

VOL. 4

NO. 11

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure, Sir, to present a petition on behalf of 336 residents of Burnt Island in the electoral district of LaPoile. The 336 signatures on this petition I believe, Sir, represents about 100 per cent of all the citizens of that community over the age of eighteen years. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is to request the government to install a water system in that community. I will read the prayer of the petition, probably that is the best way, Sir, to handle it, because the prayer of the petition is very clear and very understandable and outlines the feeling of the people who signed the petition, outlines their feeling on behalf of the municipality of Burnt Islands. It says, "We the undersigned demand immediate government attention concerning the problem of the lack of a system to provide drinking water for the homes of this town. We are a prosperous community -"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: I cannot compete. "We are a prosperous community and relatively speaking have contributed greatly to the economy of this area and to the Province as a whole. Communities in the immediate area have been supplied with adequate water systems while our patience in this matter has been rewarded

MR. S. NEARY: with neglect and inaction on the part of the Government. Because an industrial water system supplying approximately forty per cent of the homes presently exists, the cost of extending this system to provide water for all families would not be excessive. Therefore we reiterate our demand for Government action and inclusion of funds for this project in the next Provincial Budget." Now, Sir, I might point out that the industrial water line that is referred to in this petition was put in in 1975 by the Government of Canada through a DREE grant and the water line, the industrial water line from the tank down to the fish plant, was put in for the purpose of supplying fresh water to the fish plant and runs right along by a number of houses that have hooked into the water line and these houses are getting drinking water, thanks to the Government of Canada, whereas the other people in the community have to bring their water in buckets. The hon. gentlemen who watched Here and Now there a couple of weeks ago probably saw a documentary that was done by Roger Pike, who freelances for the CBC Here and Now in Western Newfoundland, who went down to Burnt Islands, brought his camera down and did a program on the problems the people are having in Burnt Islands in securing drinking water and showed them bringing water in buckets, in buckets in the community. Most of the people in Burnt Island still have to lug water in buckets and in this day and age that is not good enough.

Now, I understand, Sir, it will cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$300,000 to provide these people with a system whereby they can have drinking water, good drinking water, brought right into their homes and I think, Sir, that it should be done, as the people say, in the next fiscal year; when the Budget is brought down this project should be announced. If not, Mr. Speaker, if it is not, then the only hope that I can hold out for the people in that community is that with the rapid change of political ties that is taking place in this Province these people will get their drinking water supply one way or another in the next year or so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for
(Mr. Ottenheimer) Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Unless some others want to address
themselves to my hon. friend's petition, I would like to -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is the only
one who stood.

MR. NOLAN: Alright. Very good.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of approximately eighty residents of the Glebe Road in Foxtrap that my old friend opposite will be familiar with. This is a road that is used quite a bit since it extends between Greeleytown and also over to Dunne's Hill Road, used by school buses and so on. And this is one road in the area - and I might say not only this road, the one that I refer to now, but I can think of Dunne's Hill Road and so on - that is in an absolutely deplorable condition, and this in spite of the fact of request upon request from residents and the member and also petitions and so on to have some work done in this area. Now that we have a new Minister of Transportation and Communications, I hope that he will address himself to an area that is one of the most neglected road-wise in the whole Province. I hope that he will take the trouble and I am sure he will take a look at the complete situation there, which is badly in need of upgrading on the one hand and paving on the other. I am sorry to say that his predecessors certainly did not address themselves to this, and this is to their shame, of course.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, signed by the residents that I referred to, is one that is brought to the attention of the House at this moment because of the deplorable condition of the Glebe Road, as I said, in the Greeleytown or Foxtrap area.

MR. NOLAN:

Now the undersigned people on the petition are all users of this road and feel that something needs to be done and done soon, because the grading that is done, whether it is on Dunne's Hill or the road referred to in this petition, is merely a waste of public money and, particularly at this time of the year, it makes the Burma Road look like the Trans-Canada Highway.

Now I would like very much, Mr. Speaker, for the minister to address himself to this problem in Foxtrap that is of real concern to the people there, and because in some ways this road

MR. NOLAN: acts as a short-cut. We must remember that the schoolbuses come in Dunne's Hill Road and then down the Glebe Road and on to Greeleytown Road, making the run more economical and efficient if you had this Glebe Road in some kind of half decent condition. So I present this petition to the House, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the eighty residents and also on behalf of the school bus operators, on behalf of the residents of the area and on behalf of the parents of the area. One cannot help but feel that for some reason there seems to be a plot to punish the people of Foxtrap. Now why is this I wonder? Why is it that, in spite of the constant requests for attention, the Dunne's Hill Road, the Glebe Road and others, why is it that nothing has been done there in spite of the fact - and this is evidenced, Mr. Speaker, by figures that are available to us - that in certain districts and in certain areas you have considerable amounts of provincial money spent on roads, paving and so on? Now why is this? We are all talking about cleaning up the House of Assembly. Well, why do you not start by answering the people of Foxtrap and telling them why they have been discriminated against on their road work for so long? Now I want the Minister of Transportation, please, one, to accede to the requests of these people and to give some serious consideration, I hope in good time, in the next few days, give some kind of a response when he has an opportunity to study it with his officials as to what can be done this year. It is badly needed for the people and on behalf of those that signed this petition.

So, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to lay this petition upon the table of the House and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay followed by the hon. gentleman for Fogo.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition also this afternoon on behalf of three hundred and eighty seven constituents in the Roddickton - Englee - Bide Arm area of my district.

March 28, 1979

Tape No. 521

AH-2

MR. RIDEOUT:

Hopefully it will not be the last time I will do that. This petition comes as a response to questions and light bills in that particular area over the last three or four months. I raised the matter in the House during the Fall Session,

Mr. Rideout: I guess, and asked that the matter be investigated. Whether it was or it was not I do not know; we have not had any correspondence from anybody in any position on the matter since that time. But what we do know, Sir, is that the light bills in the Roddickton-Englee-Bide Arm area, also in Conche-Main Brook which is in the riding of the Strait of Belle Isle, but all serviced by the Roddickton Power Distribution District, has taken a phenomenal increase over the past four or five months, so much so that the residents, I think, have expressed a great deal of concern about it and have not received any proper answer so far. So they have taken the liberty of petitioning this House, as I might remind the House, Mr. Speaker, as the residents of Westport had to do twice a couple of years ago when their light bills went out of whack, and the same thing appears to be happening now in the Roddickton-Englee area.

The prayer of the petition says, "We, the undersigned customers of the Roddickton Power Distribution District, do hereby protest what appears to be unrealistic and unreasonable increases in our electricity costs over the past few months. We humbly request that the House of Assembly direct the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to carry out an independent and thorough investigation into the extraordinary increases in our rates, that meters be checked and replaced, if necessary, and that all steps be taken to have our electricity bills reduced to the reasonable level they were before some strange phenomena started a dramatic increase in them about four months ago!"

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to give the minister responsible for Hydro in the House some background information, over the past four months a number of customers served by the Roddickton Power Distribution District have been noticing dramatic increases in their light bills. Now we know that light bills have gone up maybe 10 per cent or 12 per cent over last year, but there has been a number of people in the Roddickton-Englee area who find that their light bills have increased

Mr. Rideout: over 800 per cent in four months, gone up over eight times as much in four months from what it was four months ago. There are dozens of people, Sir, who find that their light bill has increased 500 per cent. There are dozens of people who find that it has increased over 300 per cent, 200 per cent, hundreds have doubled. So something has obviously gone wrong in the Roddickton-Englee-Bide Arm-Conche-Main Brook area;

MR. RIDEOUT:

in that whole system there is something obviously gone wrong. Now as I said in the preamble, Sir, I raised this matter in the House a number of months ago. We were promised an investigation. Maybe one was done. I have not received any word, The people down there have not received any word. But what we do know is this, is that in the past four months, light bills, hundreds of them, documented in this petition - and I hope the minister responsible will take time to go through the figures before he gets in touch with Hydro and will be able therefore to quote the figures to them - because we have the October, November, December and January figures on the petition and those people have documented the fact that their light bills have gone up two hundred, 300 up to over 800 per cent in those four months. Now there has been a dramatic increase in electricity rates, Sir, in this Province over the last couple of years but all put together it is not 800 per cent or 500 per cent or 250 per cent. So something has drastically gone wrong no doubt about it in the Roddickton Distribution District.

The people have requested Hydro to come in and do something about it. To this date nothing has been done about it. The bills are still excessively high compared to what they were four months previous. The people have not got an answer as to why that is so. There has been some rumours as to why it is so. We know that light bills in the Roddickton Power Distribution District were grossly under-read for some time. That has been documented. But Hydro has said, and has said through their minister in the House that they would make no efforts to collect what they estimate they have lost. We know that is so. But we do not know why it is so that the bills have increased

MR. RIDEOUT: dramatically, like 800 per cent, 500 per cent and so on as this petition so dramatically documents.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the new Minister of Mines and Energy will make this a top priority. Those people have been paying those bills now. You have no choice but pay your electricity bill. If you let it go for a month or more then they are there with the plyers and they snip you off. So you have no choice but pay it. So I would hope that the minister will investigate the figures that are in this petition. I would hope that he will find the correct answer, whatever it is, and I would hope also that if those people have been paying too much for their electricity bills for some fault of Hydro or Hydro's equipment, then the proper steps will be taken to credit those people with any excess money that they have paid in.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those residents I place the petition on the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I could say a word or two in support of this petition, I am not sure in what capacity, perhaps as the putative member for the area from which the petitioners come, or, perhaps more accurately, as the member for the area which includes the communities of Main Brook - Conche, both of which are in the present district of the Strait of Belle Isle, the district that is going to undergo some surgery—hopefully beneficent, possibly malignant. Mr. Speaker, I can support wholeheartedly what my hon. friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has said and I would commend to the minister - we have a new Minister of Mines and Energy but I know that he will carry on the traditions established by his predecessor who has since gone on to another, possibly higher, position.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very real problem that grows out of the variations in meter readings, and while I am here signing today's mail to my 13,000 constituents, perhaps I could read a letter which I received from a gentleman in Main Brook. I will read the relevant part of it, and I will supply it to my hon. friend if he wishes. Just to show the sort of thing that is happening, this letter was written earlier this month, March 14, it says, "Why should my light bill go from \$112.31 for October, to \$207.34 for January, back to \$124.10 for February?" I do not know why it goes up and down but I think people in the area have very real questions because they say that their consumption does not vary that dramatically even taking into account the fact that these people are paying diesel rates for their electricity because it is diesel generated at the Roddickton plant and at the plant in Main Brook and that the incremental rate in the diesel generated areas is very much greater than the incremental rate in the hydro generated areas. Now I can tell my hon. friend from Baie Verte - White Bay that the Hydro authority, the Hydro Corporation have responded in a positive way to a degree. I was in touch earlier with Mr. John Henderson, the Chairman of the Power Distribution District of Newfoundland and Labrador, and he did arrange

