

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

PREMIER MOORES: I would just like to say, Sir, in this morning's paper, and this is the first opportunity I have had to raise it- I was not in the House the last half hour yesterday- it was stated that recently the Premier has had two meetings with Mr. Doyle, Mr. John C. Doyle, one at Claridges hotel in London and another in Grenada. And looking up the Hansard of yesterday it says, "if the hon. gentleman wants to know why they will not bring him back he should ask his Premier who met him"- let me see where it was, a Summer resort there a few years ago- "met him in Claridges in London and met him in Grenada." And further on it says that this has been within the last year or two.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it very clear to the House, not that I would consider anything wrong with it because Mr. Doyle, I do not think, it is fair to say has any got any special consideration from this government in the favourable sense. But I would like to make it absolutely clear that I saw Mr. John C. Doyle in Grenada in 1973 when he arrived unannounced. I had one meeting with him, which was the end of that, a conference and other than that to the best of my knowledge I have not seen Mr. John C. Doyle since.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege I brought the paper with me, Sir, to make the appropriate correction because it was a misquote as the Premier can see from Hansard, that I did say that the hon. the Premier had met with Mr. Doyle a few years back, but I said if the hon. House wanted an updating they could very easily get it from the Minister of Industrial Development who met with the same gentleman in recent

PREMIER MOORES: months, within the last year in Nassau and in Panama, So I do want to make that correction, Mr. Speaker, As the hon. members can see from the Hansard that was just read by the Premier that I did say - the statement that I made was correct, Sir, but I was misquoted.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: If I may to that same point of privilege. The comments that are made in the Hansard of yesterday somewhere it said there a year or two ago, referring to the Premier, Sir, and that is absolutely incorrect.

MR. NEARY: To that point of privilege.

PREMIER MOORES: If I may just finish? Whether the Minister of Industrial Development or the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) or the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) or any of the other members who may or may not have seen Mr. Doyle in the interim, I think that is irrelevant. All I am trying to do, Sir, is straighten out the record as far as I am concerned.

MR. NEARY: To that point of privilege, Sir. The fact remains that the hon. gentleman did have a meeting, Sir, and that is what I said.

PREMIER MOORES: A year or two ago?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier just read out there, I said a few years ago.

PREMIER MOORES: You said a year or two ago.

MR. NEARY: Well go back to Hansard there a little bit and you will see a few years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is Hansard.

PREMIER MOORES: It is Hansard.

MR. NEARY: And referring to the hon. minister of Industrial Development, Sir, when I said within the last year.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you did not.

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 928

AH-3

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think we have exhausted the procedure applicable under the heading Personal Explanations and May makes the following points: "In regard to the explanation of personal matters the House is usually indulgent and will permit a statement of that character to be made without any question being before the House," and that I understand has been done. It goes on to say "No debate should ensue thereon but if another member is involved in the personal statement he is generally allowed to give his own view of the matter and to say whether he accepts it or not." I believe now both of those areas of explanation have been exhausted.



MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a matter of privilege I wanted to raise.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is standing on a matter of privilege. I will hear that.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would refer Your Honour first of all to Beauchesne, page 256, paragraph 331, which says in part: "The right of petitioning the Crown and Parliament for redress of grievances is acknowledged as a fundamental principle of the constitution, and has been uninterruptedly exercised from very early times." Also in Beauchesne, page 97, paragraph 106 (2) says in part: "If all the privileges of Parliament were set down and ascertained, and no privilege to be allowed but what was so defined and determined, it were easy for the executive power to devise some new case, not within the line of privilege, and under pretence thereof, to harass any refractory member and violate the freedom of Parliament." It is the first part of that sentence that I particularly want to draw Your Honour's attention to, the clear inference that all the privileges of Parliament are not clearly set down in any finite list. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, and also keeping in mind the first reference on page 256, the right of petitioning being a fundamental principle of the constitution, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is clearly one of the privileges of this House to receive petitions addressed to the Crown and/or to Parliament for redress of grievances.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier received approximately three weeks ago a petition from a large number of petitioners, in this instance in my district, which petition cites a very serious set of grievances, and the hon. the Premier has failed to discharge his obligation to present that petition to this House, and I submit,

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in so failing has deprived the petitioners of a fundamental right under the constitution.

I would refer Your Honour also to Beauchesne, page 259, paragraph 342, which reads: "A member cannot be compelled to present a petition. In 1891, a person, in England, forwarded to two members of the British House of Commons a petition for presentation; and the petition was returned to the sender because it infringed the rules of the House. That person in consequence brought actions against the members and the Clerk who had acted in the matter, but the actions were dismissed on the ground that the causes of complaint were not cognizable by a court of law." Mr. Speaker, I make reference to that because it is the obvious retort to my point of privilege. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this particular paragraph 342 addresses itself to the improper nature of a petition and that it was not presented for that particular reason. And it is clear, I believe, that all members would have an obligation to the House, under the privilege of the House again, to see to it that no petition was presented to the House which it was improper to do so by reason of the wording or the content or for whatever reason else it might be rendered improper.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have established a prima facie case that the Premier has breached a privilege of the House in not presenting the petition. I have based my case on one petition - there are others, Mr. Speaker - and I believe the case has been established and I believe it is a sufficiently important one that we ought to clear it up. I believe the case has been established, Mr. Speaker, and I am prepared at the appropriate time to move the appropriate motion. I would not propose moving a

April 13, 1978

Tape 929

EC - 3

MR. SIMMONS: motion to reprimand or to  
censure, that is not my aim here, but a motion that would  
direct the Premier to present the petition so that the  
petitioners can have an opportunity for redress of grievance  
which is their right under law.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to that specious  
point of privilege, all the references pointed out by the  
hon. member in order to give some kind of credibility to  
his privilege

MR. PECKFORD: has nowhere in it a time frame to start with, Mr. Speaker, there is nowhere in the references mentioned by the hon. member a time frame. And I would suggest that if the hon. gentleman is talking about a petition that was sent to the hon. the Premier two or three weeks ago, that the House now is sitting, will continue to sit for a number of weeks from this day, and that there is nowhere that I know of, Mr. Speaker, any time frame given in the references mentioned by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir who is making the point of privilege and hence there is no privileges of the House that has been broken here. And unless additional evidence based on references like Beauchesne or May or Standing Orders can be brought to bear on the so-called point of privilege, there is no point of privilege because there is no time frame and given a general, fair - the rule of common sense should apply, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest - given a fair amount of time in the given session that we are now in, and if all of these references were valid and if the point of privilege is a valid point of privilege, it would have to, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, on the rule of common sense since there is no reference that I can just generally point to now, wait until this session was near its end or at its end before a valid point of privilege could be made based on those references and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that no point of privilege exists.

MR. SIMMONS: If I may just clarify this?

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

MR. SIMMONS: It is a matter I meant to address myself to, and the minister has reminded me, the matter of time frame is an important one here and I agree with him. The purpose of my point of privilege will be served if the Premier will now indicate the intent to present it. I had assumed, and perhaps I was being wrong in doing this, Mr. Speaker, I had assumed that he had no intention of presenting since he acknowledged the petition by letter more than a week ago, and for that reason I would suggest the obvious time, the proper time to present the petition would be at least before acknowledging the letter or soon

MR. PECKFORD: after unless he had some particular reason for sitting on it, for not bringing it to the House, and that is quite another matter. But in the normal course of events the Premier has been in the House and in the precincts of the House quite regularly in the last week or so, so he certainly had opportunity, he certainly has received the petition because he has acknowledged in writing the petition, on April 4th. he acknowledged having received the petition, so I assume from that that he had obviously decided, at least for the time being, not to present the petition. The matter can be fully served, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier will now stand in his place and say he intends to bring in the petition.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: The point if I may just submit, is that I do not think any member is under any obligation, because another hon. member brings it up, to indicate when they intend to bring a petition before the House that has been submitted to them. I do not think there is any obligation there to do that. I think the normal course of time has to elapse before, as I said earlier, any point of privilege can be made. The fact that the hon. the Premier, or his office has acknowledged the petition that was sent in the first instance to him as Premier, and then later obviously through the House if that is an order, has no bearing upon whether there is a point of privilege or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Since this is a new point I will give a decision later after I have left the Chair and have had an opportunity to review references quoted to me and any others which might be relevant.

#### STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, last year my department undertook a comprehensive study into the cod glut problem which has plagued the inshore fishery, especially the trap fishery, for the past number of years. That study, which took more than six months to complete, resulted in a forty-seven page report being presented to me earlier this year with a number of major recommendations. The first recommendation in that report called for

MR. W. CARTER: the establishment of information desks throughout the Province to facilitate the exchange of information concerning the most effective distribution of fish catches to processors around the Province. The report estimated that 25 million pounds of codfish are lost to the Province annually because fishermen are forced to dump their fish or cannot haul their nets because of the processing plants are unable to handle the additional raw material. If this fish could be landed and processed it would mean an additional \$14.4 million into the provincial economy in terms of landed value, finished product and manpower. Mr. Speaker, the objective is to eliminate the dumping of fish which will increase landings for inshore fishermen and increase plant throughput and plant utilization. I am pleased to announce today that a management committee will be set up to oversee the establishment and operation of these information desks. At the close of the season the committee will submit a report to me concerning their operation. The

Mr. W. Carter: committee, which will serve without remuneration, will be made up of Mr. Gus Etchegary, Mr. Bud O'Brien from the Fish and Trades Association, Mr. Calvin Greene from the Salt Fish Processors Corporation, Mr. Bren Kennedy from the Salt Fish Corporation, Mr. William Short from the Fishermen's Union.

Six information desks will be established in each of the following locations; Port Saunders - and I should add, by the way, the locations while in some cases are not noted for their fish production are centrally located, and we believe are better able to serve the needs in this particular case than maybe some of the other more well known fish producing areas. The locations will be Port Saunders, Grand Falls, Gander, Harbour Grace, Marystown, and Stephenville. These locations, which were unanimously agreed to by all of the participating agencies and individuals, were selected for their geographic location, adequate communication facilities, and the availability of office space.

Each information desk will be responsible for a designated area. It will be staffed by two individuals who will work overlapping shifts from 6:00 A.M. in the morning to 9:00 P.M. in the evening, Monday to Saturday, for a three month period. Each office will establish and maintain contact with landing points, processors and truckers with a view to facilitate the exchange of information concerning availability of fish and plant capacity.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, a co-ordinating manager will also be appointed to supervise the functioning of the desk, and to serve as an intermediary on behalf of the Management Committee. It is intended to second a suitable person from within government for this position, or failing that to engage a qualified person for a four month period starting May 1.

This project, Mr. Speaker, represents the unanimous view of the Fish Trades Association, the Salt Fish Corporation, the Salt Fish Processors Association, and the Fishermen's Union. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that representatives from these groups were



Mr. W. Carter: members of the Committee appointed by me last Fall-or at least last Summer to undertake this study. And like I said earlier, representatives from these four main groups, competents in the fishing industry have agreed to serve without pay for the period mentioned in an advisory and in a management capacity.

Mr. Speaker, we realize that the cod glut problem will not be solved overnight. However, this project should go a long way to alleviating the problem. And I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee to which I have referred was chaired by a former Chairman of the Fisheries Loan Board, Mr. Cliff Russell, who spent quite some time travelling the Province, visited in all thirty-five areas, fishing areas. It was ascertained during the study that while the glut does occur in many areas, plants in many areas are blocked during a certain time of the year, that even during that period there are plants in the Province with vastly under-utilized capacity. And that is why we believe with this kind of a co-ordinated information service, with the proper kind of co-ordination with respect to the transporting of this fish, which we had done, that to a large extent the glut problem can be overcome.

We have also, Mr. Speaker, undertaken a complete inventory of all of the trucks in the Province that are capable of handling fish, of transporting fish, and we have asked the owners of these trucks, the trucking companies, to co-operate with our regional desks during the glut period. This, Mr. Speaker, is but one initiative that we will be announcing with respect to this problem and I am hoping within a few weeks to be able to announce another initiative that we will be taking in 1978, and certainly more long-term initiatives that we will be studying and hopefully getting in place in 1979 and the years to come.

But like I said, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious problem, the matter of the glut. Millions of pounds of



MR. W. CARTER: fish are dumped, left in the traps, causing, as I have said in my statement, a loss to the Province, of an estimated \$14 million a year, not to mention many hundred hours of labour in the processing sector.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, how many recommendations were made exactly? It just escapes my mind at the moment.

MR. W. CARTER: How many what?

MR. F. ROWE: How many recommendations were made in this report?

MR. W. CARTER: Oh, about seventeen I guess, sixteen or seventeen altogether.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, time will not permit me to get into the details of this particular ministerial statement to the degree to which I wish, Sir, but it is absolutely astounding that we have 25 million pounds of codfish, which are lost to the Province annually, and this means of course \$14.4 million lost to the provincial economy each year. It is an absolutely astounding figure and any move that can be made at all to handle that particular situation, and correct it, any small move, however small it is, is welcome.

The ministerial statement makes reference to the fact that during the past Winter a number of processing plants installed additional freezing and processing capacity to handle the finished product. I would ask the minister sometime if he could table the number of plants and the locations of these plants throughout the Province so that we can see, you know, whether there is a reasonably and relatively good distribution of these additional freezing facilities.

Sir, the gentlemen serving on the committee are good gentlemen, on the information desk, the committee there, There is one glaring omission, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the location of these six information desks which are to serve the Province, the minister said. Now, Sir, we all know that Labrador is a part of this Province, and I sincerely suggest

MR. F. ROWE: and recommend to the minister that he reconsider the location of - add a seventh, or delete one here and put an information desk, I understand probably the most central place in Labrador would be the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, because there is a tremendous fishery on the Labrador Coast. I do not know the degree of the cod glut, the trap cod glut on the Labrador Coast. I understand it is not that great but I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these information desks will be handling more than enquiries directly related to the trap cod glut. I would think that other problems such as the herring glut, the lack of barrels to handle the herring and these other related problems in the fisheries will come to these gentlemen at these information desks. And I would recommend, I really cannot see the rationale, I have nothing against Grand Falls whatsoever, it may be centrally located, but I really cannot see the rationale for having Grand Falls, for example, there as a location for an information desk, and no location whatsoever in the great land mass of the Labrador section of our Province and I sincerely recommend to the minister that he establish an information desk in the Labrador area.

Sir, if I may continue for just another moment, I am really surprised that after all of the studies by the previous administration, and the present administration, over the past twenty-seven or twenty-eight years, that we do not have a vast amount of information with respect to processors and truckers with a view to facilitate the exchange of information concerning the availability of fish and plant capacity.

I am really surprised, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have this information on hand now within the various agencies of the government, the federal government, and the provincial government.

Sir, the only thing that I can say in closing is this, that I cannot obviously criticize any small step forward in solving that particular problem because it is a very serious problem in this Province of ours. However, there are seventeen recommendations

MR. F. ROWE:

and although this has the unanimous view and support of the Fish Trades Association and Salt Fish Corporation, the Salt Fish Processors and the Fishermen's Union, I would think that the other sixteen or seventeen recommendations are of equal if not more importance and that it is time to get on with the job. We have the studies, now we are setting up information desks. I think the important thing to do is get into some form of activity so that this \$14.4 million can be recovered. We are just throwing away \$14.4 million each year, and of course, that could increase year after year. But the most important point that I want to make is the glaring omission of an information desk in the Labrador area of the Province and I do not think the minister can explain that away by saying that there is not a serious cod trap glut situation on the Labrador coast because I can assure the minister that these information desks are going to have to handle more inquiries than just the trap cod glut situation itself.

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

MR. W. CARTER: Maybe I can respond to some of the points made by the hon. member. First of all, he mentioned about the increased freezing capability in the Province this year. I do not have a list of all of the locations and the actual increase in the number of freezers, - plate freezers and so on, but I have been told by my officials that 1978 will see -

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: I realize that I did put some questions to the minister, but the minister now has made a ministerial statement and now I have made some comments and put some questions to the minister. The point of order

MR. F. ROWE: is really a point of information, I guess, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Right. In view of the fact that the minister now is making some statements as a result of statements that I have made, the obvious question to be asked is would I be allowed to respond to the minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: Would anyone else?

MR. SPEAKER: The general rule with respect to ministerial statements is the minister makes it, a spokesman - the Leader of the Opposition or a spokesman on his behalf - may make comments and ask for explanation, and that obviously requires, since he can ask for explanation, that the minister be able to reply. I think if one were to go beyond that we would be in debate, because it clearly states that there would be no debate. So if after the minister were to reply to the questions, the questioner were again to make comments and ask another question and the minister were again to answer questions, then the questioner might again wish to make further comments and we could have a whole series.

MR. NEARY: Well, can the minister introduce new material?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman to my right has the right to make brief comments and to ask for explanations, and the minister has the right to give those explanations and it ends there.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, that is what I am attempting to do if the hon. member did not interrupt. I was about to tell the House that in 1978 we anticipate an increase in the freezing capability in the Province, around 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 pounds a day. I want to make reference to his comments on Labrador. We are not setting up these

MR. W. CARTER: desks merely to establish desks. We are setting them up where they can serve a purpose. In Labrador, of course, there is no glut that I am aware of, no serious glut, and even if you had a glut in certain parts of, say, Northern Labrador, it would be extremely difficult, I am sure, to find ways of transporting that fish, especially flatfish, to a nearby plant. What was the other point you mentioned?

MR. NEARY: You have had long enough. Sit down, boy, sit down!

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not want to know the information.

MR. W. CARTER: I can understand how this kind of a statement would irritate the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. the minister is asking me a question, Mr. Speaker, so I would answer his question if I am permitted.

MR. SPEAKER: That is all right.

MR. F. ROWE: I did point out the fact that I was aware of the fact that there is not necessarily a serious cod fish glut situation the Labrador coast - not a serious one - it is serious in some other parts of the Province, but what I am submitting to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries is that there are herring glut situations because of the lack of availability of, say, herring barrels and this kind of thing and other facilities to take care of it, and salmon and all other species of fish. And what I am suggesting to the minister is that these information desks are going to have to contend with inquiries and questions and problems other than those directly related to the cod fish trap glut. And the point that I am making is, taking that into consideration, it is

MR. F. ROWE: a glaring omission not to have an office representing the Labrador portion of our Province, namely in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. H. COLLINS: Violates every rule in the House.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. Minister of Health, as usual, has not made a speech in this House of Assembly yet this session.

MR. NEARY: No, not allowed.

MR. F. ROWE: He certainly has not made any sense except to yap away from the corner there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Now my point of order is this.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. That is exactly what I was going to ask the hon. gentleman, what the point of order was.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are not allowed to make a speech.

MR. F. ROWE: The minister has accused me, Sir, of violating every rule in this House. I heard him very clearly and distinctly. Now I ask the minister without qualification, through you, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw that statement because it is quite unparliamentary and untrue.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: To that point of order. As Your Honour alluded to a little while ago, the minister has the right to make a ministerial statement and a designated - the Leader of the Opposition, or a designated person has the right to respond in a few short comments to that statement, and ask some question of clarification. Obviously the hon. member has been getting away with debating the issue ever since it was introduced.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member will inform me what he is alleging that the hon. member to my left said.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. Minister of Health, Sir, accused me of violating every rule of the House.

MR. NEARY: If you cannot attribute motives -

MR. F. ROWE: Right, Sir, and I might add in response to the hon. minister, that I got up for the second time, begged the permission of the Chair in order to answer a question put to me by the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: So I ask the Minister of Health to withdraw without qualification.

MR. NEARY: Can the Premier not control his members? They are out of control.

AN HON. MEMBER: Some days.

MR. NEARY: Only some days. What about weekends?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The point of order, as I understand it, is the hon. gentleman to my right has alleged that the hon. Minister of Health has stated that the hon. gentleman to my right has violated all the rules of the House, or violated rules of the House.

MR. NEARY: Untrue.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not for me to judge the truth of the allegation or not, obviously that is a matter - I am not aware that he attributed any motive to him. It would appear to me that - I mean one hears quite frequently a member from one side to the opposite say, "Oh sit down, you do not know the rules." Or, "Sit down, you are breaking the rules," or this or that and if all of those were to be points of order then there would be sort of constant interruptions. It appears to me that in the adversary situation there is not impugning of motive or a personal derogation of a member there. Obviously I can rule the hon. gentleman out of order on the very basis of it because nobody is supposed to say anything unless they are recognized, and that might be the most generic concept: Anybody who



MR. SPEAKER: says anything without being recognized by the Chair is out of order. And of course there are few, if any, present who do not at times put themselves in that category.

MR. NEARY: Charge it up to stupidity.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of a number of teachers at St. Clare's High School in Carbonear, who are, and it is a fairly lengthy prayer, Mr. Speaker, so perhaps it would be appropriate if I paraphrased somewhat.

Essentially what the teachers are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the recent policy of this government to reduce the teaching staff in the Province will adversely affect, number one, the student/teacher ratio in this Province, which in turn will affect the number of dropouts in our schools and will also affect the variety of course content in that some major and fairly modern methods of teaching and course instruction will be either reduced substantially or irradiated.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in this House for the past month or so, been bantering this issue, and I say bantering because that is essentially what is happening. The Opposition, us, the hon. members on this side of the House are saying that the government has been wrong,



MR. MOORES: that it is wrong to reduce teacher-student ratios and teaching staff because of economic reasons. And the government on the other hand is saying that they have a responsibility to the people of the Province to keep the government accounts in line with the requirements of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up in Carbonear I attended for all of my life perhaps one of the best educational systems this Province could offer. We had exceptional laboratory facilities, recreational facilities and usually when there was a modern programme injected into the system by the Department of Education it was sent to Carbonear and some other schools in the Province. And as a result of that the drop-out rate in that school system was one of the lowest in the Province, and by comparison a small two room school just about a half mile away with ten grades in one classroom had one of the most appalling drop-out rates, not only in the area but in the Province as a whole.

So what I am saying in effect is that when the Minister of Education makes a statement and he does not see anything wrong with -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: I think it is fair to all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that Standing Order 92 and Standing Order 97 apply here. Standing Order 92: Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains. Standing Order 97: There shall be no debate on the petition unless the House has it under consideration.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is now straying from the prayer of the petition that he is presenting and that he is getting into statements being made by the Minister of

MR. PECKFORD: Education and hence is being irrelevant to the petition that he is trying to present.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Carbonear on that point of order.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I thought and rightly so that I was doing the House a favour in paraphrasing the prayer of the petition and for that reason perhaps the hon. member is somewhat confused as to what really relates or does not relate to what the prayer in fact says. Unfortunately therefore I find it necessary to perhaps unnecessarily consume time of this House by reading the entire prayer. With your permission, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly the hon. gentleman when presenting a petition is entitled to present the prayer, which is the substance of it and that is what the material allegation obviously refers to, the prayer, and he has informed the House that he is paraphrasing it rather than reading it verbatim and that is certainly acceptable.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. NEARY: Number four has kind of muzzled the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: If I can continue, Mr. Speaker, or if I may continue. The resolution of the petition says that "we strongly urge you as representatives of the interest of Newfoundland children to reconsider the proposed policy of teacher cutbacks and in so doing take a forward step to improve the quality of education." And that is exactly what in my opinion the Minister of Education, as representing the policies of the Government of Newfoundland, is not doing. In cutting back on teacher staff in this Province, and vis-à-vis teacher-student ratios, will do nothing, absolutely nothing to increase the quality of education. but over an extended period of time and implicit in that statement is that this is merely the start of a government trend in this Province that will do nothing to improve but, God forbid, decrease what is perhaps already in Canada

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 935

AH-3

MR. MOORES: one of the systems of education which leaves a lot to be desired. Thank You.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to wholeheartedly support the petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague, the member for Carbonear, on behalf of the staff of St. Clare's Central High School. I had the privilege a short while ago, as my hon. friend is aware,

Mr. Neary: to address the staff and the pupils of St. Clare's Central High School in Carbonear. It was one of the best experiences, I think, I have ever had to go into that high school to see these bright young students there, the auditorium was blocked, filled to capacity that day, the nuns were there, and it was a very enjoyable occasion indeed. So I could not let the opportunity go by without supporting the prayer of the petition.

And in so doing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this, that what is developing now, what is unfolding in this Province at the present time are a number of confrontations between the University and the department, between the school boards and the NTA, between the NTA and the minister, between the parents, the PTA Associations, and the staff of the schools, and the Department of Education. And the whole thing is just one great big shemozzle. The minister, Sir, has thrown the educational system in this Province into chaos. And, Mr. Speaker, I think the only way to resolve this matter, the only way to resolve it, Sir, as far as I can see is, apart from reconsidering what the prayer of the petition asked for, the reconsidering the cut back in teachers, in the various schools in this Province, the only real solution, Sir, is one that I have been advocating now for eight to ten years, and that is to set up a fact-finding committee to take a look at our whole educational system to see if we are getting the value of our educational dollar, and if we are headed in the right direction in education in this Province. That is the only way the matter, Sir, will ever be resolved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in support of this petition. One of the points that particularly caught my attention when the hon. member was presenting the petition was the reference to the fact that the teachers were concerned that the teacher cut back would affect the variety of course content. And that is a major point, I think, Mr. Speaker, in this petition, that

Mr. Lush: the cut back with respect to teachers will indeed affect the variety of course content. This is something that we have not been overly blessed with in Newfoundland, particularly in rural Newfoundland, the number of courses that we could offer high school students. Indeed -

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh, here is the new House Leader. Thank God.

MR. SIMMONS: Number two is back.

MR. RIDEOUT: It was a shambles while you were away.

MR. LUSH: If one were to look at the course content in Newfoundland today I am sure you would find a tremendous discrepancy in the courses that are offered in various schools throughout the Province, particularly when comparing urban schools with rural schools.

And as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the members of the House I did have an opportunity to look at that very aspect one time last year, and I found out that in schools - with comparing urban schools with rural schools, that the discrepancy went from thirteen courses offered, a maximum of thirteen courses offered in one particular school to six in another school. Six was almost the bare minimum that a student can do to qualify for university. So when we look at this I think we can find a tremendous discrepancy, and certainly a situation which does not give students in this Province equality of educational opportunity when in one instance you have one school able to double the course offerings as that given to another school.

So I think this is certainly a major point of this petition, that the teacher cut backs will affect the variety of course content because certainly the number of courses that can be offered in any school is related to the numbers of teachers in a school. And in rural Newfoundland in particular that our students have no way at all of competing with students in urban centres where, as I said before, students have twelve, thirteen courses to choose from whereas in other schools they have no choice at all but just to take what is laid on.

Mr. Lush: And this cut back in the teachers is going to restrict even more that flexibility.

And just a further point on these course offerings; I think another point that hon. members should be made aware is that—let us take, for example, a science programme. Many of our schools can only offer a general science course, an earth science course, whereas, again in schools with more teachers and more facilities, they can offer chemistry, biology, physics. So, Mr. Speaker, this cut back in teachers will certainly affect the quality of education in terms of the variety, and in terms of the variety of course content, but more pointedly so, it is going to affect educational equality, equality of opportunity because students in areas where the teachers are reduced are not going to be able, certainly schools are not going to be able, to offer the variety of course content.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to support this petition. It is a petition, I believe, that is deserving of the support of every member of this House, and perhaps we could do a lot worse today than take the rest of the time of the House until 6:00 P.M. to talk on it, because it appears to be obviously the only way we are going to get to talk about it in this House. It is a serious matter, many people are concerned about it. It is a subject of literally dozens of petitions already, either presented in this House or about to be presented. on the way to members of the House,- and yet we are not getting any opportunity to properly air the subject that is so important to literally every Newfoundlander today. And that is the consequence, the very frightful implications of the decision of the Minister of Education and his colleagues in Cabinet to put into effect this year the now well-known educational cutbacks.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the other day - my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has repeated what he said many times, the need for an inquiry of some sort. And I can understand that the Premier must be running out of judges for public inquiries, but there are other routes to go if a public inquiry is not practical at this time. In this House we do not use the committee system nearly as much as they do elsewhere in Canada. Indeed, apart from the Committee of the Whole and Supply and Ways and Means there is only one Standing Committee,

MR. SIMMONS: Public Accounts, which is operating in this particular House. We have no select committee at this particular time, and perhaps we ought to be looking at either a public inquiry or an inquiry through the process of a select committee. Let us find out once and for all if what the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) just said is true. I happen to believe it is true, I happen to believe the education system is going to be a long while recovering from the blow that it is being dealt this year by the minister and by his colleagues in Cabinet, a long time recovering from the blow. I may be wrong, and if the minister would like to prove me wrong what better way to do it than to recommend to his colleagues that a select committee of this House be set up, or otherwise, a public inquiry be put in place without delay to determine once and for all the questions that everybody is asking and nobody has a definitive answer to. I believe we would come a step closer if we had a select committee or a public inquiry to look into this matter now and find out once and for all what adverse effect on the quality of education and on the equality of educational opportunity, which my colleague mentioned, what effect it is going to have on these matters in the foreseeable future.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just add a word or two to the remarks of the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

First of all, as I said two or three days ago when one petition was presented, I believe the issue is much more complicated than the pupil/teacher ratio. I think the member admits that himself. It is much



MR. LUNDRIGAN: more complicated. It is also much more complicated than the amount of money being spent on education. Right now, as I pointed out before, we are looking at \$150.9 million, 49.5 per cent of the total education budget is going to teachers' salaries - that is in the day school system, not in the College of Trades and Technology, not in the Fisheries College. And obviously, there is a lot of money being spent on teachers' salaries. So I do not think it is quite that simple. I raised the point a couple of days ago that we have to look at what is happening to the educational dollar. What is happening to the salary dollar? How many of these salary dollars are going directly front and center into the classroom? I raised the question and I did not criticize - I am not well enough aware to criticize what is happening to the educational dollar, but I am curious to know what breakdown there is in the classroom dollar and the administration dollar. That is the question we have been talking about for the last several years. I am not certain of it - I am concerned about it, as I said before.

I remember being a teacher for a number of years and I remember being in school systems where the quality of education was excellent. And I think the quality of education, by the way, in our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is superior to a number of the Canadian provinces even today. And maybe it is training, as the member said, maybe it is, but I have lived in three and I have studied in several and I will say categorically that our system is superior to what they have, certainly I can say in Ontario, where I have had practical experience for half a dozen years. But I am worried about the administrative dollar. I am really

MR. LUNDRIGAN: worried about it because I have got a feeling, and I believe the teachers will say themselves that they are concerned that the bulk of the salary dollars today do not end up directly through curriculum and classroom activity, which is where curriculum exists, going into education directly into education. And I think that when the effort is put in place that I have heard the minister allude to, some kind of a task force, I believe he said, or some kind of an inquiry, some kind of - not a Royal Commission. I do not want to see a Dr. Phil Warren Commission, that that will be beneficial and I think it will bring this out in the open. Now I am going to comment directly on the member's recommendation this afternoon. I think he has a good recommendation. That is about the first time I have stood in my place and made the observation that the member has a good recommendation, but I believe he has a good recommendation. I support his recommendation. I think the idea of the members of the Legislature other than the Cabinet - who do not have, never will have time to really delve into this will be a worthwhile and useful process to have some kind of a committee specifically struck not an education committee that will last twenty years, but a committee specifically struck that can meet and do some practical work. Not only in this field, but also yesterday we talked about Labrador services, Labrador resources, Labrador resolutions that is the way that members who are full-time, most of the members today are full-time members, can be put to practical benefit and maybe all they will add down the road three or four months is a little bit of light on the subject. It might not be an answer, the recommendations might not be practical, but it will add a bit of light. It is not a search, an inquiry - I hate that word because it almost sounds like some kind of a hunt or an investigative type of thing - not that, something that will allow members who have a role to play here in the Legislature to visit around the Province and hear from the teachers. And I will tell you what, I will predict teachers will say they are concerned about the fact that a lot of educational dollars are not directly benefiting the young people in the classroom.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burin - Placentia

West. I will recognize the hon. minister after.

