

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, MAY 15, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to
present a petition on behalf of 2,035 residents in my
own district and surrounding districts. The petition,
Mr. Speaker, is sponsored by the Port Blandford to
Winter Brook Rural Development Committee, a recently
formed development committee representing eleven
communities in the Southern half of the Terra Nova
district and representing some 5,000 people.

As indicated earlier, the
petition has 2,035 signatures on it and is accompanied
by letters of support from the Port Blandford -
Musgravetown Lions Club, the Loyal Orange Lodge and the
Cambridge Kinsman Club, the Town Council of Musgravetown
and the Town Council of Port Blandford.

The prayer of the petition,
Mr. Speaker, reads thus: "To the hon. House of Assembly,
the petition of we, the undersigned, being residents of
and electors in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador,
humbly request that the government allocate funds in this
fiscal year to start a programme of reconstruction, upgrading
and paving of the present roads from the intersection of
the Trans-Canada Highway - Port Blandford to the intersection
of the Cabot Highway, Lethbridge, the present road from
Lethbridge through Brooklyn and Jamestown to Winter Brook
and the road from Musgravetown to Canning's Cove." So
actually we are talking about three major road systems,

MR. LUSH: the road from Port Blandford to Musgravetown, the road from Musgravetown to Canning's Cove and the road from Lethbridge through Brooklyn, Portland, Jamestown and Winter Brook. Actually, the petition is worded in such a way that the petitioners see this road, the Port Blandford to Musgravetown road and the other roads as one road, if you will, a continuation of the one road. But all of these roads are linked to the Musgravetown to Port Blandford road which provides the major link to the Trans-Canada Highway for the residents of these communities. This road system also provides a major link, the the most economical link for Westward bound traffic for residents of the district of Bonavista South and Trinity North, and several hundreds of the signatures on this petition come from these areas.

Mr. Speaker, the Port Blandford to Winter Brook Rural Development Committee have some interesting plans for the development of the area concerned, but in their estimation the development of the area is contingent upon a good road system, a good transportation system, because many of the industries in the area are of the nature that demand a good road system, for example, logging and lumbering, agriculture and fishing and then tourism. And this has certainly heightened in the last few weeks with the announcement of the golf course going in the Southern part of the park located in Port Blandford. And if we are to reap the full benefits from this development, then certainly there has to be a good road transportation system. And certainly contingent upon the development of the Bonavista South district - plans announced by the Minister of Tourism to set up Trinity as an historic village, certainly it is important that this road be developed to give tourists an easy access to that area of the Province.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, this is the third time that I have presented a petition from the people of this area to have their roads paved, and the member who represented the district before me, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, I know that he presented petitions many times on behalf of the people concerned as well. And, Mr. Speaker, the people's patience is beginning to wear thin. They have a right to a good transportation system. They are taxpayers and they have been aggravated and frustrated by the amount of road paving in adjacent districts, witnessing the taxpayers' dollars of this Province being

MR. LUSN: , spent all around them, and yet nothing being done in their own area. Mr. Speaker, the petition identifies two major reasons for the reconstruction and upgrading and paving of the roads. One is to develop the economic opportunity and, I think, all hon. members will agree that it is absolutely essential that we follow this requirement and this be a prerequisite. The area identified in this petition has tremendous economic potential, tremendous economic potential but it is contingent certainly upon a good road transportation system. And secondly, for social reasons students having to use the roads daily to be commuted back and forth to schools, the use by the general public of carrying on their business, travelling over these roads daily. So, Mr. Speaker, the two major reasons advanced in this petition, the economic opportunity and the social reasons, the rights of the people to expect good roads.

Mr. Speaker, the committee met with the Minister of Transportation sometime ago and discussed this problem, discussed this petition and I must say we had a very congenial meeting with the minister and I would trust that when he stands to speak in support of this petition that he will refer to some of the points raised at that meeting. Mr. Speaker, in closing let me say that I support the petition wholeheartedly and hope that the minister will be able to see his way clear to be able to start, to make a beginning of the paving of this road this year. Nobody expects all of those roads to be done in the one year, the people are reasonable but they would like to see a start, and the Rural Development Committee would like to see a start so that they can get on with the plans that they have in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that it be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the appropriate department.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague for Terra Nova (Mr. Lusn). I believe the petition is signed by more than 2,000 people, 2,035 residents

Mr. AIDLOUT: of that area in response to a drive undertaken by the Port Blandford-Winterton Development Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the prayer of the petition is very reasonable and it has laid out very well and very clearly, the situation facing those 2,000 odd residents of that part of our Province. As they say in their petition the reconstruction and upgrading of the three road systems involved provide the major link to the Trans Canada highway for that particular area of the Province and serves, from what I can understand from the prayer of the petition, a very large portion of the Province located in three or four electoral districts, I believe, the district of Terra Nova, Bonavista South and Trinity North. So, Mr. Speaker, it is a very important petition yet the prayer of the petition is so reasonable that I cannot see how the minister can refuse to take some action on it this particular year.

Mr. Speaker, what the cry of the petition, the prayer of the petition actually boils down to is asking the government to invest dollars into the resource development of this particular area of the Province which, if you are to listen to the government, is actually their intention. This is not investment into social policies or things of that nature, but it is actually investment into the resource development of the Province because building roads, reconstructing roads and paving roads is actually building up the infrastructure that will lead to the further economic development of that particular area. The economic opportunities related to tourism, related to the transportation of fish and fish products and all those kind of things, Mr. Speaker, are very important when we talk about developing the infrastructure of a particular area.

So the prayer of the petition, Sir, is very reasonable. They are not asking that it all be done in one particular construction year, they are asking that a beginning be made, they are asking that some sort of concrete start be made so that they can see that their needs are taken care of. I think the prayer is very reasonable, I take pleasure in supporting it and I hope that the minister in speaking to the petition will give those people some hope that some work will be done in their area this year.

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

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). Once again we have to go over the same route, the rough roads, and the effect they are having on the economic and social development of a large number of rural areas in Newfoundland. The reconstruction and upgrading of local roads is a priority item, and I am sure the minister will hear more petitions on this subject. This is the third time of asking. I think it is about time that something was done about it. And the socio-economic development of this historic area has been too long in being developed and realized.

You cannot develop the full potential of the total area without good communications. And as so well pointed out by my friend from Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) the fisheries are very, very much dependent on that local road set up. You cannot get the big tractor-trailers to go in there and haul the product out because they cannot keep their equipment on the road. And if we could have more of these places properly developed our economic picture would not be as bad as it really is. And we are certainly dependent on fisheries for a major part of our development.

I am sure the minister realizes that and I am sure he will look at this petition in a favourable light. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

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

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague for Terra Nova, representing 2,035 citizens represented from the areas from Port Blandford to Winter Brook, the Rural Development Committee. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is very reasonable, they are asking for a start on reconstruction of three major road systems. And as has been pointed out by my hon. colleague for Terra Nova a good road system is very important if we are going to attract tourist development in this Province. Most people travelling in this Province, if we do not have a good road system, if they are coming by road and travelling about the Province will only make it a one shot

Mr. McNeil: deal, and I do not think that is the intention of this government in trying to promote tourist development.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate in supporting the petition from the citizens from my hon. colleagues district, Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my support to that of the others in supporting this petition. I might add that the total amount of road is, I think, about sixteen miles. And recently we had occasion to be informed about this road when a number of people were unable to travel this road to perform a duty on behalf of our party in Lethbridge because the roads were just too bad. And this means, really, that a lot of the ordinary interaction between communities, neighbouring communities is made much more difficult because of this road which has been neglected for so long.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the petition. Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have a petition presented pertaining to roads. It seems like every second day we have one or two, which points again, of course, to the fact that there are a large number of roads in this Province that still need to be upgraded, paved and what have you.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I am wondering, perhaps, if the allocation of money for these roads, such as the one we are talking about right now, could not be, perhaps, done in a more democratic fashion. We talk about prioritizing, putting roads on a priority list and going before Cabinet and so on. As we heard today on the radio in the news regarding the capital works, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, water and sewer projects, in particular, are prioritized and they are going to Cabinet. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, if it has not already been done with roads in this Province it probably will be done very soon.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the thing that needs to be looked at is the possibility, perhaps, rather than just having a shadow, a shadow for Highways, and Transportation and Communications on this side of the House, I wonder if we could not take it a step further and have that shadow sitting at some of the meetings, not the Cabinet meetings, obviously, but sit in on the committees that sit and prioritize these and in that way, Mr. Speaker, the people who represent fifty-four per cent of the people in this Province, on this side of the House, can know that they are prioritized. They just do not have to accept the word of a minister who decides to go to the press and say, "We have prioritized the capital works projects in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing." Or, "We have prioritized the roads in this Province." Therefore, with that shadow sitting on that committee, the shadow will know which roads have been prioritized and then, of course, Cabinet would be more or less put in a position where they would have to go on priorities and here is where the democracy comes in.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about roads here but there is something rotten I think in the state of Denmark and I think that what has been happening in this House over the last couple of weeks is symbolic of the feelings throughout this Province. The people are fed up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman he is required to relate his remarks to roads construction, with particular reference to the roads referred to in the petition.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me simply say before I sit down, that even though we saw some people on the other side there smiling at the suggestion of making sure that the priority list is adhered to, it seems to me that it is a big step forward in the case of democracy and, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is what is done in connection with this road. The need is there. The priority is there. I support the petition.

000

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: I still have a petition to present, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave to revert to petitions? Agreed.

MR. J. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 285 people from the community of Seal Cove, Fortune Bay. The prayer of the petition reads, "We the people bring to your attention via this petition, the need for medical services in Seal Cove and surrounding area. As of present there is not a medical attendant in Hermitage. However, when there is a doctor in attendance we get a bimonthly clinic service. For a community of approximately 600 people this is not an adequate service. A weekly visit is necessary to maintain a good standard of health. This is our request to you, that you would see our need for this service and help us in our need.

Perhaps it is the poor road condition which is the reason why the doctors will not commit themselves to a weekly clinic day.

As the powers that be you know that we, as voters and taxpayers, should not be deprived of, and are indeed entitled to a good medical service for ourselves, and especially our children and senior citizens. Here once again we give voice to our thoughts, and strength to our demand by signing our names below."

And this is signed by 285 persons which is just about every voter in the community of Seal Cove.

In supporting this petition, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I am very, very thoroughly familiar with the area and with the conditions which we have to contend with. My own hometown of Gaultois is served by the same medical doctor as Seal Cove, Hermitage and Sandyville are. And we did have a doctor up to about a month and-a-half ago and because of the travelling

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3101

MM - 3

MR. J. WINSOR: that doctor was required to do, some of it
by boat under sometimes rather adverse conditions. When the
weather was a bit rough, the wind was in from the Westward,
they did not like it. This doctor

MR. J. WINSOR:

happened to be a lady who is not too partial towards going by boat. So she moved down to Mose Ambrose and we are now left without a doctor in the area, especially Seal Cove where they have their clinic. I think their clinic services were reduced because of the fact that the doctor did not care too much about travelling over their famous road. And so it goes on. One thing is tied in with another. Bad communications by road makes it very difficult for the doctors to travel.

Now then, the citizens have to travel. For any medical services now they have to go to Harbour Breton, a taxi fare of \$25 for some who do not have cars and they may have to wait there for hours which means another \$25 taxi fare back, and that is \$50 plus drugs which are very expensive. It all adds up to a very sorry picture. So I have very much pleasure in supporting this petition by the people of Seal Cove.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for

Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great privilege to support this petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague on behalf of 285 residents of Seal Cove in a community with a population of 600 people. Mr. Speaker, this petition addresses itself to a most important matter, the need for improved medical services, and I believe that the people have a right to expect good medical services.

In the past, Newfoundlanders have undergone tremendous deprivation and hardship and sacrifice due to the lack of medical services, I suppose caused to some extent by insufficient numbers of doctors and in some cases because of the lack of a good transportation system,

MR. LUSH: because of the inaccessibility of many of these communities. But, Mr. Speaker, this is 1978 and I am of the firm opinion that no community in this Province should be without good medical services.

I remember when I went to that great pioneer town of Churchill Falls, one of the first things that all of the people going there would ask, Is there a good doctor there? And one of the first people moved in on the site was the doctor - indeed, moved in in advance of any other residents. One of the first people moved in was the doctor. And I am sure that they would not have gotten people to go there without first having had the assurances and the services of a doctor - good medical service, a hospital built within a year.

Mr. Speaker, relate that to our own situation where for hundreds of years people toiled away in their communities, viable communities, fishing communities, logging communities with no medical services available to them - twenty-five, thirty miles away - it is a wonder how our people carried on for so long without demanding these services: good, viable communities, taxpayers of this Province, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these people are entitled, as I said before, to good medical services. The request is not unreasonable, it is a right. And I would hope that the minister when standing to support this petition - and I hope the minister does stand to support this petition - does agree to a very reasonable request from the people of Seal Cove demanding an improved medical service, a service that they deserve and a service to which they are entitled. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the petition and hope that the minister can see his way clear to do something about it.

MR. SPEAKER:
White Bay.

The hon. the member for Baie Verte -

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to support the prayer of this petition presented by my colleague from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor).

Again, as before, I believe the prayer of the petition is so reasonable that I would have thought by this time the minister would have been up and told us that his department will certainly take the corrective measures necessary to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, when 600 people have only access bi-monthly - twice a month - to the services of a doctor, I think that certainly is a ridiculous situation. The least 600 people can expect is to have a doctor or

MR. RIDEOUT:

some other qualified medical practitioner like the nurse-doctor that they use in certain rural areas of the Province, the least they can expect is that one of those qualified medical people can make at least one trip a week to their community to care for the needs of those 600 residents. I think it is totally ridiculous that we have this type of situation in Newfoundland today, and I would hope that the minister can let us know before this day is over that his department will take the appropriate corrective measures.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the same type of approach, the same type of approach used by the Grenfell Mission in this Province could very well serve much better the medical needs of the people of the South Coast of this Province and maybe it is in this light and along this road that the minister should direct the attention of the officials in his department.

Mr. Speaker, we know that because of financial restraint there are many things that we cannot have in this Province but certainly, if we cannot have access to medical services then we may as well close up shop for what good it is going to do us. Mr. Speaker, for example, I understand that the minister's department is only funding the building of one new medical clinic in all of Newfoundland this year. We can talk about hospital cutbacks and things of that nature, but maybe we should be looking at a system of community clinics that can be adequately staffed by properly trained nurses or nurse practitioners and adequately staffed once a week or every couple of weeks depending on the needs - certainly with 600 people it should be more than twice a month where those people can receive adequate medical service. It must be very frustrating for those people, Mr. Speaker, because this is a fundamental basic need. If we cannot provide medical service to our people then, as I said, we may as well close up shop and forget it.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support

MR. WILBOUT: the prayer of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition presented on behalf of the 600 people in Seal Cove asking for more frequent and better health care facilities. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone of us in this House of Assembly must realize that the people who go around and take the trouble to deliver or distribute or whatever they may do with these petitions, the people who go around and get the signatures on those petitions, I am sure that they do not do it just for the fun that there is in it. Because in the many petitions that I have presented in this House over the last three years, from various areas of my district, the first question that I run up against or the question that arises at meetings or so on is, you know, it is a lot of work. It is time consuming to go around with these petitions and unless they expect to get something beneficial from the work that they put into getting these petitions on the go and, of course, getting them delivered here, presented in this house then the people, as I say, are not doing it just for the fun of it, there is no fun in it, they are doing it because they see a need and they are frustrated to know when and hope that, by drawing up a petition getting it presented in the house will mean that their efforts will come to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, we hear about Cabinet ministers resigning because hospitals cannot be built in various areas of this Province, and we hear about a five year plan which will be announced on September 29th of this year for hospitals in this Province. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that here are a bunch of people who are not looking for any multi-million dollar hospital, all they are looking for are the basic health care needs, needs that every Newfoundlander, I am sure, is entitled to. In that same petition, Mr. Speaker, roads were mentioned again, only last week the member, the same member presented a petition on behalf of the road that leads to that community and here

May 15, 1970

Tape No. 3103

AM-3

RR. CALLAN: in this petition they say " we cannot travel to other areas to see doctors because of the bad condition of the road" so we have it tied right in here,

Mr. Callan: bad roads leading to the community and, of course, bad medical facilities existing in the communities.

Mr. Speaker, the government cannot have it both ways. They talk about the fact that we should leave every little community the way it is, they say that resettlement was the biggest mistake in history and all of that, well if this government, Mr. Speaker, is against resettlement, and they want to see the people cling on to their small communities -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - then they should -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do believe the hon. gentlemen has significantly enlarged the area of the material alteration of the petition.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, what I was leading up to, what I was going to say is that if we are going to have these people living in Seal Cove then let us provide them with the medical facilities which they deserve and which they are entitled to, by right. Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those of the other people who have already spoken in support of this most worthy cause. It is inconceivable in this day and age that people would have to drive forty miles over the worst kind of a dirt road in order to see a nurse or a doctor.

MR. W. CARTER: Forty miles.

DR. KITCHEN: This is a disgraceful -

MR. W. CARTER: It is not forty miles.

MR. LUSH: Stop your nonsense.

DR. KITCHEN: However long it is from Seal Cove to Harbour Breton, forty miles it is?

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty miles.

DR. KITCHEN: Pardon? How far is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: They have to come back.

MR. W. CARTER: Thirteen, fourteen.

DR. KITCHEN: It is more than that. Whatever it is. Twenty miles.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty miles.

MR. J. WINSOR: It is twelve miles from that down to Hermitage.

MR. LUSH: Ten miles that is all.

MR. J. WINSOR: The minister has not been there.

MR. LUSH: And in view of the condition of the roads it is probably equated to about sixty miles, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN: The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that these days when most of the - I can understand why the people on the opposite side are not too interested because most of them come from communities where there are at least one, sometimes two or three hospitals as there are in this city here where most of the government members come from. There is a difference between living in a rural area where there is no hospital and no doctor, and living in a city where there are many doctors and many hospitals.

We are talking about a place now where people have to get in a car and bounce over the dirt road not knowing what is wrong with them, perhaps they have a bad back, perhaps their back is dislocated, and going over the road with potholes such as it is from Seal Cove to Harbour Breton is not going to improve anyone's back. And it is probably much easier for one person, i.e., a doctor in a well-equipped car to come to a place than for the people, all of the people to have to go to see a doctor.

I am very much interested, Mr. Speaker, in seeing what the minister is going to have to say on this very rudimentary, very simple request from people who deserve the service.

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

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by my colleague for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor). The petition is signed by 285 people from the communities of Seal Cove and Fortune Bay, and their request is a very simple request asking for improved medical services. I understand from the petition that one of the reasons why they are having difficulty in getting medical service is because of the inadequate road system. Again this shows the importance

MR. MCNEIL of a good road system to receive some essential services in any community.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition gladly and I do hope that the Minister of Health will stand and also support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verde-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 112 residents of Burlington in my district. Mr. Speaker, the people on the other side might be taking to heart today the old saying "Blessed are those who have nothing to say and cannot be persuaded to say it." Because, Sir, some very important petitions have been presented to the House and we do not know yet where the - particularly the ministers - stand in relation to them.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of this petition on behalf of those residents of Burlington is one and the same prayer as has been contained in many petitions presented to the House on numerous occasions during this session. And I would expect we will see many more such petitions if the House lasts much longer. It says that we the undersigned parents of Burlington strongly protest the government cutbacks in educational spending and teacher layoffs. We sincerely believe that the action taken by government in those two matters will greatly affect the quality of education in our area and throughout the Province. Thus we strongly urge the government to reconsider the stand it has taken with regard to education."

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the prayer of the petition let me say that those cutbacks as proposed by government cannot but affect the quality of education in this Province.

MR. RIDEOUT: especially in the rural areas of the Province in a district like I represent. I had the understanding from the minister when we were doing his estimates a short while ago, that none of the school boards in my particular area were to be affected by cutbacks this year. And I have been informed by one particular school board, Mr. Speaker, that that certainly is not the case and that one particular board is losing three teachers as of this moment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, and as has been said by other members, this policy of educational cutback in this Province again boils down in its effect to urban versus the rural areas of the Province. Those parts of the Province that can least afford to raise from their own sources, that have the weakest tax base, are the ones that are going to suffer from educational cutbacks, from the increased portion that the school boards must come up with for school bus transportation and so on.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is a policy of putting the cart before the horse, where you are going ahead with the cutbacks and studying the effect after. We are not dealing with a piece of wood, we are dealing with human beings whose lives could very well be impeded by this particular policy of putting it into effect and studying the effect of those cutbacks after it is done. That is the role of the task force and the task force, though very small it is, has a great job on its hands, Mr. Speaker, and it is not going to be able to report to the government in any great detail until - and they are not going to know the effects of this crazy policy of cutbacks before the harm is done.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost like building a house and after you have finished checking to see if you have built it on solid ground. That is exactly what this policy is. You do the cutbacks now, after the policy is in place then you study the situation to see if you have done any harm and in this particular case we are talking about harm to human beings and to human lives.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government would seriously reconsider, especially its effect on rural Newfoundland. As I have said on many occasions in this House, a teacher or so lost in a large central high school in a big centre of this Province may very well have no effect. But a teacher lost in a small rural community in this Province can throw the whole educational programme of that school, helter skelter and the results of it will be felt eight or ten years down the road as far as that particular crop of students go. It is a crazy policy, an insane policy, and on behalf of the 112 residents of Burlington who signed this petition, I hope that the government will reconsider.

Mr. Speaker, I table the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to stand always on a petition relating to education and teacher cutbacks in this Province and it is no exception to stand and support this petition presented by my hon. colleague on behalf of the residents of Burlington in reference to teacher cutbacks.

In speaking of these cutbacks I tried to impress upon hon. members two major effects, particularly with respect to rural Newfoundland, the part of Newfoundland to which my hon. colleague referred, the part of Newfoundland from which the petitioners come.

Mr. Speaker, the two major effects are, multiple-class situations. This is having more than one class in a particular classroom. That is one teacher taking care of two, three and four classes. And this is something we have been trying to avoid for years, getting to a one-class situation and then with reduced numbers. Because with the kind of educational demands today, there is no possible way that any teacher can work effectively with more than one class and not effectively with it, if the numbers are not reasonable. And when we have a class of thirty

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3105

MC - 3

MR. LUSH: students, thirty-five students, as so many teachers have, we compound that problem now by putting in several grades. No teacher, Mr. Speaker, can work effectively with more than one class.

I have worked in that kind of situation.

I have taught from grade six to grade eleven and know

MR. LUSH: reading specialists, guidance counsellors, and on down through the list we can go. But in these rural areas of the Province they have been tremendously discriminated against with respect to quality education and equal educational opportunity, and now with teacher cutbacks giving rise to multiple-class situations a teacher teaching two and more classes and a severe cutback in programmes and services, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the minister would see that this trend is reversed, that instead of reducing teachers that we will try and reach a respectable teacher ratio for the teachers of this Province, and more importantly for the students of this Province so that all areas can look forward to quality education and equality of educational opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition, I have no hesitancy at all in supporting it, and I would hope the minister would rise and speak to this petition.

Mr. Speaker, it is terrible to see so many ministers not rising today to speak to petitions, the great democratic right of people to petition their government, and ministers just sitting down and saying nothing with these scores of petitions - it is a sad situation. I would hope that the minister of Education would change this trend and get up and intensely speak to this petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, we have here again still another petition against the cutbacks that have been announced in the teacher supply ratio in this Province,

DR. KITCHEN: the province with the worst ratio of pupils to teachers in Canada.

This petition cannot be ignored, neither can the petitions that have already been presented under this topic be ignored, because they represent the fears of the people of the Province that their children, their boys and girls, their sons and daughters, are going to be adversely affected. This is something that we cannot ignore. There has been some argument made here previously that this represents the activities of a pressure group namely, teachers, but my experience is that you cannot force people to sign petitions. People sign these petitions because they believe in them, in most cases.

I understand also, this particular school board will lose three teachers this coming year as a result of this iniquitous policy that has been announced.

DR. KITCHEN: I am very much worried about what may happen in Burlington next year. We do not quite know what is going to happen because the programme, as it affects Burlington, has not been stated. I am sure the board has not made up its mind yet. But I am sure that the people who signed that petition would like to be reassured, or assured by the Minister of Education that he is looking at what the board will decide and he will not let them do anything that will adversely affect the people of Burlington. Maybe it is possible to save a teacher here and there. I am not going to categorically say that we cannot save teachers here and there, that would be possibly saying something that we do not know about, but if we could monitor what is going to happen here, and if the remedial reading teacher were to be cut out in Burlington say, and that were judged to be necessary, then I would like to see the minister guarantee the people of Burlington, No, Sir, we are not going to go that board, you are not going to do that way, cut out something else but you must not cut out this one.

I would like very much for the Minister of Education, who has a responsibility here to rise in his place now, the first person who will have risen in his place today to support any petition. The members opposite are like zombies in the sense that they are just there listening, wishing the dickens that the whole thing was over so that they could get on with something else. The idea that people should petition the government seems not to be able to be established or listened to by the people on the other side.

There are people honestly, seriously desiring help from the government and I think that the Minister of Education has the duty and the obligation to rise in his place and support this petition and not hide away in a corner.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition of 112 residents from Burlington. I think the request of their petition is very reasonable in that they are against the government policy of cutbacks, in the light that the government is not sure if the quality of education is going to be affected.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what will this government say if the task force clearly shows through their present policy that the quality of education is and will be affected for many years to come? What will they say? I imagine that they will follow through with their present policy and they will say that it has been the fault of the previous administration. Again a situation with the cart before the horse.

So, Mr. Speaker, I gladly stand and support the petition and I hope that the government will make an about-turn in this very important matter concerning the quality of education in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I stand and support the petition on behalf of 112 parents in the community of Burlington regarding the educational cutbacks promised by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, last week I was down in Little Heart's Ease, down in my district attending a public meeting organized by the Parent Teacher Association which takes in a half a dozen communities down that way, the high school being in Little Heart's Ease, but the pupils and parents from a half a dozen communities down in Southwest Arm. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that down in Little Heart's Ease last week the people who attended that meeting did not demonstrate that their little hearts were at ease. As a matter of fact, I would say that their hearts were rather heavy, because, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CALLAN: again I must say what somebody else has already said, it is not just teachers who are against these educational cutbacks, it is parents, it is students as well.

Some of the questions that were directed to me at that meeting last week, like the one in St. John's the week before that, Mr. Speaker, were how does the minister feel they wondered, and how can the Minister of Education, being a former educator, superintendent, and so on, how can he justify these things? And, of course, the answer is that he does not justify them at all. He has not justified them in this House. He says there will be no reduction in the quality of education, At the same time, members from his own party stand up and give examples of where there will be two classes in the one classroom where this year there will be one. If that will not result in interfering with and adding to the deminishing of quality in our educational system then I do not see why it does not. Why did we fight so hard to get to the point where we have one class per classroom

MR. CALLAN: rather than three or four or five or six or seven or eight? Mr. Speaker, we have heard all kinds of arguments in this House against educational cutbacks, all kinds of arguments. We have a task force - a couple of years ago this administration did something which I agreed with wholeheartedly and I went out into my district, attended public meetings and I explained to the people what the government were trying to do and I tried to point out to them that the government was doing the right and proper thing when they put out a white paper on snow mobilizing and all-terrain vehicles. But, Mr. Speaker, in this case the government has not gone to the people and said "We want you to give us some input. What do you think of this idea that we have?" They made the decision first, then they set up their task force second.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) last week in supporting a very, very similar petition to this one told us that in this Province of the people who start school in kindergarten thirty-four per cent complete grade eleven as compared to double that number, sixty-eight per cent, in some other Provinces like Ontario and Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I would say the figure of thirty-four per cent is even worse still, because in this Province a person successfully completes high school at grade XI but in the other provinces we are talking sixty-eight per cent of the student population completing high school which consists of grades XII and XIII, so therefore we are much further behind than these figures indicate. I do not know what it will take, Mr. Speaker, to convince the minister of Education and the administration that he is a part of, I do not know what it will take to convince him that here, if we ever saw one, is a backward step. We cannot afford it. Of course, we are spending a large amount of money. Approximately one third of our provincial budget is going towards education but, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about schools for the deaf, we are talking about universities, we are talking about an awful lot of trade schools and so on where this money goes, so it is a little bit unfair to suggest that we cannot afford to spend this amount of money.

MR. CARLSON: In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford not to spend it. What are we building on? What do we have to build on if we do not build on the youth of this Province? They are the leaders, the men and women of tomorrow. And as previous speakers today and other days have pointed out a grade XI education is a minimum standard, a minimum standard of education. The day is gone when people want to go to a friend to get someone to file an income tax return for them or to go and fill out an unemployment insurance paper or to witness a document with an X because they cannot sign their own name.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition and I hope that the government will take a second and a third and a fourth and a fifth look at this before they go ahead with the crazy scheme of cutting back education in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to very briefly add my support to this petition so ably presented by my colleague for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout). It is just a clear indication of how much dissatisfaction is rampant in Newfoundland over the education cutbacks. I have hundreds of letters in my files down there now about the same subject which will be coming up later when I get a further chance to speak on it.

If the minister is going to speak to this petition presented by my colleague for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) I will sit down. I do have another petition, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to present. Apparently the minister indicates that he does not want to reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present this petition to the Hon. House of Assembly from 244 people of Hermitage-Sandyville and the prayer reads thus: "Please find attached a petition from the people of Hermitage and Sandyville in support of a new elementary school. We feel this is a long overdue project and should be given top priority. Please consider some problems with the old school which will warrant

May 13, 1970

Page No. 3100

44-3

MR. J. WINSON: our request for the new building. The Department of Health has reported it as being unfit for kids and we would like to add that pupils from primary and elementary will easily pick up diseases in the classrooms due to poor ventilation. The fire commissioner's report is attached

Mr. J. Winsor: and this can speak for itself. Where are we sending our children? The location, the main street in the community and with the opening of the fish plant we find traffic increasing daily which leaves the avenue for accidents more common. The building is not even protected by fencing. The heating system; the furnaces are so located that if either should explode the cost incurred by building two such schools as we are asking for would fall short of the cost caused by loss of lives. We invite any member to look at this situation and we feel we would have your sympathy. The foundation of the building is now starting to crack and crumble in places, this is also very serious.

We plead with you to consider our need and urge you to act immediately. We are aware of the financial problems experienced at this time, but we feel our problem and need is something you cannot put a price tag on. Our kids depend on us, and we are depending on the Committee, and with God's help we can only hope that our kids will have a new school for September 1979 at the latest."