MR. ROBERTS:

a meeting which was held in Main Brook on the 15th of February, attended by the Mayor of Main Brook, the then minister - the Premier nods; he obviously is very much on top of the situation. I am not surprised, but I am glad that he is - and representatives from Conche, Roddickton, Croque and Bide Arm also attended the meeting. I think it is fair to say, and I know that the Premier would concur, that that was a preliminary meeting. Mr. Henderson, or the officials who were there representing Hydro undertook to make certain further studies. One of the letters I have just signed is a letter to Mr. Henderson asking him whether he in turn has received any report as yet. So the matter, I know, is being looked at, but I would still think the prayer of the petition should be taken very seriously as I know both the minister and the Premier and all of the members in the government will do, because it is a very serious problem. The cost of hydro power in the North is very high, granting, as I will quite readily, that there are very high subsidies coming from the public Treasury, but even with those subsidies the cost of power being paid by people in these areas is considerably beyond that which every other person in Newfoundland and Labrador is being asked to pay. The incomes in the area, generally speaking, are lower, not because of any inclination or lack of effort, but simply because the economic circumstances of these areas are such that people often do not have the opportunity to earn incomes on an annual basis or to earn good incomes during the part of the year when they can work. And, of course, all of the employment in the area is seasonal.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would commend the petition to the government. It is a serious problem; it is one which I hope will be followed up on. The work has

MR. ROBERTS: begun: it is a matter which should be pushed through. I think the people in all of these communities, it does not matter in this sense whether they live in Baie Verte, White Bay or whether they live in the Strait of Belle Isle, they have in each case a right to be heard in this House, a right to be treated fairly by the government, and I would urge the government to consider this petition with that end in view.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Fortune - (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hermitage, speaking on this petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER: I think I have indicated I would recognize the hon. gentleman from Fogo next, then I will recognize the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition on behalf of 154 voters from Frederickton in Fogo district. The prayer of the petition is that "Whereas Frederickton Elementary School is in a deplorable condition, and whereas Frederickton educational representatives have been trying for a number of years to get a new school, and whereas the Integrated Educational Committee states that it will have some difficulty in financing new school construction, we, the undersigned voters of Frederickton, hereby petition the provincial government to provide the Integrated Educational Committee with sufficient funding to carry out new school construction at Frederickton."

Mr. Speaker, this school which the petition refers to is a very old school in today's comparison. I think it is between thirty-five and thirty-nine years of age, a four room school. It accommodates approximately ninety students; it has but three washrooms, about three by four in size, one for the boys, one for the girls and the staff have to use the other. I trust they do not get ptomaine poisoning or something there and they all

March 28, 1979

Tape 525

EC - 3

CAPT. E. WINSOR: decide to use the one washroom
at the same time. However, Mr. Speaker, the people of
Frederickton feel that it is about time now that the
government provide finances to construct a new school.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

Frederickton feels that it has been left out. There are two schools at present under construction in Fogo district, one at Carmenville and the other at Musgrave Harbour. But this does not satisfy the people of Frederickton.

I understand also that there is no gymnasium in the school. The children during the Winter season just cannot take any part in sports at all. The heating system there is not working very well. In one end of the school it is too cold to keep the classroom open on cold days. And where in the near proximity of the heating system it becomes too hot and they have to open all of the windows and doors, consequently of course that chills the remaining part of the school.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this petition, and I ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher and prof at the university and spokesman for Education in the absence of the present spokesman for Education on this side of the House, I would like to lend my support to this particular petition presented by the member for Fogo on behalf of 154 voters of Frederickton in the district of Fogo.

Sir, I am saddened to hear that we have such deplorable conditions existing in a school such as we have in Frederickton at the present time in this day and age and I would like to hear the present, the new Minister of

MR. F. ROWE: Education's thoughts with respect to getting the necessary finances to the denominational education committees in order that they may be able to push the money in the direction of that particular school board.

When I look at the budget for this year I see that we have \$13 million set aside - for the past year that is, the '78 budget - I see that we have \$13 million set aside for building and equipping schools, that is capital expenditure. That \$13 million is out of a total of \$305 million gross for the Department of Education which represents only about four per cent. And we have all too often heard the government hide behind the cloak of the denominational education committees because obviously these are the groups who actually disperse the monies to the various parts of the Province. But obviously the DEC's are not receiving enough capital works money for the purpose of building these particular schools.

The member for Fogo (Captain Winsor) has described the deplorable condition of the school in Frederickton, the elementary school, and the integrated school committee obviously wishes to have this money to build a school and I would like to hear the new Minister of Education, particularly since he was, I believe -if the Minister of Education is listening -I believe he was at one time a chairman of a school board here in St. John's and he should have some very strong feelings on this and realize the problems that exist with respect to money that is required for the building of schools and improving schools.