MR. P. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition. Within the past week I have had to reply to some 2,000-plus inquiries that I got in my district asking me if I agreed or disagreed with the government policy regarding the teacher - pupil ratio. Mr. Speaker, I have replied to them that I did not agree with it. For Mr. Speaker, I was brought up with one teacher for eleven grades with about sixty-eight or seventy pupils, one teacher from grade one to grade eleven, and I made the grade eleven so sometimes I think I must be fairly bright or either that I had a darned good teacher. But realizing that I was very much interested in one of the previous speakers who spoke of the difference between urban and rural schools, Mr. Speaker, the principle of the thing, I certainly do not agree with the government's policy and I think it was a terrible area to consider when they were trying to cut the costs, trying to save money, to infringe on the education of our youth. I think, Mr. Speaker, it should have gotten top priority and I was surprised when the Budget was brought down to find this happen because we have come a long way in Newfoundland since 1949, since I came to this House, in the educational field and I would hate to see any set back in it. I certainly whole-heartedly support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, rising to speak to the petition, I want to point out that we have not cut back the pupil - teacher ratio. The pupil - teacher ratio as the same we had, as I mentioned speaking to a petition earlier, that we had helped to go to one to twenty-five ratio and the addition of some specialists teachers in 1976. But now we find that we cannot do that right away because in this particular year it would have cost about 209 teachers and we could not do it across the Province so we felt we should keep a like stance across the Province. In the meantime there are being a 128 less positions next year,

MR. HOUSE: a lot of these resulting from the fact that there is a serious decrease in the populations in certain areas of the Province. And consequently we were getting pressures from boards who had the one to twenty-six, who did not seem to be suffering any loss of quality of education. They compared fairly reasonable with those who had a one to twenty-five.

Now I have been meeting with the NTA groups, the NTA Conference, the NTA parent groups, and discussing this with them, and I think they are talking about quality and one of the things I want to find out that the loss of a programme or the cutback of a teacher may not necessarily mean loss of quality. There are two different things. You may have more variety, but quality education is not only related to pupil/teacher ratio. There are a lot of other factors.

Now what we have said is that for next year we are going to go with the situation that we have. We do not think there will be any appreciable loss in quality. And I cannot back that up no more than the people who say there is going to be. But we do not think there will, and if there will it will be minimal by virtue of the number of teachers who are involved and we are going to review it for the school year beginning in 1979. And in addition to that, of course, we are setting up a task force to review the implications of declining enrollments because you cannot simply say, "Let us put in a one to twenty-five ratio and all will be well." There are some other problems that we have got to think about and the task force that we are setting up will be looking into the implications of our present regulations. Even if we had a one to twenty-five ratio in districts that have sparse populations, and of course the other implications that will be looked at also is the costs of operation to boards, because with declining enrollments you still have the same size schools so the cost of operating is going to be just the same.

So what I am saying is that we have given our

MR. HOUSE: position to the boards. We have indicated that we have no intention - I think the record of this government has been good in education. I think if you will look back in the last six years you will see some tremendous steps taken forward. We do not think this will have a drastic effect and we will be reviewing it in the 1979 year.

For the benefit of the members who want to see what is going into the classrooms, rather than, you know, what is going to be for administration, we mentioned there are 7,865 people, teachers, in the schools in the Province and they are teaching 154,000 pupils. Apart from the principals of schools, our breakdown is there are 134 supervisors, and 32 superintendents and that is not a great proportion. I would consider that - that is what we are giving anyway from the department - consider that not to be over ambitious. I thought that we could have more than that.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell us, how many principals, assistant principals, administrative staff and all that sort of thing?

MR. HOUSE: The principals are supposed to be part of the teaching staff.

MR. NEARY: Even though they do not teach.

MR. HOUSE: In a lot of cases they do. As a matter of fact, in my district, when I was a superintendant I insisted that every principal do some teaching.

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to rise on this because many of the things that were being said have been said before. But not wishing to debate, and I will not debate, but I must say that the minister when he talks about the quality of education not suffering, I want to draw attention - first of all one thing that we forget, is if a school has declining enrollment and they lose twenty-five students or twenty-six students and they lose

MR. J. HODDER:        one teacher, that means not that twenty-five students dropped out of a grade seven class and therefore they dropped a grade seven teacher, it is not as simple as that. There might have been one student from about thirty different classes in that particular school. The other point is that the programmes - now the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) a few minutes ago was talking about the high school, but I think the most dramatic example that can be shown as to where the quality of education is suffering is in the primary and elementary schools. And I talked to a principal and a teacher of a grade five class which at the present time has seventy students. Now that class is divided into three groups, seventy students, three groups. We will look at just one aspect and it will only take me a second. One particular class, we will call it "A" class as an example, has thirty students at the present time. That particular class has an enriched programme of reading because the children

Mr. Hodder:

in that particular class came to school with educational type background whereby they did not need the same type of reading so they are having an enriched programme. The middle class with twenty-three students will have a more basic programme, the Nelson series where they do more of technical parts of reading. The third class in that particular school had seventeen students, now these are the students from the disadvantaged classes.

Now next year, because that school is being cut back by two teachers, instead of having A, B, and C class or the three classes they will only have two. Now, Mr. Speaker, who loses? The students that lose in that particular school are going to be the disadvantaged children, because the middle group will get through, and the ones with exceptional ability will get through. But the ones who are going to suffer are those students in that reading programme who came from educational disadvantaged backgrounds. And that, Mr. Speaker, sums up to me that because of teacher cut backs in that particular school, therefore the quality of education is suffering in that school, and therefore disadvantaged students in that school are being thrown aside and said, Buddy, fend as you can, you are thrown in with all of the rest, and we have no special help for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, as a former schoolteacher I cannot help but to rise to support this petition presented by my colleague of a former party, and of course, a colleague of this present Opposition party (Mr. R. Moores).

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the quality of education, Now I happen to have a young fellow who is going to school this year in Kindergarten. One week he goes in in the morning, and the next week he is in just in the afternoon. Mr. Speaker, out in the district of Ferryland, which is represented by the President of the P.C. Party, they are going to lose a couple of teachers out there next year, and the consequence will be that where this year a primary



Mr. Callan: teacher has a kindergarten class in the morning, and then another kindergarten class in the afternoon, as I was just describing, which is happening in my own community, what is going to have to happen in that particular school system next year is that the kindergarten students will not be given the privilege of going to school in the morning one week, and in the afternoon the next, say thirteen students, thirteen little boys and girls aged five and six years old; thirteen, which is a fair size class anyway for kindergarten, and a half a day each week is a lot better for them than a full day, a full day as opposed to a half a day.

As I said, out in the district of Ferryland what is going to happen next year is this, that that primary teacher is going to have to have all the students, twenty-six students, starting in the morning class and is going to have to end up teaching Grade I in the afternoon. So if this is not interfering with the quality of education, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how else you could describe it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: When a teacher has to give up the position where thirteen students in the morning, and then the second half of the class, the other thirteen or twelve or thirteen in the afternoon, when they have to be all lumped together to attend school all the time in the morning so that that teacher can be made available to teach another grade in the afternoon session, if that is not an example of interfering with the quality of education then I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, I remember twenty years ago when I went and taught school for the first time in a little community that is represented now by the Minister of Health, a community that got pavement last Summer, it is only a small community, but anyway, Mr. Speaker, in that school in Benton I taught all classes, Kindergarten to Grade IX inclusive, There were two students in Grade IX who wrote the public exam, and both passed, but, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering how the quality of the education of the other grades fared because I was so anxious to get a couple of public examinations students through.



April 13, 1978

Tape 940

PK - 3

Mr. Callan: I went up to the system, Mr. Speaker, and finally I ended up in a high school doing subject teaching fifteen years ago in a school on New World Island which I had the occasion

MR. CALLAN:

to visit the first week in December of last Fall. And, Mr. Speaker, when I ended up in that high school doing subject teaching I vowed never to go back into the other system any more, because obviously subject teaching in a large high school is the opportunity that every student should have because that is where the quality of education is best.

So, Mr. Speaker, anybody who thinks that reducing the number of teachers in our Province does not interfere with the quality of education are not examining all the facts. Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few seconds of the House to support the petition presented by my colleague representing the district of Carbonear (Mr. Moores), Sir.

I think the best way I can support the petition is to tell a story, as sort of an analogy to the situation here, about a proud mother who was looking at her son marching off to war with this great army, and her son was out of step with the rest of the army marching down the main road. And she said "Look at my wonderful Johnny! How come all the rest of the army are out of step?" And this is exactly the situation that the Minister of Education is in today. Every significant organizational group in education are indicating to the minister that the step taken by the government is going to downgrade the quality of education in this Province. And the minister, Sir, I would submit, is the only one who says that it is not and in that sense, Sir, the Minister of Education is like young Johnny .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Social Assistance

MR. BRETT: Regulations and the Child Welfare Regulations for 1977.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Health.

DR COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 53 in the name of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). He asked information with regard to the number of dentists recruited outside Newfoundland for the calendar year 1977. The number is seven, seven dentists. He also asked the number of visits made overseas by recruiting teams and the countries visited. The answer to that is nil. He also asked the names of the personnel of the Department of Health who visited. And of course that is not applicable.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, Your Honour often has the opportunity to welcome visitors to the galleries and I would like to draw the House's attention to the fact that Mr. Terry Hart, the News Director of CKGA and CKCN in Central Newfoundland, is in the Press Gallery today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned, Sir, about the Ministerial Statement that was made the other day by the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture in connection with the spray programme for the spruce budworm. I have one or two questions I want to put to the minister and I believe my colleague would like to ask a number of supplementary questions because of the vagueness of the Ministerial Statement and the rationale behind it. I would like first of all, Sir, to start off by asking the minister if the government considered the alternative? Did the government, for instance, consider a crash reforestation programme, a crash programme to cut the wood, stockpile it if necessary, open up the Linerboard mill to use the wood in the Linerboard mill, to get assistance from the Government of Canada to

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 941

AH-3

MR. NEARY: build roads so the wood could be cut - that is the wood effected by the spruce budworm - if the minister and the government have looked at the alternatives before making up their mind to get into using chemical to try and get rid of the spruce budworm?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have looked at all the alternatives, And I might say before I answer specifically the hon. member's question that I heard him say on radio yesterday morning that it was ridiculous that we had not - I admitted that we had not checked with Nova Scotia authorities before making the decision on the spraying programme. And I did not say that in the House. I said in answer to a specific question from the Leader of the Opposition that we had consulted with Nova Scotia as with all other provinces, What I did

MR. MAYNARD: say was that I was not privy to the Cabinet position that was made in Nova Scotia, and that is for obvious reasons, Mr. Speaker, I do not attend cabinet meetings in Nova Scotia and I have no idea why they made the decision they did, neither should I.

As far as reforestation is concerned we started in 1974, after the Forest Management Taxation Act was passed through this Legislature, a programme of forest management in this Province. It was the first time in history that there had ever been a forest management programme. A part of that programme was reforestation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you do not bring into being a programme of reforestation overnight, it takes some time, a number of years to develop a nursery, to get the seedlings, to plant in various areas, to do thinning, reseeding, fertilization or whatever. But we are into an extensive programme of reforestation and that, as far as the budworm infestation is concerned, and as far as any other infestations are concerned, or diseases that may strike our forest, is our long-term outlook. We are looking at aerial application of insecticides only on a short-term basis. Our long-term prospect is to build up through reforestation and management techniques a forest that is immune, if at all possible - which I doubt very much - but as immune as possible to insect and disease attacks. So the budworm thing, the spraying is a short-term programme which we hope to combat by a long-term programme of forest management which we are in the process of doing now, and had started in 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY: did not answer the second part of my question about cutting the wood that is affected by the spruce budworm. Will there be an all-out attempt this year to cut the timber, especially the timber that is near the Stephenville Linerboard mill, to cut that wood and either stockpile it, export it, or use it in the paper mills, or open up the Linerboard mill and use the wood? How much of the wood will be cut? And has the minister approached Ottawa to get any assistance to try and salvage this wood that will be lost to Newfoundland forever unless it is cut this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Okay, Mr. Speaker, in my statement a few days ago, a couple of days ago, I indicated we had signed agreements with the two paper companies whereby they would harvest a minimum of 260,000 cords per year of bug-killed timber. That, as I understand it - and I really cannot give the reasons because I am not an engineering technician or anything like that - but as I understand it, is as much as they can take if they want to keep the quality of paper.

The Linerboard mill if it were operating would be able to take a certain amount. It would probably increase to another 100,000 or 150,000 cords per year. The hon. gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) mentioned in his speech the other night that linerboard could use anything which is a totally ridiculous statement, because Linerboard cannot be made out of anything, it has to have a certain amount, and a significant amount, of quality wood. There is no question about it, that if Linerboard were operating we would be able to harvest more of the bug-killed timber, but the bug-killed timber would not be able to supply linerboard

MR. MAYNARD: itself. And that is not the only problem with linerboard.

Now as far as the federal government is concerned, we discussed with Mr. Cullen, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration - I am not sure what the title is.

MR. NEARY: Manpower and employment.

MR. MAYNARD: Manpower and employment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MAYNARD: Okay, toss it up and either way it all comes down the same thing.

A few months ago, early in 1978, the possibility of diverting Canada Work's funds into

MR. MAYNARD: make work programmes such as thinning, reseeding, general forest management. Mr. Cullen has agreed to divert some of the Canada Works funds into that sort of project. Our officials and the Canada Works, or the Employment and Immigration officials in Ottawa are now working on the details and I would assume, based on Mr. Cullen's assurance, that by this Summer we will have extra number of dollars, and I cannot say how much it is at this point in time because Mr. Cullen has not given us a definite figure, but we will have extra number of dollars to add on to our make work projects in general forest management.

I hope I have not missed any of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. gentleman for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same minister but it specifically concerns the spray programme as announced. Government has chosen to go with the insecticide Aminocarb. In the report, the Report on the Spruce Budworm Committee, chaired by Dr. Randell, Dr. Randell's Committee recommended against the use of Aminocarb and I will read, with the Speaker's permission, verbatim, and I will read it slowly. Here is what Dr. Reynold's says.

"In general there is little information available relating to the long-term effect of Aminocarb on man or other animals. Thus we agree with recent statements, that the effect of an insecticide on non-target organisms and the potential for environmental harm be examined as fully as possible before the insecticide is used operationally. This principle applies to the chemical Aminocarb, or Matacil is referred to.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the report on which the minister based his decision.

MR. FLIGHT: It is the Report of the Spruce Budworm Committee, the recommendation. My question is for the minister to indicate to the House how it is that he chooses to use a chemical, Matacil, or Aminocarb,



MR. FLIGHT: that was totally rejected, or he was advised against by the Committee that he set up to advise government on the spray programme and the choice of chemicals.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear! A good question.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is twisting the words of the Committee because the chemical Matacil or Aminocarb was not totally rejected by the Committee. They suggested that we use Fenitrothion and if the hon. member would kindly check with Dr. Randell, who was Chairman of the Committee, he will tell you- and I am not going to put words in his mouth- but he will tell you that that was because the Committee was not aware that Aminocarb was registered in Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to answer specifically the question, which I answered, I believe, yesterday, with regards to Matacil or Aminocarb. We have checked, and we have gone through the documentation and I cannot table it in the House, it is a stack about four feet high, a documentation on Aminocarb that has been registered with the Canada Department of Agriculture. And in case the hon. gentleman was not listening yesterday, I will read out again the legislation applicable in Canada, that has to be recognized before any chemical is registered.

Number one - The Pest Control Products Act.

Number two - The Food and Drug Act.

MR. FLIGHT: We heard all of that yesterday.

MR. MAYNARD: Okay, I will repeat it just in case hon. gentlemen did not hear it. Number three - The Environmental Contaminants Act. Number four - The Fisheries Act. Number five - The Migratory Birds Convention Act. Number six - The Ocean Dumping Control Act. Number seven - The Canada Water Act. Number eight -

April 13, 1978

Tape 944

EC - 1

MR. MAYNARD: the Northern Inlands Water Act  
and the Water Pollution Prevention Act.

MR. SIMMONS: We know that, we are smart.  
We are not -

MR. MAYNARD: If the hon. the member for  
Bay d'Espoir knows all that well then he does not have  
to sit in the House and listen, Mr. Speaker, when I am  
answering a question.

MR. F. ROWE: Why minus the minister's  
salary then?

MR. MAYNARD: And the minister got thirty-seven  
cents after taxes were taken out yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MAYNARD: So I went back to the administrative  
officer of the department and I said, 'Would you split it up  
into fifty-two digitals please?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MAYNARD: But in case all of those acts are  
not applicable to the chemical Matacil or Aminocarb,  
Mr. Speaker, there are a number of committees that scrutinize  
this chemical. One is the federal Inter-departmental  
Committee on Pesticides; another is the Canada Committee  
on Pesticides Use in Agriculture, which includes federal/  
provincial university and industry; another is the Canada  
Weed Committee; another is the National Research Council  
Associate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry Aviation;  
there is another one, the National Research Council Associate  
Committee on Scientific Criteria for Environmental Quality;  
there is another one, the Canadian Association of Pesticide  
Control; there is another one, the Federal Association of  
Pesticide Control Official -

MR. MAYNARD: I am answering the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: With vulgar language.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Pesticides.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, professor.

MR. MAYNARD: I will not comment on that.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, after all of that, what I am suggesting as an answer to the hon. gentleman's question, and any subsequent questions he may bring up, is that we have checked it very thoroughly, we have done a lot of study on it, and there is no evidence that we can find where Matacil or Aminocarb is harmful to human health or animal or aquatic life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Apparently, practically everybody is wishing a supplementary as I understand it. The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) is on a different line, in fact.

One further supplementary from the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans. I think all of the others are on supplementaries except for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, this topic, number one, is very topical and it is going to become an issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: We are discussing a very important issue here, Mr. Speaker. We are discussing the health of the people who live within the spray area, and the question, Mr. Speaker, is this; Will the minister confirm to the House that the only evidence, based on all the reports of the various agencies that he has named, the seven federal agencies that exist in Canada today, is the knowledge that Aminocarb

MR. FLIGHT: will kill budworm. There is no experimentation done to determine what else Aminocarb can or will kill either in human or the total ecology. There has not been extensive experimentation done that would advise anybody as to the end result of using Aminocarb in the atmosphere. The results of that kind of experimentation is not available, and all we know is that it kills spruce budworm. We do not know what other risk there is to the total ecology, and that is the reason why Professor Randell refused and pointed out in black and white to the minister that he recommended that further experimentation be done. It is a very dangerous situation we are in here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: Newfoundlanders are going to be guinea pigs.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has just made a statement - he has not asked a question - he has made a statement which is based on a number of false assumptions. The suggestion that the chemical Matacil is dangerous to human health means that the people who administer the Food and Drug Act on the federal level are idiots, because it has been registered by the Food and Drug Act, it has been registered by the Federal

Mr. Maynard: Fisheries Act, it has been registered by the Canada Drinking Water Standards.

MR. FLIGHT: It was banned in the United States.

MR. MAYNARD: And it would not - it is not, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: I was registered in the United States last week.

MR. MAYNARD: That is a falacy. It is not banned in the United States.

MR. NEARY: I was registered last week in the United States -

MR. MAYNARD: It was never registered until last week or until two or three weeks ago in the United States. But -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, that is misleading.

The chemical Matacil was never banned in the United States.

MR. NEARY: It was only registered last week.

MR. MAYNARD: Fine, Mr. Speaker. It was only registered last week, but it was never banned.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. MAYNARD: I mean to say that the chemical is banned means that it has been on the market and is taken off. It has never been on the market in the United States. Matacil in Canada has been in the experimental stages since 1965.

MR. FLIGHT: Only on the budworm.

MR. SIMMONS: What you are saying is it never had a chance to be banned, it was not on the market.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, that is such a ridiculous statement. Only on the budworm, that means that all of the people in Ottawa who -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MAYNARD: - control pesticides and who administer the Acts, The Environmental And Canada Water Safety Drinking Standards and all this sort of thing, that is saying that the only thing that they have to concern themselves about is budworm. That is so ridiculous as to be self-evident.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize a supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: On the same subject, Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us in view of the fact that in the last twenty-five years in New Brunswick spraying - it has taken twenty-five years of spraying in New Brunswick, since 1952, it cost \$100 million - and in view of the fact that, for instance, the State of Maine has been told that the federal funds will be cut off for spraying, where it has been in progress for twenty-three years because they are making no headway and it is getting too expensive, could the minister indicate whether he has undertaken to consult with the Nova Scotia Cabinet or the minister there in Nova Scotia, at the political level, to decide exactly where we are going before we get into this kind of thing, and end up in a situation such as New Brunswick is in, in which \$100 million may have to be spent down the road? And certainly in view of the fact that the egg mass counts last year in New Brunswick went up by 40 per cent after twenty-five years of spraying, \$100 million of money into it, this spray programme showed nothing last year but a 40 per cent increase in egg mass count, whereas Nova Scotia was a decrease.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Okay, Mr. Speaker, first of all on the consultation bit between the different provinces; I explained that a couple of days ago that there is at this time, and it only started in 1977 admittedly, an Eastern Spruce Budworm Advisory Council which includes the State of Maine, plus the five Eastern provinces of Canada, and the two federal governments, the U.S. Federal Government, and the Canadian Federal Government, which exchanges information, and exchanges all documentation that may be made available in any jurisdiction, and analyzes it.

In regard to the decision by the State of Maine to phase out their chemical insecticide programme by 1981. The statement by the State of Maine, if the hon. gentleman would read carefully, says that government involvement will be phased out by 1981. But

April 13, 1978

Tape 945

PK - 3

Mr. Maynard: private industry can still go ahead. Now the fact is that a lot of the Northern part of the State of Maine is private wood lots. These people can still go ahead with spraying programmes.

New Brunswick started out twenty-eight years ago in trying to combat the budworm. It is true that you cannot eliminate the budworm

MR. MAYNARD: by aerial spray and we have never suggested that it is an ultimate solution to the budworm problem. We know and we realize the only thing that happens with an aerial application of insecticide is that it gives the tree one more year of life. We feel that in this Province in certain areas that that is absolutely necessary. We know at this point in time there is no scientific or technical evidence that the budworm can be eliminated. We feel pretty sure that two or three years down the road with the things that are coming on the market now, in the laboratory stage, that there may be biological controls that will eliminate the budworm.

MR. FLIGHT: What evidence do you have to support that?

MR. MAYNARD: Well, okay! We used one biological control last year in an experimental stage called VT, and please do not ask me to pronounce the words that go after the letters. It is very effective. The problem is that it is in very limited supply in the laboratory stage, number one. The number two problem is that the dispersal equipment on aircraft, and it has to be applied aurally, the dispersal equipment has not been refined to the point where you can apply it. In other words, the normal type of nozzles on the wing of an aircraft which spews out fuel and a chemical will clog up with VT. So that has to be worked out. But that is only a year or so down the road when that sort of thing will be worked out. There are other biological agents that are coming on stream which are proven in the laboratory to be effective, they just have to be translated into field operations, okay? So we are confident that within two or three years we will have something that is more effective on the budworm and has less danger than we already have, environmentally.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question is to the same minister. The minister in his ministerial statement a day or so ago laid great emphasis on the buffer zones around spray areas, a mile and a half at least from water supplies and other things of that nature. It is my understanding that 70 per cent of the spray sprayed out in the aerial spray process never reaches the areas that it was intended to



MR. RIDEOUT: reach. In view of that, would the minister tell the House what is the point of those buffer zones and what protection we have for water supply sources in parks and other areas that were never intended to be sprayed in the beginning.

MR. NEARY: in the woods when spraying.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, the buffer zones, Mr. Speaker, have been worked out on the basis of knowledge that we have and the statement that 70 per cent never reaches the trees is, obviously, totally ridiculous and has no foundation, in fact, whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: Oh, no!

MR. MAYNARD: Number one, Mr. Speaker, if you spray something out of an aircraft unless the wind is blowing very hard it has got to land within a very short distance.

MR. NEARY: five mile an hour wind to ten miles an hour.

MR. MAYNARD: The maximum wind factor that can be used in spraying applications is 5 mile per hour. Now I suggest to you that it is very unlikely -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. MAYNARD: - that that chemical is going to go up. It is not going to defy totally the laws of gravity but be that as it may.

MR. SIMONS: Not unless.

MR. MAYNARD: In tests that have been taken in field tests experimental tests; it has shown that a two mile buffer zone for a large aircraft is adequate to eliminate practically all of the drift that might occur. As far as small aircraft are concerned a half mile is necessary because they are only flying about fifty feet above the trees. This has been worked out. It is no magic formula, it is something that we have determined on the basis of experiments and experience in other provinces, in other jurisdictions, in other states of Eastern areas.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow a final supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay d'Veerde. Then I will recognize the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West, on a new question, the hon. member for Fogo and the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, if there is time.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker a supplementary. Sir, in view of the fact that with a five mile per hour wind you only have fifty per cent of the spray landing on target, and with a ten mile per hour wind none lands on target, according to a noted authority, and in view of the fact that the minister stated yesterday that this Aminocarb is more toxic than the other chemical that was to be used and the lifespan is only three years and it is a well-known ecological principle that a pesticide once used over a long period of time the animal mutates and mutation occurs and it can survive, can the minister indicate specifically what studies have been done and what evidence the minister has that the by-products, for example, the by-products of the breakdown - I mean if Aminocarb only has a life span of three years, has the minister any indication of the nature of the by-products for the breakdown of that chemical and whether or not they themselves are not dangerous to the natural ecology of the area that is being sprayed or missed where the target is being missed? And also, is there any evidence to indicate that in fact mutations do occur and that is the reason why the spray is not working in the Province of New Brunswick?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Super budworm.

MR. F. ROWE: We could end up with a super budworm.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: well, obviously, Mr. Speaker, if we had any evidence whatsoever, and we have researched a lot of material - I cannot say that I have researched all the material myself as we have stacks and stacks of material down in the department on the Aminocarb by the trade name Matacil - there is no evidence that we can find of any mutations occurring in any living organism. If there were

MR. MAYNARD: we would not use it. I want to make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that I live in this province too and so do the other members of government who have made this decision, and so do the other members of the department who have made the decision. It should be quite obvious to the general public that we are not anxious to spray a chemical over our children that is going to damage their future life. I mean, it is not something that you get up in the morning and say, Okay I will do this before I have a cup of coffee. It takes a fair amount of deciding.

We have not found any evidence in the documentation that has been provided on Aminocarb to show us that there is any fear of danger and therefore we have gone ahead to make the decision on Matacil. Now, on the breakdown capabilities: As the hon. gentleman is well aware any chemical has a half-life of a certain number of days. As I understand it Aminocarb has a half-life of about three days. Now there is no question about it that the next half-life is three days and the next half-life is three days and it may go on for infinity before it breaks down completely. But what we have found is that Matacil breaks down so much faster than Fenitrothion. The residue in the soil, as in the water, has such a shortened length of time that it is much more - let us say it is less violent on aquatic or marine insects or marine life and this is why we have been able to decide on Matacil as opposed to Fenitrothion which has been shown to have a longer breakdown period, a longer half-life and has been shown to occur again at some future time in the soil.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry I cannot recognize other hon. members who have been endeavouring to get in.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! 1501-01.

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I presume,

Mr. Chairman, we are still on 1501-01. We are. Yes, the minister's salary.

Mr. Chairman, I was just reflecting on the comments made by the Minister of Forestry, the thirty-seven cents. I suppose this one will go down in history, in Woolco fashion, the thirty-seven cent day in the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: Bargain day.

MR. SIMMONS: I did not know you could go below \$1.00, but he demonstrated it not only in his answer but in his answers to the questions this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, thirty-seven cents.

Mr. Chairman, it is a fairly noisy House but I have lots of time.

MR. NEARY: Could we have order in the House, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the -

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

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, cannot speak. He cannot hardly hear himself talk. The hon. members on the opposite side are holding meetings, kicking up all kinds of racket, lowering the decorum of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I am not aware that the hon. member had indicated that he was having difficulty.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. member did, Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Chairman, I was just waiting but you would have to be stunned, Sir, not to realize that it was very difficult to speak in the House in the last few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks I would like to address to the subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: God help us, Mr. Chairman: Surely God we are not going to have another afternoon of that Yahoo, the member for whatever over there, Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). I am sick and tired of him, Mr. Chairman, absolutely sick and tired. He yaks all the time. He never stops.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: I was sitting here doing my work.

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

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman has obviously gone berserk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of order has come up.

MR. HICKMAN: If there is any noise coming from this side of the House I would suggest that it is not coming from a member of the Progressive Conservative Party.

MR. DOODY: On that point of order, Sir, we have some imported talent from the other side. We are having two serious meetings here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The Chair can only recognize one hon. member. The hon. House Leader, I believe, was still on his feet.

MR. HICKMAN: What I was saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. the Minister of Tourism obviously had not uttered a sound. He was as silent as a mouse and the hon. gentleman decides to lash out at him and call him an unparliamentary name and then it turns out that lo and behold! the problem does not lie within this party at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Perhaps it would be useful for me to make the observation that at the end of Question Period, there is a certain amount of going back and forth and the House does become a little noisy at this time, which is not to condone that, but I am afraid that it is a fact of life. It clearly would make it a bit difficult for an hon. member who rises at that time, I would like the hon. members to pay some attention to that fact.

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member commences his speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Or a point of privilege maybe. I recall a few days ago that there was a ruling made by the Chair of the House of Assembly, whether we were in the Committee stage or in the House stage, that the word 'Yahoo' was considered to be unparliamentary to be used in the House. The hon. gentleman just used that word again. I would ask that the Chair ask the hon. gentleman to retract that statement again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think that the hon. member is correct in saying that a ruling was made that the word referred to, that is 'Yahoo', spelled I believe, Y-a-h-o-o, if I remember correctly, that this particular word was considered unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. member if he would withdraw it.

MR. SIMMONS: I will withdraw without any qualification whatsoever, absolutely no qualification. I withdraw it. I am confused and influenced, I suppose, by the - influenced by the press these last few days and the headline in particular that the Minister of Forestry may be replaced by a Yahoo and I was assuming there was going to be another shuffle from Tourism to Forestry. But it being unparliamentary I shall not say it and I withdraw it unequivocally.

There would be no point in going to Forestry anyway 'Jim' because the salary is not very high over there at the moment.

April 13, 1978

Tape 949

EC - 1

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, the other night as I was running out of time, I was about to refer to a suggestion that perhaps the government ought to take a page out of the book of the Government of Nova Scotia - the good Government of Nova Scotia. And I was prompted to say that by some observations I have been making in travelling back and forth to Nova Scotia or more particularly, through Nova Scotia and reading the papers and talking to people up there, one gets the distinct impression, as you observe the Nova Scotia economy and observe initiatives that are taken at the government level, whether in fisheries or in their department of development or in their tourism/recreation thrust, you get the distinct impression that they honestly feel they have a commodity - and I say that in its broad context - a commodity worth selling, a Province worth promoting. They make no apologies for their endeavours in the fishing industry, as I observed in this conference in Sydney a year ago in November. They take a very forthright approach to their tourism policy, and generally, without getting into specifics, Mr. Chairman, they generally give the appearance at least - and I believe it has some substance to back it up - give the appearance of having first of all, a sense of direction of where they want to go in terms of economic development, and secondly, Mr. Chairman, have around them the team of people that can project that kind of a thrust. I am prompted, in particular, to say that today as a result of an editorial that I saw in one of the local papers two or three months ago. And the editorial was labeled or headed 'Learn a Lesson', and basically what it said was that this government ought to be looking at the



MR. SIMMONS: initiatives being taken by two other of the Atlantic provinces, in the case of the editorial, the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Government of Nova Scotia.

MR. HICKMAN: - know definitely at this point (inaudible) accordingly Halifax Harbour (inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, the Minister of Justice interjects that the rate in Cape Breton is 30 per cent and I do not know what that has to do with my comments except that it happens to be in the same province that I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting an overall comparison of the economic state of the two provinces. We would come off on the short end of that one except in one instance -

AN HON. MEMBER: The fisheries.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no! In the fisheries we would come off on the short end, too. We would not come off, Mr. Speaker, on the short end in terms of resources or potential development. In terms of what we are doing we will come off short - we will come off short in every department including the fisheries. And it is there particularly, Mr. Chairman. And I noticed this during the conference a year or so ago in Sydney that the people of Nova Scotia, the Government of Nova Scotia are literally light years ahead of our Province in terms of direction, fisheries policy, fisheries development. They know where they are going, they articulate it very well, and therein lies our two problems in the fishery - we do not know where we are going and depending who you listen to on a given day, whether it is the Premier or the Minister of Fisheries, we



MR. SIMMONS: are not articulating very well, at least we are articulating in several different directions. That is another one of our problems. If the Minister of Justice wants to compare unemployment rates - and it is my understanding from a very scant knowledge of Nova Scotia that Cape Breton would be the more depressed part of the Nova Scotia province - if that is the case, I will cite to him our Cape Breton and it is called Bay d'Espoir, and the percentage is not 30 per cent I will have him know, it is about 78 per cent or 80 per cent.