Now in supporting this petition I would like to read what the Fire Department has to say about it, the Fire Inspector, Mr. Ryan, ex-Fire Commissioner. "On the above date"-and this is 1977-08-02, and addressed to the Superintendent of the School Board - 'on the above date in the interest of fire prevention a life safety and inspection was carried out at the subject noted property. Structure; one story wood frame, present enrollment approximately 134 students. As a result of inspection I am to advise you that the building in question is below standard, does not meet code requirements, and under present conditions presents a hazard to life and property. My suggestion is that the services of an architectural engineer be consulted for professional advice regarding interior finish, corridor widths, exit facilities, substandard wiring and heating units, evacuation alarm system, and population density. We suggest that it is imperative that immediate steps be taken to bring the present building up to an accepted standard. Signed by F. J. Ryan and Mr. Gus Janes Fire Chief at Hermitage. "

There is a clear indication of a building that is certainly not suitable, Mr. Speaker, for children to be in. I have

Mr. J. Winsor: I've seen the building. It is an old one, the elementary school. They had a new high school built a number of years ago, and they have held off until this time. There were certain priorities, obviously, on school buildings, and they are about the last to be served in Hermitage.

And for what I have just read, I think, it is about time that something was done about this school. And I would certainly like the minister to address himself to this, if he has not to the others. And I have very much pleasure in presenting this petition and supporting it. I ask that it be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, if there was nothing said in this House today that would make a member's blood run cold it would certainly be to listen to the prayer of that petition just presented so ably by my colleague for Fortunes-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor). How the glue bound ministers can sit in their seats, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out to the hon. gentleman that debate is not allowed under the proceeding of petitions.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, I apologize, Mr. Speaker, but this is enough to upset a person. I will try to stay within the rules.

Mr. Speaker, how anybody can stay in their seat having listened to the prayer of that petition is unbelievable. When the Fire Commissioner, such a noted and respected person in the Province as the previous Fire Commissioner, Frank Ryan, can go down and inspect that building, say that it is of low standard, and then include in his report, in black and white, with the printed word, that life is at stake, that 134 students attending that school that their lives are at stake every day they go in there, that the Department of Health, the Minister of Health's Department and their officials can go down there and say that it is not fit for human habitation, Mr. Speaker, what is the point of all of this? What is the point of having the Fire Commissioner make an inspection and a report? What is the point of having the minister's officials go down and make an inspection and a report if nothing is going to come of it.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is obvious from the prayer of the petition that the school is a hazard to the lives of the children that go to school and work there. It is also obvious, Mr. Speaker, from the prayer of the petition that the location of the heating system, for example, is detrimental to the lives of the students if anything should happen to it.

I have seen schools in this Province, I have seen them in my own district, Mr. Speaker, old school buildings where when they installed central heating they went in and put furnaces one over each exit - two exits to the school and the furnace up on 2 X 6 planking, wooden planking and the furnace up over the door. How in God's name if anything should happen are those children supposed to evacuate that building out through the walls of flame that would be barring the exits from the building? Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous. It would make the blood of any member run cold to know that this type of thing is happening in our Province today.

And we are asking this House, Mr. Speaker, to vote supply to the Department of Education to be passed on to the appropriate DEC's so that it can be spent as they see fit to build or to reconstruct school buildings in this Province.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for the Minister of Education to take the bull by the horns, and in this case I mean the DEC's, and try to sit down and establish with them some sort of priority situation when it comes to the building of new schools in this Province. The type of situation that my colleague has referred to should not be allowed to go on any longer. The lives of those 134 students are too important for that, and if the minister has to use his ministerial

MR. RIDEOUT: influence with the DECs then so be it, but let us not always slough the responsibility off and shrug our shoulders and say, We give them the money but we cannot do any more. That is just a classic example, Mr. Speaker, of not wanting to carry out our responsibility. We give them the money, we vote the money from this House and let us have some input into how it is spent and where it is spent and with what priority it is spent.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of that petition and if nobody, as I have said, has risen on a petition today, then I would hope that the glue will fall off the pants of them over there and they will get up.

MR. J. CARTER: The Pampers will fall off them over there.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I again rise to support this petition.

These petitions being presented by my colleagues today, Mr. Speaker, indicate the needs of the people of this Province, the needs of the people whom we represent, and I would expect, the needs of the people that members on the government side of the House represent as well - roads and petitions related to education. And, Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the right of our people, as I have said previously, to petition their government, a basic democratic right to petition the government for the things that people feel they need. And certainly, the matters raised here today with respect to education are very serious and grave needs.

This particular petition referring to a school building - the necessity for an adequate school building to properly house students and to

MR. LUSH: see that they are provided with comfort and health and safety. I do not know whether the minister's bill on Occupational Health and Safety applies to schools or not, but if it does not it certainly seems evident from what the hon. member says that there should be some such bill that would prevent students from having to be housed in schools that are injurious to health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all suggesting that the government should have to build super-structures. I think throughout this Province that there are many cases where we have built schools that probably have been rather expensive and probably too expensive for the communities to maintain, but all hon. members here, I think, would like to know that our students are attending schools where their health and protection and safety are insured, not as the case herein referred to by my hon. colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the experience of teaching in some pretty poor buildings, some pretty inadequate buildings, buildings where the wind came whistling through, where there was no running water and no toilet facilities, and I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether there has ever been any studies done or any

MR. LUSH: research into the relationship between the structure of a building or the adequacy of a building and academic achievement. The hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) I know he has done all kinds of studies and correlations and this sort of thing. I do not know what the relationship is between school buildings and achievement, I do not know, but it seems rather obvious if a building cannot offer comfort and convenience to children. It would seem that they certainly cannot achieve very well academically if the school is cold, if there is no running water, there is no sanitary conditions in the school and there is no fire protection. I think all of these things would somehow relate to the attitude of the students, and I would think make it very difficult for a teacher to instruct rather effectively in a situation like that. It seems to me it would not be a situation very conducive to education, to the teaching-learning process. And, Mr. Speaker, if there is no research at all to support such a correlation between the condition of a building and achievement, if there were no studies at all it would seem rather logical and rather reasonable and rather sane for us all to assume that every school should offer the kind of situation that is conducive to good teaching, teaching that is going to guarantee the health and the safety of all students attending, because otherwise, I do not think it is a situation that is very conducive to learning.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely support this petition and would hope that other members on the government side would rise and support this petition as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this petition. As I understand it, the elementary school in Hermitage is a fire trap. Now my hon. colleague just mentioned about the possible relationship between buildings and achievement and I should say, and I have done a considerable amount of study in this field both in this Province and elsewhere, there is no relationship

DR. KITCHEN: between achievement and the condition of the building. There is no relationship, that it is so small in comparison with the other things, but it is not that. So why should I support the petition? I support it not on the grounds that the youngsters will learn better because the research that we have, and it is very voluminous, indicates that there is no such relationship in a general way, but I support it on the grounds that no youngster should live in a fire trap. And this is the problem with some of those old schools that had started off as one room buildings thirty or forty years ago. Somebody added a room, and then another room and then an office and then took away the office and probably put on another room and so it goes. Then someone tries to put in toilets and then puts in wiring, puts in a furnace, perhaps, and before you know it what started off as a safe little school becomes something entirely different.

Now I do not know the particular situation in Hermitage but I can imagine what it is like compared to many other schools that I have seen.

I might bring to the attention of the hon. House something in support of this petition. A study was done some years ago, I think it was about seven or eight years ago by Dr. Ralph Fisher and Dr. Phil Warren of the university who had a fairly large research grant from DREE, I think it was \$100,000 and perhaps it might have been at the time when Your Honour was the Minister of Education or perhaps even before that. They indicated, the Fisher-Warren report, that there were a number of fire traps in this Province masquerading as schools, with a very strong recommendation, if I remember the details properly, that these things should be given some priority assignment at having to be eliminated, and to eliminate them. And I was under the impression that virtually all these old fire traps had been done away with. Now it is very sad to hear that there is at least one

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 2111

211 - 3

DR. KITCHEN: fire trap left, at least one, I
could not agree more with the hon. member for Baie Verte -
White Bay (Mr. Rideout) when he says that there should be a
priority list for schools that government should have. Never mind
what the DEC has, what the government should have that says
these

DR. KITCHEN: schools have to be replaced in order to get another copper, these have to be done first. And with all due deference to my hon. colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), I believe, getting rid of a fire trap school is probably even more important than putting a gymnasium in Eastport, if there is such a thing. And that is the sort of thing, I believe, that the Minister of Education should look at. First, the old fire traps have to be done away with for the safety of the youngsters, not because they are going to learn any better, but because you have to have them safe. No one wants anything to happen. And over the years this school has probably become ever more dangerous.

I do not know what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, to get people to rise on the other side to support this thing. It reminds me of the story of the fellow who was going down the road and he saw another man there trying to get the horse to go. And he was urging him to go - 'get on', and so on, and the horse was not moving. So finally he took up a big stick of wood and hit him over the head. - 'What did you hit him over the head for, buddy? You are not going to get him to go that way.' 'No, but I got his attention.' So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should do that with the Minister of Education.

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

MR. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition.

The petition demonstrates the need for a new elementary school in Hermitage.

Mr. Speaker, when you have a school facility or a school and school programme for the quality of education, and you have in the facility itself a building that is turned

MR. McNEIL: down by the Department of Health, and worse still, turned down by the Fire Commissioner because it is a fire hazard and then have the Minister of Education or the government state that they are concerned with the quality of education and the safety of the children - it is a contradiction, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is the right of all children that they receive an education and the quality of education should be protected and it is a right to be assured personal safety in school facilities, but in a case where you have a facility that has been turned down by two different bodies, I think it is a must that the government should act immediately.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition sincerely and I would call upon the Premier to immediately support the petition and act immediately to take these children out of this fire trap.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the prayer of the petition of the residents of Hermitage and their plea for funds for an elementary school in that community. Mr. Speaker, in doing so, I might say that I am glad that members on the opposite side are not rising, especially if they rise and make suggestions such as one or two of them made last week on ways of getting facilities for our communities - selling apples and oranges from door to door and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I think the government have a responsibility. Obviously, the people in the

MR. CALLAN: communities have. But the government have the responsibility to see to it that modern day facilities are provided for our modern day people. Our people in our communities have a responsibility and I think, Mr. Speaker, that they discharge that responsibility when they pay their ten cents - eight now is it? - thanks to the federal government - when they pay their eight cents sales tax at the store and when they pay their income tax. I think the people, especially the people who live in places like Hermitage and various parts of my district where people are primary producers - they fish and farm for a living - they are turning out the new tax dollars that we badly need in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking here about a fire trap, a school that is a fire trap, it is unsafe, perhaps unhealthy. Mr. Speaker, is this government by its retrogressive action suggesting that we

Mr. Callan: should go back to the junk of wood a day times, or the bucket a day toilet? Mr. Speaker, I do not want anybody to get the impression that we are horsing around on this side of the House. But the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) referred to a horse story. There is another story about a horse, Mr. Speaker, you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. The people in this Province have led this government, this administration to the water but they are refusing to drink. They are not discharging their responsibilities as they should be doing, in this case in Hermitage, where the people are asking not for some luxurious hospital that will be under-utilized, not for some million dollar stadium that will be closed nine months of the year, not for some extravagant indoor swimming pool which will be used a couple of hours a day, they are asking for a bare necessity. they are asking for a safe, healthy place where they can send their children to get the education that they badly need in the society in which we are living today. a society that asks us to prepare our children for the future by giving them the basic education, the basic skills so that they can go on to trade schools, and universities, and then equip themselves to go out into the work-a-day world and earn a decent livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition with great pleasure, there is no question about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence.

Mr. Speaker, I wholly support the prayer of this petition and I hope that government again will see the light. Thank you.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting A Tax Upon The Consumers Of Gasoline And Other Like Liquids." Whatever the like liquids are I do not know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Other like liquids. Canada Dry -

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. And, Sir, with reference to the serious matter that I raised in the House of Assembly on Friday respecting the Director of Air Services - I think, the minister will recall that he did confirm that the Director of Air Services had gone to Texas to fly back a helicopter or assist in flying back the helicopter for Sealand Helicopters Limited - the question, Sir, I would like to direct to the minister is, would the minister confirm or indicate what say or what authority or what input the Director of Air Services has in hiring of helicopters for government services; That is, setting quotas for flying hours, time spent aloft by helicopters for government services?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the allocation of flying hours in the Air Services Division is done primarily through a major tender with which members are aware. There are other hours which will be allocated during the year over and above that. Where these can be placed in blocks sufficiently large to tender they also will be tendered. There are from time to time emergency flights, and special occasions, and special circumstances in which the person in charge at any given time of the Air Services Division will have the authority and sanction to order such a helicopter or such a chartered flight. To that extent I would assume that the Director of Air Services would be involved in that minimal area.

I would also like to take this opportunity at this particular time to bring to the attention of the House another very serious and important matter which the hon. member yesterday or Friday brought to the attention of this House, a rather crude and salacious allegation to the effect that the Director of Air Services carried a tape recorder in his shirt pocket in which he recorded the conversations of ministers while they were flying in the King Air. The Director of Air Services is not in the Province to defend himself against that charge, which I notice the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was smart enough not to repeat outside of the House. But the people -

May 15, 1978

Tape 3113 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

AN HON. MEMBER:

We made it in the House.

MR. DOODY:

in the department with whom I have spoken.

MR. LUSH:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, on that point respecting the tape recorders, the minister is saying I made an allegation. I made no allegation, I simply directed a question to the minister asking the minister to investigate something that I had found out through a process of research. I made no allegations then and I made none outside the House and I do not make any now, Mr. Speaker. So I think the minister should be asked to withdraw these remarks.

MR. HICKMAN: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice has a contribution.

MR. HICKMAN: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Those of us who were present in this hon. House on Friday morning I am sure would interpret very clearly that the manner in which the alleged question was framed by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was a bit more than a question, there was an allegation which again has been corroborated this afternoon by the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) saying that this arose out of research that he had conducted into this very serious allegation that was made. And I would suggest that the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications is very much in order in refuting this charge against a public servant who does not have the right to defend himself in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! All the Chair has to decide is whether there is an legitimate point of order and if so to rule thereon. Whether or not the hon. gentleman to my right made an allegation with respect to the Director of Air Services carrying a recording device or whether he did not is a dispute with respect to facts and/or a difference of opinion but it is not a matter on which the Chair is required or indeed can properly make any decision. It is a difference of opinion but not a matter involving the order of the House of Assembly.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege, privilege of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL: I heard what the hon. gentleman said the other day and it has now come up and the earliest opportunity is right now when this matter has been answered by the hon. the Minister of Transportation. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman prefixed his remarks by saying there was a rumour - and I think he would indicate that he said there was a rumour - he was not saying that it was definite or his research. He used the word rumour. And, Mr. Speaker, my privilege is this that this constitutes an abuse of the rules of this House casting an injurious reflection upon an individual. It is based and expressed to be based entirely on rumour, Mr. Speaker. I would contend that this is a dangerous and diabolical abuse of parliamentary immunity. It is one thing to accuse a member of this house of Assembly of improper conduct - at least he or she can be present to answer - but it is another thing altogether, Mr. Speaker, to cast reflections upon the trustworthiness and the conduct of persons outside the House, particularly if that person happens to be a public servant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to paragraph - it is much more I contend, Mr. Speaker, than a dispute between non-members, this is a statement that was made by the hon. member, Section 150 of Beauchesne sets forth the rules with respect to what a member may say and gives the wide latitude which we enjoy in this House and I quote from it verbatim: "If a member should say nothing disrespectfully to the House or the Chair, or personally opprobrious to the other members or in violation of other rules of the house, he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings or injurious to the character of individuals; and he is protected by his privilege from any action for libel, as well as from any other question or molestation." That is the general rule under which we operate, that is the parliamentary immunity. But, Your Honour, I refer you to

May 13, 1973

Tape No. 3114

PL-3

MR. WASSER: Section 141 of Beauchesne on page 123 which indicates that this immunity has to be exercised with at least a modicum of responsibility. It says and I quote in Subsection (1) "It is impossible to lay down any specific rules, in regard to injurious reflections" Now, Mr. Speaker, I am grounding this point of privilege on the fact that it was an injurious reflection. So it says that "It is impossible to lay down any specific rules, in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate against particular members, or to declare beforehand, what expressions are or are not contrary to order; such

MR. MARSHALL: depends upon the tone and the manner and intention of the person speaking; sometimes upon the person to whom the words are addressed, as to whether he is a public officer or a private member not in office or whether the words are meant to be applied to his public conduct or to his private character, and sometimes upon the degree of provocation which the member speaking had received from the person he alludes to. And all of these considerations must be attended to at the moment as they are infinitely various and cannot possibly be foreseen; Mr. Speaker, in such a manner that precise rules can be adopted with respect to them." So we are at a stage now, Mr. Speaker, where we have to come to consider what are injurious reflections on people. And I would contend that surely in this particular case that this constitutes an injurious reflection and therefore, an abuse of the parliamentary immunity. Surely, the hon. member in this case has gone beyond the pale of responsibility to this House to use his immunity in such a matter that it does not assail individuals inside and particularly outside the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: What is more serious than to use your immunity to cast reflections based on rumour against a private individual? Where will they stop short, Mr. Speaker? Will it stop short of the use of this House to wreck and tarnish the reputations of defenceless individuals? Should it be tolerated? I say, absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, and in the Chair of this House reposes the right and the duty to hold this in, to draw this to task once it has been drawn to Your Honour's attention. Having assailed the reputations of members in this House is it now the policy of the Opposition to proceed against the public at random?

MR. MARSHALL: This, Mr. Speaker, is parliamentary tyranny at its zenith, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw and to apologize to this House for the abuse of the abuse of the rules that this House is operating under and at the same time to publicly apologize to the individual concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, these tactics must cease. They have to cease, or otherwise where is this going to stop? Are we now going on a raid at random against individuals outside of this House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for

Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: To that point of privilege which is not a point of privilege at all, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the hon. member did not rise at the earliest time which would have been Friday, and if not Friday, certainly at the beginning of today's session, which is an obvious attempt to waste the Question Period. And the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) certainly slept on his rights. He did not raise this point of privilege at all at the earliest time, and Mr. Speaker, I submit it is not a point of privilege.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I will take the matter under advisement and give a decision on it later.

A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. the minister did indicate that the Director of Air Services may have some input into the quota of hours established and

MR. LUSH: my supplementary is, Even though the Director of Air Services performed this particular job during his own time, during his annual leave, would the minister agree that no civil servant in such an important position can wear two hats, one hat while in the employment of the government and a different hat while on leave? Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this particular situation, the one referred to, must be a glaring example of conflict of interest. So can the minister comment on that situation?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is alluding to the Director of Air Services again, I would think. The Director of Air Services has been an employee of the Province of Newfoundland for a great many years, certainly long before this administration took office, and I would hope that he will be an employee of the Government of Newfoundland for many years to come.

We have had no indication or suspicion that the gentleman is anything but a man of sterling character, one who can be trusted implicitly and one who has not demonstrated either to this administration or to

MR. DOODY: our predecessors that anything other than this was the case. If proof can be found to the contrary then certainly action would be taken to the contrary. Certainly we have absolutely no intention of reprimanding, removing, firing or otherwise disqualifying the gentleman from the lawful exercise of his duties unless we have absolutely certain grounds under which to do it. We have no reason to believe the man will do anything but a fair and reasonable job. If hon. members opposite feel that they have information to the contrary, I would be certainly glad to entertain it and to look at it. Certainly the fact that he carries a page boy beeper in his top pocket, as do all the pilots in the Air Services Division, is certainly not cause either to fire him nor to have his name cast around this House the way it has been over the past several days.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: The point referred to by the minister is not the question that I had asked, Mr. Speaker. I will ask the minister another question. It seems rather strange and peculiar that any person would pay their own expenses to carry out a service for another person or another company, so my question to the minister, is the minister convinced that the Director of Air Services did perform this particular task of ferrying a helicopter from Texas at his own expenses?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: I am not absolutely certain that the gentleman actually ferried the helicopter from Texas. I know that he was one of those who participated in the ferrying of a helicopter from Texas. I have no doubt at all that this was done at his own expense. To the effect that I have no information to the contrary, I know that the Director of Air Services is a pilot, and has been a pilot

MR. DOODY: For a great many years. I know that he has been interested in obtaining a helicopter pilot's licence for some time. I know that he has been trying to log as many hours in helicopter work as he can on his own time. I know that he is somewhere in excess of 100 hours right now which he finds very satisfying. I think that this is the motivation which impelled him to take on this particular project. To the best of my knowledge that is entirely the story. If I find that it is otherwise then I shall take appropriate action. I think if hon. members opposite have reason to believe that it is otherwise they should inform me or other members on this side of the House so that appropriate action can be taken. But I see absolutely no point in further pushing around the name and the reputation and honour of that gentleman who has been in the government employ for a great many years. I see nothing that can be gained by public conversation and I do not think there is any point in pursuing it further unless something material can be demonstrated.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: The minister on Friday made reference to the fact that the Director of Air Services was reprimanded or disciplined. Could the minister indicate to the House when the gentleman was reprimanded or disciplined? Was it immediately after the incident or was it one week ago, two weeks ago, just when was the Director of Air Services disciplined?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I do not remember or recall ever having suggested that the Director of Air Services was reprimanded or disciplined. I do recall having informed the House that the Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications upon learning of the Houston to St. John's helicopter trip, wrote a letter to the Director of Air Services suggesting to him

MR. DOODY: that in his position as Director of Air Services there might be some people in the Province who could construe this as a possible cause of conflict of interest some time in the future and advised him that it would not be in his best interests to do this sort of thing again.

What the actual date and time of that particular letter was I really do not know, Your Honour. I do not have it on the top of my head. It is not one of the more pressing items on the agenda at the present time.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: The minister indicated then that there was a letter sent to the Director of Air Services.

MR. DOODY: I indicated that on Friday.

MR. LUSH: Would the minister be willing to table that letter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that a letter had been sent from the deputy minister to the Director of Air Services. I indicated the same thing on Friday. I think that my word in this matter should be sufficient for the hon. House. I have absolutely no intention of tabling inter-departmental correspondence between the deputy minister and one of his directors, not at this point. Certainly not at any point if it can be avoided.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: I wonder if the minister could indicate whether the Director of Air Services has use of a government car carte blanche use? To my knowledge no civil servant, no one other than the Premier of the Province has total and full use of a government car. So could the minister indicate whether the Director of Air Services does have access to a government car?

May 13, 1973

Tape No. 1116

001 - 4

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: I would sincerely hope not, Sir. I know the Director of Air Services has a car at his disposal when he is on call and on duty and he has to be ready for emergency flights out to various hospital calls and so on. I would sincerely hope that this is not used for private operations,

MR. DOODY: joy rides or Sunday afternoon drives or what have you, which is what the indications are from across the House. It is something that I will look into and if it is the case then certainly it will be stopped. But I certainly do not have any indication that this is so.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: The minister indicated on Friday, I think it was, that he would check into the accumulated annual leave of the Director of Air Services, and I wonder if he has done this to ascertain just what the situation is respecting the annual leave of the Director of Air Services?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully refer Your Honour and the House to Hansard. I made absolutely no commitment to look into the annual leave or the accumulated annual leave of the Director of Air Services, the Director of Transportation, the Director of Communications or any of the other directors, or officials, clerks, stenographers, security people, drivers or anybody else in the department, I will leave that to the very capable and competent hands of the administrators of the department. And to the best of my knowledge the Director of Air Services is on annual leave. Certainly if it was not accumulated, if it was illegal he would not be on it because the deputy minister would see to it that it was not so. I do not understand this line of questioning, I do not know what the hon. member is getting at. Is he suggesting that the Director of Air Services is off with pay? Is out of the Province with pay? Has exceeded his annual leave? Is there some illegality been suggested or is it just a general smear of the Director of Air Services?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. Could the Minister of Justice indicate what provision there is in this Province for the providing of firefighting equipment to unincorporated areas, no matter what the population may be in this Province?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any provision for unincorporated areas. The policy we have in this Province right now a policy that came in two years ago, and a good policy, one that is working exceptionally well, is to provide firefighting equipment to municipalities on a cost sharing basis, I think, it is 50-50.

MR. CALLAN: Right.

MR. HICKMAN: The hope is, and in fact, I am sure it does happen that the municipalities that are bounded by unincorporated areas and who have firefighting equipment in their municipality will very quickly and very readily respond to any call for assistance to fight fires and if they do not respond, and I think this is worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, that over and above a person being appointed as a fire chief for any fire brigade in any municipality that fire chief is also a special assistant to the Fire Commissioner and the Fire Commissioner can direct that there be response.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps in the way of preamble I might suggest this to the Minister of Justice. You know, in view of the fact that we have communities such as Southport which is probably about forty miles from Clarenville - last week a bad fire took place at Southport in my district, the nearest firefighting equipment is in the municipality of Clarenville, forty miles away, the whole town could be gone, and there are on that stretch of road from the TCH to Southport nine communities with a fairly large population - why is it not possible, just because there is no municipality there, why is it not possible that in spite of that there should be at least one community with a recognized group incorporated, if necessary, it does not take much to incorporate a community or group who wants to get together for a good reason. And here we have a group that would like to obtain firefighting equipment. When will the minister be in a position to probably look at this, and change the existing law?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know when I will be in a position to change the existing law nor am I aware of any request that has come in from Southport to the Fire Commissioner, although there may have been over the years for fire fighting equipment. One of the reasons why this responsibility has very properly been vested in the municipality is that the

MR. HICKMAN: simple formation of a group who now call themselves a fire brigade will not satisfy the very reasonable requirements with respect to the provision of highly sophisticated, very expensive fire-fighting equipment. Someone has to assume responsibility for maintaining that equipment and operating it.

MR. CALLAN: They can do that as well.

MR. HICKMAN: And I do not know - if there is a formula whereby it could be worked out beyond reasonable doubt that someone has fiscal responsibility on a continuing basis then maybe it would be, you know, appropriate to look at it, But right now I repeat, the policy is - it is a good one and it is a new one and it is an innovative one and it is one that has suddenly seen in five years Newfoundland, which had little if any in the way of firefighting equipment outside the larger provinces - it now has by far the best fire protection services and firefighting equipment services of any of the four Atlantic Provinces.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: That will not bring back the -

MR. HICKMAN: And five years ago we had very little outside of the major municipalities. And we have made tremendous strides in that respect.

MR. CALLAN: Should you not be trying to make more strides?

MR. HICKMAN: There is always room for improvement.

MR. CALLAN: Sure there is. That is what I am suggesting.

MR. HICKMAN: And if the hon. gentleman has some proposal he would like to make setting forth to me

MR. HICKMAN: where fiscal responsibility can be attached on a continuing basis I would not hesitate to bring it to the attention of the Fire Commissioner for his professional recommendation and his professional advice.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay followed by the hon. gentleman from Stephenville.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice and it arises out of the fact that it is my understanding that a recent directive has gone out from a senior member of the minister's department to the Newfoundland Constabulary informing them that they were not to make any utterances to the press regarding their contract negotiations with the government, that they were not to call that official at home or call the minister at home or do anything of that nature without going through and having the clearance of the Chief of Police.

I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not he, as minister, gave instructions for this type of memorandum to go out from his deputy minister to the Newfoundland Constabulary?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, for very obvious reasons there was no need for me to give instructions to anyone in that respect, because on December 21, 1970, regulations were enacted by the then government under the provisions of Section 28 of the Constabulary Act, 1970, setting forth inter alia the rights of members. And one of the things - I read Regulation 8 - sub-paragraph (p): "A member shall not communicate on any matter relating to the Force with i) the press; ii) the radio or

MR. HICKMAN: television service; iii) any agency of the press, radio or television services; iv) the head of any department of government or any other person or organization whatsoever without the prior consent in writing of the Chief of Police. That is a public document, a regulation passed and made law. I cannot advise the hon. gentleman of the philosophy behind the making of that law because I was not a part of the administration when the law was made on December 21, 1970. And to suggest that we have in our force, in the Newfoundland Constabulary any police officer or group of police officers who are not fully aware of their regulations would be an insult to the Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the minister is weaseling around with the Acts again, as usual, because the minister knows full well he is quoting from the Act and I am raising a question about the business of the Police Brotherhood and that is what the directive was all about. So I ask the minister, in view of the fact that he said, No, he did not give the instructions for his deputy minister to send out a memorandum putting a blackout on any release by the Police Association regarding Brotherhood business, is the minister

MR. RIDEOUT: contemplating or has the minister taken any disciplinary action against his deputy minister in view of the fact that such a scurrilous memorandum has now forced the Police Brotherhood to pass a resolution saying that they are going to defy the memorandum itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, you know, has the Opposition embarked upon a planned attack to vilify every public servant in this Province who is not in the position to defend himself? I state categorically that to my knowledge there has been no memorandum go out from the Deputy Minister of Justice or any other official to the Newfoundland Constabulary or to the Police Brotherhood.

MR. MURPHY: Go out and find out from Steve.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, if the hon. gentleman is going out to get his instructions from the expelled member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I am sure he will get the same kind of accurate instructions that the hon. the member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) received on Friday with respect to the Director of Air Services. But I repeat right now, Mr. Speaker, that I have not disciplined, will not discipline, I have no intention of disciplining the Deputy Minister of Justice. And more than that, the matter of the interpretation and the enforcement of -

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

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

MR. HICKMAN: - because the constabulary regulations -

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister is not answering the question put forward by my colleague and in addition to that he is making some references to the fact that my hon. colleague and I are going outside and checking for instructions, Mr. Speaker, which is a reference to myself and the member for Baie Verte - White (Mr. Rideout) being incompetent, this is what it is, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: and I think this is uncalled for and I think the minister should be reminded of the rule of staying close to the question that he is supposed to be debating, the point of relevancy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not sure that that can even be interpreted as a difference of opinion. The hon. gentleman says that in my method of answering I have insinuated that he is not competent and there is no difference of opinion on that particular point. But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I am trying as best I can to answer a question that was put by the member for Baie Verte and I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. HICKMAN: - Baie Verte, and may I say that I saw -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I believe I have to rule on this matter. I do not understand that the hon. gentlemen to my left accused the hon. gentleman to my right of incompetence. I do not think that that is the fact. He suggested that he was receiving communications from somebody else and whether he was or whether he was not I do not think is a point on which I can make any decision. I do believe the hon. gentlemen to my left may have strayed somewhat into reference in his answer to a previous question as distinct from the present one.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 8.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977," carried. (Bill No. 30)

On motion, Bill No. 30 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 6.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Enable The Golden Eagle Canada Limited To Become A Federal Corporation," carried. (Bill No. 41)

On motion, Bill No. 41 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing Act," carried.