It is a sad description that has been painted here, Sir, of this particular school and I would

March 28, 1979

Tape No. 526

NM - 3

MR. F. ROWE: like to hear from the minister
and have his support on this particular petition. I
give it my whole-hearted support.

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

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 103 constituents of mine in Rencontre East in Fortune Bay. The prayer of the petition reads: "We, the undersigned residents of Rencontre East do hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the House of Assembly for a new school. The existing structure is old and deteriorated beyond recovery. This school does not possess the proper equipment, facilities, space, and atmosphere, and it is therefore almost useless as an educational tool. As a result of the above, the people of this community request a new and proper school for the 1979-1980 school year."

Now as my colleague who just supported a petition on a new school, the petition presented by my other colleague, the member for Fogo (Capt. E. Winsor), pointed out, - the minister can say, "Well, we pass out certain funds to the DEC and they pass it out to the IEC, therefore we have very little we can do about it." The big answer is of course that capital grants are totally inadequate for the whole Province. In Rencontre, I have been there in that school and it is a caution. I am sure that most people around Newfoundland think that every village, every community has a beautiful new school with a gymnasium and so on. That is not so. This building is very old, ill-planned in the first instance, drab, rotting, the roof is leaking, it is impossible to keep it tight, they do repair work on it every year, but it still leaks. There is no office, inadequate bathrooms. They made a little remedial room, and it is a cubbyhole; they cut a piece off one of the corridors. This school has three regular rooms for Kindergarten to Grade XI, approximately ninety to one hundred students, I believe. With the upcoming programmes that the government has planned - Grade XII, other programmes, expansions of existing programmes for rural schools - in most of these small schools there is no music, there is no commercial arts, no French, and how in the name of peace are the people coming up in these

Mr. J. Winsor: communities going to get the same standard of education that they get in other larger places? They deserve it just as much as anybody else. And I think it is high time that there were better schools, and certainly more teachers - you cut them back, and if a teacher has to go to a meeting now the class has to stay out of school. It happens in my hometown, and it is happening in many of the smaller schools.

So I would strongly support this petition for Rencontre and ask the minister to give it good and strong consideration in his estimates. Make sure that the DEC has enough money to pass to the IEC, to pass to the contractor. I have much pleasure in tabling this petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. gentleman, Sir, for the most humane and colourful way in which he presented that petition on behalf of his constituents. My hon. friend seems to have the knack, Sir, have a knack for really driving home the point, taking the prayer of the petition, interpreting the prayer in his own words

MR. NEARY: and making it abundantly clear to members of the House what it is the people who live in Rencontre East are asking for. And what are they asking for, Mr. Speaker? They are asking for something that people in every other part of Newfoundland take for granted and that is a decent school in which to send their children to get their education. When I heard my hon. friend describing the conditions of that school, how the timbers were rotting out, the roof was leaking, the place was falling down around their ears, I thought my hon. friend was describing a school somewhere in darkest Africa. I thought it was in Idi Amin's country that my hon. friend was describing a school, in one of the poorer countries of the world that we hear so much about on radio and television. But my hon. friend was describing a school in Rencontre East, in Newfoundland, in Canada. Canada - we are suppose to be an affluent country, a wealthy country. The answer that my hon. friend will get - I can almost predict the answer that my hon. friend is going to get from whoever the Minister of Education is now - we cannot keep up to him - who is he?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Justice.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice, my old buddy, the former Government House Leader who just got demoted, unfortunately. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will come back and say, "Well, we take the money and we give it to the school board and the DEC will decide what happens to the money." Well now, Sir, that is not good enough. The people of this Province are getting fed up with that excuse and that feeble argument and the way in which the government tries to weasel out from under its responsibility. They cannot do it anymore, Sir, the people are wise to it. You cannot just say, "Well, we are going to give just so much money to the DEC or to the school board and they will decide where it is going to be spent."

MR. DOODY: Do you want to get rid of the DEC?

MR. NEARY: Well now, Sir, there was a little movement started down in Labrador West a few weeks ago that I would not mind

MR. NEARY: supporting. I would not mind it at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And the day will come, if we ever provide the legislation whereby people are allowed to express their views in a referendum in this Province as the Government of Canada brought in recently giving the people across Canada an opportunity to express their views on referendums that apply to Canada as a whole, if we ever get a legislation similar to that in this Province then my hon. friend may come in for a rude awakening. My hon. friend may come to the sudden realization as I saw the interviews that were done on CBC Hear and Now -

MR. MORGAN: What are you speaking on anyway?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the school down in Rencontre East and -

MR. MORGAN: It is a long way around.

MR. NEARY: Well it may be a long way around, Sir, but I am supporting -

MR. SIMMONS: He does not understand.

MR. NEARY: - the petition.

MR. S. NEARY: My hon. friend would not understand, my hon. friend is a bit of an embarrassment now, a source of embarrassment to that hon. crowd over there long enough.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has embarrassed two Premiers now.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, he is embarrassing the second Premier you know.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Order, please! The hon. gentleman did indicate the long way around but I would suggest that it not get any longer than necessary.

MR. S. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, one would think, Sir, one actually should be shocked, I suppose, to hear my hon. colleague describe the condition of that school. As I say, you would swear he was talking about conditions of a school in darkest Africa. So, Sir, I hope the Government will not use the feeble excuse of just saying, "Well, we have given the money to the School Board and the DEC's and they should decide how they spend it." That is not good enough. We are going to have to smarten up, Sir, people are getting wise to that feeble excuse and these mealy-mouth words that are used every time there is a petition brought into this House of Assembly about schools and about conditions of schools and school buses and things related to education in this Province. So I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I hope that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hickman) in his new portfolio - I believe this is his second time around. No? The Minister was there before, I believe. Is this the first time around?