MR. HICKMAN: The point I am making is that the hon. gentleman is pointing to Nova Scotia as the Utopia of -

MR. SIMMONS: No, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: I would also suggest that if he had been at the meeting on the South Coast in December he would have heard the hon. Romeo LeBlanc say that for the last three years the highest employment in any fishing area

MR. HICKMAN: in Atlantic Canada, the highest employment area was on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course!

MR. HICKMAN: Not Lunenburg.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course!

MR. HICKMAN: Not Glace Bay.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course!

MR. HICKMAN: Not Richibucto.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, nobody disagrees, and the minister should keep in mind he is going to have time to make his speech. I am sure he has another side of this one to put forward. I will put forward my side of it. I do not think anything I have heard from him in the last ten minutes contradicts the overall premise that I am laying out.

The employment figures he quotes for the Burin Peninsula are understandable ones, understandable. If your base position at a given time is lower than another base position, you do not need to know much mathematics to recognize very clearly that if you have an absolute rise in numbers of employed, equal to the other jurisdiction, your percentage of rise will be greater, if you have got the lower base to begin with.

So I am not at all surprised that the figures for the Burin Peninsula are so encouraging. Indeed I lauded that very point when I spoke here the other day on the unemployment situation on the South Coast. But what it has to do with the, as the expression goes, the price of fish in China, or what it has to do with the point I have been making I do not know. Perhaps the minister knows and perhaps he will explain it to us when he gets up.

And speaking of the minister, there was somebody else speaking of him a few days ago. I carry around this picture now.

MR. SIMMONS: You may have noticed I keep it with me fairly often. I had it last day and I have it again. It is a picture of the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). It is not autographed yet but I am sure he would be glad to do so. Today he supported my idea for a select committee, a select committee of the House. I think it is an excellent idea and I am glad to have his support. So in return I am going to support him on something. Because on March the 17th., or 18th., he said, or he is quoted as saying in The Evening Telegram, "If I were starting an undertaking business, or a public relations business tomorrow I would hire 'Mr. Hickman'." And the Mr. Hickman he is talking about, Mr. Chairman, is no other than the present member for Grand Bank, the Minister of Justice, the Deputy Premier, the Government House Leader, the Minister of Finance, the ex-President of Treasury Board, the never-to-be judge on the bench, so many titles, Mr. Chairman, but we all know who we are talking about. He is the one, the same.

"If I were starting an undertaking business," the member for Grand Falls says, "I would hire the Minister of Justice." Is that not a beautiful touch? Is it not also the truth? That he would obviously be the man best for the job. And why? Because, Mr. Chairman, he has had such experience in the undertaking business. Because right now, Mr. Chairman, he works for the largest undertaking business in this Province. Right now that minister, Mr. Chairman, is employed full-time by the largest undertaking business in this Province, the largest, Mr. Chairman, the government of this Province, the largest group of funeral directors in this Province.

These gentlemen are surely digging the economic and the financial graves of tens of thousands of Newfoundlanders, and what better example, Mr. Chairman, than what is before us right now in this Committee, the estimates of the Department of Industrial Development. What a frightful warping of some decent terminology, the Department of Industrial Development. They, Mr. Chairman, are digging the graves, the graves of tens of thousands of ordinary

MR. SIMMONS:           decent Newfoundlanders, who deserve a chance and are not getting it because this department, Mr. Chairman, this department, together with a number of other departments of government, have not been prepared to even give the average Newfoundlander the time of day.

                  I quoted an example in the House today, Mr. Chairman, where the Premier of this Province would not even bother to bring a petition, signed by many people, into the House, a petition addressing itself to a serious matter. And Mr. Chairman, I tell you it is one of dozens of petitions that that hon. member is

MR. SIMMONS: sitting on, and the word is going out. I am going to help publicize it for the sake of the people concerned. Do not waste your time sending a petition to the Premier, it will never see the light of day. How is that for a Government that is supposed to care for people? What is new? Are we surprised? Are we surprised that the Premier has sat on the petitions I have talked about today? Is it any different? Is it out of character for him? Ever since he took over this Government, Mr. Chairman, he has been known to confront a problem in one of two ways, both back on. He confronts a problem in one of two ways, both back on. First of all, he backs into the problem. He stumbles into it like he stumbled into the very monumental constitutional problem he has right now about the Minister of Forestry's salary. He stumbled into that one.

MR. NEARY: Clinging onto power.

MR. SIMMONS: He stumbled into that one, Mr. Chairman, and I will tell you he is going to have to do more than stumble to get out of it. I do not know if they realize yet, Mr. Chairman, just how serious a problem they have created because they, with thirty members, could not manage to find eleven to sit here in the House despite the most efficient whipping, I use the term correctly, despite the most efficient whipping they have ever had over there; the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) is doing his job, as impossible as it is, but even with all the constant whipping he does, they cannot keep eleven guys in the House over there because it is such an unbearable thing for them. That is one of the first signs, Mr. Chairman, one of the sure signs, that a Government is on the run. The fun is gone out of it for them. They cannot stand to face the people's House, and you cannot keep eleven in not even to support their buddy, the Minister of Forestry.

MR. NEARY: They are going to brazen it out and cling onto power.

MR. SIMMONS: So that is the first way the Premier confronts his problem, back on, mind you, he stumbles into it. Well he stumbled

MR. SIMMONS: into one this time and I would be interested to know how he is going to get out of it. He can brazen it through. He has done that before.

MR. NEARY: What about the Saunders affair? I mean, how do you expect him to observe the constitution?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, there is a story.

MR. NEARY: That is how he came to power in the first place.

MR. SIMMONS: There is a story. If somebody had the information to be the biographer for this Government, what a sordid tale you would tell. What a sordid tale you would tell!

MR. NEARY: A \$100,000 affair.

MR. SIMMONS: But even the Saunders' affair diminishes almost into oblivion, I say to my friend from LaPoile, almost into oblivion in comparison to what happened to this Government on Tuesday. Indeed, the frightful thing today, Mr. Chairman - and I could understand my colleagues for asking as many questions as they did about the budworm problem. I was not at today's caucus so I just sat back and listened to the questions. Towards the end I was intending to put a question about some other issues but I found myself, knowing that I would not be involved in the Question Period, just observing the exercise, and I sat here among a dozen or so men who were asking questions on behalf of the people of Newfoundland about a very -

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: The Standing Orders set forth very clearly that the rules of relevancy apply equally in Committee as in the House sitting. I do submit that the comments by the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) are totally irrelevant as they relate to the Heading presently under debate.

MR. F. ROWE: I submit that is not a point of order, Sir, my hon. colleague was referring to the spruce budworm which, obviously, has a direct relationship with Industrial Development as it pertains to the forestry in this Province, and any remarks that he makes and any references that he makes to the spruce budworm and the possibilities of it doing any damage to related industry in this Province has a direct

MR. F. ROWE: relationship to this particular department, Industrial Development. I submit, Sir, that the hon. the House Leader did not submit a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I think I will rule on this quickly because the hon. member, in actual fact, has only about thirty seconds left of his time in any case, but relevancy is required in Committee although under the first item, i.e. salaries, a certain amount of latitude is allowed.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I did not realize I was so near the end of my remarks so I shall leave it just about there and get back to the issue I was pursuing a little later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, in opening my remarks on the Department of Industrial Development, I think it proper to point out at this time and make reference that this, although it is a small department, perhaps the smallest department in the Government, is nonetheless a department of vital importance. I would like, also, to extend on behalf of

MR. WELLS:

all of us who have not already done so our best wishes to the new minister of this department and to hope -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: - most sincerely that he does an extremely successful job in it which I am sure he will do. It is the sort of department that does not have a direct impact on the lives of Newfoundlanders the way the Department of Health might or many of the service departments. But it is a department which if wise -

MR. SIMMONS: What? I am sure the member does not mean what he just said.

MR. WELLS: Wait. Let the member finish his sentence and then by all means comment. What I was saying, Mr. Chairman, is that it does not have a direct and immediate effect in the way that the Department of Health might have if an ambulance is there to go or not to go, but what I was about to say was that in terms of the long-term benefits to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and the people who live in it this department will probably, and has, a greater impact than any other single department in the whole government.

MR. SIMMONS: It is not as easily demonstrated.

MR. WELLS: It is not as easily demonstrated and it is a long-term thing as it must be. But I would say this, that as far as I can gather and see that this particular department has, although a small staff, has a good staff and very competent people and people who would be able and I am sure are able to give excellent advice and help to the minister in taking on this department.

Now, I think - and I have adverted to this subject many times perhaps over the years - but I think in talking about industrial development in Newfoundland we have to make a fundamental point because it determines where we are going to go in the future and particularly what kind of industry we are going to try to attract to Newfoundland. The point I want to make is this, that despite the fact we are now in Confederation nearly twenty-nine years, and despite the twenty-nine years of Confederation and the tremendous benefits that



MR. WELLS:

it has brought to many areas of Newfoundland life and many years of the geographical areas of the Province, perhaps all areas, the unfortunate thing is that we have not seen Canadian capital come to this Province and develop it. I think I can state that as a fact. And I have said before in speeches and I think I have to say it again, as long as I am in this House I will say it, that when you look around and you take the period since Confederation where is the Canadian capital in terms of industrial development in Newfoundland. I have to say and I say this with a great deal of regret, that it is not here. You look at the industries which were here before Confederation that are still ongoing, Bowaters, Price which bought AND Company, you look at the mines, they are American capital for the most part, almost entirely American capital and when you look around you find that twenty-nine years later this Province has not gotten industrial development as a result of Canadian capital. And even the development of the Upper Churchill about which there has been so much talk recently as to whether or not we got a good deal - well let us lay that question aside - but where did the capital come from to develop it? It was not Canadian capital. And when you look all around this Province no Canadian capital except for one or two small, and when I say small, relatively small ventures into the fishery. And I think we have got to recognize this in this House. I think the government has got to recognize it. I think it is one of the most fundamental points that can be made. Because when we recognize that and if we accept it as it is so, because it is self-evident, then we have to say to ourselves, where are we going to go for capital? What are we going to do in order to develop this Province? Because we can say what we like about infrastructure and service industries and that sort of thing but they do not of themselves bring capital intensive development, they do not and they have not and we have got to set about - and that is the job of this department - trying to entice industry into Newfoundland whether it is relatively small industry that might employ twenty-five or thirty or fifty people or whether it is big heavy industry as it is called that will employ 3,000 or 4,000 or 5,000 people.

MR. WELLS:

Now, I have thought about this myself and thought about it over and over again because I think the future of this Province is bound up with it in a way that it is bound up with nothing else. The only thing that I can see in the immediate offing to the fishery, which I am not going to talk about now and perhaps which I am not really competent to talk about, but I do believe that the fishery is turned around by virtue of the 200 mile limit and I think the future of the fishery is great. But aside from that which development will take place? I am sure, aside from that, the only major development that I can see is industrial development based on the use of the power which is available to this Province from Labrador. And that development I would hope would be both development in Labrador and development in the Island part of the Province. But I believe for reasons which I have stated in speeches earlier, it ought to come in the Island part of the Province first because it is the key to that vital transmission line and tunnel which we need before we can ever reach, what I would call, the take off

MR. WELLS: point in terms of industrial growth in this Province. Now I will not deal with that again, I have dealt with that before in other remarks. I would like to see debate on that. I think it is the most important thing we have to debate in this Province. But when you look at industrial development, and large industrial development, I want to make the point which I have made before, and it is important enough to make again, that we cannot philosophically make a choice. We cannot say we are going to have small development to the exclusion of big development, or big to the exclusion of small - we need both, Mr. Chairman. We need the paper mills like Price and Bowaters, we need the Linerboard revived - taken over by new hands with new capital, new development - and I sincerely hope that you, Sir, in your department can accomplish that, but we also need other new major industrial development here and, as far as I can see, the only major asset we have in terms of enticing that development is the power which this Province is capable of generating. But to get that power down here, the transmission line and tunnel have to come.

Now the essential question, or one of the essential questions that has to be addressed is this, If we can entice industry here by massive development based on power, all of that power should be given at a subsidized rate or all of the industry that we hope to attract, whatever it might be, ought to pay its way in terms of the power that it would use in a particular development. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to make the fundamental decision that it ought to pay its way; in other words, that we ought

MR. WELLS: to get industry, if we can, here on the basis of no government guarantees to the industry itself to set up, and also that the industry would pay, for the power which it uses, a rate which would not be below cost. Now we might, in attracting an industry, have to pay a rate which is below the rate that they may have to pay elsewhere, because we have to do something to entice industry in Newfoundland, but it should under no circumstances, in my view, be below cost, and I think that is something fundamental. And also if there is any way that we can avoid it, and I think we should avoid it, we should not get involved in guarantees or lending to the industry itself. If we develop the Lower Churchill and if we bring power down through the transmission line and tunnel - it would have, I assume, to be done by Newfoundland Hydro - that will be at least \$2 billion for both projects and it might be more now with escalating costs. So that development is going to have to be on the credit of the Province, because Newfoundland Hydro is a creature of the Province. The only way it can be done, and it seems to me that it could never be done simply on the credit of the Province, is the underpinning would have to be a commitment of a major industry to come into the Province and set up a major plant, a major establishment. That would be the financial underpinning which, it seems to me, would persuade the money lenders of the world. And it seems to me that a project of this magnitude would involve them all over, both in Europe and North America. It seems to me that is the only kind of undertaking that will permit the financing to be raised for a vast undertaking of this sort.

MR. WELLS: So I think the credit of the Province is going to be involved in the transmission line, tunnel and Lower Churchill through Newfoundland Hydro, but the real credit, the real financial underpinning, it seems to me, would have to be the new industry whatever it be that I hope can be attracted here.

Now let us look at what it would mean if we were able to do the Lower Churchill with the power coming to the Province not going to be sold elsewhere into Quebec or into Ontario or into the U.S., but the power coming this way. What would it mean to Newfoundland in terms of development, in terms of jobs both short term and long term? Now this is something I think we have to consider. We are all familiar with the employment that resulted from the development of the Upper Churchill, and I think it is fair to say that for a period of three or four years it was one of the major economic underpinnings of the economy of the Province. Now we have learned in Newfoundland and Labrador the hard way that construction alone is not enough, because when construction falters, as it has in the last two or three years because of national and world economic conditions, you have

MR. WELLS:

got a vast number of trade people who are out of work and - my hon. friend smiles. He must be good humoured. You have got a large number of people then out of work and we are suffering from that right now. But nonetheless, when you look on the overall industrial base, construction itself is an industry and on the short term, when you look at that aspect alone, then you would have, I would suspect, in doing the Lower Churchill and the transmission line, there would be 5,000 or 6,000 people at least employed for a period of time. And the interesting thing is that they would be employed not only in one part of the Province but they would be employed in Labrador, they would be employed in the area of the Straits, both the Labrador side and the Newfoundland Island side, and then coming right down through the country or the Province until that particular transmission line hooked into the provincial grid. So that the employment would be spread right from Labrador down through the Island part of the Province and would have a maximum effect in the whole Province, and I think that is important.

It seems to me we are never going to get it until we get that major industry which is going to provide the financial underpinnings. There of course we would have two effects, we would have, one, the construction of the plant that would be required for a major industry, whatever it is, be it an aluminum plant as has been suggested over the years or whatever else, we would have the major construction of that. But more important, whatever it was it was a major plant that could use one-third, one-half, maybe two-thirds, whatever it would use of the output of the Lower Churchill, you would have employed in such a plant on a permanent, long term basis, you would have anywhere, I suppose, from 3,000 to 5,000 people, quite apart from the construction but on a permanent basis that in an Island, this side, tied together with the employment in Labrador from the development of the Lower Churchill and from the permanent workings of the Lower Churchill, the permanent running of the transmission line and tunnel,

MR. WELLS:

that would mean substantial permanent employment, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to look at. As I say, there is no substitute for it. The two man to fifty man or 100 man firm is fine, but we cannot live, we cannot survive in this Province and have the standard of living that we have become accustomed to, we cannot have it, it seems to me, and maintain it and foster it and improve it until we get that kind of industrial development along with the fishery and along with everything else that we can attract and get here.

I must say I would like to hear the remarks of other members on this philosophical question as to whether we can afford to go the big industry route or the other route alone. I say again that I believe we need both routes because Newfoundlanders, and Labradorians too, people in this Province have made it clear to all and sundry in the last ten, fifteen years that it is no good to say, We want the pastoral life, or, We want the rural life and we are content with that and we are content to have little. We want, and I think we have demonstrated that, Mr. Chairman, we want just as much as anybody else in Canada. And anybody, I think, who thinks differently is making a mistake and it is no good anymore. I think my hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) would agree that you cannot go and you should not go to the people on the Coast of Labrador or anywhere else today and say, "Well now, you are living down there, You do not need the amenities of civilization. You can get along without them." Not so, Mr. Chairman. We have got to try if there is any way in this Province to bring these amenities to the people in the Province and of course we have to recognize and they have to recognize that you are not going to make a St. John's or Corner Brook, perhaps, out of Makkovik. But at the same time they are entitled to the basic amenities of life in Makkovik just the same as we might be here in St. John's and the people of Corner Brook or Grand Falls or Labrador City.

MR. WELLS:

It seems to me we have got to go the industrial route as well as the fisheries development route, as well as the fostering of our timber resources, we have to go that route and we cannot slack. And there is where I think we have got to use, the government has to use, the minister has to use, and we in the House have to use the maximum ingenuity and the maximum selling capability to try and encourage and entice that kind of industry to this Province without the giveaway. And I feel that once we develop the hydro electric flexibility of having that transmission and tunnel, that flexibility will give the opportunity for major industry to the Labrador part of the Province and that is something I think everyone of us should be working towards.

So, this is my thesis, you might say, on this subject,



MR. WELLS:

Mr. Chairman, but I think we have to go that route and I would commend it to the minister, commend it for debate here in this House, that we have to go the route of small and large and that we have to bend every effort toward trying to get major industry in this province, because we cannot expect the Canadian Government - in fact, over the years the Canadian Government has, I suppose, made it clear to us that it is not going to foster that kind of major industrial development and the capital community in Canada has made it clear to us that it is not going to develop that kind of industrial development in this province. So we have to look to the world markets, Mr. Chairman, I will not say we have to go it alone, I will not say there will not be Federal help. I understand that the Federal Government, when we were talking before about the Lower Churchill and the transmission line, was prepared to make a contribution, not as big as perhaps it ought, but it was prepared to make a contribution.

So I do not discount Federal contribution and this province should welcome it, but as the same time we are going to have to go it alone, I think, in the major sense of attracting that kind of industry to Newfoundland. I commend the minister in his efforts and I am sure that he will receive the support of every member in this House in anything of this sort that he can come up with providing the deal is good and proper and adequate for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Straight over in the corner where you were. Very profitable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! It is not in order to make derisive remarks about any member of the House and it certainly is improper to make them about the Chairman of the Committee as it would be for the Speaker of the House. Now one understands that in the House of Assembly we are in a somewhat of an adversary

MR. CHAIRMAN: situation, but I would hope that the Chair, and this includes the Chair of the Committee, does not enter into that. I think that this would be most unfortunate for the House and certainly for the rights of all members. A remark was made and I would call upon the hon. member if he would withdraw it.

AN HON. MEMBER: I withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. The hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I wish to confine my remarks to a specific area of industrial development and prior to doing so I have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the Hinds Lake development, \$100 million, if that is to be considered industrial development then everything I will say in the next ten or fifteen minutes will be relevant. However, if one can take the Hinds Lake development, a \$100 million hydro electrical project and say that it is not industrial development, then, of course, anything I will say for the next ten minutes will not be relevant. Personally I believe that any hydro electrical development such as the Upper Churchill, such as the Lower Churchill we are talking about, the present Hinds Lake project, is indeed industrial development, and not only should the people of Newfoundland look to the benefits of that development but certainly people living in the immediate area should look to that development with great expectations. And if the area in which that development is going to be located is a depressed, or about to become a very depressed area, then certainly the people living in the area should have every right to expect that the planners of that development, the Minister of Industrial Development, the Cabinet, to the point that is economically viable will see to it that that industrial development will benefit the people living in the area in which that development is to take place, witness the feeling of relief when this administration suggested that Gull Island would be developed, witness the hon. member for Naskaupi, the feeling of relief; They saw it as a means of shoring up an

MR. FLIGHT: economy that had just flattened because of the Americans pulling out of Goose Bay. The Lower Churchill development was being counted then by the administration, and possibly rightly so, as the salvation at least in the short-term of the Goose Bay economy. and had the development gone ahead they would have been right.

Now we hear stories of bankruptcies and people sitting on equipment and expectations down the drain because that project did not indeed go ahead. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the people living in Buchans today, and in the immediate Buchans area, have the same right to expect, given the state of their economy, given the fact that everybody accepts that the mining industry in Buchans will close down in approximately eleven months; with that kind of a project going on a minimum of eight, maximum of sixteen miles of construction sites that

MR. FLIGHT: they would have had no reason to believe otherwise than that the project would be planned so as to guarantee whatever economic spinoff was possible to the people of that immediate area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I first became familiar with the Hinds Lake project, again I said this to the House before, I talked with Hydro, I got no commitments from Hydro, When I first realized that the project was going to go ahead at the complete exclusion of the Buchans area, I first blamed Hydro. I admit to the House I was wrong. Hydro's mandate is to provide electricity to this Province in the cheapest possible way, and that possibly they do not build roads. But the mandate of this government, Mr. Speaker, the mandate of the Government of Newfoundland is to spend the money in this Province, to spend the \$100 million that they are going to stand behind for Hydro in a way that it accomplishes the most in the better interest of the most people. It was the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Industrial Development who should have looked at the Hinds Lake development and said, "We will develop this since Buchans is in the state it is in, since the economy of that town is going to completely and totally collapse in less than a year, that we will see that that project is development is a way that will provide whatever economic benefit to that town and area that can be provided. And if it costs \$1 million - remember we are talking about a \$100 million project - if it costs \$1 million to build a road from Buchans into the construction sites, then we will, the Department of Transportation, will build that road."

I mean, you know, it is basic. It is basic that any area of this Province has got a right to believe that it is their resource. Hinds Lake, you can make the argument that just as surely as the offshore oil is Newfoundland's resource, or the Lower Churchill is Newfoundland's resource, then you can regionalize that argument and say that well if that is the case then obviously Hinds Lake, within eight miles of the town of Buchans, in a sense

MR. FLIGHT: is the last resource, it is their resource and should be developed with an eye to improving their lot.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that Buchans is about to close. Here we have an administration that is about to spend \$100 million within eight to sixteen miles of that town, and they have deliberately, deliberately with forethought, planned, engineered and will develop that great hydro electric project, deliberately denying the town of Buchans 5,000 livelihoods, any economic benefit whatsoever. The people in Buchans who have been laid off over the last ten months cannot possibly, they have to drive - eight hours return drive to get to the construction sites and back. They have to drive all the way around the Trans-Canada. The construction sites are within ten miles of the town of Buchans, 500 men are about to lose their jobs. 1,000 men, the minister suggested a few days ago, would be employed in 1979 which is the year, the Spring of 1979 is, when the axe is going to fall at Buchans and we are going to have 500 men unemployed.

The economy of Buchans Junction depends totally on the mine operation at Buchans. The economy of Badger is heavily dependent on the mine operation in Buchans. Not only would Hinds Lake have given us a three year breathing space, I am not demanding any jobs, all I am asking is to recognize the right of the men of Buchans who compete for jobs on those sites. You can build ten roads in from Howley if you want; build just one in from Buchans so that any person in Buchans who has got the initiative to try to get a job on that construction site has got the ability to go in there and compete. And by withholding ten miles of gravel access road - and the minister a few days ago said it was a political thing that if they build ten miles of gravel road the next day we will be asking for pavement; what nonsense! Most of this Province is still driving over gravel road. All we are asking, we are pleading for, I am pleading on behalf of the people of Buchans, is that we would get access to those construction sites so that any person who loses a job in Buchans, and there will be 500 over the next three years -

MR. FLIGHT:           lose their jobs, over the next year lose their jobs -will have the ability to compete for jobs on that site. Is that asking very much? And the expenditure to guarantee that happening would be less, based on what it costs to build fourteen miles of access road from Howley to the main generating station on Grand Lake, is less than \$1 million. That is what we are asking for. Let the press point out that we are not asking for a paved road; let them point out that we are maybe ten years down the road on that. Right now the plea is in order to shore

MR. FLIGHT: up and to guarantee the ability of people in Buchans to continue to live and work and produce and conjugate. We are asking for a \$1 million expenditure from T and C to get access to the construction sites on that Hinds Lake project.

And the other issue, Mr. Chairman, with regards to that great industrial development we are about to see at the complete exclusion of the people of Buchans, a population of 3,000 who have contributed non-stop for fifty years, is that if that access roads goes in then it is entirely then-and maybe this is the crux of the thing-it is entirely then up to the construction companies who goes into that site. I can assume that any construction company located east of Buchans would then, if that road were in there, would then chose to move their equipment in through the Buchans route. It would be automatic that they would then probably use Buchans as a mini service area. One can go on and visualize that then if that were to happen, and it is highly possible-somewhere must be used for a service center-it is highly possible then that Buchans would pick up ten or twelve, use any figure you like, million dollar spinoff in service in that construction on that job. Now are we not entitled to that, Mr. Chairman? And does the members of the House realize what that approach would mean to the town of Buchans, to all the people who are working in Buchans today and who will not be working as of next March? It is unbelievable, Mr. Chairman, you talk about fiscal planning, you talk about planning this economy so as to get the most for our dollar, and here we have a town that in a year from now will be on either unemployment insurance or welfare, and here is the administration that is going to spend \$100 million in eight to sixteen miles of that town and have deliberately, totally, utterly, deliberately refused to recognize that fact and for the expenditure of \$100 million build - look, do the members of the House realize that two-thirds of that road, the Buchans - Howley road, will be built as a result of access roads to the construction sites anyway? That over the three years two-thirds of the proposed Buchans - Howley road will have to be built as access roads



MR. FLIGHT: to the construction sites? So one third-now it is only twenty-eight miles from Buchans to Howley, so we are talking of approximately ten miles of gravel road-that will have two effects in the town of Buchans; number one, it will provide access to the construction sites on the Hinds Lake project, give the town a breathing space of three years whereby anyone 'desireous of obtaining employment on that great construction project will have three years of work three years of lead time, who knows what will happen? Maybe the mineral, maybe Buchans will be back into the mining situation three years from now. All that has got to happen is we get some change in world market conditions, we bring in a few more ore bodies- they are up there. We know they are up there. They are already working on two ore bodies with a million ton deposits. Maybe in the next three years that type of thing will happen. We are asking for three years breathing space. And the long-term effect that kind of approach would have, Mr. Chairman, is that one of the - everybody agrees that without a mining activity in Buchans that if the town is to survive it will have to be based on tourist development, based on transportation, a road in and out of that town, east - west. Other than that it cannot survive. And the short-term recommendation, recognizing the fact that it would be impossible economically even if DREE were to support it, the road from Southwest Brook to Buchans is five or six or eight or ten years down the road. Now the Minister of Transportation and Communications only had \$15 million in his capital works budget last year. Now we are talking about a vast outlay of money, and even if DREE were to fund it it would still come too late, so let us forget it. We are talking about the immediate situation that Buchans finds itself into, and one of the recommendation's the major one, was the Buchans - Howley road recognizing the fact that that is



MR. FLIGHT: that is all the time we had. We can put that road through. You do not have to pave it. I am speaking on behalf of the people of Buchans; we will not demand paving next summer, or the summer after, if the economy of this Province does not change. We will accept a twenty-eight mile gravel road for the next ten years if the economy of Newfoundland is not such that it would be right for us to do it. But we have every right to demand that that Hinds Lake project be developed in a way that will guarantee Buchans its share of the economic spinoff, our share of that \$100,000,000. It is criminal to think that we would go in there and spend that kind of money developing that kind of a project eight to sixteen miles from a town that is about to go down the drain after fifty years non-stop production. It just will not hold up, Mr. Chairman. It will not hold up and if that issue could be articulated around this Province today - everyone in this Province knows what the contribution is that the town of Buchans. There is probably not a town in Newfoundland today that has not got relatives and men who worked in those mines. If that issue could be articulated and if this Administration's approach to it could be articulated across this Province, it would bring down this Government. It could probably bring them down because they would say, 'Look, Bale Verte is going to go one day, St. Lawrence is gone, every one-industry town in Newfoundland will go, one day they will go, every one-industry town', and if the people living in these towns look at the way you are treating Buchans with regard to the Hinds Lake project then they will say, 'Maybe that is the way they will treat us'. Properly put, properly articulated around this Province today, this Administration's approach to Hinds Lake could bring them down.

This Administration has gone in, they have spent \$200,000 on the Task Force report, they have expressed a concern in all of Newfoundland and we were suckered in, the people of Buchans believed them. This Administration, and I can name three ministers who have been deceitful, deceitful as far as the people of Buchans are concerned. Shameful, the way they have treated them! I have talked privately to

MR. FLIGHT: ministers, I am not going to put them in the record, who before the plans for Hinds Lake became public indicated to me privately that, 'yes, we are glad that the Hinds Lake thing is coming on stream, now that bears well for Buchans'. When the project was put on paper and when the plans were being made, it is unbelievable, Mr. Chairman, that not one minister on that side of the House recognized the injustice here, recognized that Buchans was being dealt out of the only hope of any kind of a future, that the three years that they had left, three years, the Hinds Lake project gave everyone in that town the right to believe, 'Well, I have three more years if I have the initiative'. 'And we are not asking that we get the jobs ahead of the people who live in Deer Lake, or in Howley'.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that the areas west of Howley that are represented in Cabinet, Deer Lake/Howley is represented by the hon. Minister of Education, Humber West by the Premier. One of the Humber Valley districts, Corner Brook, will service the Hinds Lake project, and Deer Lake, represented by three hon. ministers. More power to them, Mr. Chairman, I believe in protecting and helping and pouring it into my district too but not at the expense, not at the total and complete expense of another town that needs it. Is there a minister that can stand up in this House today and suggest that the economy of Deer Lake, or Howley, or Corner Brook is such that they deserve the economic spinoff from Hinds Lake to the point that Buchans does? If there is a minister that can prove, who is prepared to state that, then I will take a back seat, Mr. Chairman, but there is not.

That project has been designed so that any economic spinoff, any value, any benefit, apart from the electricity itself after the project is made, it has been designed so that the only part of Newfoundland that will benefit is anything west of Howley.

Mr. Chairman, you know if one stands up and shouts and bawls in front of the mike, and he waves his arms, he can easily be accused of being radical, but this issue, Mr. Chairman - I have

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 958

RT-3

MR. FLIGHT:                    heard in Buchans - I have heard of the  
possibility that if we do not develop the Hinds Lake project so as to  
provide some spinoff and some

MR. FLIGHT:

benefit to the people of Buchans then we will not develop it at all. Now you can take that a little further and wonder what people mean when they say that. And you could take it a little further and say they would oppose it - you know, you would have civil disobedience. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that in this world today there has been civil disobedience with people being denied a lot less than the people of Buchans have been denied as a result of this government's approach to Hinds Lake development, and it is possible. I am not advocating it, it should not be necessary for me to advocate it, but I am saying that in this world today there have been civil insurrections where the causes have not been as great as the approach that we see this administration taking in the Hinds Lake development today, I would sincerely ask the Minister of Industrial Development that he would take another look at the Hinds Lake development, take a look at what that development can mean to the economy of Buchans given the fact that that town is going to go in March - 500 men going out of a job and the economy of at least five more communities severely affected - look at it again and see if spending \$1 million to put an access road into construction sites does not pay dividends. It may even get you elected in Buchans, and if it does that is one issue I would be prepared to go down on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: If I can get a commitment from this administration that they will build that road, I will resign.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, (inaudible)  
opportunity to enter into wide ranging observations as  
to their ideas of industrial development, but there is  
a point that has recently risen in the House with  
respect to industrial development that I feel merits  
some observation and some questions being answered.  
And this revolves around the oil refinery, the proposal  
of Ultramar which was turned down by the government on  
very good grounds, and its subsequent rejection by the  
British interests.