(Bill No. 35)

On motion, Bill No 35 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 1.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the Address in Reply adjourned debate.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I understand that now, since the 4th. of March, we are finally back to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) Draftsman.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, there was no reason why that the Address in Reply cannot be called, I am not quibbling about that, neither is there any reason why that legislation cannot be called if the minister so wished to do that. There are five or six of us on this side in the House of Assembly who are prepared to debate legislation if that is what the government wants to do. The Budget Speech has not been called. We could debate that if we so wished to do. There are a number of things we could do and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the courtesy and co-operation that the minister is always talking about to make the House work, it was only a few minutes ago, a half hour or so ago we asked the Government House Leader for the other side what he was intending to call today -

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. RIDEOUT: - after the House was in session. As a matter of fact, just before the Oral Question Period started we asked the Government House Leader what he was intending to call today, and he said he did not know. Mr. Speaker, he did not know. Then Mr. Speaker, he, out of the blue, says Address in Reply and then you hear members on the other side saying, 'question, question.' Deliberate attempts, Mr. Speaker, to clear off the Order Paper while there are a few members absent on this side of the House. Well, that will not be so while there are four or five of us over here who have the strength to rise in our place and speak to the Address in Reply.

MR. HICKMAN: We are not on the Address in Reply yet.

MR. RIDEOUT: Address in Reply, that is what we are on is it not?

MR. HICKMAN: The amendment.

MR. RIDEOUT: The amendment? Let us see now, it is so long ago, Mr. Speaker, what was the amendment? Oh yes a non-confidence motion, that is right. Three or four or five or six weeks back a non-confidence motion. I do not even remember what it said. Maybe somebody could get the non-confidence motion and we could have a look at it and continue the debate.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to have a few words to say in the Address in Reply I think the motion that was put down at that time was a non-confidence motion. The Minister of Justice is always so happy to tell us over here what we do not know, they tell us we are always wanting non-confidence motions.

Mr. Speaker, the motion I believe, or the amendment that we are debating at this particular time is that all the words after 'that' be deleted and be replaced by the following: "This House deplores the failure of the government to prepare and to present to the House measures adequate to deal with the problems confronting Newfoundland and Labrador today and demands that the government forthwith take all measures possible within their constitutional authority to alleviate those problems."

Now, Mr. Speaker, certainly every member in the House and possibly on both sides of the House could take forty-five minutes to debate that particular amendment, that the House deplores the failure of government to prepare and to present to the House measures adequate to deal with the problems confronting Newfoundland and Labrador today.

We hear on various occasions in this House, Mr. Speaker, government members getting up and saying, "No, the Opposition

MR. RIDEOUT: is not bringing forth proposals regarding unemployment, the Opposition is not bringing forth proposals regarding development of the resources of this Province; the Opposition is not bringing forth any positive proposals with regard to the development of the fishery." We hear all kinds of allegations being flung across the House at the Opposition for not bringing in those types of proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the people on the other side that they are the government and that it is their responsibility to bring forth proposals on unemployment; it is their responsibility to bring positive legislation before the House with regard to future development of our resources, like the fishery resource and so on. We do not have the staff and all the officials that go into drawing up legislative proposals for this House and neither, Mr. Speaker, are we the government. We are

MR. ALDEGUL: not the government so it is no good of the government attempting to slough off their responsibility on the Opposition when it comes to bringing proposals before the House with regards to the development of our resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am being harassed by the Government House Leader. He does not want to hear the truth, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, everytime we get up to say something on this side of the House the first thing you hear is that you have no positive proposals about unemployment or anything else. Mr. Speaker, I think the important thing for us to remember is that unless we have confidence in the ability of the government to govern then it is little use of us to talk about unemployment. It is of little use for us to talk about any other thing when we are talking about this scandal-ridden administration that is governing this Province today. That is at the apex, that is the real root of the problem that we face in this Province, that the government have almost become unable to govern because, as I said the other night in the few remarks I had to say, they have been spending most of their time, Mr. Speaker, down on the eighth floor trying to conjure up ways to prop up this scandal-ridden administration.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: The use of the words scandal ridden directed against any one or a group of persons (Inaudible) if we are going to discharge our responsibility to the voters and electors of this Province then, Mr. Speaker, I would say that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Could we have a quorum call.

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order cannot be interrupted with a quorum call. Learn the rules. Then I say, Mr. Speaker, that the comments by the hon. gentleman from Baie Verte are totally and absolutely out of order and I would ask that he be directed to withdraw same.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I do not know, but Your Honour will surely guide me if I am straying off of what

MR. RIDEOUT: I ought not to be straying off in parliamentary terms.

I do not know if the use of the words scandal-ridden administration is unparliamentary. I will wait for guidance from Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! It is certainly recognized by all hon. members, I believe, that if the word 'scandal' is applied to an individual member that this would be clearly unparliamentary and if it is applied in any precise term to a group of hon. members it would be unparliamentary. If it is used in a more general sense I do not know if this is as clear cut. But I would say that it is probably undesirable certainly to proceed along those lines unless there is a specific charge and a specific body of evidence to be presented.

The hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: Your Honour did you direct me to withdraw the remark?

MR. SPEAKER: I just gave a general remark in regard to if there is a specific charge and a specific body of evidence to be presented this line could be pursued but in the absence of that, I would think it would be undesirable to go along those lines.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Your Honour. So as I was trying to say, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that must be cleared up before we can depend on this administration to get on with the governing of this Province as they were elected to do. They have been, to say it mildly, bouncing from one crisis to another and they have had to spend so much time huddled around the Cabinet table in efforts to prop up the image of this administration that they have lost, I would submit to Your Honour, the ability to govern. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what is at the root of the problem facing this House of Assembly. It is not that the Opposition is not bringing in positive proposals regarding unemployment or any other problem facing this Province, that is the responsibility of the government, Mr. Speaker, we have not seen of all the inconsequential legislation that is in the little black book, very little in any positive concrete way of what programmes and what

MR. RIDEOUT:

proposals this government has to solve the problems facing this Province in 1978. We have a problem, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the forestry in this Province. We have out in Stephenville closed down now almost a year a great linerboard mill. And all you can get out of the government, Mr. Speaker, is that it was located in the wrong place which is pure, unadulterated nonsense. All you can get out of the government is cracks, pious cracks at the previous administration. You cannot get anything out of the government with regard to any positive plan to do anything about reactivating that linerboard mill out in Stephenville. You cannot get anything out of them with regard to any positive plan to combat the unemployment in the Stephenville area that spins off not only in the Stephenville area, Mr. Speaker, but in the Goose Bay area served by my friend, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), in my own district in the Roddickton area, for example, and the Burlington area of the Baie Verte Peninsula. One of the key factors, Mr. Speaker, so the government told us when they closed down that mill a year ago was wood supply, the uneconomical supply of wood because it costs too much to transport it to the mill at Stephenville.

Mr. Speaker, in effect, what is needed is for the government of this Province to seriously put their heads together with the other companies like Bowaters and Price and Reid Newfoundland Company and so on, other major companies that have major wood concessions in this Province and realign, take a bold new step forward and realign the total timber resource of the Province. Did the government have the wisdom and the gumption to take that bold step, Mr. Speaker? No, they did not. And, of course, the consequences of their action is that Labrador Linerboard is still down and it may continue to be down unless somebody, whoever might be interested in operating it, unless somebody is guaranteed a wood supply that is economical to get to the mill in Stephenville. And as I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that can be done by realigning, by the government re-evaluating its policy

MR. RIDEOUT:

of the distribution of the wood supply in this Province.

We talked about, for example, a number of years ago a Newfoundland and Labrador Forest Corporation. That could be one of the bold, new steps that would have to be taken in order to guarantee an economical wood supply to the mill at Stephenville. This government has not made any moves in that direction, Mr. Speaker. If they have then they have kept them well hidden and they have kept them to themselves. It seems to me that it is totally ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, for the Bowaters operation at Corner Brook to be driving up as far as Glenwood and picking up wood and the Price operation in Grand Falls driving down West past the Baie Verte intersection and on out around Sandy and Flat Waters and picking up wood and bringing it back East to Grand Falls, passing each other on the Trans-Canada Highway. It seems to me to be totally ridiculous. It seems to me that it flies in the face of any economics that you can think about. And then with all that happening we have this operation out in Stephenville forced to go on the rocks because the government did not have the initiative or the gumption necessary to take those other operations in the Province and sit them down at a table and say, 'Look for the survival of that operation out there, for the economic good of the Stephenville area, of the Goose-Happy Valley area, the Roddickton area and other areas of the Province we have got to have a realignment of the timber resources of this Province. No more can we allow you to be scattered all over God's farm cutting where you like and so on.'

Then on top of that what do we have, Mr. Speaker?

We have the spruce budworm investigation where there are today -

MR. McNEIL: The spruce budworm accompanied by the political budworms.

MR. RIDEOUT: - where there are today, Mr. Speaker, millions of cords of wood in this Province that will not be able to be harvested. It will be of no value economically and it will not be able to be harvested because the companies have not got the wherewithal to harvest it in time before the wood spoils. And we allow the wood to sit there

MR. RIDEOUT:

because it is on the Bowater claim or the Price claim. Labrador Linerboard cannot get at it. Yet, they are forced to close down their operation. What kind of nonsense is it, Mr. Speaker, that allows a government to sit back knowing all these facts? All these facts were brought out in the Labrador Linerboard debate last year that we had in this House of Assembly and yet no action was taken by the government. They let the mill close down. Mr. Speaker,

MR. T. RIDEOUT: you would think that the last thing in the world the Government wanted to do was to close down an industry and I believe that that is the case. But yet the very fundamental steps that they could have taken to realign the timber resource in this Province so that Linerboard could get cheaper wood, they refused to take, and yet they want us to believe that they have left no stone unturned in their efforts to keep Labrador Linerboard from closing down. Mr. speaker, it is just too much, it is too much for us to accept, it is too much for the people of this Province to accept that this Government really explored every avenue open to them to keep that Linerboard mill open. Now I am so hepped on the Labrador Linerboard situation because it means so much to many parts of the district that I represent and it really strikes me as nothing only inefficiency and gross neglect that this Government did not call together the major paper companies and the other companies that have wood concessions in this Province, and say, 'Look, what is needed is a realignment of the timber resources of this Province so that Linerboard can have an economical supply of wood'. That was the straw that broke the camel's back. They did not have that so the Government says. So if we are to believe that theory. then we would have expected that the Government would try to do something about it rather than putting the padlock on the door. Gross inefficiency on the Government's part that they did not do those types of things and now, of course, we are reaping the benefit of it today.

They talk about resettlement in this Province, Mr. Speaker, they try to shove resettlement down the throats of many people on this side of the House who had nothing to do with it, and the Minister need not laugh because in many cases - I am not ashamed of it - if you ask the people living in LaScie in my district who came from the Horse Islands about resettlement you will not find many complaints. They will say they did not get enough assistance in moving and that type of thing, but they do not want to go back out there I can assure the Minister.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: They talk about that, but the closedown of Labrador Linerboard, Mr. Speaker, had the effect of resettlement. Resettlement all right, not from one small part of Newfoundland, one isolated part of Newfoundland to another part where they could get better services, but resettlement right out of the country, to Iran, that is the type of resettlement that we have seen from this particular Administration when part of the answer to the Labrador Linerboard situation was right at the fingertips of the Government if they had but the wisdom and the courage to explore it, Mr. Speaker. They should hang their heads in shame for what they have done over Labrador Linerboard. There was no need for that operation to close down and for a town of twelve or fourteen hundred people, like Roddickton in my district, to be on its knees now because they cannot sell pulpwood and therefore it is not economical to cut the - in fact it is a waste of the forest to cut the wood that is there and the small pulpwood had to be left to rot on the ground. They should hang their heads in shame that they allowed that to happen without exploring every possible means of keeping Labrador Linerboard open.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me to another subject and that is what is happening with our forest resource in this Province today. The forest resource is a renewable resource, one that we should be as concerned about as the Fishery. We should be as equally concerned about preserving the forests of this Province for the future needs of the people of this Province as we are about the Fishery. I am not saying we are too concerned about the Fishery, you cannot be too concerned, but what I am saying is that we should be as equally concerned about the forests. We have not done it and there is no evidence that it is being done. For example, down in Roddickton in the northern part of my district there exists one, Canada Bay Lumber Company, and, Mr. Speaker, that is the only means of employment in that community of twelve or fourteen hundred people today. Roddickton is not a fishing community,

MR. T. RIDEOUT: has never been a fishing community over the last fifty or sixty years, and probably will not be a fishing community anywhere we can see in the future, which makes it different from Englee which is totally a fishing community and totally dependent upon the Fishery. But Roddickton is dependent and has been dependant, down through the decades, upon the Forestry, and while Labrador Linerboard was operating, Mr. Speaker, then there were no problems because most of the logs down there are saw-log material. The logs could be cut, the saw-logs fed to Canada Bay Lumber Company, cut into lumber and shipped to markets here in the Province or outside and the smaller wood that was too small for saw-logs could be sold to Labrador Linerboard. It was an ideal situation, an ideal situation that allowed every -

MR. T. LUSH: A quorum call, Mr. Speaker, a quorum call, please!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A quorum call. Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
I will ask the Clerk of the House to count the House.

I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying in the beginning I think - and Mr. Speaker, which by the way came through very clearly to anybody who was watching the proceedings here today, the people on the other side are like they are glue bound to their seats. They could not even get up and support in principle the half dozen or so petitions that were presented here today.

MR. LUSH: Important petitions.

MR. RIDEOUT: Important petitions, calling on the government to reconsider its policy with regards to education or to broaden a bit its policy with regard to highway upgrading and paving and so on. All they do, Mr. Speaker, is they sit over there and they stare at you presenting a petition, like there is something wrong with you. It put in my mind, Mr. Speaker, a few little words of poetry that may have been caused by an event that came about over the weekend and I put it down like this. Bounded like glue they sit and stare/Into space that is not clear/Wondering cringing about futures untold/Transfixed into stone by the CBC poll.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Tom you are a poet.

MR. RIDEOUT: They were shocked when they saw the Goldfarb news two or three weeks ago and the Premier sloughed it off and said, "Aw we have got a 1700 or 1800 one coming out pretty soon. That will shock you fellows in your shoes." Then CBC comes out on the weekend with a poll that was more comprehensive than one we had done ourselves. And I understand that the Premier has had similar polls done which shows the same thing. So they are over there staring into space, Mr. Speaker, knowing that their days are numbered,

MR. RIDEOUT: huddled around the Cabinet table trying to prop themselves up for the next two years in the hope that the crisis will disappear, in the hope that it will go away, in the hope that the Opposition will leave them alone. Because they are shimmying in their shoes every day now at Question Period, do not know what is coming next.

MR. LUSH: Even the old veterans are starting to resign.

MR. RIDEOUT: Hoping that the Opposition will get off the issues that are really putting the dart into the government and making them shake in their shoes.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad state of government that we have in this Province today when we have that type of administration.

Now before I was waylaid, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about Labrador Linerboard in respect to how it affects my particular district and I was explaining how Canada Bay Lumber Company, the only industrial operation in the Roddickton area, how it

MR. RIDEOUT: could operate so effectively when Labrador Linerboard was in production, but now the growth and the effective operation of that industry has been stymied because they have nowhere to sell their pulpwood material. Mr. Speaker, the people were so concerned about it that early this year we arranged to have the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture come down to Roddickton with some of his officials so that the people of the community and the council could present a brief to him and outline some positive proposals whereby, if Labrador Linerboard is not opening up in the foreseeable future, government could assist the people of that area, provide a few hundred jobs for the people of the area and assist the economy of the area. We have not heard a stir about it since, Mr. Speaker, and that is some four or five months ago.

And we proposed to the government at that time, in the knowledge that we had from Bowaters, that they would be delighted to take 30,000 cords of pulpwood from the Northern Peninsula area - they would be absolutely delighted to do so, and especially since a lot of the timber down there is infested by budworm - we proposed to the government at that time that they think about the possibility of initiating some sort of transportation subsidy to allow the economical transportation of wood up the Great Northern Peninsula to the mill at Corner Brook. Now the only reason it cannot be done at the moment is that it costs too much to transport wood across country to Plum Point and up the Northern Peninsula Highway to Corner Brook, because we are talking about over 300 miles of transportation, a lot of it over a dirt road so it is not economical under present conditions to do so. So we proposed to the government at that time that they think in terms of

MR. RIDEOUT: instituting a transportation subsidy that would be of benefit not only to Roddickton but to Main Brook, Hawkes Bay and a lot of other communities on the Great Northern Peninsula whose economies have been wiped out since the close down of Labrador Linerboard, and as I said, Mr. Speaker, we have yet, to my knowledge, to get any indication from the government that they would even think in terms of coming up with that type of transportation subsidy. And we were not talking about a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. We were not talking about a lot of money when you consider the social assistance roles that are down in that part of the Province at the moment. We were not talking about a lot of money when you consider the unemployment insurance payments that are going in down there which will soon be over because they have been out of work so long. We were talking about a positive suggestion, a positive approach to solving a particular economic problem until something can be done about Labrador Linerboard. And if you talk about positive proposals and all you can hear from the Opposition is negative stuff, Mr. Speaker, this is one particular example where we proposed a positive solution to a problem to the government, and what did we get? We got no response whatsoever from the minister, who himself took the time to come down and to listen to the brief that was so ably presented by the town council of Roddickton - no response whatsoever. So, Mr. Speaker, what does that do to us? We have tried the best we can to make a breakthrough with this present administration, to point out to them how they could effectively help an economically depressed area of the Province, and the response was nil.

MR. RIDEOUT: So is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we have lost any faith whatsoever in the ability of this administration to govern? I would say, no wonder that the amendment is down. No wonder that you may see other amendments of similar nature before this Address in Reply is over, because, Mr. Speaker, we have seen case after case where the government have been derelict in their duty to Labrador Linerboard because they did not explore the possibility of a realignment of the timber resources of the Province, derelict in their duty to the economically depressed areas of the Great Northern Peninsula because they did not take into consideration the positive proposals that we put forward to them with regard to a transportation subsidy. Mr. Speaker, we cannot have any confidence in this type of administration that goes from day to day bewildered, bouncing from crisis to crisis, spending their time huddled around the Cabinet table trying to determine how they can bounce off the next series of questions that might come from the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to propose a sub-amendment

MR. RIDEOUT: to the amendment that is currently under debate. I would like to propose a sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, to the particular amendment under debate seconded by my colleague, the member for Fortune-Hermitage that the following words be added to the amendment that we are now debating, "such as record unemployment, cost of electricity, cost of living, a fisheries policy, development of the Lower Churchill, the Nordsee proposal, the reopening of the Linerboard mill at Stepbenville, occupational health and safety legislation covering full disclosure of all election expenses and donations." Mr. Speaker, could somebody take a copy to Your Honour so you can determine whether or not it is in order.

MR. HICKMAN: In that respect I would draw Your Honour's attention to paragraph 202 of Beauchesne.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Would the hon. House Leader care to point out any specific subsection of 202 which is a long one?

MR. HICKMAN: 202(3) enlarges upon the scope of the original amendment rather than altering it and if such is the case it is out of order. So say you one so say you -

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I assume it is a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the government House Leader is obviously giving advice to Your Honour so I would hope that he would do it in a fashion that I may be able to reply to it.

MR. CALLAN: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. J. COLLINS): Order, please! I am informed that a quorum is present.

In regard to the amendment to the amendment brought forward by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), some question was raised under subsection (3) of section 202 of Beauséjour, which perhaps I should read, "Since the purpose of a sub-amendment is to alter the amendment, it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment;" I think that is the part that was thought to be applicable.

The amendment, the latter part reads as follows; "and demands that the government forthwith take all measures possible within their constitutional authority to alleviate these problems." And the amendment to the amendment then reads, "such as record unemployment, cost of electricity, etc., etc., and covering full disclosure of all election expenses and donations."

It would seem to me that the sub-amendment does fulfill the requirements of not enlarging on the scope but merely enumerates the problems mentioned. But it deals with matters not covered by the amendment in that the amendment does not actually enumerate those points. So I would rule that the sub-amendment is in order.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader lost another round.

MR. HICKMAN: I lose every round.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is it. The Government House Leader loses every round.

Mr. Speaker, while Your Honour was deciding whether the amendment was in order, of course, and rightly decided that it was the sub-amendment it almost would cause one to wonder about

MR. RIDEOUT: what is supposed to be happening in this House when you hear the comments of certain hon. members regarding the proceedings of this House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this House is a debating forum. Now, some people may be able to debate better than I can and some people may be able to debate not as well as I can and so on like that. That is not the issue at question. But it is my understanding that this House is a debating forum and it is a political forum and I have the right to get up in this House and talk about exactly what I like as long as it is within the rules of Parliament, that the language I use is not unparliamentary.

So, Mr. Speaker, it sort of digs me the wrong way when I hear members saying that there is no wonder that people think this of the House or people think that of the House, when you spend \$300 million on education and this is the type of people that you get, that this is what you get. That was said in this House

MR. POWER: - not here?

Yes, I will say it to my friend for Ferryland (Mr. C. Power), it was said here a few minutes ago. We spend \$300 million on education and this is what you get. In other words, you are getting the type of individual that I am, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay or the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) or any other member on both sides of the House, after spending \$300 million on education.

Mr. Speaker, what a narrow-minded person would make that type of comment. I am doing the best I can in this House. If that does not please gentlemen on the other side I would say, too bad! You are going to put up with me while I am here whether you like it or not. And now that I am here if it does not please all of the time the people who elected me then they will decide the next time around whether they want that same type of representation or not. So I say too bad! Never mind

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3127

NM - 3

MR. RIDEOUT: casting reflections on members by
saying, "You spend \$300 million in education and look what
we have." Tarring us all with the same brush, Talk about
tarring us all with the same brush, talk about what people
outside of this House feel about the House of Assembly, how
can they

MR. RIDEOUT:

feel any better, Mr. Speaker, when they are aided and abetted by members sitting on the floor of the House itself when it comes to downgrading the House of Assembly. A ridiculous comment, Mr. Speaker, and I hope I do not hear it anymore in this House because it is certainly not worthy to be uttered by any member of this House. We are all here doing the best we can. It might not turn on everybody but as long as we are saying what we came here to say and what we feel ought to be said in the best way we know how to say it then far be it for anybody else to criticize how it is said or what is said or the quality of what is said or the content of what is said.

Mr. Speaker, to go back to the sub-amendment. This sub-amendment has the effect now of broadening the non-confidence amendment that I stood to address myself to a few moments ago, and it lists, Mr. Speaker, one after another the areas in which this administration has failed to provide proper and effective government for this Province. It lists the record of unemployment, the cost of electricity, the cost of living, the fisheries policy that you had the Minister of Education (Mr. House) so nonchalantly refer to in the House of Assembly on Wednesday night or Thursday morning as to the Opposition not asking any questions about the fishery. Mr. Speaker, we have learned the hard way not to be overzealous in asking questions of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) because you can ask the Minister of Fisheries a question on the price of lobster and he will get up and talk about the price of tea in China and everything else rather than the price of lobster being paid to the fishermen in this Province. We have learned that the Minister of Fisheries seems to glorify in being able to kill by one or two questions a thirty minute question period and say nothing. I never saw a man, Mr. Speaker, take so much time to say so little as the Minister of Fisheries. And when he does say something then it is nothing only a verbal blast at his counterparts in Ottawa, the federal government, that has such an important role to play in the fishery development of this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, that is what the Minister of

MR. RIDEOUT:

Fisheries is doing.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice may as well batten down his hatches, the government House leader. It is the first time he had the courage, Mr. Speaker, to call the Address in Reply since some time in March. And when I get through the documents that I have here he may not call it again before the House closes. Because obviously, he called it out of frustration today, Mr. Speaker, an effort to make it appear as if the Opposition could not go into debate on any piece of legislation listed in the little black book there. And I can tell the minister that we were prepared to debate it and we could debate it and we will debate it anytime he wants to call it. So in an effort to throw us off our guard over here, Mr. Speaker, he said, I will call the Address in Reply and if they are as stunned as I think they are then nobody will jump to their feet and she will be gone through and we will be rid of 'Neary' when he gets back in the House and we will be rid of a few other of the members of the Opposition that are sticking so many thorns in our flesh.

DR. KITCHEN: No co-operation between the House leaders.

MR. RIDEOUT: No co-operation whatsoever. We checked with the minister just before Question Period and he told us he did not know what he was going to call. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, that particular piece of strategy backfired on the minister because I serve him notice now that the four or five of us who are left here are prepared to go indefinitely on the Address in Reply or the Budget Speech or legislation or anything else the minister wishes to call. We will not be intimidated by the actions of the minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that is dear to my heart, that is mentioned in the sub-amendment that I just proposed and I would say to this House one of the issues that ought to be dear to the hearts of every person in this Province and every person in this country because it has been illustrated and brought to the public attention so much over the last seven or eight or fifteen or twenty weeks by workers in Baie Verte and workers in Labrador City,

MR. RIDEOUT:

it has been brought to the attention of the national people right across Canada, is that of occupational health and safety. It is one of the first speeches ever I made in this House, Mr. Speaker. In taking my place here in November of 1975 it was to talk about the plight of the miners in Baie Verte and thereby indirectly talk about the plight of miners in other mining operations across the Province and across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we waited for three whole years from 1975

MR. RIDEOUT: to 1978 for some indication from the government that they were going to take the bull by the horns and do something to help out the people working under such hazardous conditions. And finally we saw the results of that three years of waiting one day last week. And, Mr. Speaker, here let me make the record clear, despite what was said in an editorial in a St. John's newspaper over the weekend, I believe it was, and no names were mentioned, but I assume they were referring to me when they said 'the chief spokesman for the Opposition' although they said 'Labour and Manpower' and that is not my critic role - in this case it is Occupational Health and Safety - when they said it was condemned as useless. I did not and I will not now condemn that particular bill as useless, but I will say now what I said then -

MR. LUSH: You did not.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, I did not. That is what I said, I did not do it then and I am not doing it now, condemning that particular bill as useless, but I will say now as I said then, two or three days ago in this House, that the onus more than ever before, Mr. Speaker, is now on the government through regulation, through the authority that we are going to give the minister to impose regulation, to put the flesh on that skeleton that he has created. That is what I said then and that is what I say here again today and I will spend a while talking about here today, because, Sir, the bill itself, I said then and I will say now, is useless unless - which I added with the same breath the other day and I will add with the same breath now - unless the minister puts guts into it by very stringent, very well thought out and very

MR. RIDEOUT: strict regulations. Unless that is done, then the bill itself will be, in effect, useless. That is what I said and that is what I say again now.

And, Mr. Speaker, it bores me, it hurts me to no end to see the attitude of ministers of this particular government towards what ought to be a motherhood issue. There should not even be need to probe the government, to keep darting at the government about, When are you going to bring it in and all this kind of stuff. There should not be need to disagree with the government on certain positions of the bill, because this is a motherhood issue and ought to have been in place long ago, but the attitude of ministers, Mr. Speaker, towards this vitally important area boils me to no end to put it mildly. For example, on April 25th, Mr. Speaker, a lady in Baie Verte - in my district, a lady up to her ears in the Miners' Wives Organization that is attempting to push publicly every way they can the causes for which their husbands are on strike, decided to write the Minister of Mines and Energy. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say here now, the Minister of Mines and Energy had not attempted in any way to meet with the union at Baie Verte or to meet with the company for that matter, as far as I know, but certainly not with the union, to see exactly what their story was, had made no attempt to do that, but he was sloughing off the responsibility by saying, We are soon going to introduce into the House of Assembly a piece of legislation that will, in effect, take care of the problems at Baie Verte. The Minister of Mines and Energy said that on numerous occasions; he sent telegrams in response to invitations to come down to Baie Verte, he sent that same type of thing

MR. RIDEOUT: in telegrams, but, Mr. Speaker, what do we find? When the legislation was introduced into the House of Assembly, the minister spoke and I spoke as the chief Opposition spokesman from this side and sat down, and I just about fell on the floor, Mr. Speaker, just about fell out of my seat on the floor when I heard the Minister of Mines and Energy, who I believe spoke after I did, saying that the bill will not apply to mining. And here we have, and still have in this Province two centres in the mining operation where people are out on strike for what this bill is supposed to implement. The minister saying it does not apply to mining! Now the minister hastened to add, Mr. Speaker, that under the authority of the Mining Act - I forget the name of the Act - but under the authority of some Act presently in place the minister was going to bring in complimentary regulations to the regulations that the Minister of Labour and Manpower was proposing to bring into this particular bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, what an example of gross neglect of duty! If the Minister of Mines and Energy could do that after this bill is passed, and if he is not doing it under the authority given to the government by this bill, but

MR. T. RIDEOUT: doing it under the authority of a Bill, of a piece of legislation already in force, why did he have to wait? Why did the Minister have to wait fifteen, or sixteen, or seventeen weeks to bring in the regulations that he says are going to improve the health and safety of workers in mining operations?

Now, I would like for somebody on the Government side of the House to explain that quandary to me. Why did the Minister have to wait? He says that mining does not come under this Bill that is now before the House. The Minister of Labour and Manpower says that he is going to bring in regulations under the Bill but they will not apply to mining until a year or fifteen months down the road. Then his colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, says, 'Ah, but yes, I will be bringing in regulations complementary to yours but under the authority of the Mining Act which is now in place'. Now what was the point of it all, Mr. Speaker? What was the point of that Minister waiting all this time and telling the people in Baie Verte specifically, because that is the one situation I know most, telling those people that this great Government of yours is bringing in an Occupational Health and Safety Bill and that as soon as that piece of legislation is in place we will have adequate regulations to control the operations of Advocate Mines thus ensuring by legislation and regulation that that is one of the safest operations that can technically be possible.