MR. J. NOLAN: Well, he has been everywhere else.

MR. S. NEARY: Beg your pardon? Well, the minister has been in every other department. I hope the minister will not just follow the bad examples set by his predecessors and just try to pawn it off on the School Board or the DEC.

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to support the petition presented by my colleague from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Winsor). The petition cites an example which is the case in Rencontre East. It is one of the worse examples. I have

MR. R. SIMMONS: seen the school in Rencontre East, indeed, it was five or eight years ago that I saw it and it was well beyond being slated for replacement at that particular time. I can well imagine its condition several years later. It is now late in March and even with the existing mechanism we have through the DEC it is still going to be another month or two before the DEC knows even what kinds of funds are available to it this year. Of course, then the DEC has to go through its decision making process and it is going to be quite some time before the decision filters down to the Rencontre East level, indeed, perhaps too late to begin any construction this year even if there is a favourable decision by the DEC concerned the the Board concerned, a favourable decision for some new capital expenditure for Rencontre East.

I mentioned that to draw attention to one of the problems that School Boards are facing now in respect to places like Rencontre East and that is because of the Government's failure to bring down a Budget before the end of this fiscal year, School Boards in particular, and there are other examples in other areas of service throughout the Province - water and sewer and road construction and so on - but in this particular area School Boards are going to be hard pressed to put the money to best use in the forthcoming fiscal year just because the Government has been delinquent in bringing in its Budget. I do hope, as my colleague said a moment ago, I do hope that the new Minister of Education, (Mr. Hickman), who has been a bit of disappointment to us in Justice, a complete disappointment in Finance even as a writer of budgets, I do hope

MR. R. SIMMONS: he realizes, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that in this new portfolio he realizes that this is his last chance to redeem himself and to go out of office, as he will either the day before or the day after the next provincial election, depending on his wisdom on the subject in deciding whether to run or not to run.

MR. F. WHITE: The result is all the same.

MR. SIMMONS: But this is, Mr. Speaker, his last chance to redeem himself and I do hope he takes full advantage of it and does something for the people of Rencontre East in particular, but in the overall it persuades his worthy successor to his right that much more capital money is needed to be funnelled through the DEC if places like Rencontre East are going to have a fair chance at all educationally.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions Sir, I wish to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy if the hon. gentleman is in a position to answer questions after just being in that department for only a day or two. If the hon. gentleman cannot answer the questions perhaps he might want to pass the questions on to the hon. the Premier. And my questions have to do with the development of the Lower Churchill. I would like for the minister to give us an update on what is happening now in connection with the development of the Lower Churchill. Can we expect, for instance, to see any activity this Spring and Summer in connection with the construction and the development of the Lower Churchill?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I presaged a burst of tremendous activity in that direction this morning when I found the office of Mines and Energy. I had a long detailed discussion with the authorities so charged and they have started to bring me up to date on that rather complex and important question. I am afraid I am not in a position to bring the House up to date at this particular point

MR. DOODY: because I myself have not been brought completely up to date. I would hope, during the next few days, to be in a position to give a far more comprehensive and enlightening answer and if the hon. members opposite would bear with me I will undertake to get the information for them.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, that is fair enough, Sir, but I believe there are a couple of questions that I could put to the hon. gentleman of a general nature that the hon. gentleman is familiar with because they have already been debated in this House. I think the hon. gentleman is probably familiar with this situation as much as anybody else, especially being a minister, it does not make any difference what portfolio the hon. gentleman held.

But I am talking about the calling for proposals now to use a submarine cable to transmit the power from Labrador, from the Lower Churchill and even possibly, I presume, from the Upper Churchill, to calling for proposals to use a submarine cable. Could the hon. gentleman elaborate on this and just tell us precisely what is going on in connection with this? This is a new development and I believe the House, the members are entitled to be brought up to date on what is happening here.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: It is not really a new development. In the early stages of the examination of the feasibility of bringing the power to the Island rather than shipping it west in the grand old tradition, the option of the tunnel versus the submarine cable was examined. It appeared in the beginning that the tunnel was by far the most practical route to take. Since that time some new developments in technology have presented themselves and a further feasibility study has been arranged to measure the advisability of the alternate cable crossing as opposed to the tunnel crossing. That study is ongoing and which of the two would be the

MR. DOODY: most feasible and most economical has yet to be determined. It is an ongoing study and as soon as the information is available it will be made available to the House and to the people involved. Which of the two is most practical, in short, has yet to be determined. It would appear that the cable possibility is a far more reasonable option than it had been, say, three years ago but it is far away from being a certainty. The tunnel versus the cable is still very much in question and a lot more work has to be done to determine which of the two is most practical.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I understood the hon. gentleman correctly in saying that now, almost four years after two blasts were set off on either side of the Straits of Belle Isle

MR. NEARY: to start the construction of a tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle that was meant to not only transmit electricity to the Island of Newfoundland from Labrador, but to be used for transportation purposes -

MR. ROBERTS: More than the blasts, they have spent millions of dollars on it.