Now the question that arises  
from this, or the questions that I see which arise from  
this is that I think it has to be defined, really, what  
are the minimum requirements set down by the government  
and by the people of this Province for the reopening of  
that refinery? And as a result of the questions that  
were asked in the House on that day and answered by the  
hon. the Premier, one other determination that we have  
to determine in this Province is what steps need be taken  
to assure that these requirements will have to be met.  
And we know that there are certain minimum requirements  
that have obviously been set down, because the proposal  
was, as I understood it, that if Ultramar's proposal had  
been accepted the refinery would open on the mere creation  
immediately of some thirty jobs with no guarantee in the  
future as to the reopening of the refinery itself. So  
it was determined that we would not accept this, and this  
was a good decision. I think it was a good decision that  
every sensible person will agree with. It certainly does  
not need the approbation of those pushing the Shaheen

MR. MARSHALL: interests outside of the House, or for that matter anywhere, to say that it was a good proposal. It was a good step and a wise step taken by the government. We do know the Opposition stand, or apparent Opposition stand on it anyway with respect to the refinery, that it would appear from statements that have been made by certain people in the Opposition, as I interpret them, Mr. Chairman, that their main thrust is to be that the refinery should open under the previous operators. That is the way that I interpret them; it is the way they seem to bend in towards this particular area.

But I am not really concerned with the Opposition stand, Mr. Chairman, as much as I am with the government stand, because I think we need, and we need urgently, a definition in this Province, as I say, of the minimum requirements to be set down for the opening of that refinery and when these are set I think that steps have to be taken to insure that no matter what happens these minimum requirements will be met.

Now there is no doubt that  
whatever

MR. MARSHALL:

happens to that refinery by way of operation, and whoever operates it, that there is a price to be paid, there is an ever present price. There was a price to be paid when the refinery was originally conceived. And as I see it the major price to be paid in this Province is the risk, and the very real risk, of pollution as a result of overturning of a tanker in Placentia Bay or in and around Placentia Bay with the attendant risks on the fishery of Placentia Bay and indeed on the South Coast. And I think events have shown throughout the world in the past number of years, immediate number of years, that this risk is mounting. We read from time to time all over the world of tankers turning upside down and what have you and leading to gross pollution problems.

Now balanced off against that, Mr. Chairman, at that particular time when the refinery was first conceived was the thought that we were told there were to be a certain number of jobs in the refinery, certainly - But persons operating on representations had thought that it would result in a petro-chemical complex which would result in a large number of jobs and therefore I assume they balanced this risk of the destruction or destruction might be too strong a word but then again it might not be - but certainly dire and disastrous effects upon the fishery as a result of the creation of a large number of jobs and the turning around of our economy from a fishery based economy to perhaps an industrial based economy. We know that that did not come to pass and it is not likely to come to pass. When it was first proposed, despite we received assurances then about the safety of the ships and what have you but we know and we all know that it is not possible to give these assurances because, as I say, the price to be paid, in all instances the major price, is the risk to the fishery of this Province.

Government was apparently prepared to pay it again subsequently when the second refinery was conceived or talked about. Then I was under the impression that it was being entertained purely and simply because the first refinery was operating. So the risk was

MR. MARSHALL:

there anyway and if you are in for half a loaf it is just as well to be in for the whole. But both of these factors are now absent, are gone - no possibility of any second refinery, certainly no possibility of any petro-chemical complex. We certainly have to look back and reassess our positions from time to time to determine - the rules are different, the possibilities are different - just exactly what we are prepared to pay for it now. Now there is no doubt that the refinery opening itself, you know, will have advantages because heavens knows that we need jobs and we certainly need jobs in these areas and we need them very badly. And even 450 jobs or 500 jobs would be a Godsend to this part of the Province. Indeed it is probably much less than 450 or 500 because a lot of these will probably have to be filled by persons outside of Newfoundland, as they were originally. But we do need the jobs, we cannot deny that.

We also are in debt with respect to it to the tune of about approximately now \$50 million, if I recall from the Public Accounts, as a result of the second mortgage which has been granted. It is worthwhile to note that we would have been in debt for a tremendous amount more but for the actions of the government in its skillful negotiations with respect to the second refinery. So that is what we must bear in mind. We do need the jobs and we have to pay. But we also, Mr. Chairman, must balance all of this against the risk to the fishery itself. Anybody who can stand in this House with any degree of confidence and say that there is no risk, do it, there is no risk to the reopening of the refinery, that is no risk to the fishery, I do not think anyone would seriously contend it.

So therefore I suggest then - my main reason for speaking on the minister's salary here is either the minister or the government, not necessarily now but certainly in the future, I would suggest, not just the government but indeed the Province - when you say the government you say the legislature, the government, the legislature - indeed the people of Newfoundland have really got to address themselves



MR. MARSHALL:

to this question. We need jobs, we certainly do. But we have to take into consideration when we are talking about the opening of the refinery that danger to the fishery. And there would seem to me to have to be a certain price for jobs in numbers of quantities of jobs that we will not pay to put the fishery in jeopardy.

As I say, it has recently been shown that thirty jobs is not enough and I think we have to define.

MR. MARSHALL: Now the second point is that when this definition is drawn, the questioning that took place in the House the other day with respect to the matter that were addressed to the Premier were very well taken, "What happens," it was asked, "What happens if the government takes a position in the present stage of proceedings as to what it wants to happen in Come By Chance, and is not in favour of a certain operator coming in because the terms are not appropriate, and regardless of this the British interests who hold the first mortgage decide to sell out anyway, what exactly is the government going to do?" I thought the Premier quite wisely and responsibly at the time said that, you know, that he was not going to address himself to the question at that period of time when the British interests were considering the proposal itself. But I do think that we do need, that the government does need to address itself to this particular question and that it should address itself as quickly as possible to this question. I think we have to define then the price that we are going to pay for the opening at Come By Chance, and that having been done, I think we have to realize that because of agreements that have been made, that it is all right to define the conditions upon which any operator will come in, but we have to take steps, be it by means of legislation or otherwise, to see that we are empowered and we have the power to be able to control the situation.

Now maybe in the agreements there are such provisions but I am not aware of it. But I think it is a matter that we must bear in mind, because I wonder myself what would really have happened if the British interests had really accepted the Ultramar proposal and how we actually would have had to handle it then. We would have had to handle it perhaps after the fact, and I think perhaps a definition of our policy, a reassessment of the whole situation is necessary, a reassessment of the danger of that

MR. MARSHALL: refinery, as badly as jobs are needed, but we have to ask ourselves, as Newfoundlanders, we have to be quite sure of the risks to the fishery of this Province, because I do not think that any member of this House would wish to seriously put in jeopardy the prosperous fishing industry in Placentia Bay and on the South Coast of Newfoundland. This is not to say the refinery cannot open, or should not open or what have you, but it is a plea and a request to the government to make a firm definition of its policy and for the people really, the Legislature as well, and the people of Newfoundland to consider the direction in which we are going in this Province, and what we are prepared to pay and do in order to achieve the type of development that we must have. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, could I speak for one minute so the Speaker can come in the Chair and announce the Late Show and then come back to the hon. gentleman for Stephenville?

I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It being almost five o'clock, I inform hon. members of the three matters for debate this afternoon. The first matter, notice given by the hon. member for LaPoile, (Mr. Neary), arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture; the subject matter, the various alternatives to spraying to combat the spruce budworm problem. The second, notice given by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture; and the subject matter, the spraying programme

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 961

NM - 3

MR. SPEAKER: to combat the spruce budworm. The third notice was given me by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture; the subject matter, the adequacy of the evaluative

MR. SPEAKER:

programme with respect to past experience in combating this spruce budworm.

I think now would be an opportune time to rule on the point of privilege which came up earlier with respect to petitioning. The operative section is Beauchesne, Section 342, and the second paragraph. I will read the first paragraph first because the second may be only fully comprehensible if the second is read after it. First paragraph - and this was quoted by the hon. member raising the point - "A member cannot be compelled to present a petition. In 1891, a person, in England, forwarded to two members of the British House of Commons a petition for presentation; and the petition was returned to the sender because it infringed upon the rules of the House. That person in consequence brought actions against the members and the Clerk who had acted in the matter, but the actions were dismissed on the ground that the causes of complaint were not cognizable by a court of law." And obviously that establishes that if there is an irregularity in the petition it cannot be presented.

The second paragraph goes on, "In a subsequent action, it was held that there is no right in a person desirous of petitioning the House to compel any member to present his petition and that no action will lie against a member for refusing to do so." In the present case, of course, we are in a situation where a petition has not yet been presented. And in the case of a petition not yet being presented, there is no matter of privilege and according to the second paragraph of that section of Beauchesne even in the eventuality that a member did not in fact present a petition the matter of privilege would not be involved.

The motion is that I now leave the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Heading 1501. I recognize the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess it would be in order that if I start with congratulating -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I recognized the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Orders from the Premier.

MR. MCNEIL: I guess it would be in order to congratulate the Moores Government for its achievements in industrial development. It has been marked with a series of successes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would like to, not interrupt the hon. member but I would like for the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to retract that remark he made concerning that I received orders from the Premier.

MR. NEARY: I did not make any remark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I heard the remark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: I was referring to the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doody), Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, whoever it was I will ask you to retract the remark. I feel it was directed to the Chair.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, there was no remark directed to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There was one directed to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doody).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I will ask you to retract that remark.

MR. NEARY: What was the remark, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The indication to me was that I was taking orders from the Premier.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I made no such statement, Sir.

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

MR. NEARY: If Your Honour feels that I made a remark towards him, but in actual fact it was towards the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doody), if Your Honour feels it was towards the Chair I withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. NEARY: But it was towards the Minister of Transportation (MR. Doody).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would imagine that the incidents over the last few years which have been marked with the closing of Come By Chance, the stoppage of the Gull Island project, the closing of St. Lawrence, the closing of the Labrador Linerboard Limited, the Stephenville operation and its Goose Bay operation has contributed to some measure to a good atmosphere for attracting any industrial enterprise. I am afraid that our Province probably will be recognized as an industrial junkyard if something does not happen soon.

I would like to address myself to the question of Labrador Linerboard which was marked by the government taking a giant step backwards with its closing last year. The Minister of Finance at that time when he brought down his budget stated that it would cost \$27 million to close the mill and that cost would include mothballing. To date, as is stated in this year's budget, they have spent \$34.5 million. I am told that the figure would be closer to \$43 million that is spent to date on the total closing of the Linerboard. Now, Mr. Chairman, we must remember last year when the government made the major decision to close Labrador Linerboard, the advisory board in its final report as of July 22, 1977 stated that the Province would realize, and I

MR. MCNEIL: quote, "A financial saving of approximately \$27 million over a three year period," that is up until 1980, "if operations are discontinued." Mr. Chairman, that is less than \$10 million per year for the next three years and already we have seen that the estimates have gone over what they had projected. Also during that period the Minister of Forestry knew that we had a very serious problem with the budworm, knew that a decision had to be made to either spray the province or to carry on a harvesting operation. In the minister's statement yesterday he stated that the original estimation for the spraying programme was approximately \$5 million, just half the amount needed to keep the Labrador operation going for one year. For what other reasons his department made the decision to spray instead of harvesting is beyond me. To me it would seem to be more realistic, more rational to harvest the operation on a similar scale to what they are doing in Nova Scotia, providing, first of all, employment to a province which has the highest unemployment rate in Canada. This would indeed at least bring down the unemployment figures a little and it would also have the added attraction of giving a little bit more time for the market in the linerboard area to pick up. If the mill did not want to produce linerboard it could have produced probably raw pulp, and it could have sold that raw pulp to newsprint plants in Canada or even around the world for that matter. It could have probably even approached the Federal Government not for a handout or a bail out in an industry that was going down the drain, but it could approach the Federal Government to help save one of its natural resources, the forest, which is being threatened by the spruce budworm.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Forestry stated this afternoon that the Linerboard mill cannot take any great amount of infested wood. I do not dispute the minister, but the experts in the field who were manufacturing in the Stephenville plant stated that a newsprint mill can only take a certain percentage,



MR. MCNEIL: but if you are producing linerboard it can take almost up to any percent of this infested wood, much more than what you could use for the newsprint process.

Another point that was pointed out to me was that you could take this infested wood now, take it, put it through the plant and store it or sell it as roll pulp and I think when the Linerboard mill opened at first it started off producing roll pulp and sold it. Mr. Chairman, the Government of Nova Scotia made a decision to go to harvest. In this province we have made a decision to spray, with all its calculated risk, and the Minister of Forestry cannot say that in his own heart, somewhere down deep, that he does not feel there is a possibility that he may not have all the necessary information.

MR. McNEIL: He must feel a little bit of doubt in passing the spraying programme as versus maybe a limited spraying but mostly going into the harvesting mainly.

I have also asked the chairman of the board of directors, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs and whatever other titles he may have, to supply me with some basic information regarding the cost to the Province, for example, to set up the consultant group of Woods, Gordon, how much the Province has paid to this group. I have not received this information. But remember, is it the group that made the announcement in Europe that Linerboard was closing before the government supposedly had made up their minds to close it? They had gone around Europe and they hurt us in the market place. Now we have them employed as selling agents for our mill. I wonder how much success will they achieve? I hope they are successful, but I am very doubtful.

How much has it cost the government for its advisory board, its divestiture committee? The only bright spot in the divestiture committee, as I understand, is the hiring of the doctor from the university, from the engineering department - Dr. Bob Hoskins, I think <sup>he</sup> is, and he is with the Department of Industrial Development. He is the only optimistic note in the whole committee, and from what I understand he is doing a good job and believes that the plant can work and believes that it should work more than what the government believes. He has a belief in it and he has the expertise. He is a Newfoundlander and I hope he will make his presence felt. It is too bad we could not have the combination of Mr. Sweeney and this new doctor, because maybe the two of them would have

MR. McNEIL:                   come up with a combination that we rarely see in this Province, a little bit of success in one of our major industries. And based on our natural resources that is almost the same as saying that the fisheries - well, the fisheries and the forestry are almost in the same category.

I have also asked the minister to give us a figure on the amount of severance pay paid out to the employees in the Goose Bay operation and the Stephenville operation - what is the total amount of severance pay paid out? And then the cost of mothballing. Did it include the cost of installing a smaller boiler in excess of \$200,000? I understand the main reason for this new installation is to lower the cost of keeping the plant heated while the mill is down. The only reason why they are installing this new boiler is to save on fuel while the plant is down.

Now the government has stated its optimism in the Budget Speech - that they were very hopeful for a conversion to newsprint - but yet we do not even have a buyer. And to show you how much they believe in their optimism that it will go again in a short period - which the people in that area believe that it will be this year that we may see it open again - they are installing a boiler to save money while the plant is down. Now how much fuel does it burn? Does the plant burn \$200,000 in fuel per month? If that is the case, well then it is warranted.

AN HON. MEMBER:                   A year.

MR. McNEIL:                   It burns that in a year, did the minister say?

MR. MAYNARD: It burns back in a year.

MR. MCNEIL: It burns back in a year, the minister is saying. So it is definitely a year down the road before the plant will be open, a year plus, guaranteed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, rather than dwell on the Linerboard situation - it is a thing that is very close to me. I get very emotional when I speak about it because I think the government made a very bad mistake. They made a step backwards which will haunt them no doubt - let me ask the Minister of Industrial Development if he could give me some encouragement in the area of the fisheries. For example, in Stephenville we have the former Pack Atlantic plant, one of the finest plants around, and over the past few years, or several years back, it closed down because it was not economic, it was not feasible, it could not market its product. So now the same group are back and saying it was a fantastic plant and the only problem was bad management. But the problem now is that all the machinery was tore out and sold to some company from elsewhere. But now we have a little bit of encouragement. We have a local operator in the area who is willing to get involved in the fish plant, who is willing to set up the former Pack Atlantic plant, get in there and start processing fish and also with some processing of berries of different sorts. Last year he did a little bit of experimental work in his own operation in Stephenville and now he is willing to get involved in the reopening of that plant.

Could the minister elaborate on that for me?

I think one of the stumbling blocks in that area was that piece of property was supposed to be returned back to the Harmon Corporation and in turn the Harmon Corporation was going to release it to the operator. Also in the area of fisheries, could the minister indicate if there will be any assistance given to the application of a gentleman who has applied to reopen the fish meal plant in the area? He has approached the government for assistance. His application has been

MR. MCNEIL: denied I have personally asked the Minister of Industrial Development, first, and then I went over to Rural Development for assistance, and he has indicated that he would take it personally himself and I hope that he could give me good news in this area. So if the minister could address himself to these questions I would appreciate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity that I have had to speak since this session was started and although it is only in committee by a long tradition I think that the first thing I should do is congratulate the minister on his new department and wish him well and also to make some comment on the changes that have occurred since this House was recessed. The first person I would like to welcome is the member for St. John's West, the new member whose district bounds St. John's North. I think he is an expert debater and he will bring his considerable talent to this House and will make quite a difference to the proceedings. I would also like to congratulate the former Leader of the Opposition. I think that the way that he took his defeat was very gentlemanly and I am sure that he has a long future with that party. And I think at the same time I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the new Leader of the party who promises to do a great deal for that party and has already shown himself to be a leader of some stature. I suppose I should also congratulate the hon. member for LaPoile who has been appointed House Leader but I think that in the opinion of many people

MR. CARTER: this is the most surprising appointment since the Roman Emperor Caligula appointed his horse a consul. In this case another part of the horse was appointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member, I am sure, will remember that the Chair has had to rule on occasion that derogatory remarks should not be made against hon. members. I think that that is unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

MR. CARTER: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I am in your hands. If the remark was unparliamentary, I would withdraw it.

However, the estimates that are at the moment before the House are those of Industrial Development and there has been some discussion of the large industries in this Island I think that, myself, I tend to see more future in the small industries and I would hope that this particular Department is prepared to make its fair share of mistakes by spreading what I call seed money around. In other words, if a proposal, a small proposal because we cannot afford large proposals that will go sour, but if a small proposal is made I would hope that this Department would be prepared to fund it on some partial percentage basis in order to get a possible industry off the ground. Another approach that I would like to see them do is to make it possible for business premises to be made available to small entrepreneurs. It is very hard to get reasonably priced places to carry on business, even to try out a business. I am not suggesting a giveaway program; I am merely suggesting that some premises that are now not used be made available through the good offices of this Department so that small business ventures may be attempted.

I would also like to suggest that a considerable library of business directories and catalogues be put together. There are a great many available and I will not weary the time of the Committee with a long list of publications but suffice it

MR. CARTER: to say that there is a very long list of publications that could be very profitably put together and made available to the passerby, or the man on the street, or to anyone who wanted it, or to anyone who wrote in. The North American continent, particularly, abounds in such publications. These would range all the way from government, provincial and state publications, official publications that are available free, to the various business publications that you have to subscribe for. This would cost a very small amount of money, but I think very worthwhile.

Then, one other thing I would suggest which would be profitable would be to try to encourage some kind of freight connection between the New World and the Old. It is practically impossible to export or import any goods between here and Britain, between here and France, or between here and Germany. They have to go by a very roundabout, expensive and long-delayed route, and there is one very small freight company operating at the moment on an irregular basis. Now I do not suggest that the Government get into the shipping business, but I suggest that they use their considerable power and not inconsiderable talent to encourage this kind of connection to be put together. We used to have the old "NEWFOUNDLAND" and "NOVA SCOTIA" which supplied a direct passenger and freight service to Liverpool and London and also to Boston, but this freight and passenger service no longer exists; it did not pay. I am not suggesting that we subsidize this particular service again but I would hope that some means would be found to make a regular or even a half-regular freight connection between the New World and the Old possible and this may have to involve participation of the Federal Government. But I think that we lost out very greatly when these connections

MR. J. CARTER: finally were severed. And I am not suggesting we turn the clock back. I think that this could be a very forward step.

MR. DOODY: We used to call them the home boats.

MR. J. CARTER: The home boats? I just remember them. I never used them.

MR. DOODY: I used to work down on the waterfront.

MR. J. CARTER: Now I would like to ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) while he is in his seat, and this would perhaps be some measure of his credibility, whether he would - and I will gladly give way to him for a brief period if he wanted to say it - whether in his opinion Messrs. Shaheen and Doyle have benefitted Newfoundland in any way at all? Would the hon. member care to comment on that?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to counter by asking the hon. gentleman if he has benefitted Newfoundland in any way?

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, this was a serious question because -

MR. NEARY: Ask the Premier, or ask the Minister of Industrial Development.

If the hon. gentleman will permit me? I advised the hon. gentleman yesterday afternoon, Sir, that the hon. the Premier in 1973 had met with the gentleman that the member is asking me about.

MR. HICKMAN: Five years ago.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman - And by the way the Premier said -

MR. HICKMAN: Five years ago you are now talking about.

MR. NEARY: Just keep quiet. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman asked me a question and I am answering. The hon. Premier met with Mr. Doyle at. I believe it was mutually arranged; there was no such thing as Mr. Doyle forcing or barging his way in; it was done by mutual agreement before the Premier left this Province. My hon. friend, the Minister of Industrial Development, met within the last several months. So if the member wants -



DR. FARRELL: It was not by mutual agreement.

MR. NEARY: But mutual agreement.

DR. FARRELL: No, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wants any information on that gentleman, he can either get it from his boss, the Premier, or from the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. J. CARTER: You know, Mr. Chairman, I think that that remark was to some extent uncalled for. However, I must say that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) does restore my faith in human nature. I would like to thank him. Because I remember a few years ago, I guess it was back in the middle sixties, the hon. gentleman sat over here somewhere, not too far from where I sit, I think it was this seat here, and I remember how he used to grovel before the former Premier. And now he is so full of vim and vinegar that the hon. gentleman portrays the abominable human spirit where he can bounce back with such resilience. Because I remember one day in particular, the hon. gentleman had a rather distressing cough and every now and then the former Premier used to glare over at him. He used to blush and I think finally he left the Chamber, he was so upset. But now I cannot image that kind of thing distressing him in the least. So I would say that the member has certainly progressed. It shows that the human spirit -

MR. NEARY: I never got bounced out of the Cabinet.

MR. DOODY: You got bounced out of the government.

MR. NEARY: That is about the worst thing that could happen to an hon. member.

MR. J. CARTER: You know, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman reminds me, for some reason or other, of quotations from Shakespere, I do not know what it is about him, perhaps it is because he looks something like one of Shakespere's clowns. But I keep thinking of quotations from Shakespere when I think of the hon. gentleman -

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 967

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: I am reading Beauchesne, would the hon.  
gentleman -

MR. J. CARTER: - like to boo or not to boo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Using unparliamentary language.

MR. J. CARTER: Or is this a blockguard that I see before me?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: Anyway I am sure the hon. gentleman can find  
some reference in - I was going to say in Shaheen. Anyway, he  
will double-cross that bridge whe he comes to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: But, Mr. Chairman,

MR. J. CARTER: to get back to the serious business of the matter at hand.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. J. CARTER: Pardon?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: To establish the hon. gentleman's credibility I asked a very serious question - in his opinion, did he feel that Mr. Shaheen, but more particularly, has Mr. Doyle ever done this Province any good?

MR. NEARY: Well, I will give the hon. gentleman the advice, but he can get it better on that side of the House from his two colleagues.

MR. J. CARTER: If the hon. gentleman would answer either yes or no, this would once and for all establish his credibility or -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will answer to my colleagues if the two gentlemen on that side who rendezvoused with Mr. Doyle will answer for that side of the House.

MR. J. CARTER: I am not suggesting a trade off or a bargain -

MR. NEARY: Well, the Minister of Industrial Development must have thought they did some good, because the minister was down negotiating for a couple of weeks.

MR. J. CARTER: I am asking for a straightforward -

MR. NEARY: And the Premier was negotiating in Grenada and in Claridges.

MR. J. CARTER: Obviously, Mr. Chairman, although a great deal of latitude is allowed in Committee, I am still not going to get a firm answer from the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is not in the Opposition. If the hon. gentleman wants to cross-examine he should come over here.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is not the Question Period either.

MR. J. CARTER: Nor, Mr. Chairman, am I going to move that the hon. gentleman's salary be reduced to one dollar. But I would like to move if I were able to, and I am not able to - that the hon. gentleman's salary be lowered to thirty pieces of silver. It would be very much in keeping for the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: - thirty pieces of silver.

MR. J. CARTER: It would be more in keeping with the hon. gentleman's character.

MR. NEARY: What is the rationale?

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, to get serious, to try and reintroduce a note of seriousness into this. I realize that, for some reason that I do not absolutely understand, there are two departments of Industrial Development in this particular administration, one concerned with large enterprises and the other concerned with small enterprises. I do feel that they really are -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to interrupt what is at points a very entertaining speech, but even entertainment has its limits, Mr. Chairman, its requirements of dignity and so on. The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) a moment or so ago made some reference to thirty pieces of silver. I do not think we need search our knowledge of analogies too deeply to know what implications that has, and then he immediately follows by saying, 'Well, that is in keeping with the member's character.' Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a clear inference there that is certainly most unparliamentary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, there they go, Mr. Chairman, there they go!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Well, not until I am finished and then you can say all you want to the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have raised a matter which is clearly quite unparliamentary and even in the guise of being entertaining or less than serious, I do not think the member can be permitted to get away with that kind of inference. It is a very serious one, and I believe he ought to be instructed to withdraw forthwith.

MR. J. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was on the point of suggesting that the hon. gentleman go out and hang himself -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: - but that would be unparliamentary. And certainly, I will put myself in your hands and do whatever you instruct me to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! My understanding is that the hon. gentleman has made an effort to withdraw, and clearly, I think, the easiest way out for the House would be if the hon. gentleman saw fit to do so.

MR. J. CARTER: Again, I am in your hands, Mr. Chairman, and whatever you suggest I should do, I will do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the hon. member was going to withdraw it?

MR. J. CARTER: Yes, I withdraw.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) withdrawal, Sir.

MR. J. CARTER: Before I was interrupted, Mr. Chairman, I was on the point of trying to establish the fact - in my view, it is only my view - the two departments,

April 13, 1978

Tape 968

EC - 4

MR. J. CARTER:                   the Department of Industrial  
Development and the Department of Rural Development  
more properly belong as one department. Now I understand  
that in the past they have worked very closely together,  
but I do not draw the distinction between large industries  
and small industries that a lot of people do. I believe  
that a small industry can become a very large

MR. CARTER:

one and by the same token a large industry sometimes can become a very small one, pass out of existence altogether. Some industries are too large and some are perhaps too small, but something could be said for being the right size.

MR. HICKMAN: I have to interrupt the hon. member so that the Committee can rise.

MR. CARTER: Oh, very well.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: It being five-thirty, a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The first subject of debate, various alternatives to the spraying programme, vis-a-vis, the spruce budworm.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon I put a question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Maynard), Sir, in connection with the alternatives to the spraying programme that the minister announced yesterday-or the day before yesterday in this hon. House. There are alternatives, Mr. Speaker. There was no need for a spraying programme, especially the one the minister announced, that was so vague and that seems to have been announced without very much research, without very much thought gone into it, another snap decision by the administration. There were alternatives, Mr. Speaker, and the alternatives - well, first of all let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that the government sat back for so long that the spruce budworm went

MR. NEARY:

completely out of control, came right from the West Coast to the East Coast and the government sat back and did nothing about it and now they are pushing the panic button.

But the alternatives, Sir, were to first of all engage in a massive reforestation programme in this Province. And as I started to say the other day when the minister's salary was reduced to one dollar, that we have a surplus of seedlings of young trees in this Province, we have a surplus at the present time. There is no place to - well there are places to put them but there is a surplus because the reforestation policy of the government has failed and these young seedlings are not being used. Now apart from a crash reforestation programme, Sir, the government could have also embarked upon a programme to cut the wood that has been affected by the spruce budworm. I do not know if hon. members of the House are aware of this, Sir, but once the timber has been hit by the spruce budworm, within five years that timber has to be cut or it is going to be lost to the Province forever. Now some of that timber has been hit a year ago, two years, three years ago, four years ago. The timber west of Corner Brook, as I understand it where the most damage is done - and to look at it from the air it is criminal - that timber will have to be cut this year. If it is not cut this year - this is the last year, this is the fifth year - and if it is not cut this year it will be lost to Newfoundland forever. And we are going to lose - how much timber are we going to lose?

MR. FLIGHT: Five million cords.

MR. NEARY: Five million cords of wood we are going to lose, Sir, five million cords. And here we are with record unemployment in this Province, The government cannot seem to grasp the concept of job creation. The Government of Canada has offered the Province literally millions of dollars to create jobs to cut down on the unemployment in this Province. The Government of Canada is assisting New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to build woods roads and to help cut their wood that has been affected by the spruce budworm, No sign of that in Newfoundland. The government again has not taken the initiative.



MR. NEARY:

The minister obviously has been too lazy, has not been doing his homework and here we are, Sir, with people who are desperate for jobs who could be put to work cutting that timber. Now the timber could either be stockpiled, it could be used by Bowaters and Price, it could be exported, or the Linerboard mill could be opened up and the timber could be used in the Linerboard

MR. NEARY:

mill or we could use all four ways of disposing of the timber, exporting, for use in the two paper mills, for use in the Linerboard mill at Stephenville. But the fact remains, Sir, that the minister has no policy of reforestation. He has no policy to cut the timber and the minister cannot tell us how much of the affected timber is going to be cut this year. I think the minister told us earlier today that Bowaters and Price would take 200,000 cords each this year, 400,000 cords out of 5,000,000 cords of wood that is going to be lost to this Province forever unless it is cut in the next year or two. That is criminal, Sir. It is a disgrace. The government should be ashamed of themselves. They have sat back too long. They let the spruce budworm get out of control, now they are hitting the panic button. They have no plans to deal with this matter and I would submit, Sir, to the House, is it any wonder that we reduced the minister's salary down to \$1.00?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is much point in replying because the hon. member is just as ill-informed as he always is and there is not much point in trying to get anything through to him but I will try, to see if he can absorb anything at all.

The alternative to spraying I have outlined on two or three occasions. There is an alternative in the long run and it is an alternative we will be pursuing and we are pursuing and have been pursuing for the last four years, and that is intensive forest management. There was no vague announcement made regarding the spraying programme the other day. It was a very precise, clear cut announcement which at least all except one Newfoundlander could understand. And I have outlined our programme. We have a programme. We did not sit back for seven years and watch the budworm infestation grow and then

MR. MAYNARD: push the panic button. We are not pushing the panic button now. If we were pushing the panic button, Mr. Speaker, we would be spraying 9 million acres, not 1.2 million acres. Obviously we are not pushing the panic button and the people in the Department of Forestry and Agriculture are very responsible, very keen individuals and they are doing a tremendous job, a very tremendous job in the whole field of forestry in this Province.

The hon. member says we have no policy of reforestation. Well obviously he does not remember because the previous administration obviously did not have any policy of reforestation. The only thing that was ever spoken was about a thirty page speech by the former Premier which came up I think to Sir Richard Squires' day and then cut off there, but without announcing any policy at all. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is look at the budget of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture over the past six years and will note that there is a distinct, clear-cut, no-nonsense policy of forest management in this Province.

The Forest Management Taxation Act, 1974, set out in legislation the forestry policy, and anyone who has not read that act and has not been familiarized with it, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they get familiar with it.

The surplus of seedlings, the hon. member mentions, what a lot of nonsense. There will not be any seedlings until 1980, Mr. Speaker, how can there be a surplus in 1978? You know, it is so much nonsense that it defies the imagination how any hon. member could stand up in the House and say there is a surplus of seedlings. There is no place to plant them. Why do we want a place to plant them? We will not have any to plant until 1980. Yet it only takes one year to scarify the ground and plant seedlings. So obviously, you know, the comments are so ridiculous, 'wood to the Labrador Linerboard mill. 'We can force Price and Bowaters to use all the surplus wood.' Oh yes,

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 970

NM - 3

MR. MAYNARD: we can force Price and Bowaters to use all the surplus wood! They also cannot sell their paper once they use all the surplus wood, or all the bug-killed wood. What is the point of using bug-killed wood one hundred per cent when you cannot sell the paper? I mean, Price and Bowaters are only keeping in business when they can sell their product. That is another ridiculous situation and the comment that

MR. MAYNARD:

we can run Labrador Linerboard by bug-killed wood. The hon. member from Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) mentioned that a few moments ago. Where, Mr. Speaker, do they come up with their information? Because it is so off base and so inaccurate and so out of line that I have had my officials searching for days to find out any basis for the information that they have been spouting about in this House, and there is none.

MR. FLIGHT:

Why do some mills keep running on paper clippings?

MR. MAYNARD:

There is no basis. You know the hon. member says they can run a mill on paper clippings. Where are you going to get the paper clippings? If you are going to use paper clippings to produce 100,000 tons of newsprint or linerboard a year, then why go cut the surplus wood, the bug-killed wood? Make up your mind what you are going to do. One way or the other, hon. members if they are going to ask a question then they have to research their facts and ask a question that is relevant and ask questions that can be answered. Unless they do that then there is no point in commenting on the ridiculous comments they have to make.

MR. SPEAKER:

The second matter for debate is the spraying program vis-a-vis the spruce budworm.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, for the five minutes I have I want to address myself to a different aspect of the spruce budworm spray program. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to use an insecticide, Aminocarb, trade name 'Matacil', that we do not know enough about. I would probably not have been in a position to stand here and make that type of an accusation but for the research that the hon. Minister refers to.

Mr. Speaker, in the report of the Spruce Budworm Committee, the committee that the hon. Minister set up to advise him as to the way he would go with the spruce budworm spray program,

MR. FLIGHT: Dr. Randell, and I will read it again, I will read it slowly and I am not taking anything out of context, I am quoting:-"There is little information available relating to the possible long-term effects of Aminocarb on man or other animals, thus we agree with recent statements" and his reference is McTaggart-Cowan 1977, "that the effect of an insecticide on non-target organisms and the potential for environmental harm be examined as fully as possible before the insecticide is used operationally. This principle applies to Aminocarb."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that would not make a normal person suspicious, I do not know what would. This is the recommendation contained in the report to the Government on which I presume they would have based their spray program. Now the Minister indicates there were eight agencies, I think there were eight agencies, the Fisheries Act, The Ocean Dumping Control Act, all the acts, well I contend, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Randell had the benefit of all the information that was contained in these various acts. He and his committee spent the summer preparing this report. He would have had the benefit of these. It was nothing new when the Minister indicated this report, This recommendation is or should have been based on the information available from all the knowledge, all the reports, and all the government agencies that are available to the Minister. Dr. Randell's report, normally one would think, would be based on those. So, having had the knowledge and having had the benefit of all the reports on Aminocarb in Canada today, Dr. Randell came back and said we are not aware of the harmful effects and we should not use Aminocarb until it is further and fully examined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could spend more time on that one, but I want to refer for a second to the answer that the Minister gave to my hon. colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) with regard to his claim that only thirty per cent of the pesticides landed on the target area, and I quote Dr. Crocker, and if anybody in

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 971

RT-3

MR. FLIGHT:

this House denies his qualifications

I can have this tabled and circulated. Dr. F. S. Crocker, B.Sc., M.D., F.R.C.P., birthplace Corner Brook, is presently a member of the Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, a pediatric specialty certificate, associate professor of pediatrics, mainly in Halifax, and listen, "It really bothers me and I was unaware of this as well until this Fall that only thirty per cent of pesticides released out of airplanes ever got to the woods. I really was unaware that seventy per cent went hither and yon. It is not surprising therefore when you see that Bermuda is able to tell the

MR. FLIGHT: United States what they are spraying on the Eastern seaboard and there is a paper reviewing the air analysis and they are able to tell them what chemicals they are currently using. So I mean if this does not bring into question the whole spray programme.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other point, since we do not know what the adverse effects of Aminocarb is, how does the minister convince this House that in a very controlled spray programme

five days after that spray programme indications of the chemical used were found in the Corner Brook water supply with a four mile buffer zone? Now we are going to a one to two mile buffer zone in a national spray programme in which there are communities located within the boundaries of the spray programme or certainly on the fringes. We do not know what the adverse effects of Aminocarb are but having seen that there were traces of the chemical in the Corner Brook water supply with a four mile buffer zone, what evidence can be present to this House that there will not be signs of Aminocarb or that Aminocarb will be kept out of the water supplies of people living in the spray area or adjacent to the spray area?

Mr. Speaker, I will point something else out that this government might well have legal cases on their hands because right now in New Brunswick as a result of the same thing - I am surprised that the people in Corner Brook have not slapped somebody with a lawsuit - There are lawsuits right now in New Brunswick against the Provincial Government for that very issue. So we could well find ourselves with not only an unsuccessful and a dangerous spray programme but we could find ourselves in the courts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I have never at any time suggested to anyone that there would not be any traces of chemical in the soil or in the water after a spraying programme. What I have said is that with the dosages that are used and the chemicals that are being used



MR. MAYNARD: there is no known danger to human life, wildlife, aquatic life, terrestrial or whatever. It is true that there were traces of Aminocarb in the Corner Brook water supply and it was not five or six days after, it was immediately after a spray programme and immediately after a test was taken and the amount of Aminocarb in the Corner Brook water supply at the intake was two parts per billion. And if the hon. gentleman would care to check with the Federal authorities who administered a Canada Safe Water Drinking Standard he will find that the safe limit is one hundred parts per billion. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the amount after a direct spray that was found in the Corner Brook water supply was two per cent of what is considered safe. Now that is not something to jump up and down about.

The hon. member is obviously taking the word of people who are against the spray and I do not have anything against those people, I respect their point of view, I also respect the point of view of people who say that there has to be protection for the forest and I think it is very important that we protect a \$260 million industry. Is that not important?

AN HON. MEMBER: ourselves in the meantime.

MR. MAYNARD: Is the hon. gentleman disagreeing with the people who have established those acts and regulations? Is he telling them that they are all buffoons and fools because they have registered Matacil?

MR. FLIGHT: How about Dr. Randell?

MR. MAYNARD: I cannot speak for Dr. Randell. Let me tell the hon. gentleman something in case he does not all ready know it. The committee was not a government committee.

MR. FLIGHT: They reported to you.

MR. MAYNARD: They reported, Mr. Chairman, to whoever they like. It was not a government committee. It was a committee established because I wrote to the President of Memorial University and asked him in a letter

MR. MAYNARD: to set up an independent review committee to completely analyse the spruce budworm situation and report to us as to what the possible solutions are. There are two things that we did not agree with or two suggestions that we did not take. One was the use of -

MR. FLIGHT: twenty years ago.

MR. MAYNARD: Is the hon. member over there going to make a speech, Mr. Chairman, or is he just going to bla, bla, bla for the next hour or so.

MR. FLIGHT: I can make one if you want me to.

MR. MAYNARD: There were two suggestions in the Randell Report that we did not accept. One was the use of Fenitrothion. We have talked to Dr. Randell and asked him why he did not suggest Matacil as well. He said that he was not aware that it was registered. I have evidence that it was registered. Another suggestion, Mr. Chairman, in the Randell Report was that we do a two year programme which we also rejected and we are doing a one year programme. We are not into a long-term programme. We are not into a programme that locks us into a continuous aerial application of insecticides, of chemical insecticides

MR. MAYNARD:

as New Brunswick and Maine have done. We will only do it on a short-term basis. We will only do it with chemicals that, based on the knowledge that is available at this point in time have been considered safe by the federal authorities. That is all we can go by.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The final subject deals with the efficacy of the evaluation programme past experience of other provinces vis-a-vis the spruce budworm.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious and obviously a very controversial subject. And I should state to the minister that those people who are against spraying are not trying to state that those people who are pro-spraying are buffoons and neither should I think that those people who are pro-spraying should think otherwise because the people anti-spraying are looking for some information, some facts and are questioning the so called experts or real experts regardless of who they are. I think in 1978 we are obviously starting. We are at the forked road and we have got to make a decision and a decision has been made by this Province.

My argument is basically that before we made the decision or probably in making that decision, consultation has gone on with other provinces to see what has happened there. So let us look at some of the other provinces and the situation existing. Obviously New Brunswick started in 1952, twenty-five years of spraying. They started in 1952 spraying 200,000 acres and ended up in 1976 spraying about 9.5 million acres. The minister states that we are only starting here to spray, I think, I believe he said 1.2 million acres is it, this year, and not the total 9 million acres which would be required or could lead to it. Our argument is basically then that New Brunswick has escalated the spraying for twenty-five years at a cost of \$100 million. They have obviously committed themselves to a path from which they cannot stop now because if they do stop they evidently, as well as the budworm situation, they are

MR. STRACHAN:

obviously politically saying that what we have done for the last twenty-five years and \$100 million worth is a total waste.

If we look at Quebec, Quebec started in 1970 and they were spraying and still are spraying and they see no end in sight as New Brunswick at the moment sees no end in sight. In the state of Maine and I argued earlier on, the minister quite politely pointed out the state of Maine the federal funds or the amount of state money which is going to go into spraying will be cut off by 1981 although private operators or private owners will continue to spray. But they have decided that the spray programme, the cost of the spray programme is far too high to meet. In other words, they have stated that they cannot continue this very, very expensive spraying programme for the results that they are getting.

Again over in another Province, in British Columbia there was a problem there, not the same problem but there was a problem in which spraying had to be decided upon and the Cabinet decided against it as being economically unsound. So maybe the minister can give us the reasons for some of these decision made by other provinces because we are at the forked road and if we start off down that road, then obviously we will have no choice but to continue on with this programme which does what? In New Brunswick the results of the spraying programme showed an increase in the egg mass count in 1977, a forty per cent increase after spending \$100 million and twenty-five years of spraying, an increase in the egg mass count.

Our argument here or what we are trying to propose and what the minister has put down, the members suggesting this, is that there is no way of safely or usefully harvesting this timber. Possibly the minister, as he has stated, has researched this in his department. But our argument is basically this, that he is therefore arguing against the logic of the Nova Scotia government who have made the decision that the only way out of it is to harvest it.

MR. STRACHAN:

I ask the minister then if we cannot use it here for the Linerboard Mill, if we cannot use it for the pulp operation that we have described, if we cannot use it in the pulp mill and the paper mills? Then what is Nova Scotia going to be doing with the wood that they are going to be harvesting rather than falling to the spray programme.

So I think some of these questions we want answered and so on. And we feel very deeply that before a real decision is made and probably a decision has been made, but it must be investigated. It needs, I think, a full scale debate on this question. And nobody is trying to point a finger -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: - at any one individual because it is almost a personal decision as to whether one is for spraying or against spraying. It is a very difficult decision to make. And obviously we are not trying to state that the minister or his department or the government are buffoons at all. It is a very touchy and controversial subject. And I do not think the minister should retaliate by giving us advice from

MR. STRACHAN: experts, whoever they are, suggesting that we cannot challenge that advice, because that advice and especially in the area of pesticides in the world, has been shown over the years to be often very, very wrong and that is our whole point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, for a person who is only making a dollar a year I feel that I am earning it at least today anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MAYNARD: Just think what would happen if I was earning \$1.50.

Mr. Speaker, I think that some members are under the wrong impression that I have indicated we cannot usefully harvest and use bug-killed timber. I have not said that. As a matter of fact, I stated either today or yesterday when questions were asked that Bowaters and Price are committed to harvesting 260,000 cords per year of bug-killed timber, to use in their paper making process. That, according to technicians and I cannot argue with them because I am not a technician with that expertise, is all that they can use if they have to keep the quality of paper that the customers demand. There is no question about it, that if Linerboard was operating they could possibly use another 100,000 to 150,000 cords of bug-killed timber. But that in no way will take care of the amount of timber that is being destroyed by the budworm every year. And we are building access roads, we have been building them for about five years, we are into the process now of building them on company limits and on Crown limits, wherever there can be a salvage programme.

We are working out with the federal government at this point in time, the same as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are, a programme under the Canada Manpower or Canada Department of Employment, I am not sure what it is called right now, Mr. Cullen's department, a possible programme to speed up the harvesting for sawmills, for the

MR. MAYNARD: paper mills, for whatever use, but as much as can be injected into the system.

Some mention was made of the fact that New Brunswick and the State of Maine have been into the spraying programme for twenty, twenty-five, thirty years - I guess it is close to thirty years in the Province of New Brunswick - and that they cannot stop now. I do not agree with that of course. I agree that twenty-five, thirty years ago there was not much of a prospect of stopping that spraying programme because that was the only known method. As a matter of fact New Brunswick started out with DDT, until it was banned about ten years ago for use in Canada. But they then changed to other chemicals such as Fenithrothion, and Malacil and some others. I believe that they were going to use Seven at one time, a chemical called Seven, but it has never been registered for use in Canada although Maine has used it for a number of years.

But in any case, through that period of time, Mr. Speaker, there has been some research going on and in the last couple of years it has really been co-ordinated, on trying to find a biological control for the budworm and I believe, as I said earlier today, that we will have a biological control on stream within the next one or two years, which will eliminate the use or the necessity of using chemical controls. The only two problems which ~~does~~ not seem to me to be insurmountable with BT, for instance, at this point in time, is that it is not into a mass production technique and that the mechanical parts of the aircraft that are used to apply it are not worked out in a proper manner. But apart from those two minor things, relatively minor things, this will be available for use within a couple of years. And it is effective and it is a non-chemical. It is something that is applicable only to the budworm. It attacks nothing else. It is a biological control.

So we are quite confident with the short-term chemical spraying, the prospect of biological control within the next two

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 974

NM - 3

MR. MAYNARD: to three years, and the fact that we are  
and will continue into a very intensive forest management improvement  
programme, depending on the amount of money that is voted for it  
by the Legislature, excluding the minister's salary, and we feel  
that with that two pronged effort over the years we will be able



April 13, 1978

Tape 975

EC - 1

MR. MAYNARD: be able to build up a forest that can not only withstand a budworm attack, but pretty well any other insect or disease attack that may come along. I hope I answered the hon. member's question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6:00 P.M., the motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay'.

In my opinion, the 'nays' have it.

I leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.

2731

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 13, 1978

APR 13 1978

QUESTION #53

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Number of dentists recruited outside Newfoundland for the calendar year, 1977?
- (b) Number of visits made overseas by recruiting team and countries visited?
- (c) Names of personnel of Department of Health and/or other Departments who visited these countries and cost of such trips?

ANSWER

- (a) 7 dentists were recruited to establish in rural areas.
- (b) Nil
- (c) not applicable

April 6, 1978

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Heading 1501-01.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at six o'clock, the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), Sir, had a few words, which is most unusual in this Chamber, and the hon. gentleman asked me a direct question, if I thought that Mr. Shaheen or Mr. Doyle had made any contribution to this Province, and I referred the hon. member to his colleague, the Premier of this Province, who had met with Mr. Doyle in 1973 or 1974 in Grenada and again at Claridges, and to the Minister of Industrial Development who met in recent months with Mr. Doyle in Nassau and in Panama. The hon. gentleman did not seem to be satisfied with that information and so now I am going to ask the hon. gentleman a question, if the hon. gentleman thinks that Mr. Richard Greene has made any contribution to this Province, or if Mr. A.B. Walsh has made any contribution to this Province, or if Mr. Mullolly, the President of Affiliated Marine Metals, has made any contribution to this Province, or if Mr. Andrew Davidson has made any contribution?

MR. MORGAN: Come on with the slander! Come on with the slander!

MR. F. ROWE: He has accused you of slander now.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman just accused me of slander, Sir, and I would like to -

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

MR. NEARY: That is unparliamentary, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The -

MR. MORGAN: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman is tossing around names of people who cannot defend themselves in the House of Assembly and in my view no matter what way these names are used it is a slanderous thing to be doing, using names of people who cannot

MR. MORGAN: defend themselves in this House of Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The point of order is that during an interjection one hon. member is alleged to have said that the other member was engaging in slander and what I have to decide is if a remark or an allegation that an hon. member is being slanderous is unparliamentary. If the members of the committee will just permit me a few moments?

MR. NEARY: Do not take it out of my time.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman if I can assist you there, Sir. At the bottom of page 130, the third line from the bottom, the word slander is referred to as one of the words that are unparliamentary. The last word in the third last line if we are in the same edition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What paragraph?

MR. F. ROWE: We might have a different edition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think that having perused our authority, the authority that we usually go to, where the word slander is mentioned, it has an adjective with it but I do not think that would change it substantially. I think the word slander must be considered unparliamentary so I would ask the hon. member if he would withdraw that remark.

MR. MORGAN: Withdraw what remark?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The remark that referred to slander.

MR. F. ROWE: Withdraw what you were saying. It is very simple.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, for the point of clarification my comment was made, and it is probably now in Hansard, my comment was, "Come on with some of your slander." I was not saying that the hon. gentleman who was speaking was using slander. My comment was, "Come on with some of your slander." Now I was not saying that he was using slander.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think that in the context of the use of the word, the word slander I think must really apply to the hon. member who was speaking, who was on his feet. The word slander does have an unparliamentary flavour to it so I would ask the hon. member to withdraw. These words are often used in the heat of the moment but I think that it would be best for the decorum of the House if the word slander was not

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 976 (Night)

AH-3

MR. CHAIRMAN: implied even obliquely to an hon. member's remarks to the House.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, as all members of this House of Assembly in committee stage or in House stage are aware we have to abide by your rules. I withdraw the word slander as being considered unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend will tell me if Mr. Andrew Davidson

MR. NEARY:

has made a contribution to the Province, well then, Sir, I would be quite happy and prepared to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Now then, Mr. -

MR. J. CARTER: Would the hon. member -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I have the floor, Sir. Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) is sitting over there waiting to get honourable mention.

MR. FLIGHT: From the Bay of Islands.

MR. NEARY: From the Bay of Islands, rather. I will come to the hon. member for Exploits, but the hon. gentleman for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) is sitting over there waiting for honourable mention. Well, Sir, I want to tell this House that I believe, I really believe that the hon. gentleman is sincere, and the hon. gentleman is an honest man.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you very much.

MR. NEARY: Just the same, I believe the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) is sincere and conscientious and an hon. gentleman and an honest man. And I believe the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is an honourable, sincere gentleman. And I believe the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) is a very sincere and honest man.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, we are now debating the estimates of the Department of Industrial Development, and it is completely irrelevant to the debate whether or not what the opinion of the hon. gentleman is on who is honourable in this House of Assembly.

MR. FLIGHT: You are jealous.

MR. MORGAN: It is irrelevant to the debate.

MR. FLIGHT: He is jealous because he is not getting mentioned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

As has been stated a number of times, in Committee the comments have to be directly to the head with the allowance that latitude is allowed on the first. My understanding is that the hon. member



Mr. Chairman: now is referring in his debate to a remark that was made by another hon. member in his debate -

MR. NEARY: Yes, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: - so that one cannot rule this subject out of order. But I would point out to the hon. member that if he can possibly do it the rules of the House would ask him to try to direct his remarks as narrowly as he possibly can to the subhead that we are considering.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Your Honour. I thank you very much.

The hon. member is probably jealous because I am not going to put him in the category to which I am referring, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) -

MR. MORGAN: I do not want to be mentioned by you.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member for Placentia East is an honourable, decent man who used to write letters to the newspaper, Sir, telling the people of this Province how corrupt the former Administration was, what a scoundrel and a rogue the former Premier of this Province was. I remember reading letters -

MR. PATTERSON: I have some of the speeches you made when you ran as an independent. Remember the Newfoundland Democratic Party?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. PATTERSON: I will produce them here.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PATTERSON: You did not say too much about the little dictator from Gambo. I have your speeches.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am praising the hon. gentleman.

MR. PATTERSON: I do not want your praise.

MR. NEARY: I hope the hon. gentleman does not go -

MR. PATTERSON: I do not want your sarcasm.

MR. NEARY: I hope the hon. gentleman does not lose his cool because I am praising the hon. gentleman for taking the position that the hon. gentleman took.

MR. NEARY: What I am leading up to is this, Sir, Mr. Chairman, I have evidence before me to lead me to believe, Sir, that certain public servants in this Province were used to deliver political payoffs, and this is a very serious matter, Sir, and all these honest and honourable gentlemen that I just mentioned sitting and backing this Administration, supporting this Administration, supporting the Premier and the ministers in this government, Sir, may be shocked and surprised to hear that there has been an abuse and a misuse of power, there has been an abuse and a misuse of government facilities.

And I am going to end up my few remarks, Sir, in a few moments by making a motion which is unprecedented in this House, and I hope that hon. gentlemen who have professed down through the years to be so honourable and honest, who have written letters to the newspapers, who have come out publicly inside and outside of this House condemning the former Administration, the Premier of this Province, for being such a rogue and a scoundrel, for his Administration being so corrupt, and for he himself being such an unsavoury individual, I hope that all these hon. gentlemen, including the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), the member for Placentia East (Mr. Patterson), the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), the member for St. John's North -

MR. J. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: - I hope these hon. gentlemen, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of order has come up.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I have source for it, Beauchesne, Citation 155, Sub-Citation -

MR. NEARY: What page?

MR. J. CARTER: Page 131. Number (3), a part Number (3), and the citation being, "No member can be allowed to attribute any intention to insult others; or" and I am

MR. J. CARTER: skipping a couple of lines now - "that certain members would shrink from nothing" - because the implication here, Mr. Chairman, is "that members on this side of the House would shrink from nothing, however illegal or unconstitutional; or that members came to the House to benefit themselves" etc. etc. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that particular citation applies to the particular gentleman at the moment and either that he should withdraw, or failing that the alternative would be that he table some evidence of the charges that he is making.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

If you would just permit me. Would the hon. member for the benefit of the Committee just refer to the specific remarks that he alleges the hon. member for LaPoile made that are unparliamentary?

MR. J. CARTER: He was saying, Mr. Chairman - I cannot quote him directly but if necessary I suppose Hansard would bear us out - that he had all kinds of evidence before him that he could lay before this House that would make hon. members shrink from associating with this government. I am paraphrasing, obviously, Mr. Chairman, because no one can remember the details of the hon. gentleman's slings and arrows. However that is the import that I got from my seat here and I think that this citation is a suitable one to use in this situation.

MR. S. NEARY: Sit down, boy!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

My understanding of the matter is that an hon. member understands that there was an implication in the hon. member for LaPoile's remarks that would seem to fit into the category under Section 155, sub-section 3 in Beauchesne which states, "No member can be allowed to attribute any intention to insult others; or that certain members would

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): shrink from nothing, however illegal or unconstitutional;" It would seem to me that the remarks that would fit into that category would have to be quite clear and unequivocal and quite pointed rather than that they would be in the general area. I think I would have to rule that I had not heard enough of the hon. member's remarks on that line to say that there was a clear violation of that particular stricture in Beauchesne so I would have to ask the hon. member if he would continue his remarks.

MR. S. NEARY: Thank you very much, Your Honour. Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned previously in this hon. House, Sir, mundane matters pertaining to the misuse and the abuse of government aircraft in conveying illegal weapons from here to Montreal. Well that is just an insignificant matter. But, Sir, what I am concerned about is the misuse of government aircraft and the abuse of government aircraft in conveying people to Montreal to deliver brown envelopes.

And, Sir, I want to make a motion now. I am going to make a motion, Sir, and I want to point out to this hon. House that the Minister of Industrial Development fired and then rehired his special assistant - his executive assistant. I want to make a motion, Sir, because I have certain questions and I cannot bring these matters into the light of day unless I have evidence brought before the House, unless I have a witness brought before the House. It is not, Sir, unusual; it is in keeping with the rules of procedure of this House for a member to ask that a witness be brought before the House. And I would like to have a witness brought before the Bar of the House, Sir, and placed under oath so that I can put questions to this particular individual that will shed light on the matters that I think appear to be corrupt. Now we will either

MR. S. NEARY: clear the air or we will prove a prima facie case. And I would like to move now, Mr. Chairman, that the minister's special assistant, Mr. White, be summoned before the Bar of this House so that I can have the opportunity to put questions to Mr. White in connection with certain goings on, certain activities in the minister's department, not only his present portfolio but in his portfolio as minister of - <sup>was</sup> it Intergovernmental Affairs? Whatever it was, Sir, whatever the two portfolios the gentleman perviously held down, Public Works and Services and I believe Intergovernmental Affairs -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, President of the Executive Council.

MR. S. NEARY: Well President of the Council and Public Works and Services. These are very serious matters, Sir, very serious matters and I move, Sir,

MR. NEARY: that the minister's special assistant, Mr. White, be summoned before the Bar of this House so that I can have the opportunity to cross-examine the gentleman under oath, so that I can bring up into the light of day, put on the table of this House, bring before members of this House, certain information that I have come in possession of in the last few weeks, not voluntary. I was approached and the information was given to me and I think that members should have the facts, they should have this information, and if they are not prepared to do that, Sir, then I can tell the House that the House is going to get the information anyway, but I would prefer that the members of the House heard it from the minister's special assistant.

MR. J. CARTER: A point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER: It is my understanding that any hon. member may make a motion. Presumably this one is seconded. Once having made the motion he then sits down and the motion is debated. He cannot just make a motion and then speak interminably, Mr. Chairman. There must be some limit.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am sure Your Honour wants to rule on that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member is correct. A motion is made and then whether it is valid or not, whether it can be put, whether the question can be put, is capable of being put has to be judged. I have made notes as to the motion and I think I have the sense of it I feel that the hon. member probably has finished making the motion?

MR. NEARY: I move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by my colleague, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), that the present Minister of Industrial Development's special assistant be summoned before the bar of the House to give evidence into what I think is corrupt practices on the part of this administration.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: On that motion. Number one, apart from the

MR. HICKMAN: fact that the motion is scurrilous, the kind of motion that derogates this House beyond all description, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) stands up, says that he has some information, implies impropriety and then in the Committee of Supply says, "I want to bring a gentleman before the bar of this House to examine him to find out whether what I am saying is right or wrong." Now if that is not an abuse of the privileges of this House, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen one. In this committee we are dealing with a vote or votes of supply for Her Majesty. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I do not know under what sort of a guise but allegedly in answer to a question put by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), now wants to bring someone before this committee to find out whether or not what he suspects is true. Even a kangaroo court would not accept that kind of a motion or tolerate that kind of an approach to debate.

MR. NEARY: I can get it anyway.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, the hon. gentleman can get it provided whatever he is talking about he can prove beyond all reasonable doubt, and if he cannot prove it beyond all reasonable doubt then he knows the consequences thereof and the very serious ones. It is about time that this House moved away from what is in danger of becoming a Star Chamber and get back to debating the issues that hon. gentleman were screaming about for months that they wanted to debate in the House and that we have not heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I believe I have heard arguments that would allow me now to make a ruling in regard to this matter that has been raised. The point before the Chair is that the hon. member wishes to make a certain motion which I have notes on here, I will not read it at the moment because I would like to go into other matters that have a bearing on it first. I would direct hon. member's attention to Section 230, Subsection (1) of Beauchesne which reads as follows: The first sentence of -

AN HON. MEMBER: Page?

MR. CHAIRMAN: My edition may be different from yours. It is Section 230, Subsection (1). The first sentence reads: "The ordinary function of a Committee of the Whole House is deliberation, not enquiry." And it goes on after that.



Mr. Chairman:

I would also direct hon. members attention to Section 242, Subsection (2) which reads - part of Subsection (1), first, the second sentence which reads, "No amendment can be moved which is not relevant to the grant under consideration." And then Subsection (2) of Section 242 reads as follows: "The only motion allowed, when a resolution is under consideration in Committee of Supply, is that the amount be reduced or that the Chairman leave the Chair (either without making a report or to report progress on certain resolutions)." And Subsection (3) reads: "Each resolution can only be dealt with by being agreed to, reduced, negatived, superseded, or, by leave, withdrawn, and the withdrawal can be made although the decision of the committee has been taken upon amendments proposed to the resolution."

In considering these guides in the authority to which we refer very frequently, I would have to rule that the motion proposed falls more into the area of enquiry rather than to deliberation, And secondly, that it does not fulfill the stipulations of either agreeing to, reducing, negating, superseding, or withdrawing the subhead which deals with the salaries of the minister's office.

So I would have to rule that the Committee is not capable; it is outside of the authority of the Committee to accept such a motion.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Sir.

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

MR. NEARY: According to Beauchesne, Sir, pages 234 and 235, Your Honour, in Committee of the Whole it is our right, and not only is it our right, Sir, but it is our duty to summons witnesses. And Your Honour has skipped over that particular part of Beauchesne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Justice



MR. HICKMAN: Is the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) questioning the ruling from the Chair? I understood that the ruling was clear, direct, unambiguous, that the motion was improper and cannot be accepted in this Committee. And that is the end of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: There is only one way you can stop it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The point of privilege that arises is whether the hon. member's remarks were questioning the ruling. I had in effect completed the ruling. And my understanding is that the hon. member was bringing up points that bore on that ruling, so I would have to rule that his remarks were directed towards questioning the ruling. And of course he is aware that there are methods of doing that, and I cannot accept his questioning the ruling unless he goes through the prescribed form.

MR. NEARY: That is right. I am quite aware of the procedure to appeal Your Honour's ruling, but I just wanted to draw to Your Honour's attention pages 234 and 235 which deals with summoning witnesses before the Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would have to ask the hon. member is he appealing the ruling?

MR. NEARY: No, Your Honour. I just want to draw that to Your Honour's attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I am afraid that I cannot recognize the hon. member unless he is appealing the ruling because other than that I had recognized the hon. the Premier.

MR. NEARY: On a point of information then,

Mr. Chairman. Could Your Honour then tell the House -

MR. DINN: You are questioning the ruling.

MR. NEARY: No, a point of information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: A point of information. Would the hon. wooly-eyed, wild-eyed Minister of Municipal Affairs just keep quite for a moment!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I wonder if I could have some instructions from the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I am afraid that it is not within the Chair's authority to engage in this conversation. The hon. member is quite aware that he can approach the Chair and ask me, certainly, but I do have to pass on now. I have recognized the hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, if we talk about the industrial development of this Province we obviously have to talk about some of the entrepreneurs/promoters/developers of the past, such as Mr. John C. Doyle

PREMIER MOORES: Now, Sir, with Mr. John C. Doyle we know his history in this Province. We know he is a fugitive from justice in the United States. We know he is a fugitive from justice in this Province today. And we know he has spokesmen, some people would call them parrots, some people would call them puppets, some people, I suppose, in certain vocabularies would call them pimps. But, Sir, whatever the case may be, I am not saying who is a spokesman for Mr. Doyle, who is Mr. Doyle's man, I would not say that, I do not know. But it is fairly obvious -

MR. F. ROWE: You have not got the guts to say that.

PREMIER MOORES: Oh, I will.

MR. F. ROWE: You have not got the guts to say who is the pimp in this House.

PREMIER MOORES: No, no, I never said there was one in this House.

MR. F. ROWE: You are implying it.

PREMIER MOORES: No, no I am not. I have not mentioned this House yet. I am talking about John C. Doyle and his spokesmen. Now get it right.

AN HON. MEMBER: If the cap fits, wear it.

PREMIER MOORES: No, no!

The fact is, Sir, that there are people who can be spokesmen for Mr. Doyle of all types, all over. The fact is there are people who could even be remunerated by Mr. Doyle to do certain things. And I am sure that that is the case, that there are people who could be buying -

MR. NEARY: Well the Premier talked to him down in Grenada.

PREMIER MOORES: - there are people buying lots of land, there are people with new cars. There are people that had campaigns financed. There are people who are in the pocket of Mr. John C. Doyle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: But I am not saying that it is anybody in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: And, Mr. Chairman, when there is someone in the pocket of John C. Doyle -

MR. NEARY: Name names! Have the guts to name names!

PREMIER MOORES: No, no, no! Mr. Chairman.

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

When the temperature in the House rises to such a degree that disorder is likely to become uncontrollable, I think the Chair has the duty to intervene. I so intervene now and ask hon. members to attempt to preserve the decorum of the House more obviously.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier has used the word "pimp" in this hon. House.

PREMIER MOORES: Not referring to any one in it.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, no! Because you do not have the guts.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier said a member of this House, Sir.

MR. HODDER: What a thing for the Premier of the Province -

MR. NEARY: Now the hon. the Premier has to put up or shut up. He has to name names. Now the pimp is either on that side or on this side. And I would submit, Your Honour, that the hon. the Premier put up or be asked to retreat that statement because it is unparliamentary, Sir.

PREMIER MOORES: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman. Just for clarification, I did not refer to anyone in this House in that context. I said Mr. John C. Doyle uses people of that ilk and that type. I never referred it to anyone in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not have, Sir, the citation in front of me, but it clearly says somewhere in Beauchesne that an hon. member in this House cannot say indirectly what he does not have the guts to say directly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: Now the hon. the Premier has gotten up in this Committee and he has made certain accusations using some very unsavoury words, such as pimp, being in the pocket of somebody, financing campaigns, and down the line. Now the hon. Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. F. ROWE: Now the hon. the Premier winks at his colleague to the right -

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes! (Inaudible) shake-down they tried in Grenada.

MR. F. ROWE: - getting some satisfaction out of the fact that I am repeating it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: But the fact of the matter, Sir, is that the hon. the Premier is smearing somebody in this Province.

PREMIER MOORES: I have heard (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: And it is obvious, it is pretty obvious he is doing it indirectly to somebody in this House.

PREMIER MOORS: Oh, no!

MR. F. ROWE: Now he either has the guts to name that person or he puts up or shuts up.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I think I can rule on that point of order. The Chair, firstly I think, has to preserve the rules that apply within Committee and it has to be pointed out that the rules that apply in Committee have been offended. It is not my understanding at this point in time that there was a clear offence against the rules in Committee and that I have not had a citation quoted to me that I can refer to to change my mind on that. So I would have to rule at this point that I have not been made aware of any clear offence against the rules of this Committee.

Hon. Premier.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of privilege.

MR. S. NEARY:

It would appear, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. the Premier has cast a reflection on his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir, who spent two weeks recently as a guest of Mr. Doyle in both Nassau and in Panama City. Now, Sir, the hon. the Premier has insinuated directly or indirectly that his hon. colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development, is a pimp, and I resent that because I like the hon. gentleman, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY:

I like the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. gentleman was there as a guest of Mr. Doyle. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was negotiating on behalf of the government or was there on vacation. I do not know. I am not prepared to say. But I resent the fact that the hon. the Premier has indicated in this House that his hon. colleague is a pimp, and I ask the hon. Premier to retract that statement. That is my point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Chairman, if I might just

on a point of clarification I was not referring to the hon. Minister of Industrial Development nor the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. A. HICKMAN:

Mr. Chairman, it is enough for the

hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to get up on a point of privilege and by some sort of insinuation try and weave in to his remarks a direct accusation that was never made against an hon. gentleman in this House as he has just done with respect to the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, and I therefore ask on this point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for LaPoile be directed forthwith to withdraw the charge unequivocally.

MR. S. NEARY:

What charge?

PREMIER MOORES:

That the Minister of Industrial

Development is a pimp.

MR. CHAIRMAN(DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I have to rule on the privilege  
now because it -

MR. S. NEARY: Can I stand on the Point of Privilege now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I am prepared now to make a ruling because I do not feel that the Chair is doing its duty if it allows the time of the Committee to be spent on a matter of which there is no doubt when it comes to a ruling from the Chair. Hon. members will understand that a privilege is a very well defined matter when it comes to either a privilege of an hon. member or a privilege of the House itself. It is a very serious matter, <sup>This</sup> is why it takes precedence over all other proceedings including points of order. It is a serious matter, <sup>it</sup> is a very specific matter, and the guide that we have before us in judging this, whether it is in order to accept it as a point of privilege - and I would point out that it is not the duty of the Chair to judge on the substance of the privilege. That is the prerogative of the House itself. All the Chair can rule on is whether it can be accepted as a point for consideration - the acceptance of a point of privilege comes down to whether a prima facie case exists. That is where there is a clear, unequivocal doubtless impingement or violation of privilege, this has to be a very clear, a very obvious, a very self-evident thing. It cannot be done by implication, <sup>it</sup> cannot be done indirectly, <sup>it</sup> cannot be done obliquely: It must be obvious to anyone who looks at the matter. It is clear, I think, that the matter before us is not anywhere near that category and I cannot accept that a point of privilege is before the Chair.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier there a few moments ago said that he was not referring to the hon. Minister of Industrial Development as a pimp or the member



MR. S. NEARY: for Conception Bay South  
(Mr. Nolan). Now would the hon. the Premier indicate  
which member of this House he is referring to as a  
pimp?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

There is no point  
of order before the Chair. The Chair is now aware that the  
hon. the Premier has referred to any member of this House  
as a pimp or indeed he is not aware that he has referred  
to any individual as a pimp.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That,  
Sir, is absolutely accurate, I am saying that Mr. John C. Doyle  
uses such people.

MR. S. NEARY: He uses the Premier, as he did.

MR. DOODY: Order, order!

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Chairman, there seems to  
be a certain sensitivity, Sir, in the Committee that was  
not obvious before.

MR. S. NEARY: No.

PREMIER MOORES: No, Sir, I am just saying that  
Mr. John C. Doyle is in the habit of using people, I think that  
is fair enough, and certain people get into his debt and  
then defend him to the bitter death. And I think, Sir, if we  
look at the track record of Mr. Doyle in this Province,  
if we look at his performance in this Province, and if we look  
at the character of the man who tried to exploit and take  
advantage of this Province it is most unusual indeed to find  
a qualified Newfoundlander, a man who cares about the future  
of this Province, who would in fact not analyze the track  
record, the actual court record, the economic record of this  
Province. But for some unknown reason, whoever that person  
could be, and there are several of them, why they would defend

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Doyle come hell or high water. Now, Sir, in most societies anyone who does that obviously has a reason. I would think that a person of Mr. Doyle's calibre and category certainly has the ability to use people through pressure and power that he so richly exerted in this Province for far too long. Now, Sir, I am saying

PREMIER MOORES: that in this particular case, or in any particular case, Mr. Doyle obviously uses spokesmen.

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I feel very sorry for the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir, I feel very sorry for him. The hon. gentleman I know is under pressure and I want to come to the hon. gentleman's rescue, Sir. Is the hon. Premier referring to his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development?

MR. HICKMAN: That is not a point of order.

MR. NEARY: It is, Mr. Chairman, because the hon. the Premier is talking about several people in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I do have to ask the hon. member if he has a point of order to make it.

MR. NEARY: The point of order I want to make is this, Sir, that I want the hon. the Premier to tell the House whether or not he is referring to the free vacations that the hon. Minister of Industrial Development had as guest of Mr. Doyle.

MR. HICKMAN: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege.

MR. HICKMAN: That allegation just made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has imputations far beyond anything that the rules of this House will take. I therefore ask that the Chairman name him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name him! Name him!

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege is before the Chair that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made allegations that are of undoubted imputation of bad or unworthy motives on the part of the hon. Premier against another member.

MR. NEARY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.  
If Your Honour will remember correctly -

AN HON. MEMBER: Order! Order!

MR. NEARY: I am speaking on the point of privilege,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour is finished and I am speaking on the

MR. NEARY: point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: You are going to get it anyway so you may as well get it tonight as get it tomorrow or next week. It does not make any difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! On the point of privilege. The time is short and I think that the Chair would be negligent in its duty if it spent undue time on a matter that it really is not in a position to judge. I can only say this that the Chair is not aware of any remarks that fell into the category that I mentioned a little while ago where it was clear, unequivocal and without any doubt. There were not any remarks that the Chair is aware of that fell into that absolutely clear-cut prima facie case. I would ask the hon. Premier to continue.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Would Your Honour indicate to the House if the time for these estimates has expired?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not in order.  
I would inform the House, though,

MR. CHAIRMAN:

that there is a very short time, only about a half minute, left in this head.

PREMIER MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much. And without another point of order I am sure there will be something.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a great deal of sensitivity on behalf of Mr. Doyle here tonight.

MR. NEARY: No.

PREMIER MOORES: And the fact that there is sensitivity I am not saying that he also has, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) also has, any of the qualifications I mentioned. I am not saying that, Sir, at all. But, I am saying he seems to be very sensitive about the qualifications. It would seem that -

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

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

MR. NEARY: The Chairman knows full well, Sir, that you cannot attach motives to members in this House, directly or indirectly. You cannot do through the backdoor what you cannot do through the frontdoor, and I ask Your Honour to ask the Premier to retract that, Sir.

MR. DOODY: Do you ever get tired speaking?

MR. NEARY: Because the sensitivity is not on this side, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is going to be over there, though.

MR. NEARY: I would suggest -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if we could get Mr. White before the Bar -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - of this House we would find out where the sensitivity is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

The Chair does not recognize that a point of order is before it that can be ruled on. I have to state that the time for this heading has now been expended.

April 13, 1978

Tape 985 (Night)

PK - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

On motion Head XV, Industrial Development,  
without amendment carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading 111 Executive Council, 301-01.

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now first of all, Sir, before going into the estimates themselves I think probably that any discussion should be on the Premier's salary, which is the second item, because the Lieutenant-Governor's establishment is something that has been traditional in the House and I would not like to think, Sir, with the Queen's visit this year and with the Lieutenant-Governor in residence that some of the possible debate that could happen in this House would be under that heading.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the Lieutenant-Governor's establishment carry, Sir, and then we can go straight down to the Premier's office where we can have a good go at the Premier. And, Sir, if we just skip over that one, Sir, and if it is in order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about the Premier's salary for a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I have one announcement to make before we actually call the sub-heads. Hon. members will be pleased to note that in the gallery we have the newly elected mayor and council of the town of Mount Pearl in the person of Mayor Harvey Hodder, Deputy Mayor Austin King and councilors Derm Connolly, Fred Bannister, Pat O'Keefe, Eric Reid and Eric Wells.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion 301-01 through 301-02-06

Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 302-01 Carry?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Sir, when we are talking about the estimates of the Executive Council there is my office, there is the Executive Council office, the Treasury Board Secretariat, Planning and Priority Secretariat, Intergovernmental

PREMIER MOORES: Affairs and the Special Action Group and I would suggest, Sir, that in the two hours we have that either Intergovernmental Affairs or the Action Group or any of these could take that two hours very meaningfully but unfortunately there is a time limit in a very diverse series of headings.

First of all, Sir, I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition is in Quebec tonight and not here but I am sure that the real leader is here unencumbered. But the fact is, Sir, that I would like first of all to speak about the visit of Her Majesty this year. I think that is something that has to be dealt with without some possibly of the emotion that normally goes into the House and particularly it seems the last few days. But the fact is, Sir, that it is a great honour for this Province for Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II to be coming here this year. The history of our Province I think, Sir, dictates that we have been I suppose some of the most loyal subjects of Her Majesty, and our traditions and our heritage over the years have demonstrated just that. Whether it be at the time of the settlement of this Province, where some of the early settlement came from Ireland, but a great deal of it and the majority of it came from the West country, England in the days of Elizabeth I, I suppose. Also, Sir, I would suggest with Her Majesty coming that Newfoundland's tremendous loyalty once again, where there was the highest per capita enlistment in this Province of any part of the Empire, as it was known then, came from Newfoundland both in the First and Second World War and in those wars played their part for the British Empire and for the Queen of <sup>whom</sup> they were so proud.

There have been, Sir, strong ties between the monarchy and this Province for many, many generations if not from the very beginning. As I say, Sir, the monarch and the monarchy have strong ties for many of our people. It is interesting, Sir, when we talk to individuals about our Queen's visit this year just how quietly enthusiastic the people of this Province can be. There is still not



PREMIER MOORES: just a reverence, Sir, I do not mean that, but a respect and an admiration for the institution that I would suggest is not prevalent in a great many parts of the world today, of the English speaking world. Unfortunately, Sir, her visit here will be short this year. The fact is that we wanted her to meet as many of our people as possible, together with the federal government whom we have planned this with, but unfortunately she is only going to be here for in fact a day and a half, and of that day and one half she will be in St. John's and then on to Corner Brook. I particularly, Sir, would have wanted her to go to Labrador but with the flying time and the disbursement of the people in the Labrador area that unfortunately was impossible. I think it would have been very opportune and I think it would have been very symbolic but at this particular time it was very difficult to arrange.

Sir, the idea is to expose her to as many - that is not exactly the right phraseology, Sir, but to make her available to as many of the populace as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: But the fact is, Sir, that the agenda has been brought

PREMIER MOORES:

forward, a tentative agenda, with the idea of her seeing as many of our people and as many of our people seeing and meeting her as possible. And the tentative agenda, Sir, is for her to arrive in St. John's on Wednesday, July 26th where she will go to Government House to meet the Governor General, the Prime Minister and members of the media and so on. The active day is on the Thursday of July 27th when, amongst other things, she will be laying a wreath at the War Memorial, hopefully - and this is all tentative - hopefully turning the sod and laying the cornerstone for the new library at Memorial, going to City Hall for a civic function, visiting the annual Regatta, which I think is very important - because the Queen going to the oldest regatta in North America, something that has been, I suppose, traditional certainly in Britain for many, many years - where the tens of thousands of Newfoundlanders will be gathered that day, for Her Majesty to go into that area with the band music and all that is with it, I think it will be a very moving moment. Then there will be a garden party at Government House, later the Duke of Edinburgh Awards here in the city and then a provincial-federal dinner in the evening; the next morning leaving for Deer Lake, Corner Brook and Stephenville. She will be hopefully leaving here - well, I do not mean hopefully heaving here, but it is tentatively planned that she leave here at 10:35 A.M. She will go to Deer Lake where she will meet dignitaries. She will then go to Corner Brook where there will be a civic reception, and that plan has not been totally decided as to what will happen in Corner Brook, and then leave for Stephenville airport where the people of the Stephenville-Port au Port-St. George's area will have an opportunity to wish her a

PREMIER MOORES:                   fond farewell from this Province.

The fact is, Sir, that no matter what we talk about - we can talk about the cost of Government House as probably one of the highest in Canada, we can debate what the tradition means, we can debate how important it is to each of us - but the fact is, Sir, that to a great many Newfoundlanders, young and old, the tradition of the monarchy is one that is looked upon not only in good light, but with great admiration and great respect, and, Sir, I know on behalf of all members of this House, we will be welcoming her to this Province in the fashion that we want to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:               Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES:               Mr. Speaker, talking about the various headings that pertain to the governmental aspect of the vote, first of all, in my office in the Executive Council - and I will try to go through these as quickly as possible - we have, as can be noticed from the estimates themselves, tried to reduce expenses in every way possible, whether it be maintenance, cleaning, office supplies, telephone, staff or whatever the case may be.

But, Sir, whilst I am under the heading of Executive Council and talking generally on what is here listed as the Premier's Office, there is also one other tribute that I want to get on the record for this House. And the hon. members opposite, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, who unfortunately is not here tonight: but there is one individual who will be retiring this year, who, I think, has the total respect of this House of Assembly, a man who entered the Civil Service in 1934 as assistant to the

PREMIER MOORES: Secretary of the Commission of Government, and then he was the Registrar of the Department of Natural Resources. He has been in the Civil Service, obviously, from that date, for forty-four years. It is very rarely that we have a civil servant here in this Province or anywhere in Canada, not just with the time that he had punched in, but also the dedication and the capability that the man has shown as well. In 1948 he was Assistant Deputy Minister of the Department of Natural Resources under the Commission of Government. He was Secretary of the Newfoundland delegation sent to Ottawa to finalize the terms of union with Canada. In 1949 he was the first Private Secretary to the first Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, from 1949 to 1956. After that he was Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance and eventually, through many other appointments, he became the Clerk of the Executive Council and Deputy Minister

Premier Moores: of the office of the Premier, designated the head of the Newfoundland Civil Service in 1972. It is very rare that a man such as Jim Channing, Sir, comes along. And I know that this House wants to go on record -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: - for the tremendous contribution he has made. His replacement, I suppose, as an individual will be impossible, because when you have a great public servant we do not have that many that often. It is very, well, saddening for those who operated in the Cabinet, as I know the hon. member for the Straits (Mr. Roberts), and the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe) did with Mr. Channing not to feel the deepest regret that he will not be there irrespective of what government whenever takes over. Because I know when we came into office he was of tremendous assistance, and I know he was to the previous administration as well.

Now, Sir, regarding the Treasury Board estimates Mr. Maynard - I am sorry, Sir, the hon. the President of Treasury Board, will be -

MR. NEARY: Out of order!

PREMIER MOORES: - I am out of order on that. The hon. the President of Treasury Board will be speaking on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that there has been a tremendous improvement in the Treasury Boards over the years, and I think that is there as evidenced by a great many people. A fiscal control that has been exercised by Treasury Board and the manner in which they have done it has been on many occasions, I suppose, been upsetting to other line departments, and I know certainly the ministers, and certainly to many people outside of the Cabinet altogether. But the fact is, Sir, that they have been not only efficient but effective.

The reputation that we have gotten as being fiscally responsible internationally and in the bond markets of this world has been,

Premier Moores: in a fair degree of measure, due to Treasury Board. As I say, what they have done has not always been popular, but the job needed to be done. They have become the bargaining - they have always have been, of course, the bargaining unit of the government. And once again at a time when, a few years ago, there was very high inflation, when demands from all sectors of the private and public sector were heavy on employers, in this case in the public sector, of course, the demand was on the government, with this being the case, the bargaining unit of Treasury Board whilst they were tough, whilst they withheld strikes, while they made certain recommendations to us in Cabinet as to government, in a very, very difficult job, I think it is fair to say, Sir, that most of the people in the Public Service Unions would say that the bargaining unit of Treasury Board, in the main, had been fair, and certainly had been respected. The top personnel of that department, Sir, in my opinion, are without any equivalent that I know of in Canada.

Regarding Intergovernmental Affairs, Sir, the hon. minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs will be dealing with that heading in detail. The increasingly important role of Intergovernmental Affairs I am sure is known to all members of the House. Not only do they just do DREE agreements any more, where they negotiate with the federal government in that context, but a great deal of co-operation and liaison between the provinces of Canada is necessary, through Intergovernmental Affairs, exchanges of personnel for various departments of government to other departments in other provinces of Canada are necessary. Equally today Newfoundland is dealing in many cases with nations, whether it be West Germany, whether it be Iceland, whether it be wherever, and the Intergovernmental Affairs Department and the Secretariat has indeed a heavy load, and one which is becoming of increasing importance as the future comes upon us. It is one that in an international society, such as we have been in our past in this Province, is one that is going to take a much more meaningful role, as I say, in the future.

Premier Moores: Now, Sir, regarding - and I will save my remarks for the Action Group until a little later, because obviously I do not have time now because I do want to speak on that in great length because to me it is very important. But, Sir, in the meantime I would like to talk briefly about the Planning and Priorities Secretariat because I think a lot of people in this House, and a lot of members in this House, and a lot of people generally when it comes to the Planning and Priorities Secretariat do not realize just exactly what a key function that Secretariat has in government. It is, I suppose, in many ways technical. I know that Planning and the role they play has been laughed at many times by many people, particularly the Opposition, but, Sir, no government in this age could operate without a central planning agency if they are going to develop in the very rapidly moving times we have in our society in Canada, the Western World, or in the world today.

The fact is, Sir, the Planning and Priorities Secretariat is an advisory and a co-ordination unit which serves myself and the Cabinet.

PREMIER MOORES: The Secretariat provides advice to Cabinet on matters brought before it by the line departments and co-ordinates programme proposals to ensure consistency with government policy. Each of the secretaries to the three policy committees, the Resource Policy Committee, the Social and the Planning and Priorities itself, is responsible for preparing comments and recommendations to assist ministers in the decision making process. In other words, they provide the background and the knowledgeable information that is required of them.

The Secretariat, through the programme review and development division, also assists the policy committees and line department senior management in evaluating the effectiveness of departmental programmes so that new programmes can be introduced and unnecessary programmes eliminated.

Sir, when we talk about the Planning and Priorities Secretariat, they have many and varied roles within government. First of all, they were responsible for the preparation of the blueprint for development which was attached to the budget. Whilst that, once again, Sir, can be smirked at, the fact is the preparation of the development plan involved a great deal of background work such as detailed listings of the programme necessary to implement the plan, the cost on current and capital account for the five years, and a stimulation of the fiscal impact of the plan on the Province over the next five years.

Now, Sir, we have heard various comments made about that blueprint itself but as yet, Sir, I have not yet heard anyone come up with positive proof as to where it is wrong. They say we think it is wrong, it may be wrong, but based on basic background information, which this Secretariat have, they have brought forward what could be done in a blueprint for development which we have approved. It shows 40,000 jobs over a five year period.



PREMIER MOORES: There was a great deal of research went into that document and rather than knock that sort of impact, Sir, and that sort of plan, I would suggest that people try to support it and make sure it happens.

Secondly, Sir, the sort of thing they do is the preparation in co-operation with, once again, Intergovernmental Affairs and line departments of various submissions that go to DREE for subsidiary agreements. Work is being completed, for instance, where they had a fairly large input in co-ordinating the information in the progress in the areas of tourism, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, Labrador development, the infrastructure and initiatives in the St. John's urban region and Corner Brook.

Also, Sir, the Secretariat has seconded two staff members to a special committee which is undertaking regional planning for the fisheries development. The purpose of this committee is to assess the availability of resources resulting from the establishment of the 200 mile management zone, and to develop harvesting and processing capabilities together with the necessary infrastructure to maximize the development of the additional fisheries resource.

Now, Sir, in that regard there is a great many things that are going to have to be done. For instance, two of the things we have talked about for quite some time, first of all, is the potential Crown corporation, which will be under the aegis of Fisheries, which will, as I have said many times, be the liaison for the training programmes for our future fishermen and even our present fishermen, the liaison for establishing new markets, particularly in Europe, the liaison for equity participation, if need be, in order to get foreign capital in without control, if that is an emotional issue. Also, Sir, the committee, as well as planning this Crown corporation, which covers all aspect of harvesting,

PREMIER MOORES: processing and marketing, and all the training and other adjuncts that go with that. Also they have been responsible for commissioning and partaking in a distribution port study, of which I think there will probably be two or three in the Province in time, but the fact is, Sir, that this distribution port will be an area where the fleets can operate most efficiently, obviously in one location as you have in many ports in Europe or Western Canada or the Western United States, or wherever, whereby the fish when it is landed has a central location to be distributed from to those plants that are either under-utilized today or seasonal, that need fish for other periods of the year. It will be a centre where, as I say, the distribution to the various plants is needed but, most importantly, Sir, the Planning and Priorities Committee is bringing together a

PREMIER MOORES: programme and a plan of how this can be done, where there is government involvement, where there is private enterprise involvement and exactly what role of each is. For instance, Sir, I believe that, and as do they, that the infrastructure and all those things that are normally the role of government should be done by government. But whenever it is possible for private enterprise to do the job, government should be there to encourage private enterprise to do just that.

Sir, without taking up too much time on that, also the Planning and Priorities Committee, as an example, review the major policy issues, including the federal/provincial social security system, health, manpower planning, extended nursing care facilities, unified family court, and services to the mentally retarded, the involvement in environmental assessments of the Gull Island and the transmission line projects as well as the Wabana and Corner Brook development, co-ordination of the implementation of the Royal Commission on Newfoundland Government, participation in federal/provincial manpower needs committees, co-ordination of the implementation of the Canada Newfoundland subsidiary agreement, economic research, which is important, the institute for research and public policy, consultants to do studies on the St. John's urban subsidiary agreement, and the Labrador interim subsidiary agreement, both shared by Ottawa. They do a lot of work on the Labrador Resources Advisory Council.

What I am saying, Sir, in essence, is the Planning and Priorities Committees are an integral and very critical part of government. The role that they have to involve the brightest young men in government. They have to be the people who plan for the future based on fact, and not on fiction, based on giving advice that is not going to result in an emotional decision, but rather one that is going to play the role

PREMIER MOORES: that has to be played in order for any government to move ahead properly.

The fact is, Sir, that, as I have said, the Planning and Priorities Committee, I suppose, is paralleled in all Provinces today, it is certainly paralleled in the federal government, and I would say that under the direction of Mr. David Vardy in this case, he and his staff, through the Resource Policy Committees are doing an excellent job.

Sir, basically I will answer obviously any questions that come up under these headings. I want to reserve a full twenty minutes, sometime during the question period, for the business of the Action Group, because, Sir, in my opinion that particular function, and that particular role is probably one of the most important in the Province, I think it is very important that it be explained at the appropriate time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all, Sir, I want to refer to some of the comments that were made by the hon. the Premier in extending a welcome, prematurely probably, to Her Majesty the Queen, who is due to arrive in this Province this coming Summer. We too, Sir, on this side of the House would like to say how pleased we are that Her Majesty the Queen is going to visit the Island of Newfoundland this coming Summer. We are disappointed that Her Majesty will not be able to find the time in her itinerary to visit Labrador and I might say, Sir, that when the hon. the Premier was talking about the visit of Her Majesty I could not help reminiscing a little bit.

I think on the two previous occasions that Her Majesty visited Newfoundland she left our Newfoundland shores via Portugal Cove, twice on the Manico, and twice, Sir, when Her Majesty came to Newfoundland and left Newfoundland to join the

MR. NEARY: Empress of Scotland, I believe it was that was anchored in Conception Bay, Her Majesty left from Portugal Cove. On these two occasions I was there myself and personally saw the departure of Her Majesty.

Now I remember once that the hon. Don Jamieson rushed back from Portugal Cove - that the Minister of Justice will remember - the hon. Don Jamieson, who was broadcasting at the time, described the departure of Her Majesty from Newfoundland the last time she was here, from Portugal Cove when she left on the Manico to join the Emperess of Scotland, and it was the - hon. members may recall who were there, or who heard the broadcast - it was one of the most outstanding example of seamanship that was ever demonstrated in this Province. Captain Saunders was the captain of the Manico at the time and he received a letter of congratulations from Her Majesty when she - no, Captain Mark Saunders,

MR. S. NEARY:

not Bill Saunders, Captain Mark Saunders. It was outstanding. It was one of the biggest storms that we had for the year and there was no breakwater in Portugal Cove at the time. So, Mr. Chairman, we have very vivid memories of the last visit and the visit before that-before Her Majesty became Queen she also left from Portugal Cove-very vivid memories of Her Majesty's visit and we are looking forward with great enthusiasm to the forthcoming visit of our monarch Her Majesty the Queen.

Now, Sir, we are also interested in the retirement of Mr. Jim Channing. Mr. Channing has been now Clerk of the Council, I believe for twenty- let me see, twenty-nine years, I believe. If there is a man in this Province, Mr. Chairman, who knows the secrets of the previous administration and the present administration it is Mr. Channing, because Mr. Channing sits in on every meeting of Cabinet

AN HON. MEMBER:

He should be canonized.

MR. S. NEARY:

He should be canonized. The gentleman will go straight up when he dies, straight up, Sir. He is a martyr and should be canonized, Sir, and if that hon. gentleman could ever talk, if he could ever break his oath of secrecy I hope that, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Channing will find something useful to do in his days of retirement a very clever, very intelligent, very outstanding Newfoundlander and I am sure that Mr. Channing will just not go into retirement and hibernate. I hope that he will write his biography or his autobiography because there is no man on the face of this earth who knows more about this Province and the goings on and the decisions and being a part of the decision making- not participating in it, not allowed to speak, but for me to ask for advice, sitting back. I do not if hon. members who have never been in the Cabinet realize where Mr. Channing sits.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Channing sits in the corner with a little desk and makes notes of everything that goes on in Cabinet. There are no minutes kept of Cabinet meetings but there are what they call Orders in Council, and it is Mr. Channing who has to issue the Orders in Council.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not Canning, Channing.

MR. S. NEARY: Channing, rather, Mr. Channing.

I was thinking about -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are thinking about Mr. Canning.

MR. S. NEARY: - my hon. friend here. Mr.

Channing issues the Orders in Council and knows everything right from the time of Confederation right up to the present time - even with Commission of Government. That gentleman I suppose carries around more secrets in his head than even the former Premier or the present Premier of this Province, or the two of them put together.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or the late W.J. Carew.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right. And so, Sir, we are sorry to hear that Mr. Channing is retiring but we do wish him well in his retirement and we do hope that he will still continue to make a major contribution to this Province in some other form.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman back to business.

The hon. the Premier dwelt for some length, Sir, on the proposed visit of Her Majesty the Queen and the retirement of Mr. Channing, and deliberately did this, Sir, deliberately spent a lot of time on it to side track the major issues, the controversial issues in this department that we are doing, Executive Council, in the Estimates. The Premier in the last part of his remarks was talking about a distribution port, a central location for gathering, collecting and marketing fish. Well what the hon. the Premier did not tell this House was that a study had already been done on a central port and a gentleman by the name of Mr. Andrew Davidson - who

MR. S. NEARY: had been referred to earlier in the debate tonight and that we are going to hear about in the days and the weeks ahead. Mr. Andrew Davidson will be a name that will go down in history that will be remembered in this Province - Mr. Andrew Davidson was commissioned by this government, by the Moores administration, by the PC Government, was commissioned and sent overseas to his native home, to his native England, sent over to do a study on a similar port that they have in England called Grimsby. And the hon. Minister of Finance refused to pay Mr.



MR. NEARY: Andrew Davidson for his trouble. Mr. Andrew Davidson, the Minister of Finance, the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Transportation and Communications, refused to pay the hon. gentleman because the Department of Fisheries would not recognize the fact that Mr. Davidson had been commissioned by the government, by the Premier, and by the Minister of Industrial Development, and by one or two other ministers, and sent overseas to study Grimsby. And we are going to hear a little bit about the Grimsby affair in probably the next week or so. So I am not going to dwell at any length on it tonight, except to say that the minister may regret the day that he refused to pay Mr. Davidson for making that study of a distribution port, because the hon. the Premier was so anxious, and so interested in Mr. Davidson's affairs that the hon. the Premier sent him overseas to study Grimsby and come back and establish a similar port to the one they had in England right here in this Province. And there is an outstanding debt, and that debt will be paid in spades before this session of the House is over.

MR. DOODY: A spade is a spade.

MR. NEARY: That is right, in spades, Sir.

MR. DOODY: He will not be paid in dollars.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, so much about the distribution port, the central location for collecting fish. The study has already been done. It has been submitted to the government by a Mr. Andrew Davidson, and the government has refused to pay the gentleman the money that is owed to him. Well, I cannot say they refused to pay, Sir, I can only say that there were brown envelopes sent to the gentleman from the P.C. Party that were suppose to be part payment, not from the government itself for whom he did the work, but from the P.C. Party - brown envelopes were dispatched out of this Province, and we will hear more about that in the days and the weeks ahead.

MR. DOODY: Does the hon. member believe that the P.C. Party is going to set up a commerial part (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the P.C. Party were terribly worried of what these gentlemen were going to say before the 1975 election, and so they were silenced. They were silenced. These gentlemen were silenced. And we will hear, in due course we will hear why they were silenced.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who were silenced?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Andrew Davidson and company were silenced.

AN HON. MEMBER: By whom?

MR. NEARY: I just finished telling the - with brown envelopes.

AN HON. MEMBER: With brown envelopes?

MR. NEARY: Yes. I do not know what was in the envelopes but I intend to find out in due course, and when I do find out I will lay the information on the table of this House.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has arisen.

MR. MORGAN: I mentioned tonight earlier that the gentleman referred to in speeches in the House of Assembly outside the House who cannot defend themselves when attacks of that nature are made, in my view it is on the verge of slander. And I refer now to the hon. gentleman's comments indicating that a certain gentleman was bribed by somebody else. He was paid off.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. MORGAN: He was silenced. That kind of innuendo is on the verge of slander. And I would ask the hon. gentleman to retract these kinds of statements about people who cannot defend themselves in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the point of order as raised by the Minister of Tourism is not a point of order for the same reason and ruling that Your Honour gave earlier this evening when the hon. the Premier was making exactly the same kind of

Mr. F. Rowe: statements, not being direct, not naming names or anything like that, and Your Honour already ruled when a point of order was brought up against the Premier that it was not indeed a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: He named names now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The duty of the Chair -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The duty of the Chair as I see it is to maintain order in the Committee itself. And I do not think that that duty extends to the protection of the public per se. If an hon. member refers in a disorderly way, that is, disorderly in terms of the functioning of the Committee, in the course of remarks about individuals outside of the House, well I think it is the duty of the Chair is clear that some intervention has to be made.

I understand the hon. member feels that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) should not be referring to an individual, who is not of this Committee, in the manner that he did. But I do not see that the Chair had a duty to extend any protection to that individual. And in making his remarks I do not feel that the hon. member was actually outside of the rules of this Committee. So I do not see that the Chair at this point in time has anything that it can rule upon.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of clarification, maybe a request of information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You are questioning the ruling.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not questioning your ruling. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling, but again I would like to bring to the attention of the House that I feel, as one member of this assembly, that it is totally unfair to any citizen of our Province to be slandered, or attempt to be slandered, by any speaker in this House when the outside person referred to cannot defend himself.

MR. NEARY: Name him!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is this - Mr. Chairman, may I make my point please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member is on a point of order and I would ask if he would make the point of order, please.

MR. MORGAN: The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that I would ask for a ruling from the Chair as to what extent can individual members of the House of Assembly attack members of the public at large without being called to order by the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I feel that the Chair cannot go further in this matter than the ruling already made. I am not trying to evade the issue, but as far as I see it the duties of the Chair are such and such

MR. CHAIRMAN: within Committee and I feel that the Chair would be exceeding those limits if I went further than the ruling I gave despite what might be desirable.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman that I am referring to, by the way, is not a citizen of Newfoundland. Mr. Davidson is a citizen of Montreal, and if the hon. gentleman wants to know, he had his house raided recently -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) You slandered the guy.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am not slandering the gentleman. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing but great admiration for this gentleman. I have had negotiations, correspondence, discussions with the gentleman in -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what Mr. Davidson told me.

MR. MORGAN: He (inaudible) the House (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Look, Mr. Chairman, when I am going after elephants I am not going to be sidetracked with rabbit tracks!

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I am going after the big gun, the hon. the Premier, Sir. The hon. the Premier of this Province, Mr. Chairman, his government, his administration was defeated two days ago in this hon. House and the hon. the Premier decided to cling on by his fingernails - power hungry, will not let go, should have brought in a vote of confidence in his government or should have gone down to Government House and resigned. The hon. the Premier decided to brazen it out despite the advice given by all

MR. NEARY: the top constitutional experts in the whole of Canada. Mr. Chairman, it was a very serious matter. It was a defeat on a money bill, and the hon. the Premier should have gone and resigned or brought in a vote of confidence in the administration. It was a money bill, Sir, it was the minister's salary. We were in Committee of the Whole on estimates.

And now the Premier gets up tonight and again, brazenly, with the apparent face of a robber's horse, and praises up the Planning and Priorities Secretariat. Mr. Chairman, what a gall! Mr. Chairman, you know, it is not the elected representatives on the government side who run this Province. It is people like the Treasury Board Secretariat, the Planning and Priorities Secretariat, the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat and the Special Action Group. The Premier and his ministers have insulated themselves from the public. Nobody can get to see the Premier. As I said a few years ago - and every day I stop on the 8th Floor to take a look at it - the carpet on the 8th Floor will last forever, because it is unused, nobody using it, nobody is allowed to get in to see the Premier. First of all they have to go through the Treasury Board Secretariat, the Planning and Priorities Secretariat, the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat, the Special Action Group, and then the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor), who is a special assistant, and then the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), another special assistant. The government is insulated

MR. NEARY: from the public, and the people of this Province cannot get to see their Premier or their ministers. And the Premier deliberately stalled in introducing his estimates to sidetrack the controversial Action Group.

PREMIER MOORES: No.

MR. NEARY: Oh yes, Sir. Mr. Chairman, there is \$2 million - Resource Public Relations Programme and I am going to challenge the Premier right now, because I have only got a minute or two left, I am going to challenge the Premier to lay on the table of this House an item by item account of the expenditure of that \$2 million. The Premier does not have the courage to do it. He does not have the courage. The Premier will not put that information on the table of this House. The hon. Premier intends to? Will the hon. the Premier tell us how much is going to be spent on McConnell Advertising? How much VOXM will get? How much CJON will get? How much CBC will get? How much NBC will get? How much The Daily News will get? How much The Evening Telegram will get? Will the hon. Premier tell us how much the middle men are going to get? \$2 million! We want, Mr. Chairman, we want a detailed, item by item account of that \$2 million, and I challenge the Premier now to produce it tonight in this hon. House before we finish the hon. gentleman's estimates.

The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs, Sir, should be wiped out altogether. It is useless. It serves no purpose.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. NEARY: No purpose at all. It should be abolished and the people who work in that department should not necessarily be laid off but should be put to work at doing something useful for the government and for the people of this Province. It is a waste of the taxpayers money.

MR. W. ROWE: Right on! Another body blow!



MR. DOODY: Thank God we do not have television in here.

MR. NEARY: But the special Action Group, Sir, we heard about Mr. Cole's salary there a couple of weeks ago, \$47,500. And not only that, that is only part-time. That is only part-time. The Director, Mr. Cole, is getting \$47,500 for a part-time job. He can still go off and broadcast the hockey games.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman makes as much - what?

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that for a part-time job?

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I hope they are all Tories who are dying over across the bay.

\$47,500, Sir, one of the highest paid public servants in this Province. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against Mr. Cole. I think he is a fine Newfoundlander. He has done well. He has managed to go to the top in broadcasting hockey games. I had the privilege of sitting down one evening recently in a discussion with the gentleman.

But, Sir, I would say that that is a classic example of extravagance and waste. And if this government want to use Mr. Cole, use him for some other purpose, but do not waste his time and the taxpayers money on this foolish Action Group, which is one of the most expensive telephone lines in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When two members rise simultaneously, the Chair has to make a choice. We do have to fall back on some sort of guideline on that situation and the guideline is that in Committee we alternate side by side. So I would recognize the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason for rising to my feet so quickly was the fact that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) felt that the Intergovernmental Affairs Division should be



MR. DOODY: disbanded, disbursed and set on its several ways to do whatever efforts they may find themselves capable of which could be perhaps more beneficial to the people of the Province.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that that sort of reasoning, combined with the comments that the hon. member has made about Treasury Board and P and P -

MR. MORGAN: Industrial Development.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tourism.

MR. DOODY: - about these various bodies and groups that are associated with the Executive Council, demonstrates the sort of idea, or the lack of idea, the hon. member has about how something as large

MR. DOODY: and complex and complicated as government has become, should be dealt with. To think that the group of specialized line departments responsible for transportation or industrial development or whatever can also find the time, the ability, the talent and the efficiency to deal on a reasonable and sensible basis with our counterparts in Ottawa and in Calgary, in Montreal - the hon. member recently referred to citizens of Montreal, I had not realized that Montreal had separated from Quebec, nor even that Quebec had separated from Canada, but I think what he meant was that the gentleman was a resident of Montreal. In any event the point is, Sir, that this is a very highly specialized society in which we do business today and government, for better or for worse, is an extremely big business, perhaps a lot bigger than it should be. In my own opinion it is a lot bigger than it should be. But the fact remains that we have to compete as best we can on a level that can do the best possible job for the people of this Province. Intergovernmental Affairs is a function of that process and one that is very necessary. I will grant you that the sum total of the number of people who are involved in Intergovernmental Affairs is by no means the measure of their worth. The twenty-four people who provide the staff of that division of government are certainly not in the position to go face to face, person to person, and deal with - I guess DREE itself has more than fifty positions here in the city of St. John's, fifty to sixty positions, just that one department of the federal government. They deal with various other departments of the federal government, they deal with their counterparts in other provincial governments, they help co-ordinate the activities in a face to face - I almost tempted to use that terrible term that is so common among bureaucracies these days "to effect the interface" between these various levels of bureaucracy, and if I am not careful I will find myself talking the same jargon that these people use.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) and many other people use, I am sure.

MR. DOODY: That could very well be an improvement for me as well. But, Sir, the main purpose of Intergovernmental Affairs is to co-ordinate all the activities of government as it relates to matters that concern this government and the governments with which it has an ongoing relationship and in particular, Sir, to insure that the Province puts forward a reasonable and coherent and consistent posture in dealing with these other Provinces so that department A, and department B, and department C, and department D, do not all head off in different directions and get our wires crossed and our positions mixed and put the federal government and our counterparts in provincial governments sitting back and scratching their heads and wondering what exactly is the position of the Government of Newfoundland in its energy posture or in its DREE posture or whatever.

And that function itself would justify the functions of the division of Intergovernmental Affairs. Just in DREE alone, Sir, the Intergovernment Affairs division has been responsible for activity which amounts this year to about \$60 million, this is in negotiation with the Government of Canada on various agreements, some 90-10, some less favourable to the Province. To date we have negotiated DREE agreements totalling about \$317 million; we are in the process of moving to a point where we can sign several new agreements totalling another \$75 to \$80 million. There is an agricultural agreement of about \$15 million on the way, a Rural Development agreement of about \$21 million, we have an extension to our highways agreement coming up of another \$24 million, we hopefully will have a Corner Brook sub-agreement of

Mr. Doody: about \$20 million or a little less than that, probably \$15 million. This will bring us close to the \$400 million mark in agreements that were worked out with DREE, and this is obviously an ongoing process, because as we know bureaucracy builds bureaucracy. And that is true in this government, and it is even more true in the Government of Canada. It becomes more and more complex and more and more difficult. There are a number of new DREE agreements which are on the drawing board that we hope we will be in a position to sign over the next year. The polytechnical institute, Sir, is one of major importance to this Province. The Government of Canada some time ago announced it quite clearly, and quite loudly, and quite reasonably that it was not in the education business and it was going to get out. It was not going to get involved in building or assisting in the building of more schools.

The polytechnical institute, we feel, and I think that the Government of Canada agrees, is a training centre, an upgrading centre, an opportunity for our people in the fisheries and the resource industries to have an opportunity to catch up with the technology and the developments through a polytechnical institute. And I think that we have moved a long way towards getting that agreement signed, and hopefully over the next months more progress will be made in that area. There is an additional St. John's area agreement that we are working on. The huge Labrador agreement, a small part of it was signed this year, just a fraction of it, but the major part of it is still to be done. DREE is working on that in Ottawa very industriously and with a great deal of sympathy. And I must say at this point, while it crosses my mind, that this Province, indeed, all of the underdeveloped parts of Canada are extremely fortunate to have somebody of the calibre, of the sympathy of Mr. Lessard, the hon. Mr. Lessard, as the Minister of DREE. I have yet to come across a minister in the Government of Canada who is more sympathetically inclined, and has such a natural empathy for the problems that we seem to experience in Newfoundland. It is a bit of a paradox. Mr. Lessard is obviously from Quebec, and we have had our differences with

Mr. Doody: Quebec so one would suspect that things would not be as pleasant and easygoing as it would be with perhaps a minister from another area of Canada.

Mr. Lessard represents a riding which has, I suppose, got one of the largest unemployment problems in Canada, and one of the most depressed areas of Canada. And I think he understands our position and how we feel. I have had an opportunity to work with him during the past several months, and I look forward to working with him during the months to come. I think he is an excellent minister, and he is one of the best possible people who could have been picked for this very delicate and very important position. I wish him well, and I hope he is with us for quite a long while.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: Well, I can only say as I said during a press conference that we had during the signing of our Tourism agreement and our Interim Labrador agreement, that I hope that Mr. Lessard will be with us in his portfolio for many, many, many years to come - -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: - even if it means that he has to switch parties to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: And he felt that that was a well-intentioned thing.

MR. DOODY: So there are quite a number of things that I want to touch on on Intergovernmental Affairs, on the various other programmes that we are working on. Intergovernmental Affairs took responsibility for the implementation of the anti-inflation programme here in the Province of Newfoundland, and we had a magnificent opportunity to duplicate the bureaucratic empire that was built up in other parts of Canada to service that short lived, but well-intentioned programme.

MR. DOODY: In the Province of Newfoundland the programme was looked after by one gentleman, with a clerk stenographer, a gentleman named Wayne Mitchell, who kept receiving all these reams of papers and communiqués and additions and addendums, and filing them all and making sure they were all related to their various areas and so on, and demonstrated that a great deal of efficiency can be achieved at a very small cost if the thing is properly managed.

All our federal/provincial agreements relating to communications, transportation, to manpower, social services, forestry and native peoples, housing, etc., are all the responsibility through the co-ordinating process and through the negotiating process of the people in Intergovernmental Affairs. And now we have an ongoing effort which was recently reached, a signing stage of the Trans-Canada Highway agreement and that will be signed during the coming week or so in Gander with Mr. Lang. We hope shortly after that to reach an agreement with him and we have the bones of an agreement worked out now and I think we will soon have the flesh attached to it of the inter-Province ferry agreement, those ferries that operate within the Province which the federal government has been operating and has accepted responsibility for, but has decided that they can no longer accept that responsibility and I think that shortly we will be able to come up with a solution that is acceptable, although it is not a perfect solution on either side, which both governments can live with, and which will be a major benefit to the people in our Province.

The various fundings of Social Services, the block fundings, the Native Peoples' Agreements, the Argentina negotiations, the fisheries meetings, the manpower agreements, the Canada Works co-ordination, the Goose Bay transfer, the St. Lawrence mine closure, the negotiations that are still ongoing that in terms of the possibilities or hoped for

MR. DOODY: probability of a tariff on imported fluorspar, all these things are ongoing. The necessity which I had an opportunity to discuss just a moment or two ago with my friend from Baie Verte, regarding the Fleur de Lys Road and the possibility of getting the DREE people involved in helping us on our health safety problem that we have in that area of the Province.

These are some of the areas of concern and some of the areas of responsibility that the Intergovernmental Affairs people have. It is a small group, as I said earlier, a low profile group, a highly motivated group. The total staff is, as I said, twenty-four people, including the minister who is in here for a salary of \$100, which seems to me to be excessive and it will probably be reduced and I will receive nothing. But that is quite all right. I am only too happy to help and throw in what I can.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is \$99 more than your friend.

MR. DOODY: That is \$99 more than my friend from Forestry and Agriculture is getting and he works four times as hard as ever I would.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) during one of his visits to the House for one of his regular diatribes, raised several points. He asked what was the purpose of Treasury Board, of IGA, of Planning and Priorities? To have to explain that to a man who has been in the government areas for so long, and who has served in government so long is simply to underline how little feeling and how little sense, or how little knowledge he has of how government operates.

The Collective Bargaining Division of Treasury Board, the Management Organization Division, the Financial Management Division of Treasury Board, it is impossible to operate a \$1 billion budget without proper management. It has to be done. The various departments of a store can operate reasonably well on their own up to a point, but if there is not a management control system of some sort in place, if there

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 997

MMI - 3

MR. DOODY: is not a co-ordinating system or function of some sort in place, the whole thing is chaotic, falls apart, counter-productive, all the efforts and all the work and all the best



MR. DOODY: intentions in the world amount to nothing, amount to less than nothing. It is a losing proposition and it is a waste of resource and a waste of people. And that is the role of the Secretariat. That is the role of the Executive Council. That is the role of the people who work in these sometimes maligned, often misunderstood, and very, very often unappreciated parts of government.

I have nothing but respect and admiration for the people in these divisions of government. They are not a very visible crew. They do not have the advantage I have of being awakened at three or four o'clock in the morning and told that they still have not put any sand on the road from Woodstock to Pacquet and -

MR. ROBERTS: And it is a collect phone call.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should be.

MR. DOODY: I do not know. I must check that. They are probably not.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not have your credit card number.

MR. DOODY: No, I do not think the credit card number is the -

MR. SIMONS: Did it occur to the minister that perhaps the reason is that probably he promised it would be done?

MR. DOODY: That the road to Pacquet, to Woodstock would be sanded when the ice is on it? Of course! And I promise that it will be too. But there are so many sanders, so many trucks, so many hills and so much ice, and we distribute them as best we can within the limited abilities that we can.

MR. RIDEOUT: Do you distribute the ice?

MR. DOODY: The minister does his best to distribute the ice as well. But I will admit that I have less to do with that than I have to do with the -

MR. RIDEOUT: I knew the minister was powerful, but (inaudible).

MR. DOODY: Well if you will drop down to my house after the House closes I will distribute a little bit of ice and you can mix your own.

MR. SIMMONS:

Would the minister permit a question? When he mentions the Woodstock or the Pacquet Road he prompts me to ask a question, I can appreciate that he would not want to be awakened at three or four o'clock in the morning, but if one of his colleagues, in this case in another district, and in this case last Monday night, made a promise that the road in a particular community would be covered with crushed stone the following day, and it is not done as of today, would he appreciate a call then or would he understand?

MR. DOODY: No, But I would appreciate it if you would give that particular person my colleague's phone number and have him phone him and get the crushed rock moved up.

MR. SIMMONS: I am glad you and I are of the same opinion. I did that very thing this afternoon.

MR. DOODY: Good. Well since you and I are on the same wave length, I think it is time that we had a very serious look at this House. She is gone completely adrift, Your Honour. There are obviously strange goings on.

I am sure that the hon. the Premier will be dealing at great length with the Action Group and the service that it will be rendering. One of the interesting questions that was raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), which I hope the Premier will address himself to, was what would be the distribution of the funding, or of the advertising budget, or the promotion budget of that Action Group in terms of the radio stations; particularly he asked what will the radio station CJON receive and what will WOCM receive and so on? I noticed that the hon. member did not mention the radio station in Port aux Basques, but I guess that is part of the chain, it is part of that same chain.

I think that that is the radio station with the open line show that does not accept collect telephone calls, which may be the reason why the hon. member's telephone bill is as high

MR. DOODY: as it is. But that is the sort of thing of course that we are not supposed to mention in this House because it is an innuendo and it is tabling and I am allowed to come in and say that I suggest that this has been an abuse and misuse of the funds, but later on Your Honour, later on I might just bring in that telephone bill and lay it on the table of the House, but I am not going to do it yet. I am saving it for another thrill, the ongoing saga, another life, another world, according to the member for LePoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. SIMMONS: As the stomach churns.

MR. DOODY: As the stomach churns. Now the hon. member tells me that I have got two minutes. Does that mean two minutes left to speak.

MR. NEARY: Two minutes to go.

MR. DOODY: I thought I had really offended the Chair.

The commission of the port study which we have been accused of refusing to pay Mr. Davidson; I, as Minister of Finance at the time, refused to pay Mr. Davidson for a port study that he wanted and as I remember it was a relatively modest sum - I forget exactly what the figure was - the study was even more modest. It was, as a matter of fact, a line drawing of pathetic proportions. The detail that followed it up was even more rudimentary and amateurish, and my capacity at that time -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I stand on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there a moment or two ago the hon. gentleman referred to my telephone bill. Now, Sir, I am not ashamed of my telephone bill. There is nothing wrong with it, and I would demand that the hon. gentleman produce the evidence or withdraw the innuendo, the statement that the hon. gentleman made, Sir. The hon. gentleman tried to slander and libel me, Sir. It was a vicious personal attack. And, Mr. Chairman, I will put my telephone bill up against the hon. gentleman's anytime. And I ask the hon. gentleman, Sir, to withdraw that statement, that innuendo. You cannot say indirectly what you are not allowed to say directly in this House, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: He said you were using it for Open Line programmes.

MR. NEARY: Using it for Open Line programmes. And I would ask the hon. gentleman, Sir, to bring in the telephone bills for every member of this House and I will stack mine up against them anytime.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! I feel I can rule on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I feel I can rule on that. I do not think it is a point of order, just a point of opinion, more or less, or explanation.

MR. NEARY: No mistake! It was innuendo, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I made my ruling. There is a way for the hon. member to challenge my ruling if he wants to.

The hon. the Minister of  
Transportation and Communications.

April 13, 1978

Tape 999 (Night)

EC - 2

MR. DOODY: I have one minute left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Order, please!

MR. DOODY: The hon. the member for LaPoile has asked me, I am sure, as a courtesy to the House rather than as a suggestion that I either libelled or slandered him, because great heavens knows that it is not my nature to be vindictive.

MR. NEARY: I will slander the hon. member before I am finished with him.

MR. DOODY: There, you see. Your Honour, is that parliamentary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: Is it parliamentary? He is threatening me, Your Honour. May I have some protection, please?

I promise Your Honour that I will bring forth the telephone bills -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: - that are attributed to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: All members'! All members'!  
Get the information on all members.

MR. DOODY: Sir, all members of the House are not demanding their telephone bills surely. If they are I would be only too happy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: - to bring them in like confetti, Your Honour. But if the hon. member for LaPoile -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I really could not care less about telephone bills. If the hon. gentlemen

April 13, 1978

Tape 999 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. ROBERTS: want to table them -  
MR. MORGAN: Five thousand six hundred dollars!  
AN HON. MEMBER: What!  
MR. NEARY: So?  
MR. MORGAN: Do you want them?  
MR. NEARY: Yes, I do!  
MR. CHAIRMAN: (MR. YOUNG) Order, please! Order, please!

I wish to inform hon. members to my left that I have recognized the hon. the member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I really could not care less about telephone bills. If anybody wants to table them or examine them, go ahead. I would simply hope, Mr. Chairman, that the fifty-one men and women who have been charged with running the affairs of this Province ought, all of us, to have better things to do. If anybody feels that any of us have charged anything improperly against telephone -

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not say that!

MR. ROBERTS: No, I did not say the minister said anything. And I am not going to get into this low little game which both sides have engaged in - the gentleman from LaPoile and the Premier equally tonight - innuendo and all that. I am not going to get into that. If anybody feels there has been something improper done then there are remedies and let them be followed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I do not want to get involved in what I think has been in many cases a waste of the public's time.

The gentlemen who have just been elected to represent the town of Mount Pearl for the next four years - I guess that is their term of office, or three years and a bit assuming that the municipal elections in Mount Pearl next time around will fall in November as they do throughout the Province, which I assume to be the case -

MR. ROBERTS:                   you know, they may have had a bit of an insight into what is wrong with this House. And I am not going to stand here tonight and read a lecture on what I believe is wrong with this House. Indeed, it could be said that perhaps I have contributed greatly to it, and if so, so be it and I will have to answer along with the rest of us. But I do think the sort of trash we have been hearing this last hour or so - and I am not saying that everything that has been said is trash, but a lot of it is irrelevant. I do not mind it being offensive; if people hold strong views and others are offended, so be it. But I sometimes wonder what in the name of all that any of us hold sacred this has got to do with the affairs of a province that has 35,000 people out of work, that cannot afford to maintain its hospital systems, that cannot afford to maintain its health care systems, that cannot afford to maintain its school systems, that cannot afford to provide people with water fit to drink and with facilities to carry sewerage away, that cannot afford to build decent roads - what, in the name of all that is sacred, are we doing here to solve any of these problems? I think that is all

MR. E. ROBERTS: that I want to say on that right now because I rose to simply say a few words, to echo some words of the Premier's when he referred to a gentleman who is retiring from the Public Service. I am not sure of the date of his retirement; in fact, I do not know if it has been set. I confess I rang Mr. Channing, Mr. James Channing, who is a long-time friend of mine and I am proud to say a very close friend of mine, and I gather it is still a matter that he and the Premier have to fix upon. I would simply say to the Premier that while I can understand Mr. Channing's desire to retire, and while I am sure that, knowing Mr. Channing as I do, he would not retire precipitously, the Premier would be well advised to keep Mr. Channing in the Public Service of this Province as long as he could.

But I just want to say a word or two about Jim Channing because I had the pleasure of working with him for many years very closely, both as staff member in the office of the then Premier, Mr. Smallwood, and then as a member of the Cabinet; and then latterly not so closely and certainly not so frequently, but from time to time, either as Leader of the Opposition or even now as a member, an ordinary member, a back-bench member of the House, a private member, I have had occasion to call on Mr. Channing. I think that his career in the Public Service - and I may say if Jim Channing were here he would be asking us all to be quiet because he is a man of genuine modesty, a man of impeccable honour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: - and a man of the utmost integrity. I realize when he hears of this, as he doubtless will, he may be a little embarrassed, but I would say he has no reason to be because when a man of Jim Channing's stature and achievements leaves the Public Service of this Province having served his full-time, I think it is an occasion that should be called upon and I would suggest to the Premier, if



MR. E. ROBERTS: he has not already thought of this, that at some time point it would not be inappropriate to suggest to this House that the House adopt a resolution commending Mr. Channing. I am not suggesting we should do it for every public servant although many have made notable contributions, but Jim Channing's contribution, I would venture to say, will never be equalled again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: The Premier outlined his career and I cannot really add to it. Jim Channing as much as any public servant, and the public servants played an important role, helped to put together the Terms of Union, the incredibly complicated and complex negotiations which went on which led to a very happy union and one which worked extremely well and I think many who were involved at the time felt that perhaps the meshing of two governments, of two Public Services, of two types of social services would have been very much more difficult to achieve than it was. Jim Channing was one of a group of men, including, Mr. Justice Puddister and a number of others, who Mr. Walter Marshall, who was then the Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Jim Thompson, who was the financial advisor to the Commission of Government in the latter years and the provincial government in its first years. many men can claim credit-and I am not speaking of the politicians, I am not speaking of the men who signed the terms; they too of course are not only entitled to credit but often they are the only ones who get it. But men like Jim Channing made the Confederation work and much of what we have today in the Public Service of this Province I think can be laid at the feet of men like Jim Channing. I have watched him carefully, a master of tact, of judgement, of discretion. Jim Channing, I suppose, knows more political as well as Cabinet secrets than any man in this Province. He sat in the Smallwood Cabinet, I do not think I ever

MR. E. ROBERTS:                   heard him open his mouth to say a word unless he was responding to a question that had been put to him, or occasionally he would give the Premier or a minister a word of advice or a word of guidance where he thought it appropriate. And he has sat in on six years now of the Moores Cabinet - and I have no idea, based on knowledge at least of what goes on in the Moores Cabinet I have some based on opinion and upon surmise but I know what went on in at least three or four of the more interesting years perhaps in the Smallwood Cabinet. And I would think that Jim Channing to say has not only seen and forgotten more secrets but could tell more about what really has gone on in the Government of this Province than any man ever can, but he never will. A man of absolute discretion, a man of superb judgement and a man who has served this Province extremely well.

His department from the Public Service will also terminate another interesting tradition. Somebody mentioned. I think the gentleman for Harbour Main - Bell Island, mentioned Mr. W.J. Carew. I think he had a slip of his tongue, not unusual for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and referred to the late Mr. Carew. As far as I know Mr. W.J. Carew is still very much alive. He is certainly not a young man. He must be not far short of ninety. His son, of course, is Archbishop Carew, the Newfoundlander who has risen so high in the council of the Roman Catholic Church, who will, I have no doubt, rise higher yet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Jerusalem.

MR. ROBERTS: Is he in Jerusalem?

AN HON. MEMBER: On his way.

MR. ROBERTS: Or is he the Titular  
Archbishop of Jerusalem?

MR. HICKMAN: He is in Jerusalem.

MR. ROBERTS: He is the Titular Archbishop  
of Jerusalem, is he? Very high in the secretariat, the  
civil service of the Vatican, the Roman Catholic Church.

But Mr. Carew, of course, is a  
brother-in-law, unless I am mistaken, of Mr. Channing. I  
do not think they are nephew and uncle. Perhaps the Minister  
of Justice could help me: I think they are brothers-in-law.  
I think they are, but in any event there is a connection,  
they work together, and that connection goes back, Mr.  
Chairman, to the last days of Responsible Government and  
through the Commission of Government on through the history  
of this Province to date. These two men between them  
since about 1924 have not only observed all the Cabinet  
secrets of this Province, but have recorded the Cabinet  
decisions and have put them into effect.

I do not think there are many  
parts of the British Parliamentary world where that has  
happened.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) Mr. Carew was not  
secretary or clerk of the Cabinet in the days of Responsible  
Government.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he was secretary to the  
Prime Minister, Sir Richard Squires. I believe that is  
where Mr. Carew began his career. He wrote a most marvellous  
poem. I have seen a copy of it. I do not know if it has  
ever been printed. Mr. Carew had and I hope has, a great

MR. ROBERTS: talent for versification,  
for first-class doggerel, and a poem about the politicians  
of the 1920's, that day.

I think he was private  
secretary to the then Prime Minister, Sir Richard Squires.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who, Mr. Channing?

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Carew, Will Carew.  
And he was secretary to the commission.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) in 1933.

MR. ROBERTS: Duder - not Mr. Duder -

MR. HICKMAN: Arthur Mews.

MR. ROBERTS: Arthur Mews, the other crowd.

MR. HICKMAN: Carew succeeded him.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, so that would still  
1933, I would say to the Minister of Justice, is still -

MR. HICKMAN: After Commission of Government -  
because there is a picture that was carried in the  
press recently showing the then Clerk of the Executive  
Council at the time of the swearing in of the Commission.

MR. ROBERTS: I bow to the minister and I  
am grateful to him. That reduces the period to a mere  
forty years, but still it is significant.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I really have said all I  
wanted to say on the point, Mr. Chairman. We will all  
regret Jim Channing's going. I think the government and  
the public service of this Province, and the people of  
this Province will be the poorer because of it, but there  
is no reason for him not to go. He has served his time  
and then some. He has earned his retirement, he is still  
young enough and active enough to enjoy it and I would  
wish him many, many years - and I would hope that the  
Premier and his colleagues will see fit to, if they  
consider it appropriate, and I hope they will, to bring

MR. ROBERTS: before the House in due course a resolution to commend a very notable career, one which has left behind it significant achievements.

Mr. Chairman, I could talk about a lot of other things in these estimates, and I guess in the last two or three years I probably have. But I have no real desire to say anything more on this head except let me again say, and I am not trying to be holier than thou; heavens knows that I have been in as many rows as anybody in this House, and I have mixed it up in debate, and sometimes won and sometimes lost. The Minister of Industrial Development is looking at me with that Irish charm of his.

I can remember one day back in 1972, and I will not forget it and neither will he, when he and I had a memorable but brief exchange. But, Mr. Chairman, the point I wish to make, and I will end on this, is simply to say that I think all of us in this House should have a very good look at ourselves. I have watched very carefully the last three or four days. I have not been in the House a great deal before that in this session. I think the calibre of debate is the lowest I have ever seen in my twelve years in this House. I think the substance of debate is the lowest. And indeed, we have talked about television in the House - my friend from Lewisporte has a resolution down again on the Order Paper - I think we should adopt that resolution, we should bring television into this House and let us let the people of this Province see exactly what is going on. And I do not say that because I think they will be pleased. I think that we will probably have 225,000 outside demanding that the fifty-one of us do something, and do something constructive.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am not laying blame on this side or that side; I think all of us

MR. ROBERTS:   have to be prepared to  
accept the blame. I think we should be ashamed of ourselves.  
This is the twenty-first day of this session and I do not  
think we have achieved one day's constructive work. And  
I mean politically constructive work as well as governmentally  
constructive work. This is a partisan forum and so it  
should be. It is a forum for debate, it is a forum for  
partisan attack and there is nothing wrong with that. But  
the calibre of debate on both sides, the

Mr. Roberts: type of subject matter we are getting our teeth into, the type of language and the type of thought we are using, Sir, is not worthy of this House of Assembly. It would not be worthy of a kindergarten. And I have never felt ashamed to be a member of this House, and I do not feel ashamed now. But I to think, Mr. Chairman, all of us would be well advised to look very long and hard at what we are doing, and what we are saying, or what we are not doing and what we are not saying and that we can guide ourselves accordingly. I think the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Chairman, deserve better than they have got right now in this House of Assembly.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to have a few words on one of the subheads or one of the sections of the Executive Council, Treasury Board which I have the pleasure of being President of. I would hope that the Treasury Board presidency will give me double the salary that I have been voted in the Department of Forestry and Agriculture then maybe I would get a check every week instead of every second week.

Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Board, I think, is probably one of the most misunderstood sections of government both within the government circles and in the House of Assembly and in the public at large. Treasury Board is often given the role of being the heavy and pounding on everyone's head when it is time to spend money and this sort of thing. And we do have very tight controls, or we try to exercise very tight controls over the spending of government, as the Auditor General reports from time to time. And we try to keep the estimates within the allocations that are given by the House of Assembly.

It is not an easy job. It is a very difficult one, in most cases, because the estimates are just that, and even though they are voted by the House of Assembly, and we have the best estimates from all departments that we can possibly have, I suppose, it is very difficult to make a precise projection at the beginning of the year

Mr. Mavnard: of what you are going to spend throughout the year. But it is Treasury Board's responsibility to first of all help the departments to prepare their estimates, what their spending is going to be. And then, of course, try to ensure that the departments spend only the amount of money that is allocated to them by the Legislature. That is the obvious role of Treasury Board, that is the one that gets in the public eye, and that is the one that gets criticized more often than anything else. And I would say that my colleagues in Cabinet are just as critical of Treasury Board as people on the outside.

But there are other roles of Treasury Board, and my colleague the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications mentioned a few of them. There is the Collective Bargaining Division, which is not heard of very often until such time as a problem arises within the collective bargaining in the civil service. The Collective Bargaining Division, while it is very small, administers or bargains on behalf of government in excess of thirty collective agreements per year, and that in itself is a very strenuous job. We have people in the Bargaining Division who are quite professional at it, but they are continuously at it month after month, year after year, and it is a long drawn out tedious job. We have what I think is a great success in the Collective Bargaining Division, and I would like to compliment that particular division of the Treasury Board Secretariat for the job that they have been able to do with their very small staff of two or three people.

I know that we have complaints in many cases where the unions will say that agreements are long overdue, and new agreements should be finalized and that sort of thing, and that we should hire on more staff. And that is probably true in some cases, but I would think that we have one of the most professional elements in the civil service in our Bargaining Division, and



MR. MAYNARD: I would like to think that they will do a job, maybe not satisfactory to everyone but certainly satisfactory as far as government is concerned.

The Treasury Board, as well has other divisions such as Organization and Management Division, which is essentially an in house consulting group which is available to all government departments, and I am sure that hon. members on the other side who have been in government have probably known of the work and experienced the work the O and M Division can carry out. They conduct studies that try to determine whether the function I think of a particular department is efficient or whether it is inefficient and quite often they come up with very significant changes in a department that is very vital to the efficient conducting of government affairs.

Classification and Pay Division is responsible for establishing and maintaining some sort of order and some sort of smoothness in the classification plans and the salary plans that government has. Here again a division that all hon. members from time to time have cause to argue with, but a division that does a very thorough job and even though all members may not agree with their recommendations, I am sure that all members will agree that they are a very meticulous division and that they do a tremendous job in trying to keep a fair and equitable salary scale across the Civil Service and when you have approximately 20,000 positions that come under their jurisdiction as far as Classification and Pay is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that is a very large and a very responsible job and they carry it out in a very good way.

The Insurance Division to mention one other one, and I will not go into all divisions of Treasury Board, the Insurance Division is responsible for the administration of government's group insurance plans and the management of general insurance requirements.

MR. MAYNARD: of government which is bringing some order into what was previously a chaotic situation as far as government insurance is concerned.

I could go on and on, but I thought it very appropriate that as President of Treasury Board, that I would say a few words and explain the role of Treasury Board as much as I can, and time does not allow us to go into the whole thing in detail, but to point out to hon. members that Treasury Board is much more than a group of people, bureaucrats who sit down and say that there is \$2 here, you cannot have \$2.50 or whatever the case might be, that they are far-ranging, that they work with all departments of government and in my estimation, Mr. Chairman, worked very effectively and very well with government. With that I will pass it over to someone else.

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

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to identify myself with the words of the Premier in relation to the visit of Her Majesty the Queen this Summer. I am sure I speak, as did the Premier, for all hon. members of this House. The Monarchy is an institution that has served us extremely well and I believe every Newfoundlander is looking forward keenly to the visit of Her Majesty.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak with any first hand knowledge of Mr. Channing's contribution to government. I know something of it second hand. I met the man a few times. But he is the kind of public servant that you hear often about and always in very complimentary terms and I would like to extend my best wishes to him as he leaves his present job in due course.

Mr. Chairman, I would like, since time is very limited, to come to a couple of matters which are directly bearing on the present heads of expenditure that we are asked to approve. The President of Treasury Board just concluded his remarks and it was only the other night when we were dealing with his estimates for his other set of responsibilities, that of Forestry and Agriculture,

MR. SIMMONS: that we passed here in Committee that precedent setting resolution to reduce the salary. It has been moved before. I have not checked the precedents to see if it carried before in a Committee anywhere although I would think it did at some point.

But, Mr. Chairman, that aside, if we made any mistake the other night, if we made any mistake in Committee on Tuesday in passing that motion that the minister's salary be reduced to \$1.00, if we made any mistake, Mr. Chairman, it was that we had in there the office of the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture instead of the office of the Premier. That was our error, if we made any. Because, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Forestry in some respects is little more than an innocent bystander. It is the Premier himself, Mr. Chairman, who must bear the brunt, who must accept the responsibility for having so ruthlessly broken faith with the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And as I was looking at the time allotment for this particular department, four hours, I was making a mental note that next year if I have any input into the matter I shall suggest a much longer period of time for this particular head. I am sorry, two hours on this particular head. And I would suggest there be a much longer period because this really is the crux of the issue. We can stand here in Committee and talk about what is not being done in Industrial Development, and I have some strong feelings on that, or in Health, and I have very strong feelings on that, or in Education, and I have very strong feelings on that, and they are being strengthened by the actions that the minister and his colleagues have taken recently, especially in this budget. But, Mr. Chairman, finally the buck stops with the Premier, in this case more so than before. Because it is the Premier who had a very high profile when this government was first getting itself elected. It is the Premier's promise of hope and better things that got this government elected to office more so than the appeal

MR. SIMMONS: or the promise of any particular Cabinet Minister or potential Cabinet Minister at that particular time.

MR. NEARY: Bill Saunders got him elected.

MR. SIMMONS: Indeed, Mr. Chairman -

MR. HICKMAN: Hughie Shea was the first one.

MR. SIMMONS: - the other players -

AN HON. MEMBER: Boys, what is wrong with you tonight? Behave yourselves.

MR. SIMMONS: - the other players, Mr. Chairman, are really only part players. Indeed they come and go. One only has to look, Mr. Chairman, at the last five or six years since this government first took office.

PREMIER MOORES:

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, we had a tremendous lecture from none other than the Premier not too long ago about decorum.

MR. HICKMAN: And a very good one from the member for the Straits.

MR. SIMMONS: And a very good one from the member for the Straits.

MR. NEARY: We never got a slap in the side of the head yet.

MR. SIMMONS: And I wish, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier would listen to not only what the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) said, but what he said, and perhaps we could get on with the business of this Committee. And if you are looking for culprits, and I am not anxious to point fingers, but I would suggest that any list of culprits when it comes to lowering the dignity of the House, would be topped by the Premier himself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other people on his team, his so-called - remember the great billboard signs painted in Ontario and put up in Newfoundland, "The Moores Team." They are all part players, the ones who sit here tonight, the ones who have come and gone. In six years they have had - the present member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), no longer in the Cabinet; the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Cheeseman, no longer

MR. SIMMONS: in the Cabinet; the former Minister of Finance and other portfolios, Mr. Crosbie, no longer in the Cabinet; the former Minister of Education, the present member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), no longer in the Cabinet; the present member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the former Government House Leader, the Minister without Portfolio, no longer in the Cabinet; the former Minister of Finance and other portfolios, Mr. Earle, no longer in the Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

April 13, 1978

Tape 1005 (Night)

EC - 1

MR. SIMMONS: I will come back to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: That is the story about a lot of those guys and I will come back to that one.

The present member for Kilbride, the former Minister without Portfolio, no longer in the Cabinet (Mr. Wells); the former Minister of Health, Dr. Rowe, no longer in the Cabinet; all these, with the exception of Mr. Earle, did not go down through defeat - they were either run out of Cabinet, forced out of the Cabinet or decided -

PREMIER MOORES: Dr. Pottle is not here either.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the last six years and the Premier can try to detract all he wants. Dr. Pottle - true - was not in his Cabinet and probably would have had too much sense to go into his Cabinet.

PREMIER MOORES: What do you know about Cabinet?

MR. SIMMONS: I know that the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) was in the Premier's Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: - have been -

MR. SIMMONS: I know very little about the Cabinet and that is where the Premier and I have something else in common, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: The Premier knows very little about it either.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not attend it because I can not, he does not because he will not.

PREMIER MOORES: There is one difference, though: you never will.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, ha! I do not attend because I can not, he does not because he will not.

April 13, 1978

Tape 1005 (Night)

EC - 2

MR. NEARY: Do not be so cocky now!

MR. SIMMONS: But as soon as they start holding the Cabinet meetings in Florida somewhere he will be there.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier will get his wings -

MR. SIMMONS: The present member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. Crosbie -

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, were you not impressed by the Premier's statement about dignity of the House? Look at Mr. Dignity, himself, now, Mr. Chairman; here he is, an example for all.

MR. F. ROWE: Bring out the handkerchiefs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Bring in your band! Bring in your band and make it a bit livelier!

MR. F. ROWE: You do not need a band when you have a mouth like that across the way.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: Seven members of the famous Moores team kicked out, rooted out, got smart enough to leave, whatever the case may be.

PREMIER MOORES: They were not even Reform Liberals.

MR. SIMMONS: They may have been - I will not say it, Mr. Chairman.

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Do not get personal now.

MR. SIMMONS: Why is the Premier so touchy these days, Mr. Chairman? I only suggested that he ought to bear the brunt, that his is the guy's salary we should reduce, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: If you are going to pay a fellow what he is worth, do not pick on the poor Minister of Forestry until you pick on the fellow who is responsible for the mess we are in; talking about planning and priorities and getting up, as the Minister of Transportation does and making statements that 'they may be maligned'; talking about the senior Civil Service. Well, perhaps they are maligned. I do not know who is doing it; we are not doing it. I heard the Premier make a crack at it by trying to blame the so-called blueprint on them. That is maligning them.

PREMIER MOORES: You do not believe the blueprint, do you?

MR. SIMMONS: I do not believe in pipe dreams! I do not believe almost anything the Premier puts out after the promises he made in Harbour Breton about a trawler fleet. Where is the trawler fleet? Where is the hospital extension for Grand Falls that he promised?

PREMIER MOORES: Why do you not go back and run for the N.D.P.?

MR. SIMMONS: Forget all that now, Mr. Chairman, the Premier will not face up to a couple of realities. The Premier has no credibility in this Province and he knows it - no credibility in Grand Falls. He is not a man of his word anymore - the word has gone out - not a man of his word; no hospital extension for Grand Falls although he said, 'No question about it, next year it is going to be there.' No trawler fleet for Harbour Breton although he staked his reputation on the line - indeed, said that night in the hall at Harbour Breton -

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman (inaudible) the Auditor General will find out.

MR. SIMMONS: It is hard enough to compete with the other crowd, boys.



MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, no trawler fleet, failed to straighten out the timber limits with Bowaters although he promised to do it - how can you believe blueprints anymore from the Premier? How can you believe anything the Premier says anymore?

AN HON. MEMBER: Dream on!

MR. SIMMONS: He has a track record of an absolute big, fat zero on every promise he has made. Where is the full employment he told us about in October of 1971? Full employment! Imagine the irresponsibility of a man who would even promise that let alone believe in it or expect anybody else to believe in it! Full employment!

PREMIER MOORES: I would not say that any more than Mr. Trudeau.

MR. SIMMONS: In the Fall of 1971 he promised full employment. Now the first question is, Why would anybody be so irresponsible as to promise it? Why would anybody be so stunned as to think that the people of Newfoundland are that gullible? He could have said 5 per cent unemployment - no, he was going to have full employment. The Utopia was going to come the day after he took office. Well, there is your Utopia, Mr. Chairman! There is your Utopia - a man who cannot even control the troops! Let him leave the Province for a day and his minister is sitting up until three o'clock in the morning talking to press officers.

MR. H. COLLINS: Burn your boats in the process.

MR. SIMMONS: Where are the hospitals?

MR. NEARY: Close the bar on the other -

MR. SIMMONS: And where, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to talk about five-year blueprints, where is another five-year blueprint that was announced in August of 1975, a five-year roads plan for the Province? Show us

April 13, 1978

Tape 1005 (Night)

EC - 5

MR. SIMMONS: that five-year blueprint,  
Will you? Where is that one?

MR. MORGAN: In the third year.

MR. W. ROWE: Into the third year.

MR. SIMMONS: Into the third year. I will  
tell you about the first year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: After the contractor was  
awarded the contract,

MR. P. SIMONS:

he goes and gets paid an amount of money to move his equipment from a Liberal district down into my hon. friend, the member for St. Mary's (Mr. W. Carter) PC district so that he could get the work done before the election.

SOME NON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. P. SIMONS:

You want to talk blueprints.

SOME NON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. P. SIMONS:

And then the Premier has the gall to stand there and malign this Public Service and blame that so-called blueprint, that pipe dream on those respectable, qualified people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us keep in mind that the people in the Public Service are not decision makers; they implement the decision, but they cannot take the responsibility if they are answerable to a government that keeps changing its mind. Today we will build a hospital in Grand Falls because there is an election, tomorrow I do not think we will do it. Today we will announce a trawler fleet for Harbour Breton because there is a by-election; tomorrow I do not think we will do it.

PREMIER MOORES: We cannot get the licenses to do it.

MR. P. SIMONS:

How can you, Mr. Chairman -

You need a licence for the hospital in Grand Falls?

MR. BEAKI:

Liquor licence only.

MR. P. SIMONS:

Is that the problem, the Premier cannot get a licence for Grand Falls.

SOME NON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. P. SIMONS:

He got a licence for the golf course in Gander. He got a licence for that, the golf course in Sander. He got a licence for the golf course.

MR. S. HEARY: No, California he has got the licence for the golf course.

MR. R. SIMONS: I am talking about your priorities, while you cannot find enough money to put an extension on a hospital in Grand Falls, you can find \$250,000 for a golf course in Gander in 1975 and your minister, the present Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation (Mr. Hickey), can commit, as he did in a speech in January in Gander, another \$500,000, another half million dollars for a golf course in Gander. And this crowd preaches to us about restraint, Mr. Chairman, about planning and priorities!

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible) in Terra Nova.

MR. R. SIMONS: The Feds are not answerable to this House and I would just as have what little time -

PREMIER MOORES: Are you suggesting you are not answerable to the Feds?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. SIMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Premier can try and change the subject. Well, they will not turn it down. They will not have to turn it down, Mr. Chairman, because if their track record on this is the same as it is on others, it will go back into a dropped balance in Ottawa because this crowd did not get around to making the appropriate applications.

MR. MORGAN: This hon. crowd.

MR. R. SIMONS: This hon. crowd and the member for Bonavista South did not get around to making the applications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: You are really tonight.

MR. R. SIMONS: Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not let your denturist stuff fall out now.

MR. R. SIMONS: What is wrong with everybody?

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible) personalities.

MR. P. ROSE: Watch out now, you got a hair out of place, you got a hair out of place.

MR. FLIGHT: You are next to go.

MR. P. SIMONS: I would love, Mr. Chairman, to have some television here tonight if only to show the public of Newfoundland that pretty face over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: The next to bounce the Minister of Tourism.

MR. P. SIMONS: All ready? All ready now? Chairman, you will excuse me if I pause once in a while but I am worried about the blood pressure of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

MR. J. MORGAN: My blood pressure is okay.

MR. P. SIMONS: And we have to give him just a minute to regain his balance once in a while.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. P. SIMONS: Mr. Chairman, I was up to the great Liberal Convention in Ottawa a couple of months ago. Tremendous success. Tremendous success that convention was, but one of the results of it was that they mailed out, I presume to all persons who attended the convention, a questionnaire trying to assess the success or otherwise of the convention.

PREMIER MOORES: The ones who can read and write.

MR. P. SIMONS: The ones that can read and write, so the Premier did not get one..The Premier did not get one.

Mr. Chairman -

MR. RIDEOUT: Brian Mulroney is going to bring him down one.

MR. P. SIMONS: And one of the questions, Mr. Chairman, one of the questions asked who had the most influence - we are talking now about the Federal Government - what group or individual had the most influence on policy and they listed the Prime Minister and the Cabinet and the Caucus and the party and the general public and the bureaucracy there were six or seven items in the list. And having thought about it, I found myself, in terms of ranking them, I found myself numbering

MR. SIMMONS:           bureaucracy one. I think it is happening on the federal level to a very serious degree and I believe we are getting into the same thing here in this Province where the bureaucracy - now that statement will be interpreted as being an attempt to malign people and that kind of thing. The bureaucracy in this Province and at the federal level, it is not unique to this particular jurisdiction, Mr. Chairman, but the bureaucracy has an overbearing influence on government policy. Now Mr. Chairman, I do not blame the bureaucracy either federally or provincially; part of the problem is that government in some respects has gotten too big, and that too is an easy statement to make because the next question is, Okay, how do you solve it? And that is not so easy to answer.

Part of the problem generates from the bigness of government itself, but part of it, Mr. Chairman, I submit, and I want to come to the provincial scene, part of it generates, issues from the vacuum at the political level, the lack of political leadership. If you say to a group of senior civil servants enough times, "Write me a paper. Give me something to read in the House. Give me something for a press conference" and you are not more specific in your direction, eventually your overriding concern is not the substance of the paper but whether it reads right.

MR. DOODY:           Reads right?

MR. SIMMONS:       Whether it reads properly.

MR. DOODY:       That is better. I thought you were coming over, you had me worried.

MR. SIMMONS:       Sematically. Oh, no. The minister and I will be together one of these days but it may well be on that side of the House and it may well not be until after the next election. But we would dearly love to have his wit if nothing else in any Liberal administration. He is a Liberal at heart -

MR. DOODY:       The day that you and I will be together is when they make Belevede a non-conformist cemetery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:   Hear, hear!

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Chairman, the role being played by the bureaucracy is a frighteningly large one. It is not an indictment of the bureaucracy, it is an exercise of the old maxim that says "If you would enlarge your authority, exercise the periphery of it." And it is easy to exercise the periphery of your authority if on the periphery there exists a vacuum, a vacuum created by an absentee Premier, a vacuum created by a lack of leadership, a vacuum created by a lack of credibility because the public record shows that what you say and what you do are two very different things.

In this Province, Mr. Chairman, the overriding reason why we are being governed to a frightfully large degree by people who are not elected at all, it is not to be blamed on them, it is to be blamed on those who were elected and failed to pursue their mandate, who broke trust with the people, who broke faith with the people who elected them in the first place. That, Mr. Chairman, is a very serious indictment and it is an indictment that I put to this particular government, I feel it very strongly, and I echo the concerns and the sentiments of tens of thousands of people throughout this Province tonight who have seen the promises of 1971 and 1972 turn into the nightmare of 1978.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, first of all, Sir, before I answer the very few questions that were asked about the Action Group, and before getting into what our position is on that particular group of people and their function, I would like to clarify one question that was bandied back and forth earlier. It is on the telephone bill, Sir. Just for information, the total telephone bill of the Opposition for twelve months, February to February was \$128,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: The phone bill, Sir, for the government members was \$31,000. And I might say, Sir, that the leading telephone account, Sir, was 737-3392, which is the telephone number for the hon.

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 1007 (Night)

Ad - 3

PREMIER MOORES: member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) which was  
\$5,700 which is the highest of any member in the House.

MR. MORGAN: What!

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh my God!



SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: A misuse of government funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier, of course, through innuendo is trying to say -

AN HON. MEMBER: He gave the facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier through innuendo is trying to say there is something wrong with the telephone bill.

PREMIER MOORES: I gave the facts.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier is giving facts, but what I am challenging the hon. Premier on, Sir, on my point of privilege is this: The hon. Premier is leaving the impression there that there is something wrong with the Opposition's telephone bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: I did not say that.

MR. NEARY: No, The hon. the Premier did not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, if the hon. the Premier did not say that, well then I do not have any point of - it is a fact. What about ministers telephone bills? Is that included in that total?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. NEARY: Only members, but not the ministers.

MR. RIDEOUT: (Inaudible) verify that.

MR. NEARY: Not the ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are twenty of us involved in that, there are only seven or eight over there.

MR. NEARY: So the ministers are not included in that total.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

My understanding is that the point of privilege that might have been raised, the question in that regard has now been resolved.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: That is right, Sir, Sensitivity is not a point of privilege.

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

PREMIER MOORES: Pardon? No, that is another one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, at the very least, and perhaps a point of privilege, I do not know, I need perhaps the advice of the House on this matter. But, Mr. Chairman, the Premier's statements cannot be allowed to stand without -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a point of order!

MR. SIMMONS: Well, let us hear my point of order first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Let us hear my point of order, first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The Chair must hear the point of order before it can judge one way or the other.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, what is the point of order?

MR. SIMMONS: Well wait, you might learn. You might learn.

Mr. Chairman, twenty members in the Opposition for \$120,000 that is about \$6,000 each, plus there are other employees of the public service in the Opposition Office,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: But I mean if you take it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Only \$6,000.

MR. SIMMONS: Hold on now! Hold on now! If you take it in terms -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Hold on! Hold on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: If you take it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Hold on now! Hold on now! Mr. Chairman,  
I am preambing -

MR. NEARY: We represent districts -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am preambing, I cannot  
get a chance to make my point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: On what?

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

I think the hon. member should be given the opportunity to  
make his order, but I would also ask the hon. member if he would make  
the order with due dispatch.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I will exercise all the dispatch  
I can, if members on the other side would do likewise. The Premier, in  
fairness to the House and to the public, should point out as is my  
assumption, I would assume that the Minister of Transportation, for  
instance, does not distinguish between phones and run down to the  
government office when he wants to call a constituent. And therefore  
the only members on the government side who are using the Government  
Common Room phones or office phones are four or five members who are  
not on the Premier's payroll.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: It is a most - it is a most -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Can I state my point of order now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: That is not a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Unless the hon. member has a further  
point to make I would -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, my point of order,

MR. SIMMONS: and as a preamble I had to point out that the Premier's statements are very misleading. And that is my point of order. The Premier has deliberately misled the Committee, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: -and should be asked to withdraw.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: I would ask that the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) be instructed by the Chair to unconditionally withdraw that remark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: On points of privileges -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, you cannot have two points of order at the same time, and I have raised a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SIMMONS: I have raised a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. House Leader rose on a point of privilege. I do have to rule, however, that it does not constitute a point of privilege. It was a point of order. There was a point of order already before the Chair so I am not permitted actually to entertain that particular point. But I think I can rule on the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir's point that he raised, that similarly I do not think that I could recognize that as a point of order. It clearly is a difference of opinion as to the import of the figures quoted, but this does not really get into the area of breaking the rules of this Committee. If hon. members on either side of the House take different meanings from figures quoted, I am afraid the Chair cannot enter into determining which is the correct meaning.

MR. NEARY: On a point of privilege.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: A point of personal privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of personal privilege has come up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to, because of the innuendo, Sir, and the snide remark that was made by the hon. the Premier in singling out my telephone bill, Sir, which was not the highest in case the hon. the hon. -

PREMIER MOORES: It was the highest.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it was not. That is a false statement, Sir. But I do want to ask this, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the -

MR. HICKMAN: Anytime at all.

MR. NEARY: I want to ask the protection of the Chair, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And I want to get it on the public record.

MR. HICKMAN: What?

MR. NEARY: - so there will be no misunderstanding, Is the Premier laying any charges? Is the Premier saying there is anything wrong with the telephone bill?

PREMIER MOORES: I was not ruled out of order.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I want the answer because that is my personal -

PREMIER MOORES: Do you want the information on the Action Group or do you just want to waste time?

MR. NEARY: No, I want the -

PREMIER MOORES: You do not want the information (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I want -

PREMIER MOORES: All you care about is your own personal bit. Now sit down and get the Action Group on the table instead of being a selfish person here who wants to dominate the House by points of order and look after your own hide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: My point of privilege is this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think that the hon. member has brought up a point of privilege. My understanding is that he has stated his point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: My point of personal privilege is this, Mr. Chairman, that I want the hon. the Premier to clear up this matter, otherwise

MR. NEARY: It could be misunderstood and misinterpreted. Is the Premier saying there is anything wrong with the Opposition telephone bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: It is a very serious matter, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! I think the point at issue here is really the same that I ruled on a short while ago in terms of a point of order. That is that figures have been quoted; now what these figures mean is open to a certain amount of interpretation unless there are further figures quoted or conclusions drawn from them. My memory is that figures were quoted but no conclusions were drawn and I cannot entertain either points of order or points of privilege unless there are further matters preceeding in the Committee.

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the kind of innuendo that has gone on here in the past few minutes. The Premier has told the Committee that the government members have spent \$31,000 on telephones. That is a lie, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: The backbenchers have, but that is a lie. Now that is a lie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: All the members on that side \$31,000, nonsense, absolute nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: I move that the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) be named, There should be no equivocation on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! When the Chairman calls for order, whether the hon. members feel they can agree with that call or not, I am afraid that the hon. members do have to heed the call from the Chair. Order was called, the hon. member arose on a point of privilege and in actual fact I think that the point he was bringing up was the one that was already ruled on in terms of a point of order. I cannot see that there was a difference from the point that was brought up in terms of points of order. So I am unable to accept that as a point of privilege and I am unable to rule further on it because the rule has already been made.

I recognize the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Before hearing any further point I have to point out that, and I will quote the authority if I am required to do so, but from memory I do have to point out that the Chair, at some point in time, has to judge whether points of order are being raised either frivolously or needlessly, repetitiously, and points of order can themselves be disorderly. So I just bring this to hon. members' attention that if the Chair decides that points of order are being raised where there is no substance to them, and particularly if they are similar or indeed identical to points of order on which a ruling has already been made, I would have to rule such an hon. member bringing up these points of order again, I would have to rule him out of order and not only would I have to rule him out of order but if it was persisted in, I would have to take a graver view of the matter.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege has been raised.



MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, we can do this in a confrontation way or I can be allowed to quietly make my point of privilege which I feel very strongly about at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I feel so strongly about it, I feel so strongly about the point of privilege I am about to raise, that if I am wrong in the allegation I make, and this can be proven by an enquiry, if I am wrong in the allegation I make I will resign my seat in the House.

Mr. Chairman, here is my point of privilege,  
if

MR. SIMMONS: the Premier's figure of \$31,000 is the total figure that all members on the government side of the House have used in conducting their business, then I will resign my seat.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, my point of privilege is this, that the Premier in giving that figure has not given nearly the whole telephone bill for the government and therefore, Mr. Chairman, has misled the Committee.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: And I am prepared to move the appropriate motion. I believe I have established a prima facie case.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, to that point of privilege, for clarification - and the hon. the House Leader will speak on the legitimacy of it or not - I find it very unfortunate we cannot go into the more meaningful things in this House, but what I said was there was \$128,000 spent by the Opposition members. I said there was \$31,000 spent by the government members as opposed to ministers. And that is exactly what I said.

MR. SIMMONS: Precisely. Would the Premier permit a question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a point of privilege.

PREMIER MOORES: No, but let us not debate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I think it is clear that this is an issue that raises strong feelings, and possibly at another time it might be appropriate to debate it at some length, but I hope hon. members will agree with me that this does not seem to be the time, and

MR. CHAIRMAN:(Dr.Collins) in actual fact, what was stated up to this point were just bald figures. I think that the confusion that is arising comes out of the fact that interpretations are put on that. Now if interpretations are stated in the House, the Chair will be in a position to rule whether there are points of order or points of privilege arising out of them; but until such interpretations are stated in the House, the hands of the Chair are tied. One has only heard bald figures and I would hope that hon. members of the Committee will not engage in debate on matters that are really not before the Chair. I would also point out that we only have a minute left in this heading, so I would recognize the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: If I might, if it is agreeable to the other side, I would like if there is unanimous consent to go until 11:00 P.M. and discuss the Action Group, which was the purpose of this thing and not this bantering back and forth, but that obviously has to have unanimous consent.

MR. NEARY: Lay the information on the table, Mr. Chairman.

PREMIER MOORES: I am asking for a chance to get up and say it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I have to inform the Committee that the time for this heading has elapsed.

On motion, 302-01 through 306-02-01, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The Committee is having a little difficulty in transacting its business.

On motion, 306-02-02 through  
307-02-03, carried.

On motion, Head 3,  
Executive Council, all items without amendment, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: I raised a point of order that  
was not dealt with. At one point during the accusations  
and calling back and forth across the House, in the hearing  
of everyone, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir  
(Mr. Simmons) said the Premier lied. The hon. gentleman  
from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir also subsequently said in this  
Committee just about one minute ago that the hon. the  
Premier misled this Committee -

MR. MORGAN: Deliberately misled.

MR. HICKMAN: - deliberately. These two  
statements are absolutely unparliamentary, cannot be  
tolerated in any legislative assembly, and I ask that the  
Chairman take the necessary disciplinary action.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, Your Honour  
will hear debate on this matter, I presume?

Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend  
made statements and I am sure that my hon. friend will  
clarify it if he is given the opportunity, not because  
the Minister of Justice, the Government House Leader, the  
Minister of Finance, gets up and demands that Your Honour  
take certain action that Your Honour has to take it. We  
follow the rules of the House. The Minister of Justice,  
the Government House Leader does not make the rules.

MR. NEARY: If you break the law outside this House, Sir, you are arrested and hauled into court. If you break the rules of this House there is an action that can be taken. And my hon. friend has every opportunity to defend himself, which I am sure my hon. friend will do.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think it was a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order raised by the hon. the Government House Leader. The phrase that was used was used in response to some information - \$31,000. I would estimate, a ballpark figure for the government would be closer to \$300,000. The Premier knows the

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 1011 (Night)

AH-1

MR. SIMMONS: difference and therefore I submitted to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that he did indeed deliberately mislead the committee.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman the point of order that is on the floor, to speak to that point of order. The fact is that the hon. gentleman from Burgeo Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) did state—and I am sure Hansard will clearly indicate that—that the Premier deliberately misled the committee, number one, and number two, the same hon. gentleman stated in the committee stage as well that the Premier had said in statements he made, "that is a lie," "It is a lie" which clearly indicates that the Premier is a liar. So, Mr. Chairman, the point on the floor is that the hon. gentleman has got to either retract these statements or be dealt with accordingly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The point of order before the Chair is whether or not the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) made certain statements and it is alleged that these statements were such that they fall into the area of being unparliamentary and therefore out of order and if so the hon. gentleman should withdraw them. I think that it is within every hon. member's memory what the statements were. If hon. members would also remember the context, the committee — indeed the House—deals with matters of governance of the Province and matters that are important to the people of the Province, but also this House and this committee also deal with political matters. Political matters are ones that engender strong feelings, they engender heat, they engender strong opinions and they are not of the same order as the actual business of governing the Province and running the House from that point of view and the committee from that point of view. So I think that it would be well to remember the context in which remarks are made. However, even remembering the context, the decorum of the House demands that certain things not be said. It is within my memory, and I am sure within the hon. member's memory and all hon. members' memories that certain remarks were made in the context that I mentioned. To preserve the decorum of the House and to preserve the image of the House, I feel that the hon. member would do a service if he would withdraw those particular remarks

April 13, 1978

Tape No. 1011 (Night)

AH-2

MR. CHAIRMAN: that were made in the way that I mentioned.

The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have no doubts at all that my charge is a true one. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that in verbalizing my conviction I voided the rule of the committee and of the House and therefore without qualification I withdraw the remark although I deeply believe it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The Chair asked the hon. member if he would withdraw the remark but I am afraid the Chair cannot do anything with the beliefs of hon. members. These are, I would submit, personal matters I asked the hon. member if he would withdraw remarks which were clearly and unequivocally unparliamentary and my understand is that he has withdrawn them completely.

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, and have directed me to report having passed Estimates of Expenditure under the following headings: XV - Industrial Development, and III - Executive Council, all items without amendment, and to report having made further progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have passed all headings of expenditure under heading XV - Industrial Development, heading III - Executive Council, have made further progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M. Those in favour "Aye". Contrary "Nay". Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.

I should on behalf of hon. members wish many happy returns of the day to the hon. gentleman who is Deputy Chairman of Committees and express the view that it will be many years before his competitors will have an opportunity to lay their tender hands on him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!