What was the point of it all? Misled the people of the Baie Verte peninsula, Mr. Speaker, to put it mildly. I could be more harsh but I am not allowed to be more harsh in a parliamentary sense - misled the people of the Baie Verte peninsula by leading them to believe that this Occupational Health and Safety bill would be the piece of legislation that would give him and his colleagues the authority to do something guaranteeing the health and safety of those workers, and then, in this very House, stands on his feet and says, 'Mining, ladies and

MR. T. RIDEOUT: gentlemen, will not be coming under the authority of this Bill for a year or fifteen months down the road, but I have the authority now under the present legislation to bring in regulations that will solve the situation at Baie Verte. What a gross misleading of the people on the Baie Verte peninsula, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as if that were not bad enough, as if that were not bad enough, let me go on to something else related to this same minister. On April 25th, and any information that I quote from here, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to table it because I think it is important - On April 25th that same minister wrote a lady in Baie Verte, who as I said in the beginning is involved with the Minors' Wives Association or Committee to help promote the cause that they are striking for, and she had written him on April 15th expressing her concern and asking that the Minister and his Department and the Government of which he was a part, take some action, take some concrete action; if legislation was needed, then bring in legislation; if regulations were needed under existing legislation, then do that, draw up those regulations; do whatever was necessary so that some of the things that the miners were striking for would not have to be strike issues but would be 'right' issues, issues that they would have a right to expect. So the Minister wrote back to the lady and said, 'Thank you for your letter of April 15th, 1978 concerning the Baie Verte situation'. He said, 'Unfortunately, we can only legislate health and safety standards, but a new act on the matter is now before the House of Assembly and should be passed this session'. Still now, the Minister told us in the House a couple of days ago that that act is not really necessary, he does not need the authority of that act to bring in the regulations and that, in fact, the regulations that will be passed under that act will have no effect on Mining for the next year or so. Anyway, that is what he says in his letter of April 25th. Then he goes on to say, 'I am fully aware of the situation and I am doing all I can within the law. It is

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3130

RT-3

MR. T. RIDEOUT: not my move now, the next move is up to the House of Assembly. Thank you for taking time to write me ..' and so on. A very, to say the least, weak-kneed approach to what ought to be and what is, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues facing people in this Province. It concerns not only the people on the Baie Verte peninsula, or the people in Labrador City, but every worker in this Province. A weak-kneed approach, to say the least.

MR. RIDEOUT:

But anyway be that as it may that was the reply. Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously the lady who wrote the letter was not - and she is a very outspoken person who can get her point across very well, capable of doing so very well - obviously that lady was not to be appeased by that type of bologna coming from the minister. So she sat down and wrote him again and pointed out what was needed at the Advocate operation in Baie Verte where legislation and regulations were needed to make that operation as safe from hazards towards human health as technically possible. She accused the government, I think, and rightly so of moving too slow in this important area. She did not think they were moving fast enough in bringing in legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what do you think she got back from the minister? What type of reply do you think that lady whose husband is now on strike for fifteen weeks got back from the Minister of Mines and Energy?

Mr. Speaker, I have heard members stand in this House and say that I did not get a road paved because of politics, because the people in my district voted the wrong way. I have heard members say that and I have probably said it myself and feel justified in saying it. I have heard members say, Mr. Speaker, that they did not get the start on a water and sewer project because the people of their district were being penalized for voting the wrong way. I have heard members say that and again I would say, probably rightly so. But, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to hear of an occasion where a member had the responsibility and the duty to stand in this House and say to his colleagues on both sides of the House that my people, the health of my people is being discriminated against because a minister says you voted the wrong way. Mr. Speaker, I hope it sinks in to members on both sides, where a minister says, I am not too concerned. We are doing what we can and if you do not believe me, I am not too concerned because you voted the wrong way. I could get very emotional on that, Mr. Speaker. I could ask the minister whether he worries, whether his prime consideration in bringing in regulations that he did not need

MR. RIDEOUT:

this act to bring in anyway he admitted in the House a few days ago, I could ask that minister was his only consideration the fact that as he says in his letter, you rejected me at the polls and you rejected the P.C. candidate in the last election at the polls.

We are not talking about a piece of pavement now, Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about a water and sewer system now, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about the lives of men, women and children in a specific area of this Province where a health hazard exists, where government action is needed, where government action is being pleaded for by the residents of the area and they get a snotty, political reply from a minister of the Crown saying, too bad you voted Liberal instead of Tory.

I am going to read the letter now, Mr. Speaker, and I am prepared to table it as I said. And I have talked to the lady concerned and she does not mind one bit her name being used in this House. It was written to Mrs. Maureen Dwyer, P.O. Box 162, Baie Verte, Newfoundland. It was written on May 3, 1978, a few days ago. And he says, Dear Mrs. Dwyer: I received with disappointment but not surprise your letter of April 27, 1978. It is obvious from your letter that nothing I can say on the matter will change your mind because it is already made up. Health and safety legislation has been drawn up and now awaits passage by the House. My move was to help get it before the House. The House's move is to pass or reject it. You would not know but it was a minority government situation here.

MR. HICKEY: Could we have the member's previous letter which the lady wrote to the minister too?

MR. RIDEOUT: I just said that.

MR. HICKEY: You are going to read it are you?

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, I will table that letter when it comes in my possession. I have had it read to me but I do not have it now. But when I get it in my possession I am prepared to table it.

It says, "I,

MR. RIDEOUT: should add that this legislation confirms the important clause that allows a worker the right to refuse to work in conditions he deems to be unsafe." Mr. Speaker, now I am reading it all ^{lest} I be accused of picking out pieces to fit what I am trying to say. "This is a major breakthrough in labour legislation which unions have been requesting for some time. ^{however,} I fail to see any thanks for it coming. So on thanks I will get back to that in a minute. It says, "Since your last letter,"-I think I indicated to the House that three letters were exchanged between those people - "Since your last letter I have had a fact sheet drawn up on just what my department has done at Advocate. You can see from it that the highest standards in North America have been enforced." I will come back to that too, Mr. Speaker. "You can see from it that the highest standards in North America have been enforced." In other words saying, what in the goodnes name are you out on strike down there for? Nobody gives us credit for that. The company have agreed to build a shower and drying facilities and I do hope miners use them when they are done. The mines in Labrador have such facilities but the miners do not bother to use them. Maybe the Minister of Labour and Manpower or the member for Menihok might have something to say about that. He goes on to say that it will be nothing less than an insult to Newfoundlanders who have heard of the Baie Verte situation in the news over and over again if those facilities are not used when built.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real guts of the letter comes here. "Finally I was not elected by miners. The vast majority of voters in Green Bay are loggers, ^{though} I did for a while have several communities in the Nippers Harbour area to Middle Arm area of the Baie Verte Peninsula in Green Bay before redistribution of seats," which was true. ^{then} it went a little further than that. "Maybe some of those people are miners but every community in that region rejected me at the poles and rejected the PC. candidate in the last election," the assistant to the Premier, Mr. Desmond Sullivan." Then he says, "What

MR. RIDEOUT: more in the name of God can I say or do? So you rejected me now what more can I say or do. My department has enforced the highest standards in North America and are changing the laws for health and safety via the new act in the House of Assembly. I will not break the law and try and enforce rules that I do not have the authority to enforce. If I had to do that for votes then the people with their votes can give them to the Liberals as they always do on the Baie Verte Peninsula. I am sure Mr. Rowe who deserted you people once before will be only too glad to get your votes again and will give you the same services as he did before. If you think the present administration is bad reflect on what Rowe and Neary would do to or for this Province. I do not think I need say more.

A. Brien Peckford, the Minister of Mines and Energy."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I did not like to interrupt the hon. member before. Now I do not know if it is unparliamentary but I am sure it was unbecoming to the language of the House when the hon. member referred to the letter as a 'snotty' reply. Probably he would like to withdraw it, correct it for the records.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, sure and I will rephrase it as I go along. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, very much.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the letter that I referred to a few minutes ago. That is the letter, Mr. Speaker, that a wife whose husband has been on strike for fifteen weeks gets from the Minister of Mines and Energy of this Province. That is the letter, Mr. Speaker, that publicly states the policy of this administration. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything to haul the guts out of the Minister of Labour and Manpower it must be that arrogant letter written by his colleague, a minister of the Crown who has basically the same problem in his district as I have in mine. If there is anything to haul the guts out of that minister what does that letter do to him, Mr. Speaker? Then the inaccuracies in the letter which I will go into in some detail. That is bad enough but the thing that

MR. RIDEOUT: really gets in my craw is the politics in the letter. If I got up and talked about the things that this government are not doing that they ought to do I am negative, I am political, I am everything. But, a minister of the Crown, Mr. Speaker, and I do not care what the lady said to him in her letter, she deserved a better reply than that from the minister. I happen to know what she said I heard it over the phone and it will be to me shortly I hope. But I do not care what she said to him. If she accused the government of not acting quickly enough then she did the right thing. If she accused the minister of not acting quickly enough then she did the right thing in view of the fact that the minister admitted in this House two or three days ago that he is bringing in regulations complimentary to his colleagues, the Minister of Labour and Manpower's regulations under an act

MR. RIDEOUT: that is already in force. Whatever she said to him, Mr. Speaker, she deserved a reply void from politics. That is the least that that lady, whose husband has been on strike for fifteen weeks deserved, was a reply that was void of politics. But did she get it, Mr. Speaker? No, she did not. She got a letter which in effect said, "We will get around to you people now with regulation and legislation when I am good and ready. You never did support me when I ran in part of that district. Then after the district was changed you never did support the PC candidate. You never did do that. So now you can give your votes where they were always given, that is to the Liberals." What a political arrogant specimen of a letter, Mr. Speaker. What a blow to a person who, because of political persuasion, may have been convinced that this government had their best interests at heart. What a blow to the followers of the party from which this government is formed, on the Baie Verte Peninsula, Mr. Speaker. No wonder they cannot raise their heads those days, when this letter is going all around the town of Baie Verte, pointing out the feelings of one particular minister. And people are asking themselves and rightfully so, is he speaking on behalf of the administration? Has he enunciated the policy of the administration? What a blow to those people, Mr. Speaker, who through tough times, and it has always been tough times for that Party in the district that I represent, but they have had some very strong people who believed in their conscience that they were doing the right thing by supporting that Party. And then they have slapped in their faces the vilest kind of political accumen that you could ever think of. When the stake, Mr. Speaker, when the stake is not a piece of pavement, when the stake is not a water and sewer system or a few thousand dollars to put in an incinerator when the stake is something much more sacred than that, when it is the health and lives of men, women and children, how do those people feel now, Mr. Speaker, that they

MR. RIDEOUT: have been told that the government has accepted the Selikoff Report and that they will take on the responsibility of paving the roads in that area? How do those people feel now when a very senior minister of the government have told them in writing, in black and white, that you have sinned against me. You have sinned against me because you did not vote the right way.

And then the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker, the man responsible for mining operations in this Province, says, "I was not elected by miners, I was elected by loggers." Well if that is the extent of his narrow tunnel vision maybe he should ask the Premier to appoint him Minister of Forestry and Agriculture so that he can do something for the loggers, his own people. He does not have any miners. Maybe he should ask the Premier to take him out of Mines and Energy and put him in Forestry and Agriculture so, that he can do one thing, serve his own people only. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the Cabinet system of government in the fine traditions of the British Parliament, works that a minister when he assumes the role of minister and assumes a department, it is the Minister of Mines and Energy for the whole of Newfoundland and Labrador, or the Minister of Health is the Minister of Health for all of Newfoundland and Labrador, not only the health of the citizens in Gander district. That seems to me to be at the whole basis of the British Parliamentary system, the Cabinet system of government. But is there any indication of that here? No, Mr. Speaker, there is no indication of that there. The minister quite bluntly and blatantly says, "I was not elected by miners."

And if that lady pointed out to him, which she did that, "You have an obligation to miners and that you got some miners votes," which they did get some miners votes. They came in 1319 behind but they got a few votes. Some of them were miners votes. And he therefore has an obligation to miners be it that he is

Minister of Mines

and Energy if nothing else. That must be an awful blow to the people of the Baie Verte Peninsula who, down through the darkest of times, stood by this party and are standing by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we have a quorum in the House, do we?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) A quorum call.

I will ask the Clerk to count the House.

We have a quorum.

The hon. the member for Baie Verte

- White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Justice, the Government House Leader, saying you are not allowed to refer to notes?

MR. DOODY: What is the hon. minister doing, harassing the member?

MR. RIDEOUT: Harassing the member, yes - deliberately harassing the member.

I am trying to make a few brief remarks here, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of his constituents who have been so vilified by one of the minister's colleagues in the Cabinet.

MR. HICKMAN: Are you going to yield -

MR. RIDEOUT: No, I cannot afford to yield, Mr. Speaker. I suppose it is the reply to the great piece of prose that I tabled a little earlier.

MR. HICKMAN: Poetry or prose?

MR. RIDEOUT: You can call it what you like.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will make a few remarks about this infamous letter written to a lady on the Baie Verte Peninsula whose husband was on

MR. RIDEOUT: strike for fifteen weeks,
looking for the sympathy, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister
of Mines and Energy under whose department this particular
subject falls, looking for the sympathy of a man that
she thought she knew because she had attended school with
him some years back, looking for some sympathy from the
government for a cause that anybody in his right mind
and anybody who had his head screwed on properly could
only say is a legitimate cause and a justified cause
and one that ought to be the cry of every one of us in
public life in this Province. And the reply that she gets,
Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, is the most blatant,
arrogant form of partisan politics that I have ever seen
in this Province.

 I have had letters, Mr. Speaker,
from constituents that I was not happy with, I guess we all
have. We do not expect our constituents

MR. RIDEOUT:

to be happy with every single thing we do. We are not all prima donnas that we can do no wrong. I have had letters from constituents expressing their concern over some things that I might have said or some particular position that I may have taken on a particular issue and they have expressed their views very strongly, Mr. Speaker, which they have every right to do. But far be it from me to write back to those people and say, you may have been one of those dirty people in the district who did not vote for me. Far be it from me to do that, Mr. Speaker. I should never expect, I should never have a right to expect to win the confidence of that person and maybe that person's support in another time down the road if I replied like that, if I replied in a fashion as arrogant as that. I have no right whatsoever ever to expect the support of that person.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy speaking for the government enunciated just that type of policy. He did not like what a resident of this Province told him and then since the minister could back up the fact that that person lived in what you might consider a very solid Liberal district then that provided the ammunition for his reply. A sad day, Mr. Speaker, for people who are on strike for fifteen weeks to receive that type of letter and have it posted on the bulletin board in the union hall so that Liberals and Tories and NDP's alike could read it and see the sympathy that existed in the heart of one particular minister for their cause, the sympathy that existed to such a degree that it could be lowered to the level of political oneupmanship. A sad day, Mr. Speaker, for the people of the Baie Verte Peninsula and all the people of Newfoundland, that when a minister does not like the stand taken by a group or a person anywhere in this Province then he would resort to dragging that issue important as it might be, affecting the lives of as many people as it might affect, he could drag that issue down to the low level of political mea culpa, because that is exactly what happened in this particular case.

MR. RIDEOUT:

How could that minister or this party ever expect to find any sympathy from even their strongest supporters, Mr. Speaker, few though they may be, who live on the Baie Verte Peninsula? Because if there is one letter that should go into the home of every person on the Baie Verte Peninsula it is that one. And I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it will be in there before too much longer. Fifteen weeks on strike, fifteen weeks without the pay that they have been used to, fifteen weeks of sacrifice to keep the body and soul together with their families fighting an issue that they fervently believe in, fifteen weeks on strike over an issue that should commend the support of every member of this House, and that is the reaction from a senior minister of this government. Too bad my friend. You rejected me and you rejected my colleague who ran out there in 1975. So now you can give your votes back to 'Mr. Rowe' who deserted you people once and I suspect will do the same again and to 'Mr. Neary' and to anybody else in the Liberals and see what kind of a state they will create in this Province. That is a sad day for the people who have been supporting so zealously that strike over the last fifteen weeks.

It is little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that you will turn on the radio today and hear the representatives of miners wives saying that we are going to come into the steps of Confederation Building. I would not be a bit surprised if they try to get into the minister's office and put him on the spot. Would anybody be surprised that those people would want to bring their protest to the steps of Confederation Building? I would not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if they tried to do it. Because if they felt that they had some sympathy in the administration then that would be a different case. But having received that letter how can they in their conscience, Mr. Speaker, feel

MR. T. RIDEOUT: that they have any sympathy in the Administration? How can they feel that they have no other choice but march in here and portray out in front of the building for all to see, their solidarity, the legitimacy of their cause, and hope that somebody in the Administration will have sense enough to listen?

It is almost unbelievable. I was shocked to tears, Mr. Speaker, when this letter was passed along to me Saturday. I had heard about the arrogance of this particular minister, I had heard it many times before, Mr. Speaker. In fact, there was a constituent of his on CBC Radio on Saturday evening talking about the arrogance of the Minister. I could not believe that it would go to such depths as this, that it would come down to the level of, bringing politics into a strike where the key issue is health and safety. Certainly the Minister of Health must be shocked to find that out. The Minister of Labour and Manpower who, though late as we have said, but better late than never, Mr. Speaker, is bringing this Occupational Health and Safety bill before the House must be shocked to know that his colleague would be so arrogant as to do that.

The president of the PC party, the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) must be shocked to know that the people who supported his cause, or his Party's cause, through thick and thin - and it has always been thin, on the Baie Verte peninsula - he should check with some of them, Mr. Speaker, to see how upset they are over the arrogance of a person and a Government that they believed in so much.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. T. RIDEOUT: The same kind of attitude? The member has indicated, Mr. Speaker, that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander because he got the same kind of letter.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province has a solemn obligation to the people that I represent, to the people that my friend from Ferryland (Mr. Power) represents, as the First Minister, the Queen's First Minister, who invites all the other ministers to come into his Cabinet - the Premier has a solemn obligation, Mr. Speaker, to reprimand and severely discipline one of his colleagues who would have the gumption and the arrogance to write that type of letter. Certainly the Premier, if he condones it, is guilty by condoning it. The Premier is not going to condone that type of arrogance, is he, Mr. Speaker? The Premier has been known, Mr. Speaker, to have resignations of ministers in his desk and in his pocket. If the Premier has the resignation of this particular minister in his desk, then he should call upon it to be served immediately. Certainly we can expect better than that from a minister of the Crown. Certainly we have the right. I would submit that the people I represent, as close to them as I am and as close to me as many of them are, having known me personally and growing up in the district and so on, being one of them growing up in the little community of Fleur-de-Lys, the people that I represent have the right not to expect that kind of arrogance from me and I am no stranger to them. But a person who is a stranger to them, whom they only know in one fashion and that is "pork-barrel" - I cannot say his last name - but "pork-barrel" the hon. Minister, a person that they only know who now comes out and says, 'I was elected by loggers so too bad for you people', certainly they have the right to expect much more than that, Mr. Speaker, from a senior minister of the Crown.

The people of Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker -

It is my understanding that the Minister of Mines and Energy, The Minister of Health, and the Minister of Justice, all were invited to attend the meeting in Grand Falls on Friday night.

MR. H. COLLINS: I was not.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: The Minister of Health says he was not. I am sorry. I am only quoting what was in the news reports.

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3136

RT-3

AN HON. MEMBER:

(inaudible)

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

But the Minister of Health, you would think, would ensure that he had been invited being the Minister responsible for hospital expansion and construction and so on.

MR. H. COLLINS:

How do you go about that?

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Oh, that is very simple, Mr. Speaker. I can give the Minister of Health a lesson in many rules of politics if he wants to accept a lesson. But the Minister should have ensured - I mean, his colleague from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) sits on that side of the House; he

MR. RIDEOUT: does not sit over here. Maybe he should but he does not. But the minister was not there, the Minister of Justice was not there and the member from Green Bay was not there. The people from Grand Falls, and rightly so, are saying that in their opinion, from what they have been able to gather from their member who was a minister in the Cabinet who, though he broke Cabinet secrecy and solidarity once before, before the Budget came in and as the Premier rightly replied to it, or in his speech in the House when he tabled his resignation said, it was an unforgivable sin

But anyway the member did it, the minister at that time did it and the people out there had reason to believe that one of their greatest stumbling blocks toward the extension of the Grand Falls Hospital is the Minister of Mines and Energy, the member for Green Bay. And that particular hospital, Mr. Speaker, serves as a referral center for the district that that hon. gentleman serves as it does for most of the district that I serve and many other districts in the Central Newfoundland area. The people have reason to believe that he is one of the greatest stumbling blocks to having that vote passed through Cabinet. I do not know if that is so or not, Mr. Speaker, but the people of Grand Falls had one sitting in the midst of that Cabinet table who ought to know whether it was the case or not. But I do know this, I do know that the Minister of Mines and Energy said publicly in Baie Verte that he was against the extension to the Grand Falls Hospital, that he had voted against it in Cabinet and that he would vote against it again and that he hoped somebody reported it to the people of Grand Falls. I do know he said that because I was there and I am not hard of hearing. I know exactly what he said.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were not asleep.

MR. RIDEOUT: I was not asleep. You cannot go asleep when the Minister of Mines and Energy is speaking. But, Mr. Speaker, he did not go to Grand Falls on Friday night though he was invited to, in person, deliver his beliefs to the people of Grand Falls and to all

MR. RIDEOUT: the people of Central Newfoundland. Maybe there is some problem with the Cottage Hospital at Springdale, I do not know. But whatever it is the minister could have justified what he said in Baie Verte. I did not get on the radio the next day and report what he had said, it was none of my business. I have the opportunity to do that in the House of Assembly. But he asked, he wished, his great desire was that it be reported. So it has been reported now, Mr. Speaker. That is exactly his feeling towards the extension to the Grand Falls Hospital.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we talked about the important area of health care and medical care in this Province and we see the Prayer of the Petition presented in this House today by my colleague from Fortune-Hermitage that outlined better than I can say, in as many words as I may chose to use to describe it, the health care of people in certain areas of this Province. An example, Mr. Speaker, where you have 600 people, 600 men, women and children of this Province subjected to a bimonthly, two visits a month from a doctor and, I suppose, if he is like most doctors being as busy as they are those visits will be three or four hours duration at the most. How many people can he see in that length of time, Mr. Speaker, on two visits a month? And we see no move by the government to take care of that particular situation or similar situations, I would submit, existing in many communities along the South Coast of this Province and along the Northeast Coast of this Province. I believe there is one medical clinic been constructed in this Province this year and that is at Flower's Cove. I do not know of any other, Mr. Speaker. That does not mean that there is no need for any more.

There are a lot of clinics -

MR. RIDEOUT: I know there are a lot of clinics. A lot of people, Mr. Speaker, are getting their clinics like they are getting them in my district through the very good use of Canada Works programmes, building a municipal building with a place for the fire truck and a place for the nurse and a place for the mayor and -

MR. H. COLLINS: Now the hon. member knows, who supports them in rentals now? Let us be fair.

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh yes, that is right. Once they are in place - I know the hospital in my particular case draws up some sort of agreement whereby they pay - Well it is enough to pay the cleaning anyway and pay the heat and light.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the real crux of the problem that my constituents are facing on the South Coast. The real crux of the problem is that they do not have enough visits from the medical practitioner in the area and maybe it is a case where the minister's department should look into the very real possibility of putting in the place this nurse-practitioner programme which I think works very well.

MR. H. COLLINS: I ask the hon. member how many doctors are -

MR. RIDEOUT: Which works very well, Mr. Speaker, I know in my district. I know it works very well in the places in my district and maybe this is the case in point where that type of programme could be expanded and put in the place. But what it all boils down to, Mr. Speaker, is the adequate medical care of the people that we represent in this Province. There are areas where it is quite adequately done. There are areas where that is not the case and from what I gathered from the prayer of that petition this evening is that the South Coast is one of the places where that is not happening especially in the community of Hermitage, I think it was, in my hon. friend's district.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there have been some things said here which I really cannot permit to go unchallenged. It was indicated earlier from members opposite that there was no doctor in Hermitage because of the restraints situation and nothing could be further from the truth. We have had several doctors in Hermitage during the past year and unfortunately we have not been able to keep them there. It is one of

MR. H. COLLINS: the top priorities in the department to obtain a replacement for the most recent doctor who was in Hermitage who has moved on to Mose Ambrose. And I am sure the hon. member for the district knows that we are doing everything within our means to get a doctor for Hermitage. Restraint has nothing to do with it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. Your Honour knows that it is not a point of order. At the very least it is difference of opinion between two hon. members and if the hon. Minister of Health was listening as closely as he would like us to believe he is listening, then he would know that I was referring to the petition tabled in this House today by my colleague, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) and that the petitioners are residents of Seal Cove, not Hermitage.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. J. COLLINS): Order, please! I do not think it is necessary for the Chair to enter a ruling here. It was an explanatory matter I feel.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So as I was suggesting, Mr. Speaker, we have to be looking at the medical needs of the people of this Province and the minister says they cannot get doctors to stay in there. Well that may be a problem. But if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then some incentives have to be drawn up or some other programme must be developed. We cannot have 600 residents who do not have ready availability to medical services like they do in that particular community. So the minister should be, his department should be, Mr. Speaker, working on that type of programme and trying to develop that type of programme in other areas of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to move on to another subject. Mr. Speaker, we have not heard very much this past

MR. RIDEOUT: number of days from anybody on the other side with regard to the Come By Chance oil refinery. We hear, Mr. Speaker, by the grapevine that a couple of ministers, even though we are in the midst of a session of the House of Assembly, are going to take a jaunt over to Europe, over to England I believe, to meet with ECGD, if those are the proper initials. We hear that there are a couple of ministers preparing to go over to Europe, Mr. Speaker, to talk to the ECGD people. What is the matter with those people coming over here, Mr. Speaker? This is where the oil refinery is. The oil refinery is at Come By Chance.

MR. HICKMAN: The money is over there.

MR. RIDEOUT: The money may be over there, but the minister was over there and he got a loan of \$50 million and he liked it so much that he wants to go back again, Mr. Speaker. The money may well be over there but certainly every time we want to talk about the Come By Chance oil refinery does there have to be a jaunt by a couple of Cabinet Ministers over to England? Unfortunately no. The Minister of Transportation and Communications is sort of insinuating that he likes the trips going over there.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point still remains we have not been given any statement of position by any minister in this government in recent months with regard to negotiations about the sale or the reactivation of the Come By Chance oil refinery. The minister made a ministerial statement a few weeks ago to the effect that the Ultramar proposal had been turned down. The minister said that in the House of Assembly. But, Mr. Speaker, we in the dark, we do not know anything else that may be going on. Are there any proposals before the government now? What about this, - the first Arabian Corporation is it? - what about the first Arabian corporation? Are there any proposals before the government from this group? Or does the government want to deal

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3138

MI - 3

MR. RIDEOUT: with all those proposals in secret?

Would they not like to inform the House of Assembly and the people of Newfoundland what is happening with their oil refinery out in Come By Chance? I know you cannot negotiate the final details and dot the t's and cross the i's in public. You cannot do that type of public negotiation. But certainly .

MR. RIDEOUT: the minister, whoever it is that may be speaking for the Come By Chance Oil Refinery issue those days, because the Minister of Transportation ^{has} so many titles that you almost have to flick a button to see when he stands up what he is speaking for at that particular point.

MR. CALLAN: Why does he not take the member for the district along with him?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, that is an excellent idea.

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier, the leader of this administration, were to take on as many departments as the Minister of Transportation and Communications, to use the title I am most familiar with, then you would have a two man Cabinet. That is about all you would have, a two man Cabinet, because the minister is minister of almost everything, has a half dozen departments trailing behind him. If the Premier had as much energy and would show the good example himself - and the Premier, you must remember, Mr. Speaker, when elected, one of his party's platforms, when the time had come and the time is now, was that he would reduce the size of the Cabinet. Well, the Premier, having found a minister who was willing to punch in as much time as the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island, if he had himself that commitment, the Premier could well have carried out that particular promise, because there would be two people in the Cabinet, the Premier and the Minister of Transportation and whatever else he is. The Minister of Justice - there would be no need to have the Minister of Justice in the Cabinet. There would be no need whatsoever. There would be no need to have the Minister of Education in the Cabinet.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, when they wanted to announce the Task Force on Education the Premier suddenly decided that he was going to take that on to himself, that the Task Force was going to be announced by him, made up, I would assume, by people approved by him and who were going to answer to him. If the Premier would take on those responsibilities as has his colleague, then there would be a two man Cabinet and you would have the rest of the ministers who are presently ministers in the backbenches. But of course, the Premier, Mr. Speaker, has not had the desire to interrupt his golfing or his salmon fishing or anything of that nature to take on as many odious responsibilities as running the Department of Education or the Department of Finance or certainly the Department of Justice or departments like that.

So, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, what is happening with the Come By Chance Oil Refinery? We have not had any progress report from any minister in this government in ages. We do not have a clue as to what is going on. We do not know if any serious efforts are being made by the government to attract a buyer.

MR. CALLAN:

They never take the member of a district with them when they -

MR. RIDEOUT:

They never take the member from the district with them so that the Opposition could be thoroughly informed as to what is happening. They go across the Atlantic jaunt after jaunt, Mr. Speaker, but they do not share the wealth. They do not do that type of thing. And it has been known, Mr. Speaker, that backbenchers from the other side have gone to Europe. Ambassadors can attest to that, Mr. Speaker. It has been known that people from the other side have gone to Europe.

AN HON. MEMBER:

- take you the next time.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to win a trip to Europe, but what I am saying is - and I think the little bit of joking debate that we have had certainly should illustrate the point that we do not know - we had no way of knowing. The minister responsible has not taken the responsibility or has not exercised what I believe to be his responsibility in keeping the House informed of a \$200 million or \$300 million project that is lying idle out there at the moment. We hear names kicked around like Ultramar and First Arabian Corporation and all those kinds of big dollar people, but we do not know where the government stands on the Come By Chance Oil Refinery at this moment.

MR. CALLAN: If he will not take me why does he not take the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) to represent us.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, or take anybody.
The key is, Mr. Speaker, that we have a right to know.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The member who represents the district has a right to know what the government is doing with regard to the reactivation of the Come by Chance oil refinery. And there has been no effort by the minister to keep the House informed with regards to what is happening. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the the minister has not seen fit to do that because it should be one of the things that he would really want to do, to keep the House up to date with regard to what is happening out in Come by Chance especially in view of the fact that they always get a couple of trips across the ocean every now and then to meet ECCD. As the minister said, the money is over there. But as I say to him the oil refinery is over here. Maybe at least you can alternate. They can come over here once in a while and if necessary we can go over there once in a while.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is another area, it is another example of where the government has failed to make any effort to take this House into its confidence and to provide this House with some concrete evidence that they are governing this Province, that they are carrying out the people's business. It is another example where the government have failed to do that and then they can throw charges of obstruction, charges of wasting the House's time, charges of negativity, they can throw all that across the House and they can stand over there, Mr. Speaker, glue bound as they were today when we were presenting petitions, They can sit over there and they can smile at it when they have not taken this House into its confidence. And that may be one of the reasons and certainly is one of the reasons that the government is getting a hard time, and rightfully so, from this Opposition. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing the job we were sent here to do. And the government should have the good sense to bring this House into its confidence and let it know exactly what is going on with regard to the sale of the Come By Chance Oil Refinery.

Mr. Speaker, the same thing can be said about the sale or reactivation of Labrador Linerboard. We have not heard a squeak, Mr. Speaker, from any minister on the other side. You would

MR. RIDEOUT:

not know to listen to - with the words that have come across the House, Mr. Speaker, you would think that the Labrador Linerboard Mill sank into the ground or sank into the sea out on the West Coast of Newfoundland.

MR. McNEIL

They would like for it to sink,

MR. RIDEOUT: You would not know, Mr. Speaker, but it did not even exist. You do not hear a ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker, informing the House, informing the members for the Bay St. George area, informing the public of Newfoundland, you do not hear a ministerial statement from - I think the same minister is responsible as is for Come by Chance - you do not hear any ministerial statement from that minister letting us know what is happening with regard to any moves that might be ongoing to reactivate Labrador Linerboard Mill at Stephenville. As I said, Mr. Speaker, if you had to judge by what has been said in this House of Assembly you could only draw the conclusion that the Labrador Linerboard Mill at Stephenville does not exist any longer. That is what attention has been paid to it in this House.

My colleague, the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) has attempted to ask questions about what is happening, attempted to find out some information through Question Period about any negotiations that may be ongoing, about the sale, the reactivation or whatever of the plant at Stephenville. The member has attempted on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, to ask questions about that very important subject concerning the people of his district. And you almost get rapped on the knuckles, Mr. Speaker, by ministers on the other side for even being so bold as to ask questions about the Labrador Linerboard. Because you may ruffle some negotiations that might be ongoing, you may ruffle some feathers in some high places, in places where the government may or may not be negotiating the reactivation or the sale of the Labrador Linerboard.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the impression you would get, Mr. Speaker. That is the impression you would get when you listen to a cross-fire of questions and answers from my colleague and the minister responsible on the other side.

MR. DOODY: Not the same minister?

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, all I know, Mr. Speaker, is that the same minister has been answering for both projects in the times that I was in the House during Question Period and I am not absent very often.

MR. McNEIL: They will not even help in the little projects.

MR. RIDEOUT: They have the Department of Industrial Development, Mr. Speaker, that has become the Department of Industrial Shut Downs^s. That is the only thing you can refer to it as. And again in the Labrador Linerboard instance as in the instance of Come By Chance, the government have refused, have outrightly refused to take this House of Assembly into its confidence and to let us know what is going on, to let us know if there are any negotiations, to let us know if there might be a deal in sight, to let us know if there is somebody even modestly interested in the Labrador Linerboard mill at Stephenville.

MR. McNEIL: The chairman of the board does not know what is going on but the Minister of Industrial Development does.

MR. RIDEOUT: The chairman of the board, Mr. Speaker, my colleague reminds me, does not even know what is going on - or he says he does not. It is a weird state of affairs, Mr. Speaker. The way that this government is governing or attempting to govern this Province is certainly a weird state of affairs. And then they come into the House and throw their hands up in frustration that the Opposition has been negative - they are not

MR. RIDEOUT: bringing in anything positive. Mr. Speaker, we are not being told anything as I said in the beginning, and as I think becomes more and more clear as I am making the few remarks that I am making. The government must be spending the vast majority of its time, Mr. Speaker, huddled around the Cabinet table trying to keep the ship afloat.

Mr. Speaker, while I am talking about Labrador Linerboard let me branch off into another little subhead on that particular project. When Labrador Linerboard was forced to close down by this government a year or so ago because it lacked the initiative and because it lacked the foresight to do anything about the woods problem, which was the key to the whole problem - the government ministers, minister after minister, said standing in their place on the other side during debate last year, that the cost of wood was the key to the problem - and the government did not have the initiative and the courage to force the realignment of forest products in this Province; then they automatically signed the death warrant for Labrador Linerboard. When they did not do that, Mr. Speaker, and thereby forced the close down of Labrador Linerboard they began almost immediately, Mr. Speaker, to play politics with Labrador Linerboard close down. Anybody who was listening to the remarks that I made this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, knows full well that Labrador Linerboard has had a serious effect on the economy of at least one region of my district - that is the Roddickton area - and another region of my district, the Middle Arm, Burlington area - two great logging areas in my district. And I am using my district as an example, Mr. Speaker, because I know it best. That is the case in

MR. RIDEOUT: other districts represented by hon. gentleman on both sides of this House. The close down of Labrador Linerboard caused a depressed economy or a depressed economic situation in many areas of this Province. It was not only the Stephenville area that was hit by the close down of Labrador Linerboard. It may have been hit the hardest or one of the hardest, but certainly it was not the only area.

And then, Mr. Speaker, this government, bowing to pressure from Goose Bay - Happy Valley area instituted a programme under the auspices of the Department of Rural Development whereby they would assist machine owners in the Goose/Happy Valley area, whereby they would assist those owners even to the point of purchasing back their equipment that had been repossessed by finance companies and other financial institutions, and, Mr. Speaker, because of the particular circumstances faced by those people and because of the particular circumstances faced by all other residents of this Province so

MR. RIDEOUT:

affected by the same set of similar circumstances. You would not hear any argument from this hon. gentleman if the policy which I think is a good one, if that policy had been allowed to apply to other areas of the Province similarly affected. But did it apply to the Roddickton area, Mr. Speaker? Not on your life. Did it apply to the Burlington-Middle Arm area where operator after operator has gone bankrupt, where they have seen their equipment that they had almost paid off taken away from them by financial institutions, finance companies and so on, where they have seen their life savings go down the drain because they were encouraged by Labrador Linerboard which was and is a government Crown corporation, because they were encouraged by Lab Linerboard to invest into the woods harvesting industry? Mr. Speaker, every last cent that they were owner of they invested even to the point of mortgaging their homes encouraged, aided and abetted by the government's Crown corporation, Lab Linerboard. Then when she went on the rocks, then when Lab Linerboard went on the rocks aided and abetted by this government was there any assistance forthcoming for those people? No, Mr. Speaker, there was not. There was assistance forthcoming for the people who lived and were in Goose Bay-Happy Valley and rightly so. I would be the last one in this House to criticize it, rightly so. But was that same assistance forthcoming for the residents of Roddickton who went under? No, Mr. Speaker. Was the same assistance forthcoming for the residents of Burlington or Middle Arm that went under? No, it was not. And that is where I accuse this government and point my finger for playing again partisan politics with the close down of Labrador Linerboard.

I have no objection whatsoever to the programme of assistance that was drawn up to aid the people of Goose Bay who were about to have their machinery taken away from them, ^{no} objection whatsoever. And aided people, Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated ^{who} had their machinery taken away from them, repossessed by finance companies, ^{the} government went and bought it back, I have no objection to that at all. It is right and proper because the

MR. RIDEOUT:

government forced the close-down of Labrador Linearboard and the government should help bail out those people who had put their life savings into buying wood harvesting equipment because of the rosy situation offered to them by Lab Linerboard. I am not against that at all.

What I am against and what I had much correspondence on, Mr. Speaker, with the former Minister of Rural Development, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), what I had a great deal of correspondence on with him was that people living in Roddickton suffering from the same set of circumstances, victims of the same set of circumstances, penalized by the same set of circumstances, backed into financial disaster by the same set of circumstances, were not aided by this government. And I would say that Roddickton and the Middle Arm area in my district next to Goose Bay were the hardest hit areas of this Province in terms of wood harvesting equipment that individuals owned. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) nods his head and he probably knows what I am talking about. So were they assisted? The member asked for the same programme to apply to them and asked very quickly. Immediately that I heard the programme announced I said, thanks be to God, this is the saviour for those people down in Roddickton and Middle Arm and Burlington who through no fault of their own are going to go under, at least they will have their equipment, at least they will have their credit protected. At least they will have that.

Now they cannot dare, Mr. Speaker, approach the bank or approach the Rural Development Authority or approach the federal Business Development Bank because their name is mud, their credit ratings are - they would not even look at them because the government using partisan politics in a programme that could very well have helped those people agreed to bail out operators in one area of the Province but not in another. Is

MR. T. RIDEOUT: the reason the same reason, as is contained in this infamous letter about occupational health and safety?

MR. McNEIL: Right on!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Is the reason the same reason, Mr. Speaker? I have no other recourse but to believe that the reason is exactly that very same reason.

The poor, unfortunate fools of Roddickton made a mistake, they voted the wrong way, the same as the poor, unfortunate fools of Middle Arm and Burlington. Yes, as I said, those two areas next to the area represented by my friend from Naskaupí (Mr. Goudie) were hardest hit by the exact same set of circumstances. No different! How does it make any difference, Mr. Speaker, whether the owner of the equipment decided to stay in Goose Bay and live on welfare, or move back to his hometown of Roddickton and live on welfare until he got a job? He was affected by the same set of circumstances, the close-down of Labrador Linerboard. So it made no iota of difference whether he lived in Goose Bay or came back to his hometown of Roddickton to live. But could he get assistance? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, it made no difference whatsoever whether the Roy Goudie's of the Burlington peninsula lost their equipment because of the same set of circumstances. It should have made no difference that Roy Goudie and a half a dozen other small operators lived in Burlington and Middle Arm and in communities like Baie Verte - it should have made no difference where they lived, they were affected by the same circumstances as affected those people who lived in Goose Bay-Happy Valley, and that was the close-down of Labrador Linearboard.

So, Mr. Speaker, what was sauce for the goose, no pun intended since I am talking about Goose Bay, should have been sauce for the gander, but it was not.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Another example of where this Government operated not according to the need of people, not according to the fact that their credit rating would go down the drain, that they would never again for years and years into the future be able to borrow a cent. They did not care. They did not care, Mr. Speaker, that they had paid off three-quarters and in many cases more of the particular piece of machinery. A man from Burlington comes to me and almost cries that he has only \$5,000 left, owing on a tractor but it is going to be taken back by IAC because the Government will not bail him out. But they bailed out the same type of person affected by the same set of circumstances, living under the same conditions in Goose Bay-Happy Valley. What do you tell that person, Mr. Speaker? How do you ever again instill in that person any confidence in the Administration that is governing this Province? How do you do it? Can you go to the minister responsible who at that time was the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and you beat yourself black and blue trying to convince him that, 'Look, it should apply to any person living anywhere in the Province if he has been affected by the same set of circumstances'? What is unreasonable about that, Mr. Speaker?

There is certainly nothing political about it. But could he get assistance? No! He did not even get assistance - or they, because at the time there was more than one - they did not even get assistance from the Government's own patronage committee, the Rural Development Authority. They could not even get assistance from them. At least their equipment could have been paid off so that it would not be repossessed.

Mr. Speaker, those people living in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, while they have their equipment, and I say, "Thank God", at least they got the benefit from it, but those people are they employed today, usefully and gainfully using their equipment? I would suggest that many of them are not, Mr. Speaker.

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3143

RT-3

MR. T. RIDEOUT: But those people in Roddickton could be gainfully employed today had they had their equipment restored to them or had they been able to keep it. And those gentlemen in Burlington and Middle Arm, and in Baie Verte on the Baie Verte peninsula could be gainfully employed today cutting pulpwood for Bowaters and Price. They could be gainfully employed. But what happened, Mr. Speaker? Their whole world was torn apart by the callousness and the uncaring attitude taken towards them by this Government.

Prop up one of our own members who has that problem. I am not against that. Prop him up, it may affect his 'politicability', his 'electability' and we may need every seat we can get. Of course, you will need every seat you can get.

MR. RIDEOUT: The problem is you are not going to get enough. But prop them up. Do what we can to prop them up but do not let it go into Rideout's district which as I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, was the one next to the district of Naskaupi that was the most affected district anywhere in this Province with regards to private operators - not saying because of other aspects of the close-down but because of private operators. So we will create a programme for what, Mr. Speaker, for what objective? What is the reason for creating the programme? To shore up one of our own members. What a way to govern the Province, Mr. Speaker. What a way to govern the Province when half a dozen operators in Roddickton and another half a dozen in the Burlington area who lost every cent of their life savings, whose homes were mortgaged to the hilt and who are now out there cringing by the telephone waiting for the eviction orders to come. What a way to govern this Province when you would draw up a programme that would only apply, a good programme though it was because notice, Mr. Speaker, I have not criticized the programme, I have criticized the way it was implemented - a good programme though it would only apply to one little political region of this Province, one individual district.

Again, Mr. Speaker, a sad state of affairs when this government - There are unparliamentary words that you could use to describe such action but, of course, I am not allowed to use them. But what it boils down to, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not mind instituting a programme to shore up our own political chances but we are not concerned about people. And I would not mind, Mr. Speaker, if the facts were different, I would not mind if the cases were not similar but they all went under because Lab Linerboard closed down and to get that into some of the thick skulls on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, the thick skull of the minister who held the portfolio at that time and who now, Mr. Speaker, finds that he can criticize and condemn some of the actions of that administration that he was part of. And to see, Mr. Speaker, those

MR. RIDEOUT: people losing their equipment that they had three-quarters and eighty per cent paid off, tractors worth \$25,000 or \$30,000 with only \$5,000 owing on them. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, hon. members ought to be able to feel for those people. Then to know that your hands were tied, you could not do anything for them because the government would not allow the programme to be implemented anywhere only in Goose Bay-Happy Valley. Then, Mr. Speaker, they come before this House and they tell us that we are negative, we do not have any positive proposals to put forth. Mr. Speaker, it is a case where negativity breathes negativity. How can you help but be negative when you know that you do not have a square deal, when you know that the people you represent have been shafted? How can you help but be negative? And when you go to the minister concerned and you lay the facts on the table and there is not one iota of a difference between an operator going under in Roddickton because of the close down of Labrador Linerboard than there is in an operator going under in Goose-Happy Valley because of the same close-down.

When you lay all that out and you expect that you are approaching reasonable men with a reasonable solution to a similar problem you would expect, Mr. Speaker, that the reasonableness of the case would prevail and that the programme, which would not have been very costly anyway because in some of those cases there was very little left owing on the machinery and you will see that that programme is made again into a political football. And they have the gumption, Mr. Speaker, to ask us not to be negative. They have the gumption to suggest that to bring forth such problems is negativity in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate. I will give my decision before leaving the Chair on the matter brought up earlier this afternoon. Hon. members will recall that the matter first came up with respect to a point of order. It was submitted on one side that the hon. the member for Terra Nova

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3144

JM - 3

MR. SPEAKER: had made an allegation with respect to the Director of Air Services-submitted by the hon. gentleman himself that there had not been any allegation. The Chair's ruling on the point of order was that this was not a matter within the Chair's purview and it was a difference of opinion as to the nature of the statements. That was followed by a point of privilege with respect to those remarks. They are fairly brief. I will read them and then give my decision.

"Mr. Speaker, this is a most important question we are"- And I should give the

MR. SPEAKER:

the source, Hansard, May 12, JM - 1. "Mr. Speaker, this is a most important question we are into now because the Director of Air Services, as I understand it, is the gentleman who sets the quota for helicopter hiring for the government and this sort of thing. But something has been brought to my attention, a very important matter and I would like for the minister to comment on as to its truthfulness and that is, it has been brought to my attention that the Director of Air Services when travelling via air or any other way, I suppose, carries in his pocket a little tape recorder on which he tapes all of the utterings of ministers and I think it is very important that the minister look into this for his own protection. I am just advising the minister on this for his own protection so that he can check the matter out. But that has been brought to my attention that this gentleman does go around with a little tape recorder in his pocket and when he is travelling with ministers tapes everything that is carried on.

"So, I wonder if the minister can comment on that and if he does not know about the situation then look into it for his own protection."

I find, number one, that the matter in order to fulfill the area of privilege, two requirements, one that the matter be brought up at the earliest opportunity and two, often referred to as prima facie which is that the substance is of such a nature that the privilege is involved and the matter will take precedence and a motion arising out of that matter will take precedence over the other Standing Orders.

I find, number one, the matter was not brought up at the earliest opportunity. On the substantive part of the submission, the suggestion was made that this was an abuse of the immunity of the House. All the Chair can do is judge whether immunity is operative or not. And immunity here is operative. It is not operative with respect to remarks at the Royal Family, high judicial officials and certainly one hon. member with respect to another hon. member. In my

MR. SPEAKER:

opinion immunity is operative and the Chair does not have the authority to judge whether immunity is properly or improperly used. That is a matter individual members judge or the House judges or whomever. However, it is not a matter on which the Chair has the authority to make any decision.

Therefore the matter is not of such a nature as to take precedence over the other Standing Orders.

It now being six o'clock I leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M. this evening.

VOLUME 3

NO. 60

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
8:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M.
MONDAY, 15TH. MAY, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few more minutes to make a few more remarks on the sub-amendment that I introduced today. I have been trying to outline cases, Mr. Speaker, cases proved to any reasonable person beyond any doubt that this government has lost, and rightly so, the confidence of the people of this Province. If all would come to all, Mr. Speaker, and people were to vote according to their conscience I may be able to go as far as to say that the government has lost the confidence of this House.

Every time we attempt to talk about areas where the government has fallen down on the job, Mr. Speaker, the first thing we hear whacked across at us is 'being negative.' The government cannot bear to have the truth told, but it is going to be told, Mr. Speaker. We are not about to be party to any agreement to have a premature closedown of this House of Assembly. We are not going to be party to any agreement of that nature, because Sir, we have oodles and oodles of information that must go out to the people and we will take every opportunity we can to present that information to the House of Assembly. It is the people's House, the people have a right to know and there will be no agreements from this side when it comes to a premature closedown of the House of Assembly, no matter what the Premier may say, in newspapers or any other means he has, across this Province. Because, as I said the other night, Mr. Speaker, I am not in any particular rush to move my bones from St. John's back to any other part of the Province as long as there is business of the people to be done. I have nothing else to do and have done nothing else since September 16th., 1975 only be a full time member. So I am in no particular rush in any way to move from here back to

MR. RIDEOUT: any other part of the Province. I do not care if that is August or September or the middle of July or whatever. We will stay here as long as is necessary.

So for the government to say that we are not dealing with the Province's business, Mr. Speaker, is nothing only a blatant attempt by the government to drag another red herring across the political scene in this Province.

MR. LUSH: Christmas Day and New Year's is all we want.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, just like we did at Easter, my colleague reminds me. Christmas Day and New Year's is good enough for me. We did not agree to a twelve or fourteen day break at Easter. The government wanted a twelve or fourteen day break. They had it over our objections, not the unanimous consent of the House, as some ministers would have the people of this Province to believe by the releases that they put out on the airwaves.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be sucked in by that kind of thought, efforts by people on the other side to say that we are misusing the time of the House, that is not the case; efforts by people on the other side to say that the decorum of the House has been lowered, that the House is not working, that is not the case. In the three years I have been here, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this House is working better than ever it did, because the issues that mean something to the people, or ought to mean something to the people, are being discussed and are being debated and certainly one of those key issues, certainly one of the key issues has to be whether or not people have faith and have confidence in the administration. And I would submit to Your Honour and to this House that that is not the case. This administration has broken faith on every count, this administration has broken faith with the people of this Province, starting back as far as September 1975 when the blatant platitudes of electoral promises were made that they knew they could

MR. RIDEOUT: never fulfill. They cannot accuse us of that, Mr. Speaker. We were not the governing party. We did not know what could be accomplished or what could not be accomplished within the bounds of financial restraint. You would never know but this hon. crowd did not know either, Mr. Speaker, and that is where they began the long story and the long trail of breaking faith with the people of this Province, exemplified in the CBC poll a few days ago, exemplified in a poll that we had done, the Liberal Party had done, a few weeks before that. So, Mr. Speaker, the day of reckoning is approaching when this administration will answer for their sins to the people of this Province.

MR. BIDDOFT: So this foolishness, this red herring foolishness, Mr. Speaker, of accusing the Opposition of wasting the time of the House of Assembly is nothing only that; nothing only foolishness, nothing only a red herring approach in an effort to embarrass us and shut us up so that we will sit down and let the government call the business as they see fit and close the House down as fast as possible. It was exemplified again today, Mr. Speaker, by the Government House Leader who did not even have the courage to inform us beforehand, which is customary, he did not have the courtesy - every day when we come to this House, Mr. Speaker, before strangers are admitted, or most every day before we even get up on the ninth floor to the precincts of the House, we have an idea of what the government intends to call on that particular day. But not so today, Mr. Speaker, where there are only five or six of us in the Opposition. Once again the Government House Leader, as he has been so noted for doing, miscalculated; once again the Government House Leader read the Opposition wrong. He underestimated us, Mr. Speaker, he thought that by a quick call of order, number one, he could have the Throne Speech cleared off the Order Paper and probably suspected that if we were as stunned over here as he thought we were he could have the Budget Speech go the same way. But, Mr. Speaker, once again the Government House Leader read us wrong. We are not about to let that type of thing happen because there are too many important issues, Mr. Speaker, to be talked about, too many important issues to be debated in this House, and one thing they are not going to be able to accuse us of and that is when we have the opportunity of debating thoroughly and fully the issues that face the people of this Province. We do not decide, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows, we do not decide in what order business is called in this House. That is not our - in fact, it is not one of our prerogatives. I was going to say it is not our responsibility but it cannot even be that because it is not one of our prerogatives. We do not decide that. But when it is called, the

MR. BIDECHT:

Government House Leader should have learned by now that those of us in the Opposition are prepared to debate to the end and until it is thoroughly and fully debated the issues that are facing the people of this Province, issues of unemployment and educational cutbacks and so on. So, Mr. Speaker, once again the Government House Leader misread and misjudged the Opposition and there it is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to talk about the crazy educational policy that has been enunciated over the past few weeks in this Province by the present administration. I have to say now, Mr. Speaker, that never before in the history of this Province were the parents and the educators so disappointed by the educational leadership of a person who ought to know better when it comes to educational policy in this Province. The present Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, must have, if he was doing his job and I know he was must have when he was a teacher, must have when he was a school principal, must have when he was a superintendent, argued long and hard and argued ferociously before the government of the day for progress in the field of education. And those of us who knew him, Mr. Speaker, those of us who knew him in those days would probably have breathed a sigh of relief in 1975, in the Fall of 1975 when that gentleman was appointed to be Minister of Education. But, Mr. Speaker, what a sad letdown for the educational process in this Province, what a sad letdown indeed, Mr. Speaker, when that hon. minister has shown about as much leadership in the field of education as you would expect from a kindergarten student. That is about the amount of leadership that that hon. gentleman has shown in the field of education.

We have seen in this Province under the leadership of that minister the continued degrading over the last three years of the quality of education in this Province. We have seen cutbacks in every conceivable area that one can imagine under the leadership of this minister. A minister, Mr. Speaker, that we may have thought would have gone into the Cabinet room

MR. RIDEOUT: and dug in his heels and would have argued until the bitter end, even to the point of threatening resignation if that be necessary -

AN HON. MEMBER: Perhaps he did.

MR. RIDEOUT: - for the educational well being, or continued progress in education in this Province. But there is no evidence that that minister did that, Mr. Speaker, no evidence whatsoever. We have seen cutbacks in scholarships. We have seen cutbacks in the amount that schoolboards must pay for school bus transportation. We have seen cutbacks in the allocation of teachers. We have seen it all. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that had to come under the leadership of the hon. member, say, for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who got the flick from the Cabinet, if that had come under the leadership of that hon. gentleman, well we might be able to shrug our shoulders and say, "Well, what can you expect?" But certainly we do not expect that type of leadership from the present Minister of Education, the man who made his mark as an educator in this Province and has certainly made another mark since becoming minister.

Like I say, Mr. Speaker, if that had come under the leadership of the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) then it would be understandable. The greatest contribution that that member made to education in this Province is when he had schools closed a little bit longer than necessary in September so that the students could engage in blueberry picking. That is about the contribution that he made to education in this Province.

We did not expect that type of leadership, Mr. Speaker, from the present minister, but we are getting it. There is no doubt about that that we are getting it. And the minister has shown his incompetence, Mr. Speaker, time after time he has shown his incompetence, has shown that he has not dug in where it matters, and that is in the Cabinet room, and fought for the progress in education in this Province that we so desperately need. Mr. Speaker, we have got students coming out in this Province now from the university or coming out of the schools now from the university.

MR. RIDEOUT: We will have them in another few weeks coming out from the College of Trades and Technology. We have them coming out of the Fisheries College. We have them coming out of the vocational schools. To go where, Mr. Speaker, to do what?

Where is the student unemployment policy of this administration? We have seen absolutely, Mr. Speaker, no evidence of any desire on the part of this administration to come up with any policy that would appreciably affect the amount of student unemployment in this Province, none whatsoever.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will be coming out of the high schools.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, and they will be coming out of the high schools now in a few more weeks. The only educational answer we see from this administration is slash her to the bone, cut her back as far as you can cut her back. But there has been no move in the other direction, Mr. Speaker, no move whatsoever to create any job opportunities for our students. Only for Young Canada Works what would the students of this Province have to look forward to? That much maligned Liberal Administration up in Ottawa who seem to be at the root of every problem that faces this Province, that every minister seems to lay the blame for every problem of this Province on the doorstep of Ottawa. The administration that has given up its responsibility of governing. That is exactly what has happened, Mr. Speaker, and now we see it again in the unemployment of students, or employment opportunities for students as they move in the thousands, Mr. Speaker, out of our schools to university, to the College of Trades and Technology, to vocational schools, to high schools, out of every educational institution that we have, as they move in the thousands out of those into the job market. Like I say, Mr. Speaker, the rhetorical question is for what, or to face what?

I am sure every hon. member on this side have, as I have, dozens of letters from students all over their districts

MR. RIDEOUT: in a desperate effort to find employment, clinging to the hope that we as members may be able to direct them somewhere where they can obtain a job. But, Mr. Speaker, there has been no programme, absolutely no programme, or no

MR. RIDDEOUT: policy thus far enunciated by this government that will move to alleviate that problem.

We asked, Mr. Speaker, a member of the Opposition on this side of the House asked a few days ago what plans this administration had to provide employment for our students, asked the question of the leader of the government, the leader of the administration, and you got some sort of mumbo-jumbo reply to the effect that they will be taken care of the same way that all the rest of the unemployed in this Province will be taken care of with the great development plans that this government has for the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: A one-way ticket out of the Province.

MR. RIDDEOUT: Which, Mr. Speaker, is a one-way ticket out of Newfoundland - not only a one-way ticket out of Newfoundland, but in some cases a one-way ticket to such far away and exotic places as Iran. That is the development policy when it comes to providing job opportunities for our people as this administration has.

A new centralization programme, Mr. Speaker, a little bit more harsh than that programme of the previous administration to say the least, to put it mildly, to be a little kind to the present administration, a little bit more harsh than that where you pack them bag and baggage and send them to the other side of the world, to the Far East or to the Tar Sands of Fort McMurray. A sad day indeed, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier could not even enunciate one particular area where his administration had a policy to offer job opportunities to the youth of this Province, the people, Mr. Speaker, whom we have to look to for the future of this Province, whom you would think we would be doing everything within our power to hold in here, not sitting back on our rears hoping that something will happen. Because, Mr. Speaker, man cannot live on hope alone and that seems to be what this administration believes. Man cannot feed his empty stomach on hope alone. He has to have more than hope -

AN HON. MEMBER: And motaballs.

MR. RIDDEOUT: - and motaballed oil refineries or linerboard mills when they need not be so, especially, as far as the

MR. RIDEOUT: Linerboard mill goes as I pointed out today already. It is enough to tear the heart, Mr. Speaker, out of anybody who is concerned about the future of this Province when we sit back and realize the negligence and neglect that has been presided over by this present administration. They have neglected every sector of our society and now they are turning on the young people.

MR. ION, MEMBER: No leadership.

MR. RIDEOUT: No leadership whatsoever in providing job opportunities for them.

MR. LUSH: The Premier said there would be about 500 jobs.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Premier figured there would be about 500 whom he would take into the Civil Service. Well, that is going to make a big dent, Mr. Speaker, into the thousands who are going to be pouring out through the doors of our educational institutions within the next few weeks - 500 who will get a scattered job in a provincial park or something of that nature. That is the great student employment programme that this administration has. And I suppose those jobs are already taken up by the favourite few. Yet the masses of those students will still continue to be unemployed, to wander without direction or without hope across the Province and across the country for the next few months. And the Premier then can reply in such a nonchalant manner that 'We are taking care of them the same as we are taking care of the rest of the unemployed in this Province.' And that he is, Mr. Speaker! And that he is taking care of them in the same way by doing absolutely nothing to solve the situation. It matters not, Mr. Speaker, whether their parents are on welfare. That does not matter, they will not receive any assistance from this administration. Speak about social assistance for those people to the present Minister of Social Services and he will fly into a tantrum like you would not believe, accusing them of being lazy and telling them to pack their bags and get out of the Province and seek greener pastures elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, there will not be much left of this Province if that is going to be our policy, to encourage them to pack their bags and move off. If that is the policy that

MR. RIDEOUT: is going to be the policy that is going to be followed by government in this Province then I would submit to Your Honour that there will not be much left of this Province a few years down the road.

And then, Mr. Speaker, to add insult to injury you have this callous, ill-conceived educational policy that has been embarked upon under the leadership of what one would think would be a credible educator in this Province. That, Mr. Speaker, adds the insult to the injury, where you have a minister who was superintendent of a rural board would permit his colleagues in Cabinet to increase the amount of money that school boards must pay for bus transportation without appreciably increasing any assistance from the government to the board to offset it. Because, Mr. Speaker, what is the point of robbing Peter to pay Paul, which is what that that type of policy would be.

The boards, Mr. Speaker, that have the least ability to raise from local sources the difference in funds that they must make up to pay for their bus contracts, that is the type of leadership we have coming from that minister. The same type of leadership, Mr. Speaker, that allows the minister to proclaim and to continue to defend the indefensible and that is the policy of cutting back on teacher allocations when we do not know what the result of that policy will be. The barn door policy, Mr. Speaker, where it is too late to close the door after the horse is gone, that is the type of policy. And then you have, to add reverence to the minister's leadership ability in that department, you have the Premier hauling the rug out from under him, taking over the task force himself. I do not know, I suppose he was disappointed in the way that his colleague, the minister, was defending the policy. I do not know what the reason was but the minister finally found that it was not he who got up in this House of Assembly and announced the task force, it was the Premier.

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister found that it would not be to him that the task force would be reporting, it would be to the Premier. Is it going too far to speculate, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has lost confidence in the ability of his Minister of Education? It would not boggle the imagination. Every other person in this Province has lost their confidence in their Minister of Education. It would not boggle the imagination to think that the Premier has also, that the minister cannot defend this crazy, insane, callous policy that has been embarked upon by the government and supported by him.

MR. LUSH: He has to go. He has to go.

MR. RIDEOUT: I did not see the minister's resignation in the papers. Whatever I can say or whatever I cannot about the motives of the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) he took the ultimate action and he had the conviction to do what he thought was right. He has gotten back in bed again with the Premier and I will elaborate on that a little later. He is obviously back in the same bed and I know, Mr. Speaker, that politics make queer bed fellows, I am well aware of that, but to see what is happening on the other side, Mr. Speaker, in this administration is unbelievable.

This crazy educational policy, Mr. Speaker, embarked upon by this government, aided and abetted by the Minister of Education, that so many people in this Province were looking forward to, to continue the march of progress that had been ongoing in education in this Province over the last number of years. And the sad part about it, Mr. Speaker, is that they insisted on going ahead with this crazy policy before they had any indication of what the result of it is going to be.

You would not know, Mr. Speaker, but that you were whittling on a piece of wood and if it did not come out right you could try it again. But you cannot do that with the

MR. RIDEOUT: human being, as any member in this House knows. If you do anything to retard the educational development of that child now, then it is something that is going to be with him for years and years and probably for the rest of his life. But that does not deter this administration, Mr. Speaker, from following the barn door policy. It does not deter them for doing it now and we will study the effects of it later. And that is exactly what they are doing with this task force, exactly what they are up to at this present

MR. VIDEOUT:

time. Instead of heeding the cries they tried to blame it on the teachers. Mr. Speaker. Well, I have not heard one person throughout this Province say that if you can lay off a teacher or save a few dollars without adversely affecting the quality of education then you ought to do that. That is not the issue. The issue, Mr. Speaker, is that we are groping around in the dark and do not know what the results of our actions will be. That is the key issue and that is the issue to which this Minister of Education has refused to address himself. I do not know if it is because he feels that he cannot articulate and defend the indefensible, I do not know if that is his reason. But whatever the reason, Mr. Speaker, the minister has not done it, has shown no signs that he has any intention of doing it and he just lets it slip on by as if it did not mean anything, like water off a duck's back. That is about the import of this major item to the present Minister of Education.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, in setting up his task force, did what? He picked two people from the university, quite competent I would say in their own field, good people, no argument from this side about that. One person happens to have been full-time in curriculum development, I believe, and the other person happens to have been associated with curriculum development for some time. And, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know that the Premier only intended to have one person, the Premier only intended to have one person on that Task Force. I happen to know that, Mr. Speaker, for a fact. But when that one person was asked he said, "No way, I will not do it alone." The Premier intended to have one person and to have that person study all the implications of this cutback policy and report to government before September. In other words it was another scapegoat hunt by the Premier: Have somebody mull over the situation and report to the Premier a little later down the road hopefully with recommendations that may be exactly what the Premier was looking for and then the Premier could slough off his responsibilities on this one-man task force. But, thank goodness, I have a lot of serious

MR. PIDFOULT: reservations about the task force as it is, Mr. Speaker, but thank goodness that particular person did not agree to serve alone and that he insisted on having at least one other person serve on the task force with him. But then, Mr. Speaker, the point still remains, the fact still remains, Your Honour, that we have two university professors qualified as they may well be and as I am sure they are looking into all aspects of this educational cutback policy in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, does not the opinion, the expert opinion in many cases of anybody else in this Province matter? Is the government saying that the parents do not have an input to make? Is the Province saying that the parents do not have something to contribute to this task force? How come there are no parents, Mr. Speaker, in the makeup of this particular task force? How come there is nobody from the Newfoundland Teacher's Association? And you could go on and on. The Premier's excuse, Mr. Speaker, is that you would have twelve or fourteen people and that it would become unmanageable because the Premier wanted to bulldoze it through, that is why, Mr. Speaker. He started off first of all by attempting to con one man into heading up that task force and when that person was too smart for that - thank God he was - the Premier said we will settle for two. But he would not settle for a representative of the parents. How come he would not settle for a representative of the students? How about business and industry and labour? No, no, Mr. Speaker! Keep it as small as you can and hopefully they will not have time, only the two of them, there will not be enough time to set up any sub-committees of the task force and spread out

Mr. Rideout: across the Province to investigate and to hear briefs and to get the opinion of the populace. There will not be time for that. So we will keep it as small as we can, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that those people will by the restraints of time placed upon them, and because of the fact that they will not be able to go all around the Province listening to representations from the people, they will come in with recommendations that this government will be able to accept and hopefully implement. And, of course, there will be no fear of that either, Mr. Speaker, because if they come in with any recommendations in the latter part of August or the first part of September, then the government, true to form as has been the case in every other committee or task force report that have come before them, the government, true to form, will take five or six months to study it, seven or eight months to study it, to look at the implications of the recommendations, and by that time the first school year under those criminal and callous cutbacks will have been effectively over and no action will be taken.

I will wager to bet, Mr. Speaker, that the task force report will not see the light of day very much before the next school year is over. It will be like the Workman's Compensation Board Review Report; it will soon be time to set up another one. One has to be set up by legislation every five years. It will soon be time to set up another one, Mr. Speaker, and the one that was set up months ago and reported to the government in June of 1975 has yet to see the light of day. So that is the track record of this government, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to task force reports.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education, being the knowledgeable educator that he is, allowed himself to be conned into this type of situation by his colleagues. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that that gentleman has fallen so far in so short a time in the eyes of the people of this Province who are looking for educational leadership? It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, that that person could allow it to happen to him. As I said, if it was the member for St. John's

Mr. Rideout: North (Mr. J. Carter) then it would be understandable.

He knows as much about education now as I know about -

AN HON. MEMBER: Savoury farming.

MR. RIDEOUT: - savoury farming.

But this minister, this minister to allow that to happen, who did not dig in his feet in Cabinet and say, "No way! You are not going to go ahead with this cutback policy until we have investigated the implications of it," and then to allow the Premier to whip it out from under his nose, take it into the Premier's office and set up a two-man task force, this minister who would allow that to happen, Mr. Speaker - another minister, another minister in the whole series of ministers that ought to tender his resignation. If he were to do the honourable thing, Mr. Speaker, if he could not convince his Cabinet colleagues to go along with him, at least to put a freeze on, at least to freeze it where it is right now until you had a chance, until the government had a chance to investigate all the implications of this cutback policy, at least freeze it where it is, if that minister never had the influence, Mr. Speaker, of convincing his Cabinet colleagues to do that much having been an educator and being a parent, he should have gotten out of the Cabinet. There is no two ways about that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. T. LUSH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I do not think there is a quorum present, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!
When the quorum call was made, to my knowledge a quorum was present.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a quorum present.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in continuing on with my remarks

I do not believe there is a quorum present at the moment, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A quorum call.

Call in the members.

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

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

I cannot hear points of order or anything else until a quorum has been obtained.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! I will ask the Clerk of the House to count the House.

Order, please! A quorum is present.

The hon. member,

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the subjects are so tender on the other side again. Mr. Speaker, as I said this evening, I am going to take all the time I want to make the few remarks that I have to make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I am not in any rush, no rush whatsoever. I am going to stay as long as I like, as long as Your Honour recognizes me, and I am going to say exactly what I feel like saying as long as it is within the bounds of parliamentary language.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: I have no intentions of being intimidated or harassed by those people on the other side who would like to see me sit down so they can go on to something else. Because where there is a story to be told, as there is in this educational policy; I am going to tell it. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will tell it when they get up to speak in this House in this debate or some other debate, because it must be told and it must be told over and over and over, Mr. Speaker, until it sinks in. It may be impossible for it to sink into heads on the other side, that may well be impossible, but hopefully it will sink in to the people of this Province that they have been shafted and led down the garden path by this administration in the field of educational programmes and progress -

AN HON. MEMBER: Some hon. (inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: - as they have in many other fields which I will come to as I make the few remarks that I have to make.

So, Mr. Speaker, the educational policy of this government, as I have already said, is completely insane, the policy of cutting back before you even study the implications of those cutbacks, the policy of taking it away from the Minister of Education, setting up a

MR. ALDEOUT: task force to report to the Premier to be buried under a dozen other task forces, as I said, like the Workmen's Compensation Review Report was buried - it has not seen the light of day yet. So the whole educational policy, Mr. Speaker, enunciated and preached by this administration and preached by this Minister of Education, being an educator himself, is unbelievable. You would never think, Mr. Speaker, that that minister, who must have - and I am sure he did if he was doing things that he ought to have done as a superintendent - must have fought with previous governments and the previous administration tooth and nail against the very things that that minister is leading into today.

AN HON. MEMBER: I would say he dictated to (inaudible).

MR. ALDEOUT: There was a member on the other side, Mr. Speaker, a few nights ago, who talked about dictator psychosis. Well, dictator psychosis is prevalent now in this administration because there are

MR. RIDEOUT: one or two ministers, Mr. Speaker, calling the shots on everything, one or two ministers calling shots on everything. I thought I heard one particular minister say, "Hear, hear!" Well that is not what they would lead you to believe, Mr. Speaker, when they talk about the team approach to government. That is not what was implicated and said in this House the other night when they talked about the Cabinet team that they had in this administration. But I have come to the conclusion that there are one or two ministers in this government who call the shots and the other hon. gentlemen just toe the line and I would say that the Minister of Education has become a toer of the line, rather than one of the people who calls the shots, if he ever did call the shots. I do not believe he did in the field of education in this Province in this administration. Because I say that, Mr. Speaker, when I recall the events leading up to the resignation from the Cabinet of the present member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), the former Minister of Rural Development and Industrial Development. That minister, Mr. Speaker, at the time broke not only Cabinet solidarity, not only broke Cabinet solidarity, as the Premier said in his statement to the House, but he also broke one of the most sacred rules of Parliamentary government, Cabinet government in the British Parliamentary system when he leaked to his people in his district information as to what was in the Budget. You would think, Mr. Speaker - the Premier at the time called it an "unforgiveable sin". Well it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that sins can be forgiven pretty fast as far as this administration is concerned, because those two same hon. gentlemen appeared out in Grand Falls on Friday night, and as I indicated a few minutes ago, they made peculiar bedfellows again in Grand Falls. Because it has never been known, certainly not in Newfoundland politics that I can remember and I doubt if it has been known anywhere else, the attack that those

MR. RIDEOUT: two hon. gentlemen made on the rest of their colleagues in the Cabinet at that particular meeting in Grand Falls.

MR. LUSH: You are not serious.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely unbelievable.

MR. HICKMAN: I was not there. So tell me.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, if he had the backbone that he professes to have, would not have to be told because the Minister of Justice was invited to the meeting but did not go.

MR. HICKMAN: If I was it is news to me.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well the Minister of Justice was invited to the meeting.

MR. HICKMAN: I was not.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Minister of Health, I am told, was invited to the meeting.

MR. H. COLLINS: I am sure I was not.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Minister of Mines and Energy was invited to the meeting.

MR. HICKMAN: I was not but I would have had to scurry all the way back from Paris for that one.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister was back from Paris Friday morning, was he not?

MR. HICKMAN: I had a commitment I had for a week.

MR. RIDEOUT: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the point remains, as I was saying, the attack made on the rest of the Cabinet by those two hon. gentlemen out in Grand Falls, that is by the Premier and by his newly acquired back-from-dispute side-kick again, the sealer, the attack made on the rest of the Cabinet by those two hon. gentlemen is absolutely unbelievable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right. That is right.

MR. CALLAN: What a team.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is bad enough for a deposed Cabinet minister

MR. RIDEOUT: be blaming the fact that the Grand Falls Hospital extension did not go ahead on other colleagues in the Cabinet, it is bad enough that a deposed Cabinet minister does that, but when the Premier jumps in bed with him, to save his political face before a meeting in Grand Falls, then, Mr. Speaker, it become despicable.

MR. CALLAN: Almost cried.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Premier practically cried to the people in Grand Falls that it was not with his blessing that the Cabinet did not approve the extension to the Grand Falls Hospital. Now, Mr. Speaker, who is the leader of the government? Is it the Minister of Justice, or the Minister of Transportation, or the Minister of Mines and Energy? Who is the leader of the government? In this case, as far as a team - it is a team all right, when the Premier, the leader of the government, goes out to Grand Falls and agrees with his deposed Cabinet minister that he could not convince his colleagues in Cabinet and then proceeds to denigrate his colleagues in Cabinet in front

MR. RIDEOUT: of a hundred-and-some-odd people assembled in a meeting in Grand Falls.

MR. LUSH: Would not take the responsibilities on his shoulders.

MR. RIDEOUT: Would not take his own responsibilities as leader and say, 'No, I did not think we could go ahead with it and I advised my colleagues not to support it,' but gives every indication that he would like to have seen it go ahead himself but that he could not get the agreement of the people who really mattered in the Cabinet. What a way, Mr. Speaker, to operate a Cabinet government! If I were a member of that Cabinet I would be looking over my shoulder every time the Premier got out of sight.

AN HON. MEMBER: They all are.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that they almost had the overthrow of the government when the Premier went on holidays at Easter, because if that is the way he treats his ministers, if that is the way he defends his ministers for a government policy, then I certainly would not, as I said, want to be part of that administration or part of that Cabinet.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the member for Green Bay, the Minister of Mines and Energy, who had the audacity -

AN HON. MEMBER: The member is not here.

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not care if he is here. or not. He can read.

AN HON. MEMBER: The salmon season opens tomorrow.

MR. RIDEOUT: - who had the audacity, Mr. Speaker, to say out in Baie Verte what he did not have the courage to go to Grand Falls and say, that he voted against the extension to the Grand Falls Hospital and that he would do it again and that he believed he had done the right thing. The minister did not go to Grand Falls and say that though,

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker. He was not there when there was a petition presented with 8,000 names on it from people in the Central Newfoundland region, 1,200 of which came from his own riding. The Minister of Mines and Energy was not there then. But he can sort of indicate to the press, as has been indicated, that one reason why he was against the extension to the Grand Falls Hospital was what it would do to the Springdale Cottage Hospital. Well, 1,200 residents of his district, which is a sizeable chunk of the hon. gentleman's district, were concerned about the type of referral service that they would have in Grand Falls that could never be, now or in the foreseeable future, handled by the Springdale Cottage Hospital. Twelve hundred people in his district obviously felt very uptight about that. You do not get a person to sign a petition easily, Mr. Speaker. They obviously have to think about the cause which has been put forth. They do not sign it that easily. And then, Mr. Speaker, as I said, to top it all off, we have the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and the Premier again become buddy-buddy and malign the rest of the already maligned Cabinet and blame it on the Cabinet that they could not get the hospital extension in Grand Falls. An unbelievable exercise in Cabinet solidarity to say the least! If it happened anywhere else, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in the British parliamentary system there would be riots in the streets, but not here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, that is the second story related to the Grand Falls Hospital extension that has not been all roses for this administration. What about a few days after the concerned citizens from Grand Falls rented or leased a special flight from E.P.A. to take them from Gander in to St. John's to meet with the Premier in a last ditch effort to get him to keep the commitment that

MR. RIDEOUT: he not only made verbally in Grand Falls but had the audacity to lay down in writing? In a last ditch effort to get him to keep that commitment they came in to St. John's and were led to believe that there might be some consideration, but then when the Oscar seeker presented his Budget the next day in the House there was no mention of it. The Oscar seeker, the only Minister of Finance in Newfoundland who could ever be nominated for an Oscar, in his theatrical antics in presenting his Budget to the Newfoundland Legislature - Terra Neuve, whatever it was - unbelievable performance, Mr. Speaker, an unbelievable performance, trying to compete with All in the Family. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, that is beside the point. What I was saying was that those people came in from Grand Falls

Mr. Rideout:

in a last ditch effort to get the Premier and the Cabinet, and most of the Cabinet were there—I was there, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) was there, the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) was there, half a dozen of us whose districts are served by this Central Newfoundland Hospital were there—and everybody, Mr. Speaker, though we knew the ink was dry on the Budget Speech, went away—the Minister of Finance was not there, Mr. Speaker; the Minister of Finance had already given the ultimatum to the Premier that "if you change one thing in the Budget you will have my resignation on your desk." The Minister of Finance had already delivered that ultimatum.

MR. HICKMAN: Now!

MR. RIDEOUT: But any way, Mr. Speaker, he was not there.

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not think he was that type.

MR. RIDEOUT: He was not there to face up to the residents from Grand Falls in their last ditch effort to get the government to change their mind about the extension to the Grand Falls Hospital.

But, Mr. Speaker, imagine after the Budget Speech was delivered, imagine how those residents of Grand Falls felt who had spent their time and their money to come in in a last ditch effort to impress on the government their need! Imagine how they felt when they heard the Minister of Industrial Development announce all of the dollars that was going to be spent out in Corner Brook on the hospital out there. We know how the Minister of Health felt, Mr. Speaker; he nearly "fell out of bed". That is exactly what the Minister of Health said, he nearly "fell out of bed". It is a wonder, Mr. Speaker, he did not roll over and take the bed with him.

MRS. MCISAAC: It was a hospital bed with the rails up.

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not know. Yes, that is probably the only reason why he did not fall out; some of those hospital beds that he closed down last year he probably had one and had the rails up so he could not fall out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shellshocked!

MR. RIDEOUT: Imagine how the people of Grand Falls felt, Mr. Speaker, when they heard blasting over the news waves, not only an edited story, but a voice script of the hon. gentleman, telling about the millions of dollars that was going to be spent out in the regional hospital out in Corner Brook.

MRS. MCISAAC: The Premier told him that.

MR. RIDEOUT: Of course.

MR. LUSH: They did not feel livid!

MR. RIDEOUT: It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH: The inner circle.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is no wonder that the people in Grand Falls their resolve became more firm than it ever was before, because they had been told in this room down on the Eighth Floor, and I was there, that there would be no major hospital construction in this fiscal year. And then to hear that type of statement, that type of announcement by the hon. Minister of Industrial Development, it would take more than a falling out of bed act by the Minister of Health to convince those people that some hanky-panky was not going on, that they obviously were not getting through to the Premier, that they obviously were not getting through to the Administration, that the Premier even though he had given his solemn word and then enshrined it in writing had no intention of keeping that commitment at this time.

And now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Health had been in Grand Falls on Friday night he may have fell out of bed again or fell off the Chair, when he heard the Premier take another piece of the action. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is soon going to, if he has got the energy, which I doubt very much he has, but if the Premier continues to be taking the areas away from ministers that is causing the government embarrassment, then he is soon going to have more on his platter than he can handle. He had to take the educational cutback thing and the task force away from the Minister of Education, and now he is taking the hospital policy away from the Minister of Health. He announced now that he is going to set up some sort of a committee, another committee, Mr. Speaker - God forbid! We will be studied

Mr. Rideout: right into the grave!

But anyway the Premier is setting up another committee now, Mr. Speaker, to study the hospital needs in this Province. There was no committee, Mr. Speaker, in 1975 when the billboards went up down on the Burin Peninsula. There was no need of any committee then, Mr. Speaker, was there?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Sir.

MR. RIDEOUT:: There was no need of any committee in 1975 when the billboard went up out in Clarenville.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lord, No!

MR. RIDEOUT: There was no need of any committee in 1975 when the promise went forth to the people of Port aux Basques. There was no need of any committee in 1975 and since when the commitment went forth to the people of Grand Falls.

MR. CALLAN: And Come By Chance.

MR. RIDEOUT: And all the other hospital projects that were promised. From now on we have to have a committee. Wall Street has told us we have to have a committee because we cannot loan you the money. Talk about pulling the wool over people's eyes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BIRCHALL: And then talk about the same administration when the sheep are brought back to the farm, brought back to this House, and when they are called upon to answer for their sins the answer is, "Ah, you are negative!" When the chicken come home to roost, you are negative! Now we have another committee, Mr. Speaker, another committee. Thank God for committees! What is the Premier going to do when he runs out of bodies to serve on committees, Mr. Speaker? The next thing there will be committees on committees, committees to study the recommendations of committee. It is unbelievable the type of government that we are getting in this Province. Now we have another committee, Mr. Speaker, to study the effects or what should be done with regard to hospital reconstruction and extension in the Province and to make recommendations, Mr. Speaker, by September 29th of this year. That is the mandate of the committee, as I understand it that committee, Mr. Speaker, made up of four or five people now has given the Premier another couple of months grace. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should have a quorum call again as some hon. members seem to have strayed.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call. Call in the members.

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3158

NM - 1

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

The Law Clerk will count the House
please.

A quorum is present.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I was reading in today's
paper that the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy), the
Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, is thinking about
resigning, or retiring from the House of Assembly. Now I see he
probably has ambitions towards a higher chair. It is good to
see the -

MR. MURPHY:

A higher chair I used to at one time,
but I do not need one now.

MR. RIDEOUT:

They say once a man, twice a child,
Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, it is good to see him aspiring
to higher office, though, and taking over a higher chair in the
House. I hope that the hon. minister might reconsider because
there is going to be, we understand, a leadership convention
pretty soon and the -

MR. MURPHY:

You are not having another one, are you?

MR. RIDEOUT:

No. We have no need of one, Mr. Speaker.
We have nothing against leadership conventions. We have a place
in our constitution that says we will have one at a certain period
of time, I believe it is within two years following a general election.
So we do not go along with that type of thing, Mr. Speaker, open
covenants of peace openly arrived at, and that is what we do
in this party. But I hear there is one brewing on the other side,
so the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) may well be, it
may be a good omen, he may well be getting the feel of the Chair,
Mr. Speaker, and along with the two or three other aspirants that
we know are over there and a couple of aspirants up in Ottawa
and so on. The member may be getting the feel of the chair.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the hospital policy of this administration. And now, as I was saying, we have another committee set up to look at what is needed with regard to hospital construction and reconstruction and extension in the Province, and again given a mandate to report by September 29th., of this year. Another committee, Mr. Speaker, that will give the Premier another three or four months of breathing space, another effort by the administration to brazen it out, and that is all it can be boiled down to. Another committee that they can have some recommendations from and then spend another three or four months studying, hoping that they will never have to see the light of day, hoping that in the interim something will happen to get the administration off the hook. Committee after committee, report after report, study after study, police investigations and all, Mr. Speaker, they are going to make some mound of paper, some mound of paper indeed they will make, when they all pile up in the centre of the table down on the eighth floor one of those days as they will, and as they must. I do not know who is going to deal with them all, Mr. Speaker, but now we have another one, another committee to study the need for hospital construction in the Province.

And as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, there was no committee in the Fall of '75 to make recommendations, it was just hospital billboards going up all over the Province. You would think that any community in the Province, 1,000 people or over, was going to get their own big fancy hospital. That was the policy of '75. But as I said, the chickens have to come home to roost and they have come home with this administration. Instead of admitting it, Mr. Speaker, there is another attempt, another subtle attempt to put off the inevitable. There is always one more avenue open to us to put off the inevitable and that is another committee, another study, another effort to brazen it out in the hope that something will break over the next three or

MR. RIDEOUT: four or five months that will bail us out in the eyes of the people. And that is exactly what is happening, Mr. Speaker, in the hospital programme.

For the second year in a row, Mr. Speaker, the medical services of this Province were cut and cut drastically, just as the educational services were cut. We had another minister so incompetent presiding over this very important department in our government, a minister who last year presided over the cutback in hospital beds across the Province.

MR. RIDEOUT: who said there had to be twenty-five or thirty beds closed at Grand Falls, for example, and who was told quite bluntly to his face in the Cabinet room a month or two ago that there was never a bed closed because they could not do it, they had such a waiting list of people that had to get in, not preventive surgery or anything of that nature but very serious surgery and could not close a bed. They indeed did not close one. The minister was told that down in the Cabinet room that night that the delegation were in here. But for the second year in a row we have a minister presiding over the degrading of the medical services that the people of this Province have come to expect and indeed, Sir, have a right to expect because we are not living in any great degree of luxury in education or medical services and many other services for that matter in this Province. And then that same minister, Mr. Speaker, had the audacity, as well as cutting back hospital expansion that seemed so important in '75, it seemed we could not live without it in '75, as well as cutting back hospital beds, that same minister had the audacity to slap a little harder the people who could least afford to pay on the knuckles and instituted a \$3 ward fee for people having to use the wards of our hospitals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, those are the people who can least afford to pay. Again, sock it to them, while you have them down keep them down, do not give them any breathing space! If you are going to put anything on put it on the poor people because, Mr. Speaker, the poor people do not use the private and the semi-private rooms in our hospitals. They are the ones who are on the wards. They are the ones that this \$3 ward fee applies to. So sock it to them again, and do the same and scuttle the children's dental programme, which is all it boils down to,

MR. RIDEOUT: scuttling that fine programme by instituting a \$2 fee for service, not explaining to the House what it was all about but having dentists from all over the Province come out, Mr. Speaker, and say what it was going to do to this great programme that was doing so much for dental care in this Province. A \$2 fee for service, it could be \$4, or \$6, or \$8 per visit to a dentist. So we have another example, Mr. Speaker, of where another department is presided over by an incompetent, by a person who cannot dig his heels in in the Cabinet room and say, "No, we cannot go along with this. I cannot go along with it. If you insist, my colleagues, if you insist on embarking on this type of programme then you will have to do it without me, and without my support." And now, as I said, Mr. Speaker, it is another case where the present Minister of Health can no longer defend the indefensible and the Premier comes to the rescue again with another committee, the same idea that was used in Education, another task force, really, is what it boils down to, to investigate and to make recommendations.

Government by committee, government by task force, government by anything you want to call it, except government by those people who were elected to govern.

AN HON. MEMBER: Action Group.

MR. RIDEOUT: I will get into the Action Group a little later.

Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable the type of government that we have come down to in this Province, as I said government by every means, task force, committee, you name it, government by every means except government by those elected to govern, and that is what it boils down to in this Province today.

And on the story goes, Mr. Speaker, and we are not supposed, that we are committing a cardinal crime, a sin, if we get up and attempt to expose the type of government that we have for what it really is. The red herring gets the

May 15, 1978

Tape No. 3159

NM - 3

MR. RIDEOUT: flick then and comes out and you are negative and you have no positive proposals. You have nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice can yawn away. There is a long time left yet. I do not expect the House to close until August so we have a lot of talking to do.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yet with regard to the problems facing the people of this Province.

Let me get back to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, have another talk to that hon. Oscar seeker who attempted to win for himself an Oscar in the hearts of his fellow Newfoundlanders when he presented his budget on that fateful day when he ruined Paddy's Day. Mr. Speaker, that was always such a great tradition -

SOME RON. MEMBERS. Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - and a great time for celebration in this Province but -

MR. DOODY: It is certainly not now.

MR. RIDEOUT: It will never be again. My friend from Harbour Main-Bell Island, Mr. Speaker, in all the wit that he can muster, has put his finger on it. It will never be a time of celebration again until this administration is rooted out. Defamed the Paddy's Day celebrations in this Province by bringing in that despicable document commonly referred to as the budget, hoping to endear himself in the hearts of the Irish, I suppose, and all the other ethnic groups in this Province by getting an nomination for the Oscar.

PREMIER MOORES. A point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT: If the hon. the Premier wants to raise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, he has every right to do so.

PREMIER MOORES: On a point of order. I thought I heard the hon. gentleman say that the Irish in this Province are an ethnic group within the Province. Is that correct?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the Premier obviously has risen on a specious point of order to say the least, to be kind to the Premier because he just arrived in the House in all his glory as usual. So what I did say, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier's ears was that the minister hoped to endear himself to the hearts of the Irish in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel it is not a point of order but just asking for information and I will ask the hon. member to continue.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now as I was sitting before I was so rudely interrupted by the Leader of the Administration.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Harassed.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Harassed, Mr. Speaker. I have to contend with all kinds of harassment from the Government House Leader and now I have got to contend with harassment from the Premier. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder if the Premier would send for his colleague from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and call a little get together over on the other side and inform the rest of his colleagues the position that he took out in Grand Falls on the weekend he might make some progress.

But I want to get back to the Minister of Justice for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN:

Every time you mention the Minister of Justice you hear sirens.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, every time the Minister of Justice is mentioned you hear the sirens. "They are coming to take you away, Ha, Ha!" Yes, Mr. Speaker. But the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, gave us some indication in this House a few days ago, a week or so ago that the government was working on an election expenses bill and that we could expect to see before this session of the Assembly an election expenses bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how that jibes with the comments of the Premier today that he expected the House to wind down pretty quickly in the next couple of weeks.

PREMIER MOORES:

I never said that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier has been misquoted he can rise on a point of privilege and correct it but that is the indication, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

The news was carried all across the Province today.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The news was carried all across the Province today that the House is winding down.

MR. LUSH:

The last of May or early June.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We had to get up here this evening.

MR. FIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, and say unequivocally that it will not wind down while there is an ounce of breath left in our bodies on this side. There is too much at stake, there are too many problems not yet discussed and that we want to see discussed, and one of them is the election expenses bill that the Minister of Justice made reference to.

MR. LUSH: I say it is not going to come.

MR. HICKMAN: It is going to be the best one you have ever seen and everybody will be tripping over each other to vote for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted to have at least one defender on the other side. A person who is so obviously willing and enthusiastically waiting to hear the truth and to continue to hear the truth as he has for the last few hours. So enthusiastically doing so, in fact, that he is banishing from the House the Government House Leader who ought to be banished for the way, the contempt with which he treated the Opposition today anyway, Mr. Speaker. He ought to be banished from the House. The Premier should remove him from the position as Government House Leader. The House never worked as well, Mr. Speaker, as it did when the hon. member from Kilbride (Mr. R. Wells) was Government House Leader. I am giving the hon. member a bouquet of well deserved thanks now, Mr. Speaker. The House

Mr. Rideout: really worked well when that hon. gentleman was Government House Leader, first when we came in here in the Fall of 1975, right?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: But since the unco-operative Minister of Justice took over, Mr. Speaker, he has not even had the courtesy to tell the Opposition until ten minutes to four when he calls Orders of the Day what the order is going to be.

Anyway, to get back to The Election Expenses Bill, we have been saying for sometime, Mr. Speaker, that it is time for the government to introduce courageous legislation in this Province to clean up election campaigns in this Province. And when I say 'election campaigns' I mean all election campaigns; campaigns for nomination, campaigns as official party candidates for election, campaigns for leadership of political parties. It is time that the government takes the bull by the horns and clean up the mess that we have in this Province today. Now I know it has been done in other provinces.

PREMIER MOORES: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. RIDEOUT: No, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER MOORES: All right.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, I cannot permit a question. The hon. gentleman will have ninety minutes, I believe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. gentleman will have ninety minutes to speak a little later on.

PREMIER MOORES: The province should cover provincial elections, but surely the party should look after their own affairs, Liberal or P.C.

MRS. MCISAAC: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Nominations, yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, that may be so, Mr. Speaker. But could we not - I mean, again you get back to the same type of situation that you have with companies, voluntarily enforcing safety and health standards. They will do it to a point. A political party may well do

Mr. Rideout: it to a point. But we should force them to do it.
The legislation should be there.

PREMIER MOORES: The executive, not the Province.

MR. RIDEOUT: The legislation should be on the books, Mr. Speaker. Ah, the Premier would not like to see it disclosed, but I would not - if I was running for the leadership of a particular party I would not mind having to disclose my sources of funding.

PREMIER MOORES: Did your party tell you or did the P.C. Government tell you, which?

MR. RIDEOUT: Not the P.C. Government, any government.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes. Well the party should be able to do that itself if they have any decency.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, what the Premier is trying to do now is to skirt around this important issue of election expenses. I say we should go the whole distance, the same thing as candidates running for nominations in ridings. That is a party business.

PREMIER MOORES: But why did not the Federal Liberals do it if that that is the point?

MR. RIDEOUT: Why did not the Federal P.Cs. do it, Mr. Speaker?

PREMIER MOORES: Because they are not the government.

MR. RIDEOUT: I am talking about Newfoundland right now.

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: Let us clean up our own affair. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest Election Expenses Acts that this country has ever seen has been introduced and made law in Ottawa by the Federal much-maligned Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: So make sure the Premier knows what he is talking about when he speaks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Well, that is what I am saying. Sure the government can do it for provincial elections.

MR. RIDEOUT: We should do it for provincial elections. We should do it for nomination meetings, or nominations. We should do it when persons become official candidates. We should clean up the election expenses problem in this Province. And instead of trying to close down the House, as has been indicated, it should not be closed down until that legislation, if it is in the making—and we can only believe the Minister of Justice—if it is in the making, Mr. Speaker, then it should be brought before this House before this session is over. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I know that one of my colleagues who is very concerned about election expenses is working on a private member's bill to introduce in this House, to clean up the skulduggery that has gone on in elections previously in this Province. And I am not the type to say that all the fault lies over there, Mr. Speaker, or all the sins lie over there or all the crime lie over there. I am sure the previous administration was as guilty as this administration, but that is beside the point. The time is come for us to clean up our act.

MR. MURPHY: That is right. Two wrongs do not make a right.

MR. RIDEOUT: Two wrongs do not make a right. And the time has come for us to clean up our Act and to bring progressive reforming legislation before this House that will once and for all dispell any thought in the minds of the people that a government comes to power owing its soul to big business, to big corporations in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: And, Mr. Speaker, how can they help, how can they help but believe that? Under the present system all political parties are dependent on donations from private individuals and private enterprise, large or small,

AN HON. MEMBER: Or unions.

MR. RIDEOUT: Or unions. That is right. But that should not go undisclosed. The federal legislation I think is a step in the right direction. With regards to federal

MR. RIDEOUT: legislation, I think, is a step in the right direction with regard to federal legislation. It certainly can be improved. Now we in this Province have the benefit of being able to look at the federal legislation and the Ontario legislation and legislation in the other provinces where it exists.

MR. DOODY: The Ontario one is good.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, I have heard the Ontario one is a better one. But we have the benefit now, Mr. Speaker, in this Province of being able to look at them all, those four or five that exist across this country - as we had the benefit of doing with the Occupational Health and Safety Bill, I might add, Mr. Speaker. That did not mean we got a better bill. We got a bill that is worse in many respects than some provinces - but we have the opportunity now to look at legislation across the country to see where it is weak, to see where it should be improved, to see where the umbrella of the legislation ought to be extended, and there is no excuse, there is no reason in the world why we cannot bring before this House a piece of legislation governing the funding of elections that we can all be proud of when it is passed.

MR. WELLS: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. RIDEOUT: No, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry.

The member can ask me a question while I am having a drink.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: If the hon. member will permit, in what he is saying because I think, you know, those of us who have thought about this subject - would like to see an Elections Act passed. I would be interested, and I have thought about this myself and I would like to hear the hon. member's thoughts on whether elections in his view should be funded entirely out of the public purse or should there be a mixture

MR. WELLS: of contributions from individuals and corporations and what sort of mixture, And also, if the hon. member has given some thought to it, I would like to hear his views on the other question and that is the extent of contributions; you know, if individuals and corporations are to be allowed to give, to what extent? Should there be limits on the amounts? Or should the public purse fund it all? And if it does fund it all, should every candidate who puts himself forward for election be funded by public monies? You know, I might belong to no party and may be a crackpot and every election that comes along I would like to run. Should I get public support the same as a candidate from a major political party? And these are very important questions. I must say, I would like to hear the hon. member's views.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, of course they are very important questions and obviously they would have to be thought out and fully thought out before we wrote any legislation. But I have given some thought to that particular subject, as the member may well gather by the few remarks that I have already made, and ideally, I would like to see elections totally funded - not the nomination process, of course - but once you get to be an official candidate I would like to see elections totally funded out of the public purse, and that would do away with any possibility of buying favour from any political party that would happen to be elected.

PREMIER MOORES: Funding all parties equally?

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh, yes.

PREMIER MOORES: Social Credit?

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, you cannot discriminate against the Social Credit, can you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: I think, Sir, the federal legislation says they must have what?

MR. WELLS: A certain percentage.

MR. RIDEOUT: They have to have so many members.

PREMIER MEMBERS: Should it be done at a percentage of the vote or should it be done on -

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, you obviously, Mr. Speaker, have to start off somewhere, and in this province you would obviously be starting off with the P.C. Party, the Liberal Party and the N.D.P. party and you could have that based on a percentage of the vote.

PREMIER MOORES: I was just wondering if you could, I am interested, by the way.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, right. And I would like to see total funding out of the public purse. Now I do not know if a province like Newfoundland can afford that or not. Maybe we would have to have so much funding out of the public purse and then put very strict limits on what individuals or companies or corporations would be allowed to contribute. Any donation over \$100, for example, I think should be made known to the public. They should have to make that known. And that would disallow people making \$25,000 or maybe - I do not know, I have never collected for a political party, Mr. Speaker, I have no way of knowing how it goes. I have never been a bagman. I have no way of knowing how large the contributions can be. But I think there have to be some strict limits on what the contributions can be where there is no public disclosure. As I said, my own indication, my own personal feeling, having not done a lot of research into this matter, would be that there be total funding out of the public purse. And I do not know if we can afford that, maybe we cannot. And maybe it is good for the democratic process to allow individuals, if they believe enough in a cause

May 15, 1978

Cape 6162 (Night)

ED - 4

MR. RIDEOUT: that they want to donate. maybe
that is good, but it would have to be done under very
strict guidelines like the \$100 limit and full disclosure
and so on.

6636

MR. RIDEOUT: So limits and disclosures, I think, Mr. Speaker, are what would give the nuts and bolts to the proposed legislation. And, you know, how you could eliminate the crackpot type situation if you are having full public funding, I do not know. But I think you could possibly do it on a percentage of the votes. You would have to have a certain percentage of the vote before you are allowed to get back any of your campaign expenses from the Provincial Treasury. I am sure it could be worked out. It is not a situation that cannot be worked out so that it could not apply to all parties, to all candidates and without discrimination.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Anybody at all can make a donation.

MR. WELLS: The system, you know, which is used in England, and that is a very rigid control on what a candidate can spend and that is something that we ought to look at as well.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right. I think that is a very important part of the federal legislation. I think there is twenty-five cents a voter up to so many voters and then - anyway, for example, the riding of Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador, the limit I believe is somewhere in the area of \$25,000 or \$26,000. You cannot spend any more than that on that particular riding. I think that is in tune with what the hon. gentleman is talking about.

I understand that in Nova Scotia, for example, it is forty-five cents a voter, you know. So I think the hon. member has a good point and certainly that should be part of any legislation.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point remains that we -

PREMIER MOORES: Nova Scotia was a bad example.

MR. RIDEOUT: Why?

PREMIER MOORES: They have committees for committees for committees. You can pay whatever they want, I think.

MR. RIDEOUT: Again, I am not totally familiar with the Nova Scotia legislation. I know there are limits on what a candidate can spend. The federal legislation I am becoming more familiar with for obvious reasons, and I think that is, in that particular respect, with the limit on the ridings on what can be spent, I am not sure what it is per voter but I do know Grand Falls - White Bay Labrador, which is the largest riding in Newfoundland, not in population but spread in geography, is somewhere in the area of \$25,000 or \$26,000. So I think the point of the argument still remains.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very important, vitally important, absolutely important that the Minister of Justice keep his commitment that he had before this session a very comprehensive election expenses bill.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): A point of order.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is giving an excellent speech about a very important matter and it is unfortunate that there are not more members present. I do not want to be calling a quorum all the time but the hon. member is giving a good speech about a very important matter and I think there should be more people here listening to him. So I would like to have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I would ask the Law Clerk to count the House, please.

We have a quorum.

The hon. member for Baie Verte -
White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, one of the most important pieces of legislation we should see in this session is a piece of legislation cleaning up the election game in this Province. The Minister of Justice has indicated that we will see it. I hope we do. As I indicated already the House will see a piece of legislation anyway, because if the government does not introduce it there is in the process of being drafted. My colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I believe, is working on it, a private member's bill dealing with an election expenses act. So it will be brought in anyway. We do hope that the government brings in such a piece of legislation and that it is the encompassing piece of legislation that it ought to be.

PREMIER MOORES: Are you suggesting that we should cancel ours and wait?

MR. RIDEOUT: No, I am not suggesting that, Mr. Speaker. The government has the obligation and the responsibility to bring legislation before the House. I am just reminding the minister that we are very concerned about it and that if we do not see it then we are working in that direction ourselves. But certainly we hope that the government brings in a bill that is an encompassing bill, a bill that takes into account the experiences and the legislation that they have in other provinces, and a piece of legislation that I hope will be the best of its kind in Canada. That is what we need and I hope the government will have the fortitude and the wisdom to do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to go on to another issue that I find burning in this Province today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that denturists?

MR. RIDEOUT: No, it is not denturists. I might get on to denturists a little later on. That is another area, Mr. Speaker, where legislation was promised last session. We were promised last session, on occasion after occasion, that we would see legislation brought in legalizing the practice of denturists in this Province. I believe it was indicated again in the early parts of this session that we would see legislation, and here we are into the middle of May and we have not seen that legislation yet. It is another area where the government says one thing and does something else.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a look at the legislation when it comes in. If it is something that I feel I ought to support then I will support it. If I feel that I cannot support it, then I will not. It is as simple as that. I think that there are areas of this Province where denturists could work and work well and I do not think the government should kow-tow or bow to the dental lobby in this Province. If denturists can be properly fitted into our medical scheme of things in this Province then I see no reason why it should not be done. It has been done in other provinces of Canada, and successfully, I might add, in other provinces of Canada. But when I see the legislation then I will decide then having studied it whether I can support it or not. So I am not going to be conned in by the minister now by saying whether I will support it or not. But I will look at it. I am prepared to have a look at it.

MR. H. COLLINS: They can read the legislation.

MR. RIDEOUT: But the minister promised us continuously the last session, when I was the shadow critic for Health, I asked the minister dozens of questions on the denturists, or proposed denturists legislation. And I was told that it was coming, it was coming, it was in the process of being drafted, and here we are a year later it is not here yet. So I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. RIDEOUT: when it comes it will be the largest piece of legislation ever brought before the House. Because it has taken long enough to draft it and if the length of time is any indication to the length of the bill then we are in for a major piece of legislation.

Mr. Rideout: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to move on and talk a bit about the building of this Freedom Road in Labrador that has been so evident in the news media lately. Many people were shocked, Mr. Speaker, to put it mildly, to find that the Government of Quebec was building at breakneck speed, it seemed or it appeared, a highway into Western Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the people of Labrador would be delighted to have the isolation broken so they can get aboard their cars and drive out. What we have been saying on this side is that the road should be coming East instead of going West from Quebec into Labrador, the road should be coming East down through Labrador and out to the Coast where we would have a Port Labrador and then connections with the Province. Mr. Speaker, we are running a very serious political game, and so far there has been no involvement, as I can see, or no evidence of involvement on the part of this government to do anything to counteract this obvious political move by the Government of Quebec in building this road into Western Labrador.

Now nobody can stand here and criticize them for doing it. They have every right to build the road up to their border, of course they do. That is not the issue. The issue is what action has been taken, if any, by this administration to counteract that, to ensure that the people of Labrador do not start looking to the West, rather than to the East and to this Province. That is the issue, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau), the present Minister of Labour and Manpower, has not been very vocal on this most important issue. In fact, I do not recall him having said anything about it since it came to light some weeks ago that the Quebec Government was building at breakneck speed a highway up to Western Labrador. I think it would be putting it mildly, Mr. Speaker, to accuse that minister of neglect.

Mr. Rideout: He is the minister from Labrador, a senior minister in the government, and there is no indication from that minister whether the government has any intention of doing anything that would counteract this move by Quebec to build a road into Western Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much at stake, so very, very much at stake if we get our Newfoundlanders, Labradorians, natives of the Province of Newfoundland wherever they live, if we get them looking economically, socially, and culturally towards the West rather than towards the East, there is too much at stake for the government to take it lightly. I would say, there is too much at stake for the minister who represents Labrador to take it lightly. And we have no reason to believe otherwise, Mr. Speaker. There has been cries come forth from this side of the House asking what the government is doing or what the government contemplates doing to counteract this move by the Government of Quebec, but there has been no response, no response whatsoever from the hon. gentlemen on the other side. And most strikingly so, Mr. Speaker, there is no response from the minister for Labrador, the member for Menihek that represents Labrador in the Cabinet. It is an unbelievable state of affairs.

I took part, Mr. Speaker, in debate in this House last session on a resolution regarding Labrador. And I said at that time and I will say again now that while I am no expert on any feeling in Labrador, or what the feeling of the people of Labrador is, as one member of this House, even though I represent a seat on the Island part of the Province, as one member of this House having been to Labrador on a half a dozen occasions, and only since I became an elected member, was never down there before, but as one member of this House I am very concerned by what I find on Labrador when I go there, I am concerned to the point that while I know very little about it, I attempt at least to scratch the surface by referring to it on a couple of occasions in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

It cannot be said any longer, Mr. Speaker, that the feeling of searching in Labrador, that the feeling of independence in Labrador stems or emanates from a very small group of radical quarts. That cannot be said, it cannot be brushed off as lightly as that any more, Mr. Speaker, because having been up there I know that it is much larger than that. I know that more people are talking about it and I know that people with credibility in their communities are talking about it and I am concerned. As a Newfoundlanders I am concerned about what I see happening up there and I would like to believe that this government is concerned. They say they are, Mr. Speaker, and I can only take them at their word. They say they are concerned but I see no evidence, especially in this latest thing that has come to life about the opening up of Western Labrador by a road through the province of Quebec. I see no evidence that this government is at all concerned about the implications of such a move by the Province of Quebec. I have heard nothing from the minister from Labrador on the matter and I do not think we have heard anything from the government, any person in the government on the matter. The Labrador resolution that is before the House at this moment talks about great development plans for Labrador but, Mr. Speaker, we better insure that we have a group of people in Labrador that want to remain part of this Province or any development plans that we have for Labrador will be useless and will be just that, plans.

I am concerned about what I see happening up there and I am even more concerned about this Freedom Road from the West, not the Freedom Road from the East that we talked about so often in this House from Labrador City down to Churchill and out to Goose and out to the Coast. It is not that type of Freedom Road, the Freedom Road that would bind even more closely those of our brethren who live in that part of our Province to the Island part of the Province. We see no move whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, from the government telling us how they intend to counteract this latest move by the province of Quebec. It is a sad state of affairs once again, a concern that we must espouse in this House and if it takes time to do it then we

MR. BROWNE:

have to take that time. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that the government - the government has a task force on everything else, a task force on things that go sour in Education and Health but we do not see any evidence in this particular area where government is moving with any speed. In fact we see no evidence that the government is moving at all to counteract this latest move by the province of Quebec into Labrador. Now as I have said it certainly will be welcome by the people of Labrador. The isolation will be broken, they will be able to drive out to the rest of Canada and there is nothing wrong with that. But they should also have the advantage of being able to drive towards their native Province and there are no moves now or there does not appear to be any move to make that dream become a reality. It is a grave concern, Mr. Speaker, of this Province but again like on so many issues that are a grave concern of this Province the government is silent. And what is even more disheartening is that the minister from Labrador is silent and has been silent in this House since the issue was raised. I have not heard anything from him.

Mr. Speaker, the ministers of this government are more silent now than they were over the Brinco takeover. They are more silent now than when they made it their great war cry to nationalize Brinco, the company that presided over and supervised the greatest in any way that you want to compare it, the greatest construction project ever to be done in the history of this Province. A company that built within budget and within the projected construction deadlines

MR. RIDEOUT: the great Upper Churchill. They were very quick to nationalize that or the grounds that we had to have control ourselves to water rights and the power and so on. But what good is it going to be to us, Mr. Speaker, if we do not make some other moves? What good is that going to be to us if we do not make some other moves to ensure that we solidify and hold on to that great undeveloped part of our Province in Labrador? And I am very concerned as one individual Newfoundlander about what is happening. As I said I am very concerned, especially when I see no moves whatsoever from this government to counteract this latest move by Quebec.

AN HON. MEMBER: The silent treatment now. They knew a little about election reform.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes. That is right. There was some indication that some people were partially familiar with the Election Expenses Act but nobody seems to be very familiar with what is happening in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, we still have not heard anything from the Minister of Transportation and Communications, other than his response to some questions that I have asked him in the House, and other than some responses he gave when his estimates were going through, to the details of the Trans-Canada Highway agreement. You know, Mr. Speaker, the issues are endless that you can talk about for hours and hours on end, issues that are of such a vital concern to the people of this Province that you know you do not even have to make notes to talk about them for hours on end, where you are getting almost, at the least, mediocre response from the government. The minister has not given us again any details of the Trans-Canada Highway agreement. We do know this, Mr. Speaker, we know that it is an agreement, the minister signed an agreement that his predecessor could not in good faith sign. We

MR. RIDEOUT: know that. Because any way you look at it, Mr. Speaker, any way you add up the figures it comes down to a fifty-fifty deal. That is what it boils down to, a fifty-fifty deal, and loaded at the rear to a point where this Province may never be able to afford to meet its commitments. The first year seventy-five, twenty-five, we can breeze along, I suppose, very well under that. The second year I believe it is fifty-fifty, the third year twenty-five seventy-five in the other direction. That is going to be the year, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. minister - of course, the hon. minister will not be minister then; he will be out of the government by that time, the government will have changed. But that is going to be the year when some Minister of Finance wrings up his face and throws up his hands in despair -

MR. DOODY: When Otto Lang has gone.

MR. RIDEOUT: - when we have to find the seventy-five? Again the only response you can get is Otto Lang or the federal government.

MR. HICKMAN: It certainly was not this government.

MR. LUSH: Blame it on Ottawa.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not this government. I wonder what government besides the federal government has signed that agreement, Mr. Speaker. Was it the government of Timbaktu?

MR. LUSH: Blame it on the former administration.

MR. RIDEOUT: It seems to me like it was the Government of Newfoundland.

MRS. MCISSAC: It was not Quebec.

MR. RIDEOUT: It was not the Government of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, with the case that we had to make, I will be the first, as I said in this House before, Mr. Speaker, to stand in this House and condemn the federal government where I feel they are not doing what they ought to do in their dealings with this Province. And then the minister is so weak-kneed, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. RIDEOUT: he could not wait for the Sullivan Report. He pinned his hopes on that, that there might be some recommendations in the Sullivan Commission Report on transportation that would cause the federal government to rethink its position.

MR. DOODY: You cannot accuse me of being weak-kneed. There are many things you can accuse me of, but not being weak-kneed.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the minister would build his hopes on that and would sign a deal - you talk about deals, Mr. Speaker, this is the hon. crowd that talks about deals, signing deals, Well, they signed a deal, Mr. Speaker, that can only be opened at the mutual agreement of both governments. It does not really matter, does it, Mr. Speaker, what the Sullivan Commission says if our friends in Ottawa

Mr. Rideout:

do not decide that they would like to see the agreement opened up for further negotiations -

MR. DOODY: They are reasonable people.

MR. RIDEOUT: They may well be reasonable people. They may well be that, but the minister, Mr. Speaker, signed an agreement that was torn apart viciously torn apart by his predecessor. He went from one end of this Province to the other, stomping across the Province - you would swear it was an election campaign, Your Honour - ridiculing the federal government for not agreeing to come up with anything better than a 75-25. He committed the cardinal sin of throwing our lot in with the Atlantic Provinces in the beginning, when every other thing we proposed to do in this Province we like to use the argument that Newfoundland is different. We are different on the oil and gas regulations because we only joined the Dominion in 1949. We are different on anything, everything and anything, but we were not different on the Trans-Canada Highway deal. The minister rushed to throw his body in with the other three bodies from the other three Maritime Provinces, thinking there might be some strength in numbers, forgetting, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases the Trans-Canada Highway in those provinces is not the only major mode of transportation in the Province concerned; forgetting that those provinces had been part of Confederation, some of them, for over 100 years and never entered Confederation like we did in 1949 with such a tremendous catch-up job to do; forgetting all of that; yet that minister threw his lot in with those Atlantic provinces in a desperate hope or in an ill-advised hope that he would have some position of strength. Our position of strength, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, would have been on our own in this particular case, bringing our case to the federal government not on the grounds, not on the same basis as the Nova Scotia case or the P.E.I. case or the New Brunswick case, but our own case, based on the fact that we only joined Confederation in 1949 and that we had so much catching up to do, and that we do not have a rail system, an adequate rail system in this Province, and

Mr. Rideout: that the Trans-Canada is the only link now across the Province, the only one, there is no other major artery across this Province. But no! Following in the tradition of blunder after blunder, Mr. Speaker, that minister who was so ready to travel, traverse from one part of this Province to another, trying to lay the blame for his negligence at the doorstep of Ottawa, did it again.

MR. HICKMAN: That is the best we could do.

MR. RIDEOUT: How could we, Mr. Speaker, how could we expect any better deal from Ottawa once we had thrown our lot in with Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island? Once we had done that and they had signed, had gone off on their own and signed, how could we expect Ottawa then in all faith and all that is good and holy, to act any different towards Newfoundland? We had been part of that same bargaining unit for months. We could not expect it in all fairness and all honesty. But if we had gone alone, gone ourselves in the beginning, then they would not be able to point to us and say, "you know, too bad you negotiated with the other three provinces for a while and we cannot sign a better deal with you guys now, you know, that would be impossible. You know, we have not got the face of a robber's horse. We cannot do that. No." But we committed the blunder again, Mr. Speaker, the tactical blunder of throwing our lot in when this government seems, Mr. Speaker, to not do it when we probably should do it, but do it when we ought not to do it, committed the tactical blunder of going with the other provinces and now having to end up of taking exactly what the other provinces took, which is a 50-50 deal over the life of the agreement. So there is no other way to look at it, Mr. Speaker, than that, it is a 50-50 deal.

A deal that was punched full of holes, a deal that was ridiculed by the -

MRS. MCISAAC: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

A point of order has come up.

MRS. MCISAAC: A point of order. I would just like to know what is in the cup on the Premier's desk? I understood that all we were allowed to have in the House was a glass of water, and it may be coffee, it may be water, but I understood that this was the only thing that we were suppose to have on our desk now. I would like clarification on that.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: To the point of order -

PREMIER MOORES: order, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what it is supposed to be. It is coffee I have here. I saw the hon. member over there the other night and I thought that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) - and as that was allowed I thought I would rather spend my time in the House drinking coffee than outside the House drinking coffee. And if there is a rule, Sir, where coffee is not allowed I would like to know it.

MRS. McISAAC: I would like to know too.

PREMIER MOORES: I have no idea. I am taking my lead from a most unusual character.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please!

The Chair will take the question under advisement.

The hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is now doing another 'first', taking his lead from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

PREMIER MOORES: I apologize for that. apologize.

MR. RIDEOUT: There are times, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier never gave any indication to this House that he has taken his lead from my colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

PREMIER MOORES: Only that the Chair did not rule him out of order as to drinking coffee.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, again for the benefit of the Premier, I think Your Honour is taking it under advisement, but by that time the Premier will have it gone anyway.

PREMIER MOORES: Please God.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to this Trans-Canada Highway deal again.

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

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

MR. WELLS: In respect to the question of whether beverages other than water can be drunk in the House, for what it is worth, I do not know if Your Honour will remember when the former administration was in office in the early days, 1949, 1950 - and I know as a student I used to drop in to the old House of Assembly down there, the Colonial Building, and I remember the Premier of the day around four o'clock in the afternoon used to send out for a great big milkshake or a sundae or something which he used to consume in the House, So if that is a precedent I do not know, but I certainly remember it happening.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Chair thanks the hon. member.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I wonder if I could move a motion that we could all have milkshakes and nothing else whatever one does here?

MR. SPEAKER: I feel notice would have to be given for such a motion. I thank the hon. the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) for his information. He has the advantage on me in that respect.

The hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker -

MRS. McISAAC: Do we have a ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: On the second point of order?

MRS. McISAAC: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. I did not feel that there was a legitimate point of order before the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: brought up by the hon. the member for Kilbride.

MRS. McISAAC: Just for my own information, I just wondered what we could bring in, if we could bring in anything.

MR. SPEAKER: I have taken that under advisement and I will get information on it.

MRS. McISAAC: Lots of us would like to bring in a cup of tea or coffee and -

MR. MURPHY: I have seen it done on dozens and dozens of times where coffee has been brought in here.

MRS. McISAAC: Have you? I thought it was against the rules of the House.

MR. MURPHY: I am not sure if it is against the rules but it has happened.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The problem has now been solved because our friend has told us, 'I do not know if it is the rule or not,' but the problem is solved. The member for St. John's Centre has said that he has done it on dozens and dozens of occasions.

MR. MURPHY: I did not say that. I said it has been done.

MR. RIDEOUT: It has been done on dozens and dozens of occasions.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: So the problem is now solved. Anyway, Your Honour has taken it under advisement and I am sure Your Honour will give a wise ruling in accordance with the rules as Your Honour always does.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was making a few remarks about the Trans-Canada Highway agreement that this

MR. RIDEOUT: Province has signed and I was saying that we had weakened our position by throwing in our lot with the other Atlantic Provinces when our case was so different. And that, of course, forced the federal government into a position whereby once the other Atlantic Provinces broke away and went on their own one by one as they did and signed the deal that they did, that since we had been part of that original group there was no way that the federal government could sign any other kind of a deal with us.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now that is what it all boils down to, Mr. Speaker, and I notice the hon. minister said, 'Hear, hear!' Because that blunder was committed by his predecessor, I would assume with the full consent of his Cabinet colleagues, and then, Mr. Speaker, they had the audacity to sign the very same type of agreement anyway. After the previous minister had gone from one end of this Province to the other, day after day, they were getting sick of looking at the hon. mug on television, getting sick of it, Mr. Speaker, laying it all over this federal government that they would only propose that which in the final analysis was a 50/50 deal; laying it all over this federal government that they would only propose that which in the final analysis was a 50/50 deal.

MR. DOODY: We had another choice.

MR. RIDEOUT: And then, Mr. Speaker, a new minister signs exactly the same deal. Mr. Speaker, that should have been realized when they threw in their lot with the other Atlantic Provinces.

So, Mr. Speaker, once again we made a blunder and we are going to pay through the nose for it. A fifty-fifty deal over the life of the agreement. We cannot knock the federal government too harshly, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the ninety-ten dollars gone into the Great Northern Peninsula Highway, or the ninety-ten dollars gone into the LaSalle Highway, or the Bonavista North Loop Road, or the Burin to Burgeo Road, is it? They have admirably lived up to what is not their responsibility anyway.

MR. LUSH: They built the Trans-Canada in the first place.

MR. MURPHY: Who says so?

MR. RIDEOUT: I said so.

MR. MURPHY: Who are they?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, see. Now it is coming out again, Mr. Speaker, on how we are getting along with the federal government. "Who says so?" Mr. Speaker, I am not a constitutional lawyer but I do know that roads are the responsibility of the Province. You do not have to be a constitutional lawyer to know that. And if you can convince Ottawa to come in and share the cost, especially at a disproportionate share from Ottawa to help build up the infrastructure so we can develop this Province, then the least we can do is give credit where credit is due and not come out with those off-the-cuff arrogant remarks of "Who says so?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: All you have to do is read the act to find out about responsibility.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I read the British North America Act before, if that is what the minister is referring to.

MR. HICKMAN: The Department of Regional Expansion Act.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes. The Department of Regional Expansion Act, Mr. Speaker, was there any Department of Regional Expansion Act when the federal government gave ninety cents out of every dollar towards the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway? Was there a DREE act in force then?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, Mr. Speaker, there certainly was not. But the federal government recognized and realized that Newfoundland had a special problem, a special case and that they deserved extra assistance from the Government of Canada and they have been doing it, without a pun, Mr. Speaker, they have been doing it liberally in this Province.

MR. LUSH: And if approached right they would probably do more.

MR. RIDEOUT: And if approached right they would have done it again. But we blew it, Mr. Speaker, we blew it when we threw our forces, our hopes in with the other provinces whose case certainly was not like ours, but when that fell through and the other provinces began to sign anyway, because we were part of that original group, what in Heavens name could the Government of Canada do only insist that they had to sign the same agreement with us? Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be very bright to draw that conclusion. Again, Mr. Speaker, a blunder by this Province, a blunder perpetrated by the government of this Province on the people of the Province and we are going to pay, Mr. Speaker, through the nose by the time this agreement runs out in three years from now.

MR. HICKMAN: Is there a quorum?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of

MR. RIDEOUT: Justice for reminding me to call a quorum because there is such important business being discussed there should be at least fourteen members here to hear it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Call in the members.

The bell is broken. I would ask that word be sent out to the highways and by-ways. Members should be called in.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins)

Order, please!

I would ask the Clerk of
the House to count the House.

Order, please!

A quorum is present.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins):

If the hon. gentleman would
permit me. In regard to the point of order that was
raised a short time ago in regard to what beverages
may be brought into the House, there is no clear
indication from a fairly quick perusal of Beauchesne and,
as far as I am informed by officers at the table, in May.

There is just one section on decorum
in Beauchesne and it might be useful just to read it
rather quickly. It is section 73 on page 74 of the 18th.
edition and it reads as follows: "Members may sit in
their respective places with their heads covered but when
they desire to speak they must rise and remove their
hats. They are not to cross between the Chair and a
member when he is speaking except that the member speaks
from a good distance from the Chair, or between the
Chair and the table, or between the Chair and the Mace
when the Mace is taken off the table by the Sergeant.
When they cross the House or otherwise leave their places
they should make obeisances to the Chair."

Subsection 2: "Members are
not allowed to read books, newspapers or letters in their
places. This rule however must be understood with some
limitations, for although it is still irregular to read
newspapers, any books and letters may be referred to by
members preparing to speak but ought not to be read for
amusement or for business unconnected with the debate."

Subsection 3: "An order has
been passed in the United Kingdom House that no member do
presume to take tobacco in the gallery of the House or at

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): the Committee table."

Part of section 4, subsection

1: "Silence is required to be observed in both Houses.

In the Commons all members should be silent or should converse only in whispers."

I do not know if all these points on decorum are invariably observed in the House so it is probably an opportune moment just to mention them.

In reagrd to precedents,

I am informed, as the hon. member for Kilbride mentioned (Mr. Wells), the former Premier of the Province on occasion did bring other than water into the House, non-alcoholic, but other than water.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): It has happened in this session that other members have brought cups of, presumably, tea or coffee into the House although again one must note that most members when they take coffee or tea do leave the House to do so. So there does not seem to be a clear precedent one way or the other. Probably what one could say is that it seems undesirable to take other than water in the House as a general rule.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it is invigorating to know that there are a few more honourable bodies back in to listen to the nation's business.

MR. DOODY: Except your colleagues.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, we are all in.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not quite.

MR. RIDEOUT: Those of us who are allowed to be in.

MR. LUSH: We are all here.

MR. RIDEOUT: Before the government perpetrated the Thursday morning massacre those of us -

MR. LUSH: Black Thursday. Or Black Friday, was it?

MR. RIDEOUT: Black Thursday. Black Thursday it was. Before Black Thursday was perpetrated on the Opposition by the government all of us were in.

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

I am afraid that there were only three members expelled for any length of time and the other members are quite at liberty to come into the House.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was making a few remarks on the Trans-Canada Highway agreement and I

MR. RIDEOUT: think I was suggesting that we have the agreement that we have because the government of this Province once again blew it - blew our position of strength that we should have had in negotiating with Ottawa by the blunder that we took, in the first instance, of throwing our hat in the ring with the other Atlantic Provinces - and now we end up to where we are at the moment with a straight fifty/fifty deal.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other, dozens of other issues that I want to get into but I am only down to a forty-five minute speech now, Mr. Speaker, so I am not going to have time to get into all the issues that I want to get into. I have three files here on the chair beside me and I have not even opened them yet. I do hope that the government will call this debate again.

MR. LUSH: Tomorrow.

MR. RIDEOUT: Because then I will have another opportunity to speak for a few minutes on a number of the other problems that are of concern to me in this Province. I am restrained by time now, Mr. Speaker. I only have a simple little forty-five minute speech left. Of course, we are so used to making forty-five minute speeches in the House that I will not be able to get into all the topics that I really wanted to delve into in some depth, Mr. Speaker, and that I think ought to be dealt with in some depth by every member. The government should not close the House, Mr. Speaker, until the Address in Reply is dealt with thoroughly so that every member, if they have the opportunity, can get practically unlimited time to enunciate their views on what is happening in this Province, where we are going, how we are not getting there the way we ought to be getting there and so on.

I think it would be a good exercise for the government of this Province to sit back

MR. RIDEOUT: and listen to the fears and concerns that we have. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that are left to me there are another few topics that I want to get on to.

Oh yes, before I get off the transportation one, Mr. Speaker, a very significant historical event or occasion will come to pass in this Province this year on June 29, when we have the 80th anniversary of the first passenger train across this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Minister of Transportation is coming back. I think he should because, Mr. Speaker, it will be the 80th anniversary of the first trip across this Province by passenger train on June 29th. And I thought my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had an excellent idea, a positive idea - we have been accused so often of being negative - a very positive idea when that member took the initiative and wrote to the President of CN, Mr. Bandeen, asking that a train be assembled to make a trip across the Province to celebrate and to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the first passenger train to cross the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. LUSH: An excellent proposal.

MR. RIDEOUT: Indeed it was, an excellent proposal, a very positive idea that could have far-reaching implications for the tourism development in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: I understand that the member received all kinds of support from service clubs and interested citizens and groups from all over the Province. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the support was just coming in from all parts of the Province for this gallant idea to celebrate something in our history proposed by my colleague from LaPoile.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have no evidence that there was any support from the administration. No evidence whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that the administration gave even token support to this idea. You would think at least the Minister of Transportation would have taken the time to dictate a letter to his friend and compatriot in Upper Canada, Mr. Bandeen, commending this idea to him on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, beseeching and begging that he act on it because it would be good for the Province. But no, Mr. Speaker, we have no indication that that actually happened. In fact, we have every reason to believe that it did not happen.

Mr. Speaker, no government support. Why, Mr. Speaker? Is it because it was proposed by my colleague from LaPoile? Is that the reason why? Is it because it was a suggestion that came from the Opposition, that if it were supported by the government, vigorously supported by the government and became a reality that the Opposition would look good? Is that the reason why it was not supported?

Mr. Speaker, that one thing could have done so much had it been properly advertised as part of our tourist information kits and brochures that we send out. Had it been properly advertised across Canada into the United States and advertised among our own people that one idea could have done so much to draw people into this Province that it almost staggers the imagination.

MR. LUSH: Is it too late?

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not know if it is too late. I do not know if the idea has been officially turned down by C.N. or not, I do not know. But I do know that as far as I am concerned I have heard people in the part of the Province that I represent say it was an excellent idea, a really excellent idea and I have every reason to believe that there was no support forthcoming from the government whatsoever. Again it is transportation policy linked in with tourist development policy, Mr. Speaker, but no support whatsoever from the administration because it came from the Opposition.

MR. HICKMAN: Why did you fellows not support us in our attempt to try and prevent the Government of Canada from scrapping the Cabot Strait, the last steamer in the Province?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would support the government in their request if they asked to scrap the Norma and Gladys.

MR. HICKMAN: You would?

MR. RIDEOUT: I would support that.

MR. HICKMAN: Would you?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, I would, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: You would not dare say that down on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not have any intentions of going down to the Burin Peninsula but it would not take a very strong politician to knock off the hon. gentleman if the last election is any example on the Burin Peninsula. So the hon. gentleman better not go crowing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH: He had better not go inviting competition.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman should he run down there will not be any competition.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the Norma and Gladys, I could spend some time talking about that but the Norma and Gladys has been talked about before, our position is clear and I do not think there is any reason that I should waste too much time on it. For the same reason I have not mentioned School Tax Authorities, Mr. Speaker - I link them in the same category - it has been well argued, our position on that. There are other more important issues than the Norma and Gladys facing us. I do not want the government to get up and say that he spent all his time talking about issues that were of no concern to the Province. I want to talk about the Trans-Canada Highway deal and the education policy of this government, and the health care policy and all those kinds of things.

MR. LUSH: And unemployment.

MR. RIDEOUT: And unemployment, the student unemployment that I made mention of earlier this evening. These are the kinds of things that I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker.

Another thing I want to talk about are the electricity rates in the Province. I could well take a couple of hours, Mr. Speaker, without wasting the time of the House, I could well take a couple of hours and talk about the electricity rates in this Province. The government's own creature, Mr. Speaker,

MR. RIDEOUT: Newfoundland Hydro forcing electricity rates to rise in this Province in an unprecedented fashion, going after - what was it? - a 40 per cent hike. Then they were trimmed down a bit by the Public Utilities Board and given 25 or 26 per cent, the government's own creature, Newfoundland Hydro. We are supposed to have cheap electricity in this Province by standards in other provinces, yet we have electricity rates going up so fast, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot keep pace with them.

The government was finally forced to take the sales tax off electricity but that easing of the burden, as I think we said in the House the day that the Oscar-seeker, the hon. Oscar-seeker read his budget, as we said in the House then and have said since, it would not be long before that ease that was less of a burden on the people would be wiped out. And, of course, we have been proven right again, Mr. Speaker; Newfoundland Light is now down before the Public Utilities Board again. They must have a beaten path from their headquarters down to the hearing rooms of the PUB justifying hikes in electricity rates in this Province.

And one of the prime reasons why they can justify it, Mr. Speaker, is that the government's own creature continues to hike the cost of electricity that it is charging Newfoundland Light. And this government, that did not think at all about nationalizing BRINCO, when we asked them in the House if they have given any thought or consideration to easing the burden on our Newfoundland consumers by doing away with the middleman, which in this case would be Newfoundland Light, they look at us like we have ten heads and they talk about socialists and socialism.

It is funny, Mr. Speaker, how the government tries to weasle out of its responsibility every time we make what appears, from our reasonable brains,

MR. RIDEOUT: to be a reasonable suggestion. Electricity rates: Mr. Speaker, when my friend from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) went down before the Public Utilities Board a few months ago and exposed the waste and the extravagance in that Crown corporation, exposed it, I would say he had a lot to do, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that the PUB only allowed them to hike their rates 25 or 26 per cent. Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker! A Crown corporation that can have somebody down at Phillip Place, I believe it is, to go out and start their cars in the morning so that the employees can get aboard of them and drive up to their headquarters in Donovan's Industrial Park, and we say there is no waste? We say that it is necessary to increase the rates again. Again the poor overtaxed, overburdened citizen of this Province has to bear the brunt of the waste and extravagance. They say tell it to us, point it out, show us where the waste exists. We do so and what happens, Mr. Speaker? No action whatsoever taken.

MR. LUSH: It falls on deaf ears.

MR. RIDEOUT: It falls on deaf ears. We have one of the most costly - we have had up to this point - one of the most costly presidents of a corporation that this Province has ever seen, not only alone in salary, but in the other fringe benefits. I wish I were lucky enough to fluke into some sort of position.

PREMIER MOORES: You never met Al Vardy, did you?

MR. RIDEOUT: No, Mr. Speaker, and I do not propose to defend him either. I know nothing about him only what I hear in the media.

PREMIER MOORES: You are a Liberal.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but does that make me a criminal? I am a Liberal and proud of it.

MR. RIDEOUT: I would rather be a Liberal, Mr. Speaker, than be on that side in this particular time in our history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: So if the Premier wants to get into that type of debate I am willing to get into it too, no qualms about that, Mr. Speaker.

Again electricity rates:

If Newfoundland Light and Power were granted their latest request, Mr. Speaker, for 10.3 per cent, this would mean that since 1974, they have been granted forty-odd per cent, I believe, and

Mr. Rideout: electricity rates have gone up in this Province since that time. Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. And then we have the government unwilling to even consider the thought of nationalizing to cut out the middleman. Maybe it is not the answer, but it certainly it can be investigated. If it is not investigated then I do not know whether it is the answer or not. I will throw it out as a positive thought, a thought that may alleviate some of the problems.

But I do know this, Mr. Speaker, that that Crown corporation, Newfoundland Hydro, has got to be brought under control by this administration. This creature, this monster that they have set up, it has to be brought under control because if not it is burden on the back of the taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, forcing, asking for, and receiving those enormous rate increases, and then of course passing them along to their consumer who very quickly passes them along to the other consumers in this Province.

There is a limit, Mr. Speaker, to what the people can absorb in this Province where we are the highest taxed of all in Canada.

MR. HICKMAN: There is a limit to the profit.

MR. RIDEOUT: There is a limit. Indeed there is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what does it do to the people on fixed incomes? The Minister of Social Services was very proud to say that he had increased social services assistance or social assistance this year by, I believe, it was 5 per cent was it?

MRS. MCISAAC: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Five per cent. What is Newfoundland Light looking for now, Mr. Speaker? 10.3 per cent. What happens to the person on a fixed income?

MR. LUSH: The unemployed.

MR. RIDEOUT: What happens to the person who has been falling behind and falling behind every year and continues to fall further behind because through no fault of their own - they might be crippled or handicapped or widowed or blind or maimed, they cannot work - and they continue to fall

Mr. Rideout: further and further behind, aided and abetted by this administration. Because those rate hikes, Mr. Speaker, if there were no increase by Newfoundland Hydro to Newfoundland Light, then Newfoundland Light would not be able to justify the type of increases they have been getting and passing it along to the consumer in this Province.

MRS. MCISAAC: And getting fatter off the Province.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right.

So a 5 per cent rate increase, Mr. Speaker, for the recipients of social assistance, and then they turn around and they no longer get their first cheque - I suppose they only got their first cheque a couple of weeks ago with the new increases reflected, as small as they were, got welcomed because those people I cannot see how they make ends meet anyway, Mr. Speaker, - but they barely got their first cheque with the new rate increases reflected in them when - To and behold! - they hear that their electricity rates are about to take another 10 per cent hike, and there goes their 5 per cent increase in social assistance, and they are 5 per cent worse off again. That is the compassion of this government, Mr. Speaker.

And then Newfoundland Hydro comes out in an unprecedented statement, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, and indicates that the rate increases are not necessary. Unbelievable state of affairs! The government could very well intervene. And when we questioned that, they, I think - how is it they sloughed that one off? - Oh, yes. The Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, which the government gives some sort of a grant to during the fiscal year, they intervened.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes they do. That is one intervention from a group that no doubt about it represents a fair number of elected officials in this Province, but it does not have the weight of the government intervening, Mr. Speaker, and the government has continued to hold off and not intervene in those herring.

Mr. Speaker, I hear in the news there is talk of a Cabinet shuffle.

PREMIER MOORES: A shuffle!

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, the Premier has been indicating all night that he has been misquoted, and maybe he has been misquoted again, but it was in the news all day that there is talks of a Cabinet shuffle. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is going to take more than a Cabinet shuffle to solve the problems that this administration has allowed to pile upon the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: It is certainly going to take more than a Cabinet shuffle. It is going to take more than the Premier playing musical chairs with

MR. BIDEOUT: the same old tired faces involved. It is going to take more than just shuffling the players around the board or attempting to dip into the backbenches to find that may not be there, and that is some new strength and vigor and idea of how to tackle the problems facing this Province. It is going to take more than political musical chairs, Mr. Speaker, to solve the electricity problem that we have in this Province and the roads and the unemployment and the fishery development problems, all the whole score of problems that I have been talking about for the last couple of hours in the few words that I have had to say.

Mr. Speaker, then the Premier talks about a Cabinet shuffle.

PREMIER MOORES: I never said any such thing.

MR. BIDEOUT: Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the Premier has been reported as talking about a Cabinet shuffle.

PREMIER MOORES: The reports are wrong.

MR. BIDEOUT: Well, again the Premier has an avenue open to him if the reports are wrong.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Is the hon. member is saying that I deliberately misled the House?

MR. BIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I will have Your Honour to rule on that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no matter on which I am required to make a decision.

MR. BIDEOUT: I thank you, Your Honour. Of course there was no point on which you could rule and therefore the answer to the Premier's question is uncalled for and not necessary.

Again, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying the Premier expects to solve the problems facing this Province by reshuffling the same old tired faces in yet another Cabinet shuffle. We saw a Cabinet shuffle - Last Fall was it? Was it a Cabinet shuffle last Fall?

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. BIDEOUT: And I suppose without being totally negative, Mr. Speaker, without being totally negative, yes, there was something

Mr. Bidart.

that came out of it. We got a new, not much different, but we got a new Minister of Transportation; more witty, more likeable, but you do not get roads paved with witicism or likability, but at least we got that. But other than that, Mr. Speaker, other than that, there was no change whatsoever. The same old tired faces that have lacked the energy and have lacked the desire, I believe, to even attempt to face the problems facing this Province.

One of their new ideas, the only new idea, Mr. Speaker, from what I can see, and I do not be absent from the House very often - I am usually here every day listening to what is going on, listening to that infamous document that ruined Paddy's Day for Newfoundlanders, the Throne Speech and all the other documents - the only thing that I can think of that we have this year that we did not have last year, with the exception of higher unemployment figures, with the exception of more people looking for work, with the exception of that, the only thing I can think that we got this year that we did not have last year, despite the Cabinet shuffle, was the action group. That is the only thing after twelve months from now until back this time last year when we were in this House debating the same problems, because they were here then as they are here now. The only new solutions or proposed solutions that I have seen after twelve months have been the Action Group which boiled down to be - what? Which boils down, Mr. Speaker, to be a \$2 million telephone line anyway you look at it.

Now they may create a few jobs. I do not know. I do not want to write them off as totally useless. I do not want to be that negative, Mr. Speaker. But I have talked to dozens of people who phoned the Action Group and what are they doing? They are doing exactly the same thing that they were

Mr. Sidout.

advised our constituents to do for the past number of years when they phoned us for advice on any government assistance available. They point them in the direction of RDA, the Rural Development Authority. They point them in the direction of FDBB, the Federal Business Development Bank. They point them in the direction of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. They point them in the direction of those kinds of government programmes. Now they may have added on a few. They may have a few that I did not know existed, but I would suspect that I know most of the government programmes that people could find assistance in when it came to setting up any sort of industry.

MR. RIDEOUT: And that is exactly what they do. So it is a programme to point people in some particular direction. It has the advantage, according to the Premier in his fireside chat that almost shook the foundations of the Province back just after Christmas, it has the added advantage, according to the Premier, of having some particular person who is supposed to guide that application on its way through.

MR. LUSH: Like Crown Lands, I suppose.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well they took one of the best gentlemen that was over in Crown Lands and put him in the Action Group.

MR. LUSH: Who was that?

MR. RIDEOUT: Bob Winsor.

MR. LUSH: Oh, the best!

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes. At least you got some action when you called Mr. Winsor.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I can see from, and I have had dozens of people say to me, "Mr. Rideout, did you ever phone the Action Group?" I said, "No, boy, I never phoned the Action Group. Why? Have you?" And then they will go into this story that when they phone up the Action Group and proposed an idea, "Yes, we think it is an excellent idea. Have you thought about RDA, and have you thought about FBDB, and have you thought about the Development Corporation?" And have you thought about this and have you thought about that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it takes \$2 million of a special programme to do that - Mr. Speaker, I am talking about one of the greatest areas where the government is wasting money this year and I do not believe there is a quorum here.

MR. HICKMAN:

Make sure.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not think there is. Count.

That is what I called it for.

PREMIER MOORIS:

Be sure over there.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I think I asked Your Honour to check to see if there was a quorum present in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

No, actually the hon. member just now asked,

MR. RIDEOUT:

I see. I am sorry, Your Honour. Maybe it did not come through clear.

MR. SPEAKER:

A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER: I am informed there is a quorum present.

The hon. member for Baie Verte -
White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I was making a few remarks about the Action Group that the Premier announced in that famous fireside chat a few months ago. And, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I have been told by many of the people who I represent that it is a case of sending the fool further. They call up the Action Group, you know, having been so enthused and impressed by this yet another grandiose announcement by the Premier, and they expect almost immediate action, Mr. Speaker, and they find out that all they have been doing, they are pawns that are being shuffled around from one particular agency of government to another.

Mr. Speaker, we were all anxiously waiting for that great announcement by the Premier some months ago and it boiled down to a \$2 million telephone line. And, Mr. Speaker, that would not be so bad if constituents were coming to you and saying, "Boy, it is a good outfit. We are getting some action." But that is not the case.

PREMIER MOORES: They have not done any good at all?

MR. RIDEOUT: No. I will be quite frank, Mr. Speaker, they have not. Now I do not know if it is the fault of the proposals that are coming in from my area or what. And I have been known, in this House tonight, for example, to give credit where credit is due and if I had somebody say to me that they got some help from the Action Group I would say it. Now that is putting it quite plainly and bluntly. But I have yet for anybody to say to me. The biggest problem, Mr. Speaker, they tell me, the first big problem is they cannot get through, and the second big problem is they are taken from one agency to another and they are no better off than when they started.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may not have yet run into the people from my district who may have been helped by the Action Group. I do not know. I have not had a chance to see them all in the two or three months that the Action Group has been in existence. It may well be that I have not run into them all and that a number of them have been helped. But as of this moment I have yet to run into some. I have run into a number of them who have become frustrated because their idea of what the Action Group was supposed to be was shattered. They thought they had a good proposal. They thought they had a proposal that could fly and they thought that with the help of this Action Group they could make it fly. But that has not been the case to this point.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing really that so many people can think so much because, you know, this announcement was really played up. There was really a job done, a saturation job, done on the people of this Province about what the Premier was going to announce when he had that fireside chat that night a few months ago. And this is what it has come down to. Now it may create a few jobs. Give it the benefit of the doubt. I have no qualms about doing that. But be that as it may, all I can say is that the people that have come to me so far have come with complaints about the Action Group and not an effort to pat them on the back as I thought might be the case and as I think now should be the case. If that group was doing what the Premier said said its mandate was and if it is doing what we voted \$2 million for it to do -

PREMIER MOORES:

On the estimates I tried to get that across to that side.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has ample opportunity to speak in the House. Every time he gets up I believe the rules give the Premier ninety minutes. So he could take ninety minutes on the Action Group practically anytime that his

MR. RIDEOUT:

heart so desires, Mr. Speaker. So it is not really fair to say that we have not given the Premier an opportunity to talk about and explain the Action Group.

PREMIER MOORES:

When given the chance I will.

MR. RIDEOUT: Another area that really interests me lately are the activities of the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. LUSH: Have you seen the report?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, I have seen the report.

I have made it my business as a member of the House to be familiar with the report and I have made it more of my business now that I have had the honour of being appointed to the Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: So, Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER MOORES: As Chairman, I hope.

MR. RIDEOUT: Pardon?

PREMIER MOORES: As Chairman, I hope.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, we would not have, out of all the members in the House, a better Chairman, a more probing Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee than we presently have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I have every confidence in my colleague, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). I think he has done an excellent job, Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and that is one of the reasons why I am looking forward so enthusiastically to working on the Public Accounts Committee with my colleague and the other colleagues from both sides of the House who are on it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Auditor General, for example, made some remarks in his last report about this Affiliated Marine Metals Company that we hear so much about every now and then in the House of Assembly. I would like to, when the Public Accounts Committee meets again, begin asking some questions about what was mentioned in the Auditor General's Report with regard to this Affiliated Marine Metals Company.

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not know too much about it. I have not had an opportunity to research myself all the wherewithal with regard to Affiliated Marine Metals, but I have heard some things in this House, I read the Auditor General's Report, which I think it is my business and my duty to read as a member of the House, and I am concerned, I am very concerned about the proposed, or the purported hanky-panky that is going on in this Province with regard to this Affiliated Marine Metals Company. And I was shocked, shocked out of my shoes, Mr. Speaker, to learn from my colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), only a few weeks ago, that the president of Affiliated Marine Metals landed himself a job with the Department that he was supposed to have a contract with to pick up used car wrecks around the Province. I was shocked to hear that, Mr. Speaker.

I have heard, and this is why I am looking forward so much to the Public Accounts Committee, especially in view of the Auditor General's Report, I have heard, for example, that the government, in the car wrecks that they hold now trying to sell, is far, far short of the tonnage that was supposed to have been collected by this Affiliated Marine Metals. I have heard the figure of 100,000 tons short, which I believe would come out to somewhere around \$270,000.

PREMIER MOORES: 100,000 tons?

MR. LUSH: \$270,000.

MR. MURPHY: That would be 100,000 automobiles short.

MR. RIDEOUT: 100,000 tons, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: I was right about it.

PREMIER MOORES: They were only paid for 20,000 tons.

MR. MURPHY: There are 20,000 tons in there.

How can there be 100,000 tons short?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, is this a point of order or something?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise a point of order at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I must hear a point of order.

MR. LUSH: The information in the budget.

MR. MURPHY: No. Well, as minister of the department -

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, is this a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has risen on a point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: Although I do not know yet what the substance of it is.

MR. MURPHY: As minister of a department, Sir, and I hear an allegation made that a project that I was responsible for is 100,000 tons short of something that only 20,000 tons were supposed to be collected, I think, if it is not a point of order it is at least a point of information and in fairness to me and my officials that I should put the record straight.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a matter on which the Chair can make any decision.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, You know, it does not take long to put the record straight. I inadvertently said 100,000 tons, what I meant to say was 10,000 tons at \$27.50 a ton. Is that not \$275,000, Mr. Speaker, the 10,000 tons was incorrect. I inadvertently said that, but the figure, the dollar value, Mr. Speaker, is correct and a quarter of a million dollars is something that this Province cannot afford to be out, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. RIDEOUT: - especially when we had that dollar put on our registration some years back that has not yet been taken off. It was put on, I believe - was not the

MR. RIDEOUT: whole reason behind it to
help pay for collecting those car wrecks? That was the
sole reason.

MR. LUSH: The total reason.

MR. RIDEOUT: So, Mr. Speaker, the
Auditor General has noticed that discrepancy

MR. RIDEOUT: as it relates to Affiliated Marine Metals, and the Auditor General has never been known to make note of discrepancies that proved to be inaccurate. That is one thing we cannot say.

MR. LUSH: \$270,000.

MR. RIDEOUT: So, Mr. Speaker, on it goes. To be kind you can call it a discrepancy that ought to be investigated. Then to know that the president of that company lands himself a job with the department with which he had the contract, I do not know what his duties are, but he is out at the scrap pile guarding the junk. I do not know what it is, but he is there. We know he is there. We know he is now being paid out of the public purse.

MR. DINN: You people wreck them and we will collect them.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, what is being allowed to take place.

MR. LUSH: Ask them when they are going to take the dollar off.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs should be more concerned about what is being commonly referred to lately as - how is it it goes? - the Carolgate Affair, is it? The Carolgate Affair, I believe I heard it referred to recently but the minister knows full well what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about this situation with regard to the firing of the engineer up in Labrador City, I think it was, where the minister told one of my colleagues a couple of days ago he sat in on a meeting as a messenger, I believe is the word he used. Imagine, Mr. Speaker! The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing carrying messages! Where or to whom?

MR. DINN: To the police.

MR. RIDEOUT: To the police?

MR. DINN: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, very good! At least we found out who the minister was carrying messages to. The police have a new messenger boy! Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that that messenger boy happens to be one of the Queen's ministers. He must be the highest paid messenger boy in the history of Canada, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there are dozens and dozens of items that can be debated for hours and hours in this House. You hear gentlemen on the opposite side trying to pretend that all is rosy.

MR. LUSH: All is well.

MR. RIDEOUT: When we bring in evidence that suggests that there may be some sort of a scandal ongoing you will see them throw up their arms. You can start off with the Saunder's affair back in 1972 and you can come on down the road to the present, 1978. Just one litany, Mr. Speaker, unexplained. To be kind you can say unexplained, very unlikely developments, but you have to push and punch and keep pounding away in order to get this government to set up any type of investigation -

MR. LUSH: In pursuit of the truth.

MR. RIDEOUT: - in pursuit of the truth.

What has become of the investigation into the fire into the Viking Building, Mr. Speaker? We know that a couple of people have been brought to court for attempts to defraud the government, we know that one person was acquitted, I believe another person is to come before court very shortly, but what about the investigation into the cause of the fire itself? Who was it that was obviously trying to destroy files over at the Fisheries Department?

MR. MURPHY: They always keep trying to

MR. MURPHY: destroy the files over there.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, that is what I said. Who was it? We have had no report. If we bring it up you are everything but a gentleman. The Minister of Health should be pushing it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. COLLINS: Which one?

MR. RIDEOUT: The Fisheries investigation.

MR. LUSH: The fire.

MR. RIDEOUT: The fire, the famous fire over in the Viking Building, another one of the shining examples of where the incompetence of the minister -

MRS. MCISSAC: A flaming example.

MR. RIDEOUT: - a flaming example of where the present Minister of Health has shown his incompetence again, Mr. Speaker, to push it and clear it up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: He is no pusher.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: No, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the minister is not a pusher because if he was he would be attempting to push out some of the skulduggery that is going on in this particular administration.

MR. DOODY: What are you on his back about?

MR. RIDEOUT: No, Mr. Speaker, you have not heard the minister being too vocal in pushing the investigations into the Public Works Department. You have not heard him being too vocal on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: Could the hon. gentleman bring himself to move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple more minutes, and I have a few more things to say. I am not ready to adjourn the debate yet.

MR. LUSH: Keep her going. Keep her going.

MR. LUSH: You are doing good, 'Tom'.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, you have not heard the hon. gentleman pushing that type of investigation.

Finally, I believe it was on Friday charges were laid against one particular person as a result of that investigation and more may be laid, I do not know. But certainly, again it was something that was pushed from this side of the House, that particular investigation.

We had the Premier promise for a full year, or more than a year, to investigate the Scrivener affair and it took the tabling, again, of documents in this House, only a few days ago, to force that type of investigation that the Premier should have been so eager to -

MR. MURPHY: You might be surprised any day, 'Tom'.

MR. RIDEOUT: - that the Premier should have been so eager to investigate.

You could not get them to agree to investigate the Dobbin affair, Mr. Speaker, that was debated in this House only a few days ago.

MR. DOODY: It cannot be raised any more.

MR. LUSH: It is a major issue.

MR. RIDEOUT: I am not debating it, Mr. Speaker, but I understand the rules of the House and I can make a brief reference to it. But you could not get them to agree to investigate that.

You have a police investigation going on into activities surrounding the linerboard operation in Stephenville. Investigation on top of investigation, Mr. Speaker, forced by the Opposition in every case.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, the type of government that we have in this Province and then they say that it is all a red herring.

How can the government govern, Mr. Speaker, when its sole intent, its sole purpose for existing is to keep all those things from coming before the eyes of the public? Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has moved the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. HICKMAN: I thank hon. members for their applause, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the hon. House Leader for Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will be in the House tomorrow. I see him within hearing distance so that places me in the position to indicate what our plan at the present time is for tomorrow, and that is to go back to legislation the debate of which I understand was adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on the Health bill.

I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1978, at 2:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1978 at 2:00 p.m.