MR. NEARY: Yes I am going to mention the figure. I believe the figure is \$110 million.

Now, Sir, what I want to ask the minister, was the government aware when it took the decision back, prior to the Provincial General Election in 1975, was the government aware that there was new technology developing whereby it would be feasible to use submarine cable to transmit the power from Labrador to the Island of Newfoundland? Were they aware of that fact at the time or did they just go ahead blindly? Or why did they take the decision if they -

MR. DOODY: Is there to be a question following?

MR. NEARY: Why did the government take the decision? Why at that time, Sir, when they knew there was new technology being developed for submarine cables, why did the government take the decision to throw away \$110 million of taxpayers' money to start the construction of a tunnel; set off two blasts on either side of the Straits of Belle Isle when they knew this new technology was only a year or two away?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DOODY: Your Honour, there are a whole lot of weird and wonderful suppositions, statements, twisted facts

MR. DOODY: and innuendoes contained in that rather long and -

MR. NEARY: You cannot say that was long.

MR. DOODY: Well in that case I did not say it, Sir. I take it all back.

The new technology that the gentleman refers to as being in being was obviously not in being or it would not be new technology. What has happened is that during the past several years tremendous advances have been made in the laying of undersea cables and in the economics and the technical feasibility of using undersea cables. The big problem that was in being at that particular time was the ice scouring, for one point, and the other was the fire problem and the oil filled cables and so on. But anyway that is a technical point which you can get into later on.

The point is that at the time that these blasts were set off the technology had not been developed to a point where it would appear that the undersea cable was the most reasonable of the two approaches to take. At that point in time it seemed that the underwater tunnel was the most reasonable approach. Since that time new technology, and I mean new technology, not technology that we knew seven or eight or two or three years ago, but literally new technology has presented itself. The engineers, the consultants are now studying that and weighing one against the other.

\$110 million of the taxpayers' money has not been thrown away, it has been used to great advantage. We did not get -

MR. SIMMONS: To get the votes.

MR. NEARY: It helped you get re-elected.

MR. DOODY: To get me re-elected? No, I do not think it had very much to do with getting me re-elected, in all honesty. I have several regrets about these two blasts that were set off. One of them was the fact that the hon. member was not in close proximity to these blasts. And there are other obvious things that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: The point of the matter is that as these facts present themselves and are proven to be demonstrable and in the best interest of the Province, despite all the comments of the hon. members opposite, they will be brought to the attention of the House and we will be examining them and we will do what is in the best interest of the Province.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A final supplementary,
then the hon. gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. gentleman, Sir, what now happens? I presume that the hon. gentleman said they looked into a crystal ball and they could see new technology coming up so they cancelled the tunnel and waited for a couple of years for the new technology to develop, \$110 million later. That is what the hon. gentleman is inferring. They could read, they could almost look into the crystal ball and see what was happening.

Will the hon. gentleman now tell the House what will happen to the tunnel? If it is feasible to put a submarine cable across the Straits of Bell Isle, will the tunnel idea then be scrapped and \$110 million of taxpayers' money go down the drain, thrown away? Is that what

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman is saying?

And I am only allowed to ask one more question, I would also like to ask the hon. gentleman -

MR. DOODY: God is good.

MR. NEARY: - ask the hon. gentleman if there will be any employment in Churchill Falls this year in connection with the construction and the development of the Lower Churchill? Two questions in one. What about the tunnel? Is the tunnel idea now being scrapped? And will there be any employment in Churchill Falls this coming Summer and Spring?

MR. DOODY: I had better try to hit the second one first, Sir, because employment in Churchill Falls really has very little to

MR. DOODY: do with what goes on at Cull or Muskrat or even the tunnel or the cable across the Straits. So the relevancy there escapes me completely.

MR. NEARY: The Lower Churchill?

MR. DOODY: No, the Churchill Falls. The hon. member said Churchill Falls.

The other point is the crystal ball concept. We have not used that method of economics nor of technological advancement. The crystal ball that was so widely in use during the years preceeding the advent of the Tory administration fortunately was scrapped and we go along now with the advice of technical people, of engineers and economists. The technical advice that we received during the past several months, well even the past several years has been that it is far wiser to wait and decide which of these two courses would be most advantageous to the Province, whether the tunnel is the wise way to go or whether this series of seven or eight or nine submarine cables is the wise way to go. The only thing we are absolutely certain of is that when this power is developed, all that can be used, and used economically and feasibly for the benefit of the people of this Province shall be done. And it may take us some more months to accomplish that fact, but I can assure this House and assure hon. members opposite that we will not repeat the disaster of giving the stuff away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verte - (Mr. Ottenheimer) White Bay followed by the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, Trinity - Bay de Verde and Windsor - Buchans.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the new Minister of Industrial Development -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

- a person who almost did in fact get blasted away by the shock waves from the other side of the Straits.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is only new in this portfolio, in there by a couple of days, but he is certainly not new to the desperate economic crisis facing the town of Roddickton, and so far there has not been any satisfactory response from this government or from any minister in the government really, about the fishing admiral approach taken by the company in Roddickton with the loggers down there. So I want to ask the minister now whether he has had an opportunity yet to direct his attention to the Roddickton situation in view of the fact that there have been numerous representations made to that department by me and by other people over the past couple of months.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

(Mr. Ottenheimer)

MR. MAYNARD:

I certainly have not had the opportunity as Minister of Industrial Development to look at the Roddickton situation, Mr. Speaker. I was involved in it when I was Minister of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture to some extent and the matter is still under investigation or analysis by the department. I am hoping within the next two or three days to be able to analyze the situation from an Industrial Development point of view and possibly talk to the principals of Canada Bay Lumber Company and try to determine what, if anything, can be done to get the operation back on stream there in Roddickton again. I will certainly be working on it actively as soon as I am able to move into the office which the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) is now vacating.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

(Mr. Ottenheimer)

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer.

Mr. Speaker, one of the key people in the situation dispute in the Roddickton area between the company and the loggers at the moment, I think, and one of the people who knows it really best is one of the minister's representatives, a Mr. Hollett in Stephenville. I wonder if the minister could make a commitment to me and to the House and to the people of Roddickton that he would direct this gentleman to get a handle on the Roddickton situation and make a report directly to him, because that gentleman is very familiar with it; he has been down there and I know his feelings on it. I know that he has a feeling for the Roddickton area and he has a feeling for the problem down there, and he did not get a chance because of politics the last time to communicate properly with the minister at that time. I wonder would the minister make a commitment that he would get on to that person and direct him, really direct that person to get a handle on the Roddickton situation and come back personally to the minister with it and take it from there and hopefully be able to resolve it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. MAYNARD: I will assure the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that I will do everything in my power to see that the Roddickton situation is resolved. And I believe I have the support of the Premier on this, that we should resolve the situation at the earliest possible date. I will talk to whoever is available or whoever has knowledge of the situation from an industrial development point of view and if they can make any suggestions to resolve the

MR. MAYNARD: situation then I will take those suggestions into active consideration. That is about all I can say at this point in time. I would appreciate it if I could have another few days to get familiar with the situation and then go back and see what we can do about it.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Premier on a subject raised in the Auditor General's Report. I refer to page 26, paragraph 36. It gives an account of the retaining of an individual to act as a consultant to government on certain special events like the opening of hospitals, roads, bridges and so on. It goes on to point out that during the year ended March 31, 1978 a total fee of \$34,000 was paid out to the individual for 136 days of work. That would prorate to a salary of about \$65,000 a year, Mr. Speaker. My question to the hon. the Premier - could he indicate to the House what kinds of services this consultant was performing? It is here in the paragraph in somewhat general terms but could he be a little more specific as to what the responsibilities of this consultant were to the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to briefly go through the Auditor General's Report and to isolate certain areas which are of concern to me and one of them is the area that the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) just raises. I had not been able to get the full detail on it before the House opened. I am told by people whom I have asked about it already that the consultant concerned performed public relations work for various government departments as it related to the opening, as the hon. member said, of schools or hospitals or other public projects which were financed out of the public chest. A lot of the advance work and work as it related to the opening of these public building was performed by this consultant. I intend to get additional detail on it for the House.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: I thank the hon. the Premier. I wonder would the Premier be able to indicate to the House whether or not he knows who this individual is and if so whether he would be prepared to give the House the name of this individual? And further I notice that the travel expenses paid out to the individual were quite extensive. In respect to 136 days he received twenty-three and one half thousand dollars in expenses. I am wondering if the Premier could indicate to the House what kind of travel might have been required. I heard the Premier saying a minute ago that he is not totally familiar with the situation and I certainly understand and respect that but perhaps if he cannot give the answer now he might undertake to find the answers to what kind of travel this person would have been required to engage in in this capacity as a consultant on these particular matters?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I do know the name of the consultant and the name of the consultant is one man by the name of Mr. Robert Nutbeam. The nature of the travelling that the consultant did around the Province - I would have to get that information for the hon. member. The consultant was Mr. Nutbeam and the monies mentioned by the Auditor General are the monies and I will get a full statement as to the travelling and work done by the consultant for the government.

MR. SIMMONS: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Again the Premier may have to take this as notice as well. I am wondering if the Premier would indicate whether to his knowledge the gentleman whom he has now identified as Mr. Nutbeam is still involved in a retainer capacity with the government, whether or not the Cabinet directive of December 1976 which, by the way, was approved three months after this individual began

March 28, 1979

Tape No. 533

AH-3

MR. SIMMONS: his work and three months after his first invoice for services rendered, whether that Cabinet directive is still in effect and specifically whether this person is still retained by the government? And further, to the same point, whether any formal contract exists on the subject or did exist even if, at this point in time, it has been terminated?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am getting the information as it relates to whether there was a contract at all or not. I will make all of this information available to the House. There is now no consultant employed by the government, Mr. Nutbeam or anybody else, to perform any kind of work like this. Absolutely not, nor will there be in the future.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries who has retained his portfolio. Will the minister, Sir, explain why or who is responsible or was responsible for an event in 1977 when a Minute-in-Council authorizing an order which, number one, authorized the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation to acquire the Cape Sambro from the Marystown Shipyard and, secondly, that the trawler be transferred to the Department of Fisheries for the purpose of inviting tenders for its sale or lease. This particular Minute-in-Council, in fact, terminated an agreement which was executed almost a year before, in November 1976, between the Marystown Shipyard Limited, the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation, and a fish processing plant whereby the fish processing plant was advanced a loan of just over \$2.3 million to purchase the trawler.

And, Sir, could the minister further explain how only one company managed to submit a bid, incidentally the same company that was involved in the original agreement in 1976, which allowed that company to purchase the Cape Sambro resulting in a loss to the government of \$1,145,000 and to the taxpayers of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I came into the picture as Minister of Fisheries in September 1977, having nothing to do with the construction of the Cape Sambro, but I am familiar with the events leading up to the awarding of the contract for the vessel and its subsequent sale to the

Mr. W. Carter: company mentioned. I believe it was in January 1976 a contract was awarded to the Marystown Shipyard by the Department of Industrial Development to construct a vessel later to be known as the Cape Sambre. That was done to stave off a massive unemployment situation in the Marystown Shipyard. Apparently work was scarce, and but for the fact that construction of that vessel was commenced, there would have been a considerable layoff at the shipyard.

The contract price for the vessel was \$4.25 million.

MR. F. ROWE: Thirty-five per cent subsidy.

MR. W. CARTER: A 35 per cent subsidy was promised by Ottawa. A verbal undertaking given by the minister then, I believe, Mr. Jamieson -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. W. CARTER: - who was, of course the member for that district, of \$935,000, which was 35 per cent of the contract price. In 1977, in January, or at least in September of 1977, the Department of Fisheries was asked to invite bids from the various companies in the Province to purchase that vessel. One bid was submitted by, I believe, it was National Sea. They offered to purchase the vessel for, I believe, it was around \$2.7 million, certainly the contract price less the amount of subsidy promised by Ottawa. We are still endeavouring to get the amount of subsidy either one way or the other. To date we have not been successful and that, Mr. Speaker, accounts for the \$935,000 amount that is being absorbed by the Department of Fisheries with respect to the contract price and the eventual sale price of that vessel.

As to why only one company bid on the vessel, I cannot answer that, Mr. Speaker. Tenders were called, public tenders were called. One company elected to submit a bid and that company was awarded the vessel for the price mentioned.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I knew very well that the Minister of Fisheries would return to his usual answer of trying to blame Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: He would have made some Premier!

MR. F. ROWE: The fact of the matter is, Sir, I would like to ask the minister why did the Minister of Fisheries— and he said he was not the Minister of Fisheries at the particular time— who is responsible? Probably the Premier could enlighten us, or the Minister of Justice. Who was responsible? Was it the ex-Premier? The ex-Minister of Industrial Development? The ex-Minister of Finance? Whoever it was, who was responsible for allowing this whole termination of an agreement made in 1976

MR. F.B. ROWE: to take place in 1977 whereby the Province lost \$210,000 in interest? Who was responsible for that? And why did it take place, the termination of that original agreement? Why would the government proceed with a new agreement, another minute-in-council without first obtaining an agreement in writing from the federal government which ended up costing this Province \$935,000 for a total of \$1,145,000? Who was responsible for recommending that second minute-in-council in 1977 which terminated everything that happened in 1976, the year before? Who was responsible?

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

MR. W. CARTER: This matter was the subject of negotiation between the then Minister of Industrial Development and the company concerned, but I can explain.

Initially the company offered to buy that vessel in 1976, for an amount less the subsidy. At that time we could not get from Ottawa, at least a firm indication as to whether or not they would then pay the subsidy or honour the commitment that was made previously.

MR. NEARY: Who made the commitment?

MR. W. CARTER: I have already mentioned, Mr. Speaker, who made that commitment.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Where and when?

MR. W. CARTER: In September of 1977 -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Jamieson made that commitment?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Speaker, and others in Ottawa led us to believe that the subsidy would be forthcoming, the subsidy of 35 per cent, which

MR. W. CARTER: lay offs would have taken place at the shipyard. I think that the fact that we were able to avoid and to avert that lay off would certainly more than justify the action taken at that time by the department.

MR. F. ROWE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: I am wondering if the work force that would have been laid off would have cost this Province \$1,145,000? Sir, a Supplementary to the minister. Sir, could the minister indicate specifically who and under what circumstances the so-called verbal agreement was given to the minister? Was it given in a casual conversation over the phone, as a result of a meeting with the three parties involved in Ottawa, with a meeting in Marystown? What was the nature of the agreement? I am surprised! Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) to indicate to the House why the Government does not copper-fasten agreements in writing with anybody - Federal Government or Provincial Government or any other Government - before they enter into a situation costing this Province in excess of a one million dollar loss, a one million dollar loss of \$1,145,000 loss to the taxpayers? I am surprised that this Government enters into any kind of agreement where they lose \$210 million of interest and \$935,000 as a result of not completing or firming up an agreement for that particular subsidy. Where and when and under what circumstances was the agreement made?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. W. CARTER: I can only say the minister of the department at that time, I am sure, acted in good faith and assumed that the people in Ottawa, at least his federal counterpart, was acting in good faith too. We did not have too much time to waste in the awarding of that contract to that shipyard, Things were pretty dicey in the shipyard at that time, the workers were about to be laid off, work had to commence on that vessel and assurance was given to the minister, to the then minister, by Ottawa that the subsidy would be forthcoming. They have since reneged on that obligation, on that promise. I can table, Mr. Speaker, letters,

MR. W. CARTER: copies of letters, that we have since forwarded to the ministers in Ottawa reminding them of their commitment and I shall endeavour to do that within a few days, if that would satisfy the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:(Mr. Ottenheimer) A final supