and these people are charged with the responsibility of compiling all of the applications that come in, approximately \$220 million worth last year. Then they are charged with the responsibility of making recommendations to the minister as to projects to be approved and what have you.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I would just like to go back to the first question I asked the minister, to ask him to elaborate on the function of the board. I gather from his answer the only function of the board was to expedite the approvals, to get it done three months before time. So I wonder, if that is not so, if the minister can further elaborate upon the function of this board and why it was set up.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the board was set up to recommend a set of priorities or criteria for the distribution of municipal grants. I wonder if the minister could table the criteria or areas of priority that this board had to work from.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I have the criteria right here, as a matter of fact. I would be very, very pleased to table it for him.

He asked me to elaborate a little bit on what the function of these officials would be in making representation or recommendations to the minister as to what projects should be approved. They make these recommendations based upon an established set of criteria. The criteria take into account whether the preliminary engineering work has been completed on these proposed projects, the total estimated cost and, if it is a new system or a continuation, they take into consideration the population of the municipality. It takes into consideration whether there is any special health and environmental problems associated with the projects to be approved. It takes

into consideration the estimated cost for property service, the potential future development of the area, the financial responsibility of the council, the agreement that at least 80 per cent of the property owners connect to the system once it is finalized, the proof of the council's ability to pay their fair share of the project, and the total estimated cost of the project as well.

I forget the last part of the hon. gentleman's question.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Municipal Affairs again. It seems as if the main criterion he has left out of his list, and that is the political leaning of the districts. While 88 per cent of the funding went to Tory districts, 12 per cent went to Liberal districts that have been ignored for a large number of years. Now, will the minister not admit that his independent board is a sham, is in reality a board set up to only legitimize his attempts at pork barrelling in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

I hope you will allow me the opportunity to elaborate a little bit, because that is a question that requires quite a detailed answer.

MR. BAKER:

That would require more time than we have in Question Period.

MR. DOYLE:

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to put to bed, once and for all, the myth that my department is firmly entrenched in the pork barrel, because it has taken over a year, Mr. Speaker - and I will table these statistics for the hon. gentleman before week's end - for my department, at my request, to put together the necessary statistics which show that the hon. gentlemen opposite are wrong in their assessment of how municipal capital projects are being awarded and being funded. Because, first of all, let me say that of all the Opposition districts opposite, we have ten Opposition districts that are fully serviced by water and/or sewer, ten districts opposite that are fully serviced by water and/or sewer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Table it! Table it!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will table the statistics for the hon. gentleman if he would to be a little bit patient. Because of that, over 40 per cent of municipalities in Opposition districts did not apply for water and sewer funding this year because of that full servicing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Now that is number one, Mr. Speaker. Over 40 per cent of districts in Opposition ridings

did not apply for water and sewer funding this year or last year because they are fully serviced by water and/or sewer. That is number one.

Number two, Opposition districts represent 30 per cent of the seats in the Province, and 31 per cent of all water and sewer projects approved during the period from 1979 to 1985 were in Opposition districts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

This 31 per cent, Mr. Speaker, represents -

MR. DINN:

I want an investigation into that one per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:

- 26 per cent of all the monies that were spent in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador between 1979 to 1985. That is fact number two.

I know this is hurting the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, but I will table all of this, a little stand up to the scrutiny of any member in this House, it will stand up to everybody's scrutiny, you can all have a look at it. And, number three, this year, even though 40 per cent of municipalities in Opposition districts did not apply for capital funding, in spite of that 20 per cent of this year's capital funding, or \$5 million, went to Opposition districts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:  
So, Mr. Speaker, I will clue up in a second. The district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is 100 per cent fully serviced. Gander is 100 per cent fully serviced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:  
The district of Naskaupi is 95 per cent fully serviced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:  
Menihek is fully serviced, Stephenville is fully serviced, Windsor is fully serviced, St. Barbe is 88 per cent serviced, the Strait of Belle Isle is 73 per cent serviced, and Bonavista North is 70 per cent serviced, by either water and /or sewer. I rest my case, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
You will never impress Harry Steele that way, boy.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
I heard the Premier tutored you in university, is that right? If so,

it is the Premier's biggest failure.

MR. EFFORD:  
And he has many of them. If the minister's figures for the other districts are similar to the figure he gave on Gander he knows he is wrong and therefore I would suspect that all the rest of the figures are wrong.

The fact is that there is reign of terror in this Province, Mr. Speaker, a reign of terror and fear amongst the municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:  
They tell me what they feel, and they tell me they feel they have to vote Tory to get -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. BAKER:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, and it is almost as good as the one the minister made a moment ago.

I will now ask my supplementary question to the Premier. Will he now, in light of what has happened in the last couple of years in this department, check with the municipalities to find out about this reign of terror? Will he, if he finds that there is intimidation being used by this minister, set up a private, independent commission to try and determine where the needs are greatest in this Province? The Premier is good at making faces. I suspect a year or two down the road he will be making a different face.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have been threatened before by the members of the Opposition. Every time they are moving towards another leader, now their eighth since I have been leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, I have been threatened. I was threatened years ago by the now open line host who was then Leader of the Liberal Party. Then I got threatened by the rest of the Liberals when the late Mr. Jamieson came back. Then I got threatened when Mr. Stirling came on the scene. Then I got threatened when Mr. Neary got on the scene. I have been threatened so often, Mr. Speaker, there is a reign of terror. It is a reign of terror on me. They are always trying to threaten me with new leaders of their party, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the press will carry the Minister of Municipal Affairs' statement as much as they carried the Opposition's. If there is a reign of terror in this Province, the terror is against Conservative districts. That is where the terror is. Because we see here, Mr. Speaker, quite obviously, that we have 40 per cent of the Liberal districts that do not even apply for water and sewer because they are already fully serviced. This year, in spite of that, Mr. Speaker, Gander gets \$500,000; the Straits of Belle Isle gets \$546,000; Fogo gets \$450,000; Bellevue gets \$100,000; Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir gets \$155,000; Mount Scio - Bell Island gets \$500,000; Naskaupi, \$330,000; Menihék, \$200,000; Twillingate, \$179,000; Eagle River, \$250,000;

Stephenville, \$400,000; Windsor, \$830,000; St. Barbe, \$135,000; Bonavista North, \$150,000; Port de Grave, \$80,000; Fortune - Hermitage, \$50,000; and St. John's East is not mentioned for obvious reasons, being it is in the City of St. John's.

Now, here is a government that has a reign of terror! The reign of terror is against our backbench, Mr. Speaker. We are not getting a fair deal.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihék.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. As he was speaking about the 40 per cent of the Liberal districts that did not apply, I just listed down all the Tory districts, and it seems to me that I got to about 40 per cent of Tory districts that are also fully serviced, which I suggest would balance it off.

MR. DINN:

Name one.

MR. FENWICK:

Pleasantville.

My question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs is this: When we raised this issue before he indicated to us that one of the reasons that it was maybe slightly lower in Opposition districts than in government districts was you had to look back over several years in order to get a more full view of it. Mr. Speaker, I have done that. Given the information



that the minister gave us this year, what we were able to collect last year and the information we got from the year before - so we have it for three consecutive years - my question to the minister is this: Could he explain why back in 1985-86 the Opposition districts got about 40 per cent of the money that the government districts did, last year that dropped into the 30s and this year, according to our calculation, Opposition districts have only received 26 per cent, just a little bit over one quarter of what the average government district got? Could the minister explain why the percentage is dropping year by year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that the hon. gentleman has been asleep for the last ten minutes. Because I have been telling him and it is quite obvious, that Opposition districts are receiving less money because, number one, there are less applications coming from Opposition districts, this year 40 per cent of the municipalities in Opposition districts did not even apply, and, number two, over ten districts that are represented by the Opposition - there are sixteen of them over there, I think - are fully serviced by either water or sewer, or water and sewer. So, Mr. Speaker, I answer the hon. gentleman.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is this: The minister has been able to get up and say that 40 per cent of the Opposition districts are serviced. I notice he has not included the percentage of the government districts that are, but I am sure he must have the information, and if he calculated it out and I would appreciate it if he would table it.

So the question I have for the minister is this: This year, 1987-88, \$680,000 on average went in water and sewer and paving projects in government districts and only \$179,000 went into Opposition districts. It is my estimate, in talking to people in his department, that the districts are evenly distributed. My question is, now that we have four times as much money going into Tory districts, could he please explain to us why the people in Opposition districts should continue to even pay taxes to their municipal authorities since it is quite obvious that there is a systematic and total discrimination against them on account of this government?

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

I think the statistics will show that the members on this side of the House who represent, as they obviously do, municipalities in the Province, are much, much, much less serviced than communities that are represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. And I think that a good indication of that would be, Mr. Speaker, in my own

district where we have less than 10 per cent of my whole district serviced by water and sewer.

MR. BUTT:  
What?

MR. DOYLE:  
Less than 10 per cent of my district. I think it would be less than probably 5 per cent of my colleague's district here. I can go to all the backbenches here and say the same thing, that probably on the average less than 30 per cent of the districts of the members on this side of the House have servicing of water and sewer.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious why members on this side of the House have to have more funding each year. Number one, there are more members and more districts; and number two, there are at least 70 per cent of the districts on the other side that are fully serviced, and that is the whole reason for it, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:  
To the Minister of Municipal Affairs again, and it has to do with the water and sewage and paving programmes in the district of Green Bay. Two years ago we looked in the District of Green Bay and there was \$1,589,000 spent, last year \$1,800,000, and this year \$1 million.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. FENWICK:  
It was just a small preamble.

MR. SPEAKER:  
This is a final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:  
My question to the minister is this: Would he please explain to us what percentage of Green Bay has water and sewage and paving? Why do we see something in excess of \$4 million over the last three fiscal years going into Green Bay district?

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

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker, I think most people would agree if you are Premier of a Province you would expect a whole lot more funding going to your district than what has gone into the district of Green Bay over the last few years.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I have been shafted by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that is not fair either. I do not appreciate it one little bit.

MR. DOYLE:  
That is right.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
I can see the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Premier think this is a joke and they do not know how much this is affecting the people of the Province. I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs

would he explain if it is not pork barrelling, the fact that Carbonear got \$996,000, Harbour Grace got \$750,000, Harbour Main got \$553,000, Conception Bay South got \$2.1 million, and Port de Grave district got \$80,000, and not one cent in 1986?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentleman why that would be, simply because the town of Bay Roberts is 60 per cent serviced by water and sewer; the town of Brigus is 70 per cent serviced by water and sewer; the community of North River had no application in, and the town of South River had no application in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I submit to the minister, and I would like to ask the minister to explain, the fact that Bay Roberts had an application in for \$1.5 million and the engineers in his department, and everybody leading up to Cabinet, approved it and said that they should get money because of the sewerage flowing over the ground. I submit that it is not 70 per cent, very far from it -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:  
- and I would ask the minister

about the town of Clarke's Beach, which had an application in, and they have no water and sewerage, and only received \$220,000 last year. Will the minister come clean and admit that it is pork barrelling in all those districts?

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

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker, I did not quite understand all that was said, but in any event our Municipal Capital Projects Board this year made recommendations to the department and to me as minister, I suppose up around the \$100 million range, so we do have more priorities than what we have money to deal with these priorities. It is not enough to say that we have \$25 million worth of projects approved and that this was all of the priorities that we had in the Province. That is not true. The Municipal Capital Projects Board had \$212 million worth of applications, and there was a lot of that priorities, but, Mr. Speaker, it has to be pointed out, whether the hon. gentleman likes it or not, that the town of Bay Roberts is 60 per cent serviced by water and sewer, and there is \$10 million in the ground out in Bay Roberts. The town of Brigus is 70 per cent serviced by water and sewer, and the community of North River, as I said, made no application for funding, and the town of South River made no application for funding. Mr. Speaker, next year is a new year and we will do the best we can to deal with the applications from the hon member's district, as we have this year in providing massive amounts of money for Opposition districts in spite of the fact that 40 per cent of all

the municipalities in them did not even apply.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:  
I would ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs to come clean and admit very clearly that in what he has said today he is lying to the members of this House and he is lying to the people of the Port de Grave district, because what he is saying is totally false. Bay Roberts is not 70 per cent completed and all the other communities are not 70 per cent completed.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member was not asking any question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

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

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
The hon. gentleman, if it was not a question, in stating and saying what he was saying, referred to the hon. minister as lying.

MR. EFFORD:  
Yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
And that must be withdrawn. Whether it is said hypothetically or unhypothetically, one cannot say or impute indirectly what one

cannot say directly, and that term lying has to be withdrawn. The rules are quite clear on that.

MR. EFFORD:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order.

MR. EFFORD:  
I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs very clearly if he would come clean and admit that he is lying to the House in the statement that he just made.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member will have to withdraw that.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, since I got elected to this Hon. House I have respected the House with the greatest respect a delegate could possibly have, and every time I stood on my feet I had respect for the House and I said what I believed. Mr. Speaker, the statement I just made I believe to be correct and I am not going to lie to this House.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member was directed to withdraw his earlier words, that there was lying going on, so I call on him now for the last time to do that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not intend to withdraw, I assume he does not, or if he does he would indicate it to me. I would suggest that the procedures is he has to be ordered by the Speaker to withdraw, and if he does not withdraw that he be

named.

MR. TULK:

The Speaker knows that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I do not need you to tell me what the Speaker knows, what you know or anybody knows. I do not need you to tell me a damn thing. I am just trying to give the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave the opportunity to make sure he fully realizes what the process is. Neither the Speaker nor I, nor the member for Port de Grave needs the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. EFFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The point now is that you are refusing to withdraw when you were ordered to do so.

MR. TULK:

What was that about, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SIMMONS:

What was that about over there?

MR. SPEAKER:

I am dealing with this point here now.

MR. SIMMONS:

You stopped dealing with it for a minute while he talked.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am naming Mr. Efford at this point.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Port de Grave has been named, and I move that he be expelled for the remainder of today's sitting.

Question.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against, 'Nay'.

The hon. member has to withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to hear the minister talk about the Liberal districts on this side being serviced by water and sewer. I suggest to him that when that money went in he was trying to pork barrell them to keep them Tory.

The minister last year set up a board called the Municipal Capital Projects Board to make recommendations to the department on what areas should be funded. I wonder if his announcement of last week was entirely in keeping with their recommendations or was it, again, used by him as a cover-up for the pork barrelling that he is carrying on?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, the projects that were approved by the Cabinet over the last few weeks were recommendations from the Municipal Capital Projects Board.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me ask the hon. gentleman if indeed the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities had any input into, first of all, the composition of the board, and, secondly, did they have any input into what projects were approved this year by Cabinet for funding under the Capital Works Programme of his department?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

No, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be highly unlikely or highly unusual for any body outside of government to have any responsibility in making recommendations to the minister or to Cabinet as to what projects should be approved. These projects are very, very closely scrutinized by the Capital Projects Board. It takes a period of months and months and months to compile \$212 million worth of applications. As I said, not all \$212 million in applications were priorities, but we did have a least \$100 million worth of applications that we would like to have seen approved. They were not approved. We approved some which were recommended by the Department of Health and the Department of Environment in the hon. gentleman's district last year, and this year as well. He got over \$1 million last year. He got over \$450,000 this year. I would suggest to him that is anything but pork barrelling.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me suggest to the hon. gentleman that Fogo has been a district that he has not had a chance to pork barrell as a former Tory district. That is the reason why we have got sewage in the trenches and in the ditches in Joe Batt's Arm, Fogo -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- and in practically every community down there. Let me suggest that to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the minister practically has a health problem in my district to deal with and he may have it before this Summer is gone. But let me ask him this question. He made a statement, made a public commitment to this House, and it was repeated by the Premier to the member I believe from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), that before the House closed for the Easter recess we would be given a list of projects that were going to be carried out.

MR. SIMMS:

Before Easter?

MR. TULK:

I said the Easter recess of the Legislature. The House recessed

and no list was provided to this Legislature. Why did the minister fail to keep his word? Or was he ashamed of the raw, rancid pork barrelling that that list shows up to exist in the government of which he is the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased and very, very happy to provide each and every single member of this House, including the press, with a copy of all the projects that were approved so far this year. It has already been made public, it has been in every single paper of the Province. I will give the hon. gentleman the newspapers if he would like to have a look at them. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to hide. As I said a moment ago, we have been more than fair with Liberal districts in the Province, considering the fact, and again I will repeat it, that over 40 per cent of municipalities in Liberal districts, because about 70 per cent or 60 per cent of Opposition districts are fully serviced, did not even apply this year for capital funding. In spite of that, 20 per cent of the funding still went to Liberal districts this year. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is not the action of a partisan government, but a very responsible and responsive government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. It is a matter that affects the privileges of every member of this House, it relates to something the Minister of Municipal Affairs said during Question Period, and I would like to alert you to that, Mr. Speaker. He just repeated it again in the last sentence or so. He said, Mr. Speaker, and I quote him, 'Over 40 per cent of Opposition districts' - by that I assume he means over 40 per cent of municipalities in Opposition districts, so 40 per cent of seventeen districts, or municipalities in seventeen districts - 'are fully serviced and therefore they did not apply for any funding.'

MR. DOYLE:

I did not say that. You do not listen.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, he should make up his mind. He put on a good, brave front today, but my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) is right. He might have used the wrong word in this Chamber, but he is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

The minister has misled the House. I have it on good

authority that money for thirteen Opposition districts is being expended this year on water and sewer, despite his statement which he tried to weasel out of a minute ago. What he said earlier was '40 per cent of the districts', and at one point he used the term 'ten districts'.

MR. DAWE:  
Eleven.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Eleven districts.

There are seventeen districts on this side, eleven from seventeen is six, so by implication only six could qualify for funding. I have it from a senior official in his department, in the last few minutes, that thirteen Opposition districts are getting funding, albeit some measly amounts in some cases, thirteen, Mr. Speaker, despite the minister's assurance to this Chamber in the last hour -

MR. PEACH:  
If you do not want it, send it back.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I am saying water and sewer as opposed to paving.

MR. SIMMS:  
A minute ago it was seventeen. Go back to school.

MR. SIMMONS:  
We have lots of time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PEACH:  
What are you talking about?

MR. SIMMONS:  
You would not know what it is, you are not listening enough.

MR. SIMMS:  
We are listening. You are making

a fool of yourself.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Take your time.

MR. TULK:  
Slow down. Slow down.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I am going to do it every day, as long as he and others keep misleading this House.

MR. SIMMS:  
Get control of yourself.

MR. SIMMONS:  
And I am going to do it as long as my cousin makes a fool of himself.

MR. SIMMS:  
You cannot waste the time of the House.

MR. TULK:  
Who says? Who says he is wasting it, you?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member has not made any prima facie case.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I am going to.

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I have already ruled on that matter now.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Oh! You have ruled on it before you have even heard it? Well, bully for you! Bully for you! Now, get a few more orders from him over there, will you? He even tells you when to name people now. Are you going to tell him to name me?



Mr. Speaker, I have a right here to make a point of privilege and if you take that right from me, you are part of the clique.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is going to take back the comments he has just made. If not, I will name him.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take it back and I ask one more time for some protection from the Chair so I can make points of privilege. That is one of the last rights I have in this House, in a Chamber where I come to represent people who are being boondoggled by a bunch of Tories who are scared about re-election, and they have a right to be scared.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member implied just one second ago that he is not getting protection from the Chair and I ask him to withdraw that without any equivocation.

MR. SIMMONS:

I withdraw that without any equivocation. Without any equivocation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What a man! We are proud of you, boy.

MR. SIMMONS:

Go out and write up your pack of lies for tomorrow, you boondoggler, you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Notices of Motion

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting An Increase in Pensions."

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure to rise to present a petition to the hon. House. It deals with, if I can give a quick little synopsis, the Olympic torch question. I gave indication, just before we opened the session, to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) that I would have a petition, because we have both, as have other members of the House, been supporting efforts to get an extended appearance of the Olympic torch in this Province.

The prayer of the petition is as follows:

WHEREAS the Olympic torch relay route only includes a small geographical portion of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and indeed it eliminates more than three-quarters of our Province; and

WHEREAS this torch relay programme is a major and significant national event; and

WHEREAS Newfoundland and Labrador should supposedly be part of this nation-wide event; and

WHEREAS a large number of people and municipalities in Central and Western Newfoundland and Northern Labrador are extremely anxious to participate along with other Canadians in this programme;

we hereby petition the House of Assembly to use whatever efforts it can to see that the Olympic torch relay committee include the three-quarters of the Province, including Labrador, that have been eliminated from the original schedule.

I mention that there are 228 names on the petition. Two that I have noted are of teachers, and the remaining names are of students of Goose High School in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Naskaupi district.

We have talked about the subject quite considerably in previous petition presentations but there are a number of points, I think, that have developed since that might bear some mention. I understand, through media reports while I was in my district, that Mr. Hunter, I believe, and some other officials were here in this Province, and that there was some fairly substantial consideration given to the fact that they are now considering some sort of a compromised arrangement which would allow, prior to the start of the actual relay as was suggested in this House, a fly-in appearance at a number of airports in other parts of the Province, where the torch could be taken into airports and ceremonies arranged right on site at the airports themselves. I believe that is how the media reported it. I would suggest that if we

cannot have the relay as extensive as we would like to see it, where it would be carried through the various parts of the Province by runners in the relay, that the compromise may be the next best thing and perhaps all we can hope for at this time. And I can visualize that at airports such as Wabush, in Menihek district, and at the airport at Happy Valley - Goose Bay. If they could land at these two airports, for example, in the region of Labrador, arrangements could be made to have some fair representation of people from the various districts participate in the ceremony.

And I am sure it would be possible for the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), if they cannot get the torch physically into Torngat Mountains, to make some arrangements to have representatives from his district present at any ceremony that might take place, say at Goose Airport, which is a central location for virtually all of Labrador.

So I think that we should continue to press for at least that much, to include the other parts of our Province presently excluded by having at least an appearance of the torch at airport ceremonies. I think the same could apply to various other parts of the Province where they have airstrips and suitable airport facilities, to allow the torch to be flown in and ceremonies arranged.

I, myself, as one individual member of the House, and I would trust that the other members from the region of Labrador would also participate in making suitable arrangements once that is agreed to.

I would like to again stress the

need for all of us here in the House of Assembly to strongly support any effort at all to extend and expand the planned current route of the Torch so that all of our Province, and I mean physically every part and geographically every part, will be represented. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I understand that the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is going to be speaking. I believe here we have a winner. I believe here we have something that he and I agree on. I just sought his agreement for me to speak before he does because I wanted to put an idea to him that he, at the very least, might want to react to.

First of all, I am delighted to support the petition presented by my colleague from Naskaupi. I support the prayer of that petition wholeheartedly. I want, since he has addressed the prayer so well, to come to a matter that is peripheral but, I believe, bearing on the overall issue.

I want to say to the minister who is about to respond that we have tried all reasonable approaches here. I believe his administration, he, himself, and others have made representation on this to have a reasonable solution found. Here we are with the same old business. Some guy sits Up-along and looks at a map and decides that because he is taking a torch from St. John's to

Argentia that somehow he has done his thing in Newfoundland. But, then, look at the route in other parts of the country and you have to zigzag all up and down just in case they miss an outhouse or something. It is the same old insult being perpetrated on us, Mr. Speaker.

I say to the minister, and I have not said this before and I do not think anybody has said it on this subject, why do you guys not consider another possibility, tell them we do not want them at all. If that is what they are going to do to us, if that is the best they can do, tell them we will live without the torch thank you very much, tell them they are not even welcome here if they are going to do that insult to us. Because, I say to the minister and I say to the administration, that the way we have had to beg and crawl on this to get them to recognize that we have a Province with a fair amount of geography here, including Labrador, I would go back - and I would even advocate the Premier, and I will sign the telegram with him if it helps the cause - and say, 'Guys, you are not even welcome here if you are going to do it the way you are talking about it, if you are going to make a backwater out of us.' As I say, in other provinces, in the West, you have got them tripping all up and down to make sure they do not miss any backyards and so on, but here, somehow, we have to beg and crawl just to get them to recognize that we have a bit of geography.

My recommendation to the minister, and I want him to react to this if he is so inclined, is to consider saying to the torch people, 'Do not come at all if that is the best you can do', and I believe

the whole process would be a lot better served than it is being served now by this absolutely third, fourth, fifth-class treatment, where we have got to go begging and crawling.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to support the prayer of the petition.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pride and pleasure to support the petition so ably presented by the member for Naskaupi. There were two hundred-and-some-odd names affixed to that petition, a number of which, I understand, were young people, students.

MR. KELLAND:

Two teachers. The rest were students.

MR. SIMMS:

Two teachers and the rest were students. So it was basically a petition from students. That joins a list of petitions that were presented in this Legislature over the course of the last number of weeks from different parts of the Province, including Grand Falls, Windsor, and Corner Brook. It is also in addition to letters and phone calls that I know we have all received. I certainly have received a fair number of them from all parts of the Province, which basically have outlined the feelings just expressed by the two speakers, the member for Naskaupi and the member for Fortune - Hermitage, with respect to the way this whole

issue has gone.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I could say modestly that no one has been more active than I have. Perhaps there have been others just as active, but nobody has been more active than I have in trying to get this whole issue changed around for the benefit, particularly, of young people in this Province who I know have a desire to participate and to carry that torch.

Mr. Speaker, they were here last week, Mr. Hunter, Chairman of the Committee, and some other public relations officials from Petro-Canada. I found out about it through CBC, who called me and asked me if I had had any contact with him. I had not. I have expressed my disappointment - that is probably a mild word to use - in a recent Telex to them, in that I suggested that because of the involvement I had over the last number of months with Telexes and petitions and all-party resolution of this House that at least they might have called me and asked me for my views first-hand. They did not. I think what they what they have offered, described by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), bringing the flame to those areas where there is an airport - basically that is what they are talking about, the flame itself - and showing it off, I think that is small potatoes, it is nothing but crumbs.

It does point out a weakness in their armour, though, because they have been holding steadfast for weeks and weeks, 'We are not going to do anything. We are not making any change.' Well, if they are now prepared to think about making that kind of a change, then I do not see any reason why they could not be prepared to go a little

further and allow that torch to be run in various parts of the Province. That is what we have been after and that is what we want.

With respect to the point made by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), the Leader of the Opposition, that maybe I might consider, as one individual at least on this side, telling Petro-Canada to take their torch and keep it, that we do not want any part of it, I have already said that to Petro-Canada. I have already said that to Mr. Hunter. I sent Telexes to Mr. Hopper, Chairman of Petro-Canada, because it is Petro-Canada that is being overshadowed in all of this. They are the organizers, they are paying the shot, and they are doing it for purely commercial reasons, in my view. Because there are very few Petro-Canada stations outside the Avalon Peninsula, they do not think they will get much out of it in return, and that is why they are having their torch relay run from Signal Hill to Argentia. I think that is grossly unfair, Mr. Speaker, and I still think they could do something to change it if they wanted to. But they are only going to do it if there is enough pressure and enough fuss kicked up, and I hope that there will be more fuss kicked up than we have had up to now, even though we do not have a lot of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have already said what the member for Fortune - Hermitage suggested we say, that we do not want the torch. I told them that. If they do not want to go across Newfoundland, then we are not interested. I have also suggested that maybe we should boycott Petro-Canada products. I have even suggested that to them,

if they did not smarten up. Because the problem is they had somebody sitting in an office in Calgary who did not have two clicks about Newfoundland, not two clicks about the geography of Newfoundland and the feelings of the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I think all we have to do is just keep up the pressure as best we can. Members from all sides should send Telexes and make phone calls to these people, especially the Petro-Canada people. They have a local office here, let us even try them. Maybe if there is enough heat put on them here they will knock some sense into the heads of the mainlanders in Calgary who organized this particular relay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
We have already heard three speakers.

MR. WARREN:  
By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:  
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Leave has been granted.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, just a couple of minutes. I want to support the petition presented by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). I might add, Mr. Speaker, that there is one element in the whole torch

relay that is very, very vital, and we go back to who started the ball rolling. I think it was a person by the name of Gordie Randell, in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. I credit goes to anybody, it goes to the guy who works for the CBC, in Goose Bay, and who started the ball rolling.

I think Mr. Hunter has correspondence from me suggesting, in addition to what the hon. gentleman has said, that I believe that the torch can start in Nain and, using the CN coastal boat, Northern Ranger, within two days it can be in Goose Bay. Also, one other very, very important thing. We have a country that was started by the Native peoples of our land, the Indians and the Inuit people. What an opportunity for Petro-Canda and for the Olympic Committee to have the torch lit and started by a native person of our Province. I have suggested this to Mr. Hunter. So far, I am glad to know, he is taking it under consideration and hopefully we will see the torch in Labrador as well as in St. John's and Argentina. I support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 1.

DR. COLLINS:

Just a word of explanation, Mr. Speaker. I believe the hon. member for Port de Grave adjourned the Budget Debate last day. Now, I guess, it is whoever wants to speak.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not sure how much time I have. Is it half or hour or is it forty minutes? Anyway, I want to make a few remarks in the Budget Debate.

My colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) spoke at length about the details of the Budget. He talked about the horrendous debt this Province finds itself in after fifteen years of Tory government. We are almost \$5 billion in debt and that translates, Mr. Speaker, into about \$8000 for every man, woman and child in this Province. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista North who, I believe, spoke for an hour and half or at length, I know that, and he talked about the budget in detail.

What I would like to do, Mr. Speake, in the half hour or so that I have is talk about municipal affairs funding, talk about funding from the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) for roads, the upgrading of roads, paving and what have you.

Mr. Speaker, during the Oral Question Period just now some members on the government benches referred to the comments made on CBC TV's Here and Now programme by the Mayor of Chapel Arm. Mr. Speaker, I responded to the Mayor of Chapel Arm two nights later on the same programme. I called the CBC reporter who interviewed the Tory mayor of Chapel Arm and he

was good enough, Mr. Speaker, to at least put in a rebuttal from me because a check that I made, Mr. Speaker, with the Department of Municipal Affairs indicated that no application had been sent from the town of Chapel Arm for water and sewer funding for at least the last three years.

So, the question of course, is, does the Mayor of Chapel Arm know what she was talking about? That is the question. She said, and I paraphrase what she said, "I do not totally blame government for the lack of funding for the town of Chapel Arm, about 98 per cent of the blame, yes, but not the total blame." She attributed at least 2 per cent of the blame to the member, to me, for not speaking up on their behalf.

My question to the Mayor of Chapel Arm is how can she expect me to speak up on behalf of the town of Chapel Arm if, number one, they had not even submitted an application for water and sewer funding, and, number two, unless I am kept informed of the activities of the town council in Chapel Arm, or any other town in my district, then, again, I cannot speak up on their behalf.

I was invited, Mr. Speaker, to attend one town council meeting in Chapel Arm in recent history and it was in 1982 during the 1982 March/April election campaign. I was invited to a meeting at the town council office in Chapel Arm the night after Bas Jamieson had been invited. He met with the council in Chapel Arm, and I think the next night I was invited to meet them. Obviously, they invited me to at least appear to be consistent. They were going to invite all candidates in that 1982 general election campaign. Bas,

of course, was the Tory candidate. I was the successful Liberal candidate, as I always have been whenever I have run in the great district of Bellevue.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I might say that when some people talk about Bellevue they say, ever since the district turned Liberal we have not been getting anything. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is Bellevue has never been anything else but Liberal.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They were Liberal Reform.

MR. CALLAN:

Liberal and Liberal Reform, there is a shade of difference. You can ask Mr. Wells and Mr. Crosbie what they intended when they left J.R. Smallwood's Liberal government and crossed the House to form the Liberal Reform Party. Of course, Mr. Wells left Mr. Smallwood to join the Liberal Reform Party. I, in 1975, joined the Liberal Reform Party and, of course, I, as well, left Mr. Smallwood and the Liberal Reform Party a year later in 1976. But anyway, it has always been Liberal. Liberal Reform or Liberal, it was never Tory, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

What about Jim Reid?

MR. CALLAN:

It was not the district of Bellevue. The district of Bellevue was created under redistribution in 1974. The first election that was held in Bellevue, the brand new district of Bellevue, was held in September of 1975 and I was the successful Liberal Reform candidate. Of course, it has been Liberal ever since it was created.

Mr. Speaker, let me for a few moments talk about the history of Bellevue and how it got created. Bellevue got created, Mr. Speaker, in the Spring of 1974 when the Redistribution Bill came before this Legislature. Redistribution comes up every ten years, the question of whether to change the boundaries in existing districts, whether to add additional seats to the Legislature, or whether to take away some districts. It came up in 1984 and, Mr. Speaker, no changes were made three years ago in 1984. A few minor changes, most of it in the interior of Newfoundland where there were no people, just caribou, moose, rabbits, partridge, ptarmigan, and other kinds of fowl and beast.

Mr. Speaker, I talked about some of this before the Easter recess. I talked about how the dirt road sections between, say, Long Cove, Thornlea and Bellevue, were promised to be paved in the Summer of 1974. It was supposed to be done and it could have been and should have been done in 1974 or 1975. It should have been and could have been done in both of these years.

I talked about the fact that the member for Trinity South at the time, which took in Bellevue down as far as Sunnyside, who did the paving in 1973 promised to come back and do it in 1974 and 1975. It was never done, Mr. Speaker, because once the Redistribution Bill came before the Legislature and ten additional seats were added while changing the boundaries of some other seats, the member at the time for Trinity South, he, of course, lived in Heart's Delight and he thought, 'Well, I am going to be running in Trinity - Bay de Verde in the next election so I would be foolish and

stupid to spend my money up in Bellevue, Thornlea and that area.' So they never got their pavement in 1974, even though he was the sitting member representing them, and, of course, so he was during the construction season of 1975. They still did not get it.

Mr. Speaker, this year there is a survey crew and there has been a survey crew in the area of Long Cove, between Long Cove and Thornlea, in recent days driving pegs and surveying. It look as though perhaps this year - there is no tender called that I have seen in any newspaper - government plans to go around Collier's Bay Hill rather than over Collier's Bay Hill which is the way the present road goes. That was promised to be done in 1974. It looks like it may be done this year, Mr. Speaker, which, of course, is thirteen years later. This government is going to fulfill a promise it made thirteen years ago, a long time to wait.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about municipal grants. Let me talk about something else that happened. In 1974 or 1975, I am not sure, but I think it was in the Summer of 1975, Cabinet met and, of course, everybody knows that Cabinet has the final approval on roads programmes, what roads will get paved, reconstructed and whatever, and also what municipal grants will be approved. Cabinet has the final approval.

Cabinet met, Mr. Speaker, in the Summer of 1975 and Cabinet decided to approve water and sewer funding for the town of Sunnyside. The member for Sunnyside and for Trinity South, the same member, of course, who promised to pave the



road between Bellevue and Thornlea at the time, was not at that Cabinet meeting. He came into St. John's the next day and found out that water and sewer was approved for Sunnyside. Then he went down to Municipal Affairs and said to the officials there, "Do not send out your telegram to the town of Sunnyside informing them they have water and sewer approval because they are not going to get it. I will not be running in Bellevue or in Sunnyside or Thornlea the next time. I am going to be running in Trinity-Bay de Verde which ends at New Harbour, coming up the shore, so I want that water and sewer to go somewhere else."

Mr. Speaker, where did it go? It went to the town of Heart's Delight and who lives in Heart's Delight, the member who then was the member for Trinity South, who is now the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid). If that is not adding insult to injury, who got the contract to install the water and sewer in the town of Heart's Delight? The member for the then district of Trinity South, who is now the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

Now, there is a little bit of history, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the Mayor of Chapel Arm is not familiar with. The Mayor of Norman's Cove is familiar with it because I told her the story before.

MR. BUTT:

Was it public tender?

MR. CALLAN:

Well, it was a public tender but I am not saying that the Public Tendering Act was interfered with. All I am talking about are the coincidences. It was not the Public Tendering Act that decided

to move it from one town to another, let me tell the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) that. Obviously the contract was subject to a public tender.

So there you see, Mr. Speaker, that is the history of this government.

MR. BUTT:

What are you on now, the budget speech?

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, I am on the budget debate, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of government members on the government benches over there who do not know what I am talking about. I am talking about the fact that this Province is almost \$5 billion in debt. I am talking about the patronage and the pork barrelling when it comes to road work.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Mayor of Chapel Arm may not realize but there is something going on in this government. I leaned about it several years ago and here is what is going on: I, as the member for Bellevue district, Mr. Speaker, have to make a choice, to squeak or not to squeak, that is the question, to squeak or not to squeak. But before I get into that, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about how contradictory the Premier is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure most members will remember about a month ago the Premier was on the public airways in his fight against Ottawa trying to get more money. The Premier was saying at the time, the squeaky wheel gets the grease. That was fine for the Premier when he was squeaking against bad old Ottawa and that

was why he was making all the fuss, he said. That is why he was making all the noise.

What does the Premier say to the people in this Province who squeak and make a noise? If you make a noise and if you try to embarrass this government by demonstrations or coming on the public airways criticizing this government you need not bother to expect to get anything; you will not get anything. What you have to do is do it quietly and then you might get something.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) says it is hard to believe. It may be hard to believe but it is true, because let me give you some examples, Mr. Speaker. I came in to see the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) about two years ago. I accompanied a delegation from the town of Hillview, well, actually the committee represented the town of Hillview, Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Within. They came into town one evening after school and we sat down, I believe it was on the sixth floor, with the Minister of Transportation and, of course, the delegation put forward an argument for upgrading the road, the twelve or thirteen miles, Mr. Speaker, between the Trans-Canada at Hillview and the dead end road at St. Jones Within. They put forward a case.

MR. WARREN:

How many votes did you get in Bellevue?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was - what shall I say - very ungentlemanly. He performed a very unfriendly act against one of

his colleagues, me, when he tried to present a petition a while ago from my district and he tried to mislead the member for Naskaupi by saying it was from his home town when it was not from his home town and, of course, it was not from his district.

Earlier in this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains asked me if he could have a couple of minutes leave to speak on a petition and I, because I was the leader of our side of the House at the time, said yes, sure, you will have to have leave. He stood and he spoke. I thought I was doing the gentleman a great favour.

Here he is now over there, Mr. Speaker, interrupting me, asking how many votes did I get. Well, it is on the public record that in the town of Hatchet Cove, which is a small town, they do a hatchet job on a Liberal candidate. In the last election in 1985, the number of votes that I got in the town Hatchet Cove were zero, not one vote.

Mr. Smallwood would say, 'Do you think I got ten or nine? Perhaps you think I got eight or seven. Some people might think I got six or five or four.' The answer, of course, is, Mr. Speaker, I got no votes, not one vote in Hatchet Cove but that does not change my affection and my concern for the people in Hatchet Cove. If they asked me today or tomorrow to help them with a problem, individually or communally, I am only too glad to help them, in the same way that I am only too glad to try to help the people in Chapel Arm, if that is the route they decide to go. Mr. Speaker, they may decide not to go that route because - let me finish my story - the committee

from Hillview, Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Within came in and we met with the Minister of Transportation. Nothing resulted from that meeting.

Apparently the minister said to the Chairman of that committee or said to somebody on the committee, 'What I would like to do next is come out to your town,' and that happened. Subsequently, the minister did go out to Hillview, but I was not involved.

I said to the committee, Mr. Speaker, 'Listen, you do not have to invite me to your meetings with ministers, you know, with the Minister of Transportation, if you do not want to.' I said to the committee, 'If you think you can get better cooperation without me, okay. As a matter of fact,' I told them, 'To be quite frank with you, I believe you would have a better chance of getting funding for your roads if you did it behind my back, so to speak.' I gave them that advice as a good member. Lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, it worked.

The committee, when the minister went out to Hillview, invited along Captain Morrissey Johnson. He had nothing to do with local roads, but he was another Tory. So the committee met with Captain Morrissey Johnson and the minister and, lo and behold, they got \$250,000 to upgrade their roads in Hillview, Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Within. Some members of the Committee after said to me, 'You know, you are right. We would not have gotten anything if we had kept you involved in our efforts but now when we broke away from you, the minister would get all of the credit.'

By the way, I should also mention,

Mr. Speaker, about a week after the decision was made to put \$250,000 into that Hillview road, I read a little article in The Clarendville Packet from the Minister of Transportation where the minister was announcing these funds and he was happy to do so, he said, in conjunction with his colleague in Ottawa, Captain Morrissey Johnson. I thought it was silly and childish but that is what happened. I can produce The Clarendville Packet which will show the article.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what did the Committee from Hillview do this year? They again invited the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) out to Hillview to one of the committee member's homes. I understand they had a great meal of turr, rabbit and moose, or whatever they served, and the minister was wined and dined. It is a smart committee, Mr. Speaker. If that is what you have to do with some Cabinet ministers, feed them good food and invite them to your home and wine them and dine them in order to get some, not P.C. Party funds, taxpayers' money put back into your community, then I say congratulations to the Roads Committee in Hillview, Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Within.

Mr. Speaker, no announcement has been made yet, or I have not seen a tender called yet for Hillview. But I would venture to guess, because I was not involved with the Committee again this year, they will get another quarter of a million this year for Hillview, Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Road. I will say they will. Who will make the announcement, I do not know. I know of one person who will not get a chance to make it, Mr. Speaker, and that will be the

member. I will get a chance to read about it but I will not get a chance to make it, because, after all, Mr. Speaker, this is P.C. Party funds we are talking about. This is not taxpayers' money they are going to give to the people in Hillview. It is going to be Tory money, I believe. That is the way they handle it. I am speaking with tongue in cheek obviously, Mr. Speaker. But it just shows how dictatorial, how discriminatory, and how small-minded some Cabinet ministers are in this government.

As I said, I have not seen a tender call for that section of road, but I did in last weekend's paper, The Evening Telegram, a tender call for pavement between Hodge's Cove and Little Hearts East, four kilometers, which I learned about through the grapevine probably three weeks ago. So that is great! The pavement this year will go down on that side of Southwest Arm. It will go through Hodge's Cove. It will go through, pass by really, Caplin Cove and it will come pretty close to Little Hearts East. It will take probably another two years, at that rate, four kilometers a year, which is 2.4 miles. At that rate it will take probably two more construction seasons to get the pavement laid all the way to Southport. Then, of course, after that another year will probably take another four kilometers to do some of the by-roads and roads that go around the community of Hodge's Cove.

MR. TOBIN:

Are you against that?

MR. CALLAN:

Oh, I am for it. I wish the tender call had talked about ten

kilometers rather than four, because that would have done right down to Southport and would have done some of the by-roads.

Mr. Speaker, I talked about the contradictions of the Premier just now, when he talks about the squeaky wheel gets the grease. So you have to make a lot of noise if you are the Premier of Newfoundland and you want to get some money out of Ottawa. That is what the Premier said on public television. But, of course, it does not apply to committees like the Local Service District in Markland or other committees. What you have to do is you have to do it very quietly and on the sly and do not involve your member. That is very important. Do not involve your member because if the Minister of Transportation thinks that the sitting member, who was elected by the majority of voters by the way and all that - he was not appointed to the job, he was elected to the job and was elected four times, Mr. Speaker - he is not supposed to be involved in taking any credit or making any announcements. It has to be done by the minister.

So it is, Mr. Speaker, that we see a government that contradicts itself, that is small-minded, that is discriminatory in the way it treats different areas of the Province. I have referred to it on many occasions, the way they are keeping two cottage hospitals open on the Burin Peninsula even though the Orsborn Royal Commission Report said, 'Close them down,' as you did with Come By Chance. Of course, other reports are suggesting the same thing should be done. I will get to that in Question Period, perhaps, tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you another example of how the Premier contradicts himself. I was going to write a letter to the Editor, as I did, I think it was sometime last Summer I wrote a letter to the Editor. It got in The Newfoundland Herald and The Evening Telegram Weekend Edition. It got good coverage. My letter to the Editor talked about how the Premier has contradicted himself on several important matters, promises that he made and did not fulfil. But, Mr. Speaker, one comes to mind as I stand here.

I think most hon. members will remember when Mr. Rompkey was our Cabinet Minister in Ottawa, when we had the Trudeau Government up there. Most members will remember Mr. Rompkey came down with some sort of a package, a package that had to be signed by the federal minister and the Premier which, of course, happens probably a dozen times a year, you know, the federal minister comes down and either the Premier co-signs some documents, it could be \$100 million or whatever.

But on this particular occasion the Premier, Mr. Speaker, said, 'No, I am not going down to the Newfoundland Hotel where Mr. Rompkey is to sign those documents.' He said, 'Mr. Rompkey, will have to come to the Eighth Floor of the Confederation Building. He will have to come to the seat of government. That is where documents are signed involving money from Ottawa to this Province, transfer payments or whatever they may be.' So we had a courier service carrying the documents back and forth from the Newfoundland Hotel. That was the old Newfoundland Hotel, by the way, Mr. Speaker. I think I

understand the real reason now why the Premier did not want to go down there. It had nothing to do with the seat of government. It had to do with the fact that the old Newfoundland Hotel was not posh enough for the Premier and that is why he wanted to stay here.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said all of these documents should be signed at the seat of government. Now, the Premier, Mr. Speaker, last year spent almost \$1 million on the Eighth Floor of this building, in his offices, to do up his offices.

MR. YOUNG:

That was not last year, it was the year before.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, last year or the year before last, within the last couple of years he spent almost \$1 million doing up his offices. Now, Mr. Speaker, -the- most important document that has been signed in this Province since Confederation, by the Premier's own admission, was the Atlantic Accord.

Did we hear any foolishness like, 'I am not going down to the Newfoundland Hotel to sign the Atlantic Accord. If the people in Ottawa want the Atlantic Accord signed,' Mr. Speaker, 'they will have to come to the seat of government. The Prime Minister and Pat Carney, the federal Minister of Energy, will have to come and to the seat of government.' Did we hear any of that? Of course not, Mr. Speaker.

Now it was convenient for the Premier to go down to the Newfoundland Hotel for a couple of reasons, number one, of course, it was not the same old hotel, it was

a posh new hotel, the best hotel in the Province I suppose, the Newfoundland Hotel today. That was why the Atlantic Accord was signed there, one reason. The other reason was, Mr. Speaker, it was a public event, and so the Premier dragged half the civil servants who work in the Confederation Building, forced them to go down and sit around and applaud and smile as the Atlantic Accord was being signed and as the photographers took all the pictures that would be kept for posterity. That, Mr. Speaker, is another contradiction on behalf of the Premier.

Now that he has \$1 million office, you would be expecting him to say that all documents coming down from Ottawa or wherever should be signed at the seat of government, as he said, of course, during the time of the Trudeau Government and Mr. Rompkey in Ottawa. But, no, no, the Premier contradicts himself once more and he signs the most important document since Confederation not in the seat of government, Mr. Speaker, but down in the Newfoundland Hotel.

That \$1 million, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier spent on his office on the Eighth Floor, that could have put a lot of pavement in Bellevue and Thornlea. It could have resurfaced the road leading from the Trans-Canada Highway down to Chapel Arm, Norman's Cove and Long Cove. It could have resurfaced that. It is capital works money so I cannot say it could have kept the Come By Chance clinic open or upgraded it to a sixteen or twenty-four hour clinic because that is current.

What I can say, Mr. Speaker, is if we did away with the Ombudsman's

office, which is a waste of the taxpayer's money, almost \$200,000 a year, that current account money could be spent to keep the Come By Chance clinic working as it should be working, at least a sixteen hour a day facility and perhaps a twenty-four hour a day facility. The Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is looking at me and he understands what I am saying.

It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health either does not have the will or does not have the power, whatever it may be, to convince his Cabinet colleagues, gentlemen and lady, since there is only one in the Cabinet, let us be fair, let us be consistent, let us upgrade the medical facility at Come By Chance. Let us give them a twenty-four hour clinic like we did at Whitbourne, after trying out a nine to five and failing, let us give them a twenty-four hour clinic. We will only be half consistent then because on the Burin Peninsula we are leaving two hospitals there, one with forty-six people working in it and the other one with sixty. What is the bill to the taxpayers of this Province, Mr. Speaker? The two hospitals combined cost, Mr. Speaker, almost \$3.5 million. What would it take to put an additional doctor and nurse, and perhaps an additional staff member in Come By Chance - utility worker or whatever? It would be about \$100,000 to put another doctor, another nurse and perhaps a utility person or someone else in the kitchen, or whatever.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, with these few

remarks I end off by saying, and let me repeat, that this government is dragging this Province head and ears in debt. It is almost \$5 billion now and with mismanagement and the way that Municipal Affairs grants are doled out, the patronage appointments that we have in this Province and the way that funding is provided for paving and upgrading of roads, Mr. Speaker, it stinks and everyone on the government benches should hang their heads in shame. If they have any shame, they should hang their heads.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the next few moments, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on some of the good things that are in the budget. In fact, you would not believe that every time a budget comes down, it is brought down by the Finance Minister. All we can hear from the Opposition members is everything that is bad. I just listened to the hon. gentleman for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and the hon. gentleman did not mention, until he was almost finished, more paving in his district. The hon. gentleman did not mention money for water and sewerage in his district. There are a lot of goods things.

I want to dwell mostly in my remarks on what the budget contains for Labrador. In fisheries alone, in the two fish

plants in Nain and Makkovik in my district, something like \$1 million will be spent this year. They will employ in excess of 100 people. Furthermore, in the estimates this morning the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and I hope the media is listening because this is very, very important.

MR. TULK:  
I should call a quorum.

MR. WARREN:  
Why do you not call a quorum? Go ahead and call it.

MR. TULK:  
I will not call it yet but would somebody go out and tell your crowd to come in and listen to your arguments?

MR. WARREN:  
I say to the hon. gentleman to go ahead and call a quorum if he wants because I do not mind. All I want to say is that the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (W. Carter) this morning -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
The hon. gentleman is up there and he is trying to do his best to make a speech and it is very difficult to do when his own colleagues will not even listen to him. I wonder if some of his people over there might out out and get a crew in for him so he will have somebody to talk to? Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) do something useful?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

If the hon. House Leader opposite has a point to make about the number of people in the House, there is a correct procedure for doing it. If he does not want to do that, he should not allude to the matter as he is only wasting the hon. member's time.

MR. TULK:

I do not want to waste too much of his time getting a quorum in here. Go out and get some people in here.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Twillingate was present at the Estimates Committee meeting this morning when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) said that the top priority for funds from the sale of FPI is major overall, major repair, major renovation, major extension to the two fish plants in Nain and Makkovik.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do you call that a bad news budget? Do you call that a bad news budget, Mr. Speaker, that the top priority will be the extension and repair of the two fish plants in my district? And what else did the minister say this morning? The minister mentioned that a marine centre will be built in the

district of Torngat Mountains. It is also one of his priorities.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How about Mount Pearl?

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about Mount Pearl? I would say to the hon. gentleman, I reside in Mount Pearl part of the year, and I would also say to the hon. gentleman that Mount Pearl is represented by one of the hardest working ministers in Cabinet and I would think that is why Mount Pearl is getting a piece of the pie.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to take exception to an item I read in The Evening Telegram some days ago, when they quoted the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) regarding water and sewerage in PC districts. He listed all the PC districts saying, "This much here, this much there, this much somewhere else," and then he made the statement, "No money for water and sewerage in the district of Torngat Mountains."

AN HON. MEMBER:

None in Menihek, he said.

MR. WARREN:

And he said none in the district of Torngat Mountains.

I should tell the hon. gentleman that if he would look at the estimates he will find an amount of \$3,063,000 for my district - \$3,063,000 is going to be spent in the district of Torngat Mountains. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know he is going to come back and say it is federal money.

MR. W. CARTER:

Oh?

MR. WARREN:



Hold on now. There is \$2,216,000 federal money, but there is \$1,414,000 provincial money.

MR. W. CARTER:

In what, water and sewer?

MR. WARREN:

Water and sewer in the district of Torngat Mountains, \$1,414,000. Not a question was asked today by Opposition members about all the money that is going into the district of Torngat Mountains, which has a population of only 3,000 people.

MR. TULK:

We know what that is. It is called blood money.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I should answer the hon. gentleman who just said that. If you want to talk about blood money, I believe the hon. gentleman was part of a group that got the hon. member from Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) to go over there. Now, that same hon. gentleman has now decided to go with somebody else.

MR. TULK:

Oh, the power of the Opposition.

MR. WARREN:

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) does have a good record. Let us look at the last four leaders the hon. gentleman backed. Where are they? Where is Mr. Neary?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Gone.

MR. WARREN:

Where is Mr. Stirling?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Gone.

MR. WARREN:

Where is Mr. Barry going to go?

And I will give Mr. Wells, with all due respect to him, two years.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can see that the hon. gentleman from Fogo has -

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy the hon. gentleman so much but I have to say that there was a leadership convention a while back and he walked into my office and I told him that no way was I going to support him for Leader of the Liberal Party, that I would take Len Stirling over him. That was terrible. He is jealous about it now.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, if I had the track record of backing leaders that the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has, then I would -

MR. TULK:

They always win.

MR. WARREN:

Yes. I must admit to the hon. gentleman that they always win at the convention. That is one thing I have to admit, they always win at the convention. But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot run the government of the Province by just merely winning at a convention.

My hon. friend from St. John's East (Mr. Long) is not in the Chamber. Hopefully he is in the confines somewhere and he can hear me.

MR. DINN:

He is not looking after St. John's East. I am looking after it now.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, I say to my hon. colleague

from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn), I am sure he must have an extra burden to carry now. He has to look after his own district, plus the district of Mount Scio - Bell Island, plus the district of St. John's East. I can sympathize with him, because, as the hon. gentlemen will realize, there are four districts in Labrador and people from all over Labrador are calling upon me to do the same thing. So I know how very, very difficult it is.

The member for St. John's East has, on several occasions, spoken about Native land claims. He has asked why government does not recognize the Inuit people's land claims. In 1977, the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs at the time wrote the Indian Band Council and the NMIA, and asked them to give him their policy on land claims. In 1982 it was requested again. Up until today they have not replied to that last letter. Now, if the Inuit people want to deal with their land claims, surely goodness they have to put their policy and their ideas and everything else together first. So I say to the hon. gentleman for St. John's East that he should forget about government not supporting Inuit land claims, because as of today there is no such policy on the table.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I appeared with my other colleagues from Labrador before the Electoral Boundaries Commission, asking that Labrador have its own federal seat. There were members of our party, federally, who were against Labrador having its own seat. In fact, I understand the former Mayor of Corner Brook, Noel Murphy, was against Labrador having its own seat.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Mr. Rompkey - I want to mention this and I hope the media can hear me, because they have been told it before - did not appear before the Commission and I wanted to find out why.

MR. TULK:

Why did you not ask him?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman, I did ask him and I will tell the hon. gentleman what his answer was. 'Well', he said, 'it would be a good Liberal seat if St. Anthony could be included.' Now, Mr. Speaker, was Mr. Rompkey more concerned about winning, because he was a Liberal, or because of the aspiration of the people in Labrador? The hon. gentlemen knows that Mr. Rompkey would not support a Labrador federal seat because Mr. Rompkey knows and I know and the hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Rompkey cannot win a seat in Labrador.

In fact, I understand that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) may be taking a crack at the federal seat. I also understand that the former member for Naskaupi may be taking a crack at the federal seat. I understand the President of the Combined Councils of Labrador may be making a stab at the federal seat. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), I know he is listening and I understand, from talking to somebody from his district a few days ago, that he has feelers out now and he is looking at the Labrador federal seat. I should also say to my friends here that I am not turning a blind eye to that seat either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I should say to hon. gentlemen that if the opportunity does arise and if I do decide to take that big giant step, I know there would be no problem whatsoever. But I am sure there are more qualified candidates than I.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go to some other goodies in the good book called the Estimates.

MR. TULK:

Remember the time you told us you were attacked by a goose? You were knocking on doors for the Liberals then.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Fogo was with me when we both knocked on doors in Rushoon and Boat Harbour, in Baine Harbour and one other community up there, I think, Parkers Cove. The the hon. gentleman knocked on doors in one community and I knocked on doors in another community and we had a bet on who would get out the most voters on election day. When the election was over and the votes were counted, the community I canvassed outdid the community he canvassed by seventeen votes, which shows that the hon. gentleman is going to have to campaign much harder.

I am glad the hon. gentleman has gone, because he takes me away from my train of thought, Mr. Speaker. I want to mention the commerical caribou hunt. I want to compliment the Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews). Last Friday was to be the last day for the commerical caribou hunt in Labrador. After representation was made to the minister about the bad weather up there this year, the minister

extended the hunt to this Saturday. There are now thirty hunters in shooting caribou and transporting it out to Nain, and in a very, very short time there will be some 1,000 to 1,300 caribou for sale on the Island portion of the Province. I say to my hon. colleague from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), who is showing much interest in what I am saying, that in a very short time he can enjoy a barbecue with nice Labrador caribou steak, caribou killed and packaged by the people in Labrador, thanks to the efforts of this government.

I cannot finish my speech without speaking about my good friend, my buddy for years and years, from Bellevue. I have to say to him that I am getting an awful lot of representation from that district. Between my own district and the district of Bellevue, I do not know which keeps my phone the busiest.

He mentioned the medical clinic at Come By Chance. I am confident that with Come By Chance going full blast and with Adam's Head going full blast, you will see the hours of the medical clinic at Come By Chance extended. And I have no doubt then when the need arises you will see an extension to the medical clinic facilities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only gentleman on the other side who spoke about something in the budget and said it was good news, but then said it was bad news, is our NATO friend, our friend who goes wishy-washy, who slithers in and out of the House, who is against NATO one day but for NATO the next day, who is for jobs one day but against jobs the next day. He mentioned that there was going to be a reduction in the

cost of electricity to the consumer in Coastal Labrador. I made representation to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Energy some time ago, and I believe the Minister of Finance will agree that I asked for much more than I got. I asked for a larger reduction than I got but, Mr. Speaker, constituents of mine and constituents of the member for Eagle River will notice next Winter that the number of kilowatt hours they use may be the same but there will be a reduction in the cost; not great but a reduction. Consumers on the Coast of Labrador will save, depending upon the number of kilowatt hours they use, anywhere from five to ten dollars a month, or maybe more. That, in itself, is a saving. Now, I am not saying to the Minister of Finance that I am expecting the Minister of Finance to do better next year, I am sure the Minister of Finance will look at the cost next year and hopefully he will be able to do better.

DR. COLLINS:

The member for Torngat Mountains is very persistent.

MR. WARREN:

I say to the Minister of Finance that I appreciate all the good things that he has done in this budget for my district, but I believe he realizes that the cost of living on the Labrador Coast is much greater than anywhere else and subsequently, Mr. Speaker, he is going to have to look at ways and means of reducing electricity rates for the consumer.

I do not know who is going to speak after me, but I hope it will be the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, because I think he is one of the most critical

individuals over there, other than the member for Port de Grave, about a Social Services programme called Community Service Projects. He is not very happy about those projects.

MR. DECKER:

I am not?

MR. WARREN:

No. You have not appeared to be. If you are, you have not said anything about it. I mean, if anybody is happy about a programme they should preach about it; I understand the gentleman can do that part of it. Surely goodness at an opportune time you should talk about some of the good things that are happening in rural Newfoundland and Labrador. I want to mention Social Services' short-term projects, as they are called.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The ten stamps projects.

MR. WARREN:

You can call them the ten week stamp programme. The hon. member can call them what he wants, but I say to the hon. member that last Winter and this past Spring in the town of Nain and in the community of Davis Inlet there was a 46 per cent reduction in the number of unemployed. So, if the hon. gentleman can condemn that kind of a programme, if the hon. gentleman can condemn a programme that is working in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, then so be it. But I have to compliment the Department of Social Services. I have to admit, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will, that out of the thirty-nine people in Nain who worked on the various projects last year training as radio operators, or training as bookkeepers, seven of those,

roughly 20 per cent, have found permanent employment. Even getting one person permanently employed shows that that programme is working. Seven out of thirty-nine found permanent employment because of the training provided by this programme.

I am sure the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) can verify some of those figures, since some of his constituents have been working at the Native Friendship Center, for example, or at the Libra House. Different projects that the Department of Social Services is carrying out are very beneficial and there is long-term employment associated with them.

I am still not satisfied with the increase in social assistance to those in need, in particular where we have different geographical regions. The monthly payments should differ according to need and according to region in my area as well as the area of Eagle River, and my friend for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) can verify that the needs up there are much, much greater.

In closing Mr. Speaker I want to say that I support the initiatives of this government in this budget. It shows that we cannot have all that we want. But I should say to hon. gentlemen who were asking questions of the Minister of Municipal Affairs today, and I can look at the member for Bellevue and the member for Fortune - Hermitage, that I am sure that in their districts there has to be more than 20 per cent water and sewerage. My district does not yet have 20 per cent, so I would say to the hon. gentlemen that there are districts represented by members on this side which need services as well.

Out of the five members I see over there now, three are former teachers.

MR. SIMMONS:

And the rest would like to be.

MR. WARREN:

I am sure they should be at least half decent at mathematics. They should be able to do mathematics fairly well. So I suggest to those three hon. gentlemen, who have some schooling, that when they go home tonight they take the list the minister has supplied and see if they can calculate district for district what has been given and what has not been given, and I am sure they will find that districts represented by members opposite have been faring off just as well as districts represented by members over here.

MR. SIMMONS:

Then what are you doing over there?

MR. WARREN:

What am I doing over here? Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not hear the first part of my statement when I mentioned the member for NATO, as I call him, who was quoted in The Evening Telegram last week as saying there were no water and sewer projects for the district of Torngat Mountains. My district, Torngat Mountains, has received \$1,414,000 of provincial money, \$1,414,000. The hon. gentleman asked me what I am doing over here - \$1,414,000, that is what I am doing over here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, less than 20 per cent of my district, I say to my hon. colleague, has water and sewer, but with a new system starting in Postville this year, \$1.2 million, a new system in Rigolet \$1.3

million, and \$450,000 in Nain, next year I can get up here and say to the hon. gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage "Last year you heard me say that less than 20 per cent of my district had water and sewerage. Well, Sir, close to 50 per cent have it this year. Close to 50 per cent." If the hon. gentleman is taking note, altogether \$3,063,000 has been provided for water and sewer in my district, \$2,216,000 federal funds, \$1,414,000 provincial funds, it is cost shared with the federal government.

I know my time has just about run out, therefore, I will clue up by saying that I am going to vote in support of this budget. It is a good budget. The only thing I wish is that the Premier would decide to pull the plug, because I am ready.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Bellevue, a point of order.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think it is a point of order. Earlier this afternoon during Question Period the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and the Premier were quoting from some kind of a document. It may have been a sheet of paper, but they were quoting. To my knowledge this has not been tabled yet. I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs across the House - I was sitting here and he was over there - if he was going to table it and he said yes.

Now, I have not seen it. I think, Mr. Speaker, we should get it. Perhaps Your Honour might want to check on that, or have someone check on it, to see if it is going to be tabled. Mr. Speaker, I am asking for a quorum call now, so that will give Your Honour two or three minutes to get that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

I was on a point of order, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have to check with the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs before I can rule on that particular point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

I, too, Mr. Speaker, would like to say a few words. I always enjoy following my good friend from Torngat Mountains. He is always so very enlightening. He gives us some of the best information, and I mean information, in the House. Some of the best information we get comes from the lips, and therefore from the considerable mind, of the gentleman from Torngat Mountains.

I suppose, as my friend from Naskaupi says, a good part of the reason for that is that at heart the gentleman from Torngat is still a Liberal. We do not forget our friends. They may wander astray, but, as a gentleman whom I saw earlier today, Joey Smallwood, used to say in his political heyday, 'While yet the light holds forth to burn, / The vilest sinner may return.' Of course, we wait with bated breath for the day when the gentleman from Torngat Mountains will come back to the fold.

I thought, as I listened to him, given the candor of his remarks, if he were looking for a text, if he were truly preaching, what better text could he have had today than that one which probably does not come from any biblical source but which is oft used to make a point, 'Esau, my brother, is hairy, but I, I am a smooth man.' I thought that was essentially what he was saying today, 'Esau, my brother is hairy, but I, I am a smooth man.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about his smoothness, because, you see, in the smoothness of the gentleman from Torngat Mountains is a very revealing characteristic about this government, this administration. He talks, Mr. Speaker, about the \$1.4 million in water and sewer which is going into the district of Torngat Mountains. I am not sure how he squares that with all the professions of poverty that the minister put forward today.

There is an awful hubbub here, by the way. I do not know if we should probably wait until they have had their chat and then proceed. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things I want to say

related to my district of Fortune - Hermitage, and if the members do not particularly want to listen I understand that, but they should take their conversations outside somewhere.

I was saying though, just in passing, that the gentleman from Torngat has given us today a little helpful ammunition. He contradicts openly his Minister of Municipal Affairs, who told us, in effect, that almost no money is being spent in Tory districts. Mr. Speaker, we will not spend a lot of time today on municipal grants because there will be another occasion to do that. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is clearly a government that has run out of gas. This government no longer has any legitimate reason for existing. It is a government that has lost its feeling for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. If you look, Mr. Speaker, at the dying days of any administration you can see parallels right here. A government that has been living high on the hog too long, that has been fleecing the public too long, the net result is that they have grown out of touch and, secondly, they have taken on that aura that somehow they have a right to govern, it is theirs as a matter of privilege, and they are beginning to talk down to the people of Newfoundland - clearly a government run out of gas. By that I mean a government with no wherewithal to keep it going and no particular direction in which to travel.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you today, to this House, about a couple of things that are of concern to me. One is the matter of the way we are treating senior citizens. Today, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Could we have order, please?

MR. SIMMONS:

Today, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to call a senior citizens' home in the St. John's area and I was informed that that particular home, one of many in this city, has a waiting list of 500 people. Mr. Speaker, if we as a society cannot treat our seniors well, I suggest it is a terrible indictment of what we stand for as a people. And I understand the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when he says money is scarce. I understand that. And if I were the Minister of Finance, or some other member were the Minister of Finance, I am sure he or she would have a difficult job finding the money for all the demanding competing needs that government faces. With that I have no argument.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of argument with the notion that when choices have to be made the first people who get shortchanged are the seniors of this country and of this Province. And I see it all round me. I see people who have given so much to our society, who have transmitted to us the value system that we hold dear, who have given us the stability that we enjoy as a society, in many cases people who fought in foreign wars for us, and I see those people now in their sunset years, as they are called, being treated really less than equally, less than fairly. I see many of them, because of meager income, on diets that are not adequate, making food choices that no person in a civilized

Western industrial society should have to make. I see them living in accommodations that are less than standard. I see them waiting endlessly for admission to senior citizen homes because they no longer can look after themselves. In some cases it might be that they cannot trust themselves around a stove or hot water any more, but otherwise they are functioning quite adequately in terms of their mental capacities, in terms of their ability to read and to enjoy leisure time, but they just need that little bit of assistance in getting through one or two daily functions. In some cases, Mr. Speaker, it may be that they need medication administered once or twice a day, and perhaps they do not really need to be in a senior citizens' home. Perhaps they need some ancillary programme that reaches out to them at mealtime or at medication time. And I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the solution to the dilemma being faced by senior citizens is to have an unlimited number of senior citizens' homes with many, many rooms. In some cases those seniors require accommodation in homes, and I speak from the experience of my late father who until a couple of years ago spent two or three years in a senior citizens' home run by an absolutely marvellous woman in Deer Lake, widow of the late Pentecost Pastor - the name escapes me now; I do not know if somebody can help me - Pinsent. The late Pastor Pinsent's widow runs one of the best homes in the Province, I would submit, at Deer Lake. It was our privilege to have him in that home for the last two or three years of his life. I saw what a home like that in a positive way can do for a person who finds himself very much alone. He has sons and daughters,



of course, but for other reasons he found himself at an age, at a time in life where he needed certain care. He was suffering, as some of you will know, from Alzheimer's disease in his last year or two.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting, first of all, that as a group, as a society, as a government, as a group of elected representatives we have to focus on what we are doing or not doing for senior citizens. And there has to be a multipronged approach; in some cases the solution is more homes, and let me address that for a moment. I believe that this administration, and perhaps the one or two administrations before it, have made quite an error on the location of senior citizens' facilities. And I am not saying this, I say to my good friend from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), to lay blame, I am saying it to hopefully be instructive so that we can draw a lesson from it. When I drive down here to the Holiday Inn traffic light, and see within view two of the largest senior citizens homes in the Province, I am appalled not that they are homes but that they are located where they are. Now we cannot change that, the point is that we have around this city homes that are catering not only to the people in the immediate St. John's area, but to people from distant parts. Let me give you an example. I know a gentleman from Ramea who spent all of his life as a fishing skipper and as the runner of a fish smack up and down the coast from Ramea down to Francois and Grey River. And at the age of seventy or so his wife could not look after herself properly any more, so they made the decision to go to a senior citizens' home, and they wanted to

go to somewhere like Grand Bank or Lewisporte where they would be by the ocean. So where did they wind up? Down in Escasoni looking down on the busiest traffic intersection in Newfoundland, a man who had got up for the first seventy years of his life and walked through his door and almost stepped in the saltwater. Now, I submit to you that that traffic light would be a welcome sign to a fellow who grew up on Cornwall Avenue or LeMarchant Road, or maybe parts of Grand Falls or Corner Brook, but it was surely not the environment to set that man of seventy and his wife of seventy down in in the sunset years of their life, 400 or 500 miles away from relatives and friends and things that were familiar to them. That is where they spent their last years. I do not have to tell you that their last years were few because where was the purpose left in it all once you put them into that kind of an environment so foreign from what they had known all their lives?

So, Mr. Speaker, as to my first point, about the need for homes for some people, I would make the appeal to all of us that they be homes which, insofar as possible, keep those senior citizens near to their loved ones, near to their home communities, near to circumstances and environments that are familiar.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point that there are thousands of people out there sixty-five years of age and over who do not need to be in these homes. They do not need that. They need some community service, some health service, maybe one or twice a day in terms of medication, in terms of cooking or

the provision of meals, maybe in terms of having their house vacuumed or otherwise cleaned on a periodic basis, maybe in terms of snow shovelling and other chores around the house and the yard. I would like to see us concentrating on those ancillary services, those backup services, so people like that can stay in their own homes and continue to maintain their independence just as long as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the obvious rebuttal to all that I am saying is that we have only got so much money. I understand that. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we can pinch a little harder, we can sharpen the pencil a little finer, more to the point we can reorient the priority a little better, so that those people - every member of this House, respective of political stripe, runs into those examples, every day of the week, of senior citizens who are hurting through inadequate budgets, lack of proper diet, lack of access to good medication, lack of access to the provision of some physical chores which they can no longer perform themselves.

Then we run into the other group that we meet in the senior citizens' homes, far from their familiar surroundings, far from their relatives. If we say the bottom line, the sad truth is that once they make that trip from Ramea or from Rencontre East to St. John's, first they see the relative once a week and then once a month and then twice a year and then, eventually, you take them back home in a box.

I believe that we owe those people something more than that. A society that cannot address the needs of senior citizens better

than we are doing is a society that I cannot be very proud of. I say, Mr. Speaker, that I just do not believe that we are doing an adequate job at all in dealing with the particular requirements of senior citizens.

I spent earlier today, Mr. Speaker, a delightful hour or two with a former member of this House and a former Premier, whom we all know as Joey Smallwood. Now, he is not your average senior citizen, but let me take him as an example. Here is a man who is eighty-six years of age and nobody can deny that during his lifetime he achieved much on behalf of the people he served. We have some differences of opinion as what emphasis he should have taken and whether some of the programmes he undertook should have been undertaken, but that is beside the point here. Here is a person who is now a senior citizen who, in his lifetime of service, gave much, and we are benefactors of it in this House.

As I look around this House I see graduates from Memorial University, and by extension, without too great a stretch of the imagination, these people got those university degrees because of Joe Smallwood's belief in post-secondary education and what he did to enhance the role of post-secondary education in this Province.

I could go on with other examples, but the point I want to make is this, that here is a senior citizen with particular needs, because of having suffered a stroke in recent times, needs that in my view were never properly addressed because we lacked either the will as a people or the services as a group of

institutions to address those needs to the degree that they ought to have been addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I could say much more about the issue of senior citizens, I feel very strongly about it, but let me come to a couple of other issues that are more directly addressed in the budget. If you reflect on Question Period today, you would have seen one of the more despicable spectacles that has been experienced in this particular House since I have been a member of it. That is the spectacle of a minister of the Crown, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) trying to say, in effect, that black is white, trying to say that what is so is not so. Mr. Speaker, he can stay here and he can bamboozle us all he wants to with figures, and contrive figures, but what he will not do, what he should not do and what he must not do and what he will not succeed in doing is convincing the person in Musgravetown who needs water, the person in Summerford who is without adequate drinking water, the person down in the district of my friend who can give me a particular community that is in need, in Gambo, whose youngsters' health is being threatened because of unsafe water, that minister, no matter how much bravado the minister puts on, and no matter how much the boys thump their partisan desks, he will not convince that mother in Gambo or that voter in Summerford, or that constituent of Mr. Speaker's in Musgravetown, that all is well in terms of the provision of water and sewer. Because, I say to the minister and to his colleagues, it is not a matter of who can shout the loudest, it is not a matter of who can make the more

incriminating accusation, it is a matter of whether we believe in the basic principle that people in the most need should get the most attention to their needs, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is not happening. When I go around Conception Bay, as I did yesterday, and I see the figures that I saw yesterday and had drawn to my attention once again, when I am told that in districts like Port de Grave the amount is \$80,000 whereas in Harbour Main it is \$553,000, Harbour Grace \$750,000, Carbonear \$999,000, Conception Bay \$2 million plus, it is not an accident, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is going to convince me, or more to the point nobody is going to convince the people who live in that district who have needs, down in Hibbs Cove, Shearstown, and so on, nobody is going to convince those people, no matter how loud that minister shouts, nobody is going to convince those people that it is fair that Carbonear gets all that and Port de Grave gets so little. That is the issue. That is the issue, I say to my friends on the other side, not that I want to give them sound political advice because I hope they trip up even sooner than they are going to at the rate they are going, but that is another issue. I say to them, candidly as friends, that if you are going to play politics at least do yourself the justice of playing smart politics. Do not go out there practicing this inane, stupid, incompetent high school politics because nobody believes you, nor should they believe you. The people of Newfoundland are smart enough to know a boondoggle when they see it, and on municipal grants they have seen one genuine, first-class boondoggle and it is not going to wash, Mr. Speaker. It is a shame what the people of

Newfoundland are being put through by this government. I have the district of Fortune - Hermitage, and I have some real needs in a number of communities, but just let me mention one because the delegation was here very recently. They met and they got what they thought was a very sympathetic understanding from the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Randell. They put to the minister a package involving about \$1 million, and this was just the emergency stuff to address road improvements on the North Side, the upper and lower road on the North side, both roads, to address some extra water and sewer needs up in the Arm so that they can have some extra housing in a growing community. And what do they get from this budget? One big fat zero. What do the people of Hermitage and Sandyville get? Zero. How about the people of Gaultois who have water and sewer needs? One big fat zero. How about the people of Seal Cove? Zero. How about the people of Pool's Cove? Zero. Belleoram? Zero. St. Jacques to Coomb's Cove, how much money did they get from this budget for water and sewer? Zero. How about Rencontre East? Zero. How about Harbour Mille and Little Harbour East? Zero, not one cent in this budget. How about Little Bay East? Bay L'Argent? Jacques Fontaine? Zero. And, Mr. Speaker, that leaves just one community in the district, the community of St. Bernard. It got \$50,000, the only community in the district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely shameful when you see the amounts that are going to other places. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that those decisions are not being made on the basis of

need, they are being made on the basis of politics, politics alone.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this world long enough to know, and in the game of politics long enough to know that decisions of government will include political considerations. I have never argued that point. As a matter of fact I would go so far as to say that if we had more politics, in the kind, decent sense of that term, if we had more politics in our decision making we would have better decisions. But instead what we have is ineptness, political ineptness. If this crowd, Mr. Speaker, was only politically smart they would be a lot better off, and Newfoundland would be a lot better off. But we have from this crowd the worst of both worlds, they play politics but they play it ineptly.

MR. J. CARTER:

Oh, shut up!

MR. SIMMONS:

Not that they can be blamed for doing so when their mentor, their intellectual camp follower is a gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) whose idea of wit is, "Shut up". I quote him, I think, fairly accurately and completely.

MR. J. CARTER:

Full marks on half of it.

MR. SIMMONS:

He is such a joy, Mr. Speaker. How his mother must have rejoiced that morning about eighty-five years ago!

MR. BAKER:

One hundred and eighty-five.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, not 185. I was not talking

about his intellectual age, which is at least 185, I would think.

Mr. Speaker, also in this budget we have that latest insult to the youth of this Province. Now who are they? Who are they, Mr. Speaker? They are that growing body of young people out there, between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four, who are walking the streets and roads and the harbours of this Province. Why? Because they are lazy? No. Because, Mr. Speaker, they cannot find work. They cannot get a job. In many cases they have completed their formal education, either at high school and/or secondary level, and they are looking for an opportunity to be involved in gainful employment.

The opportunities are not there. And so what, Mr. Speaker, does this budget do? Well, let us see. The budget says, "Government has adopted initiatives to promote entrepreneurship, including a new youth entrepreneurship programme which is to be funded in the amount of \$500,000." Five hundred thousand dollars. You have heard, Mr. Speaker, about the finger in the dyke approach. I would submit to you that that is what we are talking about here. We are talking about a programme that is so completely inadequate that it is insulting. It is absolutely insulting to those thousands of young people out there. We are talking now about a youth entrepreneurship programme, and I submit to you that there are not many businesses that you can start in this Province for under, say, \$20,000 or \$25,000 in capital per business, and that is cutting it pretty fine. I say to the young people who are Pages here, or other young people of their age group, just stop and think for a

minute what kind of job you could create if you were given outright today \$20,000 to \$25,000 dollars. Suppose you could create a small business with that kind of money; take that kind of money, \$20,000, and divide it into \$500,000 and you will find that even at the rate of \$20,000 a person you can only create twenty-five jobs, twenty-five new businesses for all those thousands and tens of thousands out there who are walking around.

The deficit has gone from \$42 million to \$176 million, and that itself is a disaster. Mr. Speaker, if the government felt a need to increase the deficit that much, surely they could have applied some of that additional expenditure towards the creation of youth jobs. Instead we have this pittance of \$500,000.

Now that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is back in the House I want to return to the subject of municipal grants but to a different theme. I have mentioned the amounts. He and I will differ and disagree on the amounts, - but I am sanguine in the knowledge that the people of Newfoundland who live in those communities who are not getting very much of that amount will not be duly impressed by his mathematical contortions in the House this afternoon. But I want to come to another issue. I submit to the minister, and through him his colleagues in Cabinet, that he and they are coming dangerously close to compromising the public service. I tell him that I have had complaints from senior public servants on that very issue. Mr. Speaker, this Province has a long and proud tradition of an independent public service. It goes back even to the difficult

days of the early 1900s and the period leading up to the Commission of Government in 1934. It was always understood that your public service was completely above politics and no politician in his right mind would even attempt to drag them in. Through the Commission of Government, Mr. Speaker, the civil service acquired a new competence and a new prestige as being completely above partisan politics. Through the Smallwood period and the Moores period the same thing was the case, that you had a civil service that was competent and above politics. The proof of that, Mr. Speaker, is that when, after twenty-three years of Liberal Government, the governments changed from a Liberal stripe to a Tory stripe, most of the civil servants who had served the Liberal administration stayed in office to serve the Conservative administration. I ask you to reflect on that period, the change-over of 1972. There were very few people who moved on from government employment at that particular transition time, and the reason was that we had had in place an impartial civil service.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the present period, 1987. I tell you, Sir, that a number of senior public servants are being put into very difficult corners by this administration. They are being asked to do things that no impartial public servant should ever be asked to do, and that, Mr. Speaker, is to the discredit of this government, that it would put the careers of career-minded civil servants at stake to serve their, the politicians, mean and narrow political ends. That, Mr. Speaker, is what is happening. Senior civil servants are being intimidated by this administration.

MR. J. CARTER:  
That is rubbish.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from St. John's North who says 'That is rubbish' to tell that to the couple of senior civil servants who said that very thing to me in recent days.

MR. WARREN:  
Name them.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Oh, yes, you would love that, would you not? You would love that so you could add them to your black list.

MR. DINN:  
That is not true.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, it is true. Senior civil servants are being intimidated by this administration. I know the minister does not like to hear that, but it is the truth. Mr. Speaker, they are being compromised into quasi-partisan roles. Many of them are between a rock and a hard place. They want to keep their employment.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Prove it. Put up or shut up.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, that is the oldest game in town and the gentleman from St. John's North knows that, even if he does not say it from his own bench, but he will figure out which one is his eventually, when he comes more often, and that is another issue.

It is the oldest game in town to say prove it. The proof here is at two levels.

MR. J. CARTER:

The proof is you are saying it.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker. I do not even care if you take my word for it. That is not the issue. The issue is, Mr. Speaker, that I am sending out a signal today on behalf of those two people and others.

MR. J. CARTER:

Name them. Name them.

MR. SIMMONS:

Do not be so foolish. Then you would be the first up saying, 'Ah, you are smearing somebody now.' Could I not hear that argument?

MR. TOBIN:

Roger, we would never believe you would smear anyone.

MR. SIMMONS:

No. You are right, and I am glad of that, Mr. Speaker. I am glad the member for Burin - Placentia West feels that way because I feel exactly the same way about him. I would not smear anybody and I know he would not smear anybody.

MR. J. CARTER:

And water runs uphill.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am sure you believe that too.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize what a service we in the Liberal Party have done the Tories in this House. Their lives, which were so drab, have suddenly taken on new meaning. They have an interest in the horse race. They have an interest in what is going on and they show new life. Some of them whom we were about to have funeral rites for are actually moving over there.

MR. J. CARTER:

It gives us something to bank on.

MR. SIMMONS:

Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, let us return to what is a very serious subject. That is, Mr. Speaker, the shameful compromising of senior public servants by this administration. It has got to stop or we are going to have to start naming names.

MR. DOYLE:

Put up or shut up.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I give notice to the minister that I am prepared to put up or shut up and I give notice to him that I have invited those two civil servants to give me affidavits because I know the kind of intimidation that can be subjected to might, without undermining them, put them in a situation where they would have to choose between a rock and a hard place. Not that they are not people of honour, but they are people who have to protect their own careers and their income. The minister can brazen this out like he did the other issue earlier today or he can listen. If he would listen he might hear the plea I am making on behalf of those two people and, by extension, other people who feel they are being intimidated, who feel they are being compromised.

MR. J. CARTER:

Rubbish.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if the member for St. John's North is right and it is rubbish, then, Mr. Speaker, at the very least the minister's concern should send out the signal that it is rubbish. They should do something to reassure these people

that they are not going to be used as the front men and the front women -

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Which department?

MR. SIMMONS:  
Oh, yes. The Minister of Labour came into this House with excellent credentials as a labour man, lousy credentials as a politician and both sets of credentials remain unchanged. He is an excellent man when it comes to knowledge of labour and not the best politician in the world. It is the latter that gets him into trouble not the former. If he would stick with his labour expertise instead of trying to stick handle in a rink that he is very unfamiliar with -

MR. J. CARTER:  
Get back to these unfounded rumors.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you very clearly -

MR. WARREN:  
Tell us about the Open Line show.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Open Line? Which one?

MR. WARREN:  
Both.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Both what?

MR. WARREN:  
Open lines.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Well, there is one in Corner Brook which I have great respect for, there is one in St. John's I have great respect for. Are there some others that I have not been on lately?

MR. WARREN:  
Tell us about the (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:  
Oh, I will tell you about that gentleman, another guy I have a great respect for, and I will come back to him. But I do not want to be dissuaded now by the intellectual giant from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), as much as I respect his views. I want to come back to that at another time. Right now I want to send on behalf of those two senior public servants a very clear signal, and a plea more than a signal, a plea -

MR. J. CARTER:  
You cannot go naming names.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I thank the gentleman for his advice because five minutes ago he was asking me to name names, and now he advises me, correctly, that I cannot name names. He is so proper on that. All right? Let us be thankful that it was only his tongue that slipped that time.

MR. J. CARTER:  
You cannot go making unfounded statements, even in the House where we have certain rights.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, we have, but I ask the ministers concerned if they are so sure that these are unfounded statements, that they send some clear signals to the Public Service. One way to do it is this: Stop doing what you are doing every day, putting those people up front in compromising positions, doing things that politicians ought to do, performing roles that men and women are elected to perform and should never be sloughed off on paid public servants; stop jeopardizing their careers in that



particular way so that, Mr. Speaker, when the government changes from Tory to Liberal, as it will very soon, we will have no more of a fallout in terms of civil servants than we had when it changed from Liberal to Tory back in 1972, when most of the public servants were able to stay in the Public Service because they had reputations and careers which were seen to be non-partisan, above politics, because they had not been compromised by that former Liberal Administration. The same cannot be said for this administration.

I appeal to them, if for no other reason then in terms of common decency, that they stop jeopardizing the careers of those people by compromising them and by intimidating them as they are doing every single day.

MR. J. CARTER:

Your time is up. You have spoken over thirty minutes now.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, there are so many other interesting things in this budget that the people out in so many parts of this Province would not get very excited about. I am referring of course to the boondoggle approach to road construction and road upgrading. There again we have people who live in the Hermitage-Seal Cove-Sandyville area, people who live in Pool's Cove, in Belleoram, St. Jacques and English Harbour West and Mose Ambrose and Boxy and Wreck Cove and Coomb's Cove; people who live in Grand Le Pierre and English Harbour East, and people who live in Little Harbour and Harbour Mille. These people continue to live on some of the worst gravel roads in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, they do not deserve the kind of treatment they are getting in terms of roads. They do not deserve it. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, when I was a federal member we identified money for those roads. The Premier of the day, of course, diverted it to another road in Conception Bay so there could be three four-lane highways between here and Conception Bay, but only one very bad gravel road through parts of Fortune and Hermitage Bays.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it comes back to the overall approach of this administration. They can slough off pleas for fairness in the administration of water and sewer funding. They can dismiss representations for fairer treatment of areas insofar as road money is concerned. They can treat likely the particular plight of senior citizens that I talked about just now. They can put on a brave face about how their botching the health care system in this Province. They can do all of that, Mr. Speaker, because they have an overriding agenda. The overriding agenda is called survival at any price, survival at any cost.

I say when an administration has no grander objective in mind than to hang on by its fingernails for some more time, it is time that administration would do itself and its electorate a favour and just get out of office.

MR. DINN:

That is the only way you are going to get in, if everybody resigned.

MR. SIMMONS:

The member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) has just confirmed the very point I was making.

MR. DINN:

It is not going to happen. Never.

MR. SIMMONS:

Do you see what I mean, Mr. Speaker? It is called the right to perpetuity in government, expounded so well by the apostle from Pleasantville, and that is my point. There has to be a better *raison d'être*, a better reason for being than perpetuity in power.

We have now come to a point after fifteen years of Tory Government, I mean, look at their faces, Mr. Speaker, look at the people who had fire in their eyes a few years ago when they came into this administration. I remember well and I refer to it so often and I hope she will forgive me, I remember so often as I look across the Chamber the fire and the purpose that the lady from Humber East (Ms Verge) had in her eyes in those early days when she fought causes so well and so successfully before she came into this Chamber. I keep asking myself, and by implication asking her, where is the commitment now? Where now is the fire in the gut that used to motivate her at almost a mile a minute in those days?

MR. TOBIN:

\$100 million in my district so far this year.

MR. SIMMONS:

A broken record, you see, an absolute broken record. As theatre, I love it, I absolutely love it.

MR. J. CARTER:

How can more money be spent down your way?

MR. TOBIN:

We could spend a lot more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, it is a broken record. There is old landslide Baird again.

My brother sends his regards and wishes you well and thanks God he had seventy-five more votes fewer than you had.

MR. J. CARTER:

How about some more attack on his brother? How about some more personal attack?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the only person in this House I would want to attack personally is the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), and following is my vicious, personal attack, prepared a long time since for just this occasion: How come, Mr. Speaker, a man so able, so intellectually capable, so superior to almost anybody else in this particular Chamber, has allowed himself to be so completely bartered away? There is another word that comes to mind but it is not kosher in this particular Chamber so I shall not use it. But how come, Mr. Speaker, a person -

MR. TOBIN:

What is that? (Inaudible).

MR. J. CARTER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

I think he gets the message very quickly. He finds it very difficult to attack a person so nice and yet so misled, a person whom it must be difficult to mislead, given his brain. But, Mr. Speaker, there he goes again wasting a brain, wasting a talent, when he could be over there

keeping this crowd at least on a good Tory track, because he is one of the two or three Tories over there, he and the gentleman from St. John's South and, I suppose, the gentleman from St. John's Center, I say, with respect, there are only about three Tories, well, two over there and one in the center.

MR. BAIRD:  
And Humber West.

MR. SIMMONS:  
No, no.

MR. TOBIN:  
Placentia.

MR. SIMMONS:  
The gentleman from Placentia! Mr. Speaker, I travelled with him and there goes a liberal. I mean a small 'l' liberal. There goes a liberal. No, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman from Placentia has some right leaning views, I quite agree, but on balanced, if you talk to him you will find that he has a liberal, small 'l', philosophy.

Now, the gentleman from St. John's North is a special case. I make an appeal to him, and I almost attack him personally, and say, 'Why is it that you sit there with the mantle of leadership just falling around your ankles, the intellectual leadership of the Tory side of that particular caucus?' Somehow, Mr. Speaker, he has allowed himself to waste away and not to put forward the Tory philosophy, which is one that I reject, but which is nevertheless necessary to a balance of political choice in this Province. That whole set of choices on the Tory side is being ignored because men like the gentleman from St. John's North,

and particularly the gentleman from St. John's North, has neither got the courage or the get up and go to get out there and fly the flag for Toryism so that the people of Newfoundland have a choice. What they have instead is to choose between a Liberal Party that is out of power and a Liberal Party that is in power.

MR. TOBIN:  
Roger, speaking of Tories, I like your tie. Did you hear me? I like the color of your tie.

MR. SIMMONS:  
As I said, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from St. John's North, who sits normally next to the gentleman from Placentia West, is not preoccupied by the colours of ties, but rather, Mr. Speaker, focuses usually on the issues, the sad thing is that he focuses only academically. He does not say I believe strongly enough in this to get out and do something about it.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there is, as they say, a method in his madness. I suspect that one of the two Tories on that side, one of the three Tories in this House, has been -

MR. TOBIN:  
There are four or five of them.

MR. SIMMONS:  
No, not the gentleman from St. John's East Extern. There is no way. That man is much too left to be a Tory, I say to him. He might have a label these days, but do not confuse the label with the political philosophy. They are only over there, a couple -

MR. BAIRD:  
Are you going to support Leo?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if my friend from Humber West wants to take little bets on the side, then we can meet behind the curtain after. As to the issues here, I want to talk for a few more minutes -

MR. TOBIN:

'Roger', as long as you do not think.

MR. BAIRD:

(Inaudible) Open Line the other day and ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Why did you not call?

MR. BAIRD:

I wanted room for the fellow who called in behind me.

MR. SIMMONS:

By the way, I have said there are only two Tories on the other side of the House. There are many more Tories in St. John's and they were some busy that morning on open line, but that is another issue.

MR. TOBIN:

There were Liberals.

MR. SIMMONS:

I certainly hope so, otherwise, no Liberals called me at all.

Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) so I can finish my vicious, personal attack. The member for St. John's North is one of my favourite people in this House. I admire a good mind and he has got one of the best minds in this House. I deplore the wasting of a good mind and that, in him, I deplore. I was about to say that he was too bright a man to be doing this

unwittingly.

I submit to this House that he has a method in his madness; he has, in effect, been bought. The envelope he holds is not my money but his. He has been told to cool it because if the true Tory philosophy got articulated abroad in this Province, they would not have a chance at all, even less chance than they have right now over there. So, the price he pays for sitting in the Caucus is that he sits closely cloistered by the bouncers in the Caucus, the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and from Placentia (Mr. Patterson), the two bouncers, he is cloistered there so he cannot really get loose. When the member for Placentia is unavoidably absent from the House, they bring over the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) to keep an eye on him. They sit him directly behind the parliamentary giant on that side, the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) and, as if that were not enough, they put him not far, just kittie corner, as they call it on the Mainland, from the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) the only other intellectual seat mate he has in the House, the only other Tory in the House, save the gentleman who, through his role, has to be impartial.

Mr. Speaker, I now finish. I have a couple of matters I want to say next day. I want to adjourn the debate. Before I do, I now finish my personal attack by making a humble plea to the gentleman from St. John's North that he would stop being bought, he would stop being the patsy, if you like, of the people whose only goal is to win, win and win some more. I ask him to speak out for the Tories in

this Province so that the people of Newfoundland can have a real choice as between what is intellectually Tory and what is intellectually small 'l' liberal.

Mr. Speaker, it being near 6:00 p.m., if I may, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Before moving the adjournment, I would like to inform the hon. members of the committee meetings: This evening at 7:30 p.m., Government Services Committee, the Department of Labour; tomorrow morning, 9:30 a.m., Resource Committee, the Department of Mines and Housing; tomorrow evening, 7:30 p.m., Social Services Committee, Culture, Recreation and Youth. So, this evening 7:30 p.m. Labour; tomorrow morning 9:30 a.m. Mines and Housing; tomorrow evening 7:30 p.m. Culture, Recreation and Youth.

I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 29, 1987 at 3:00 p.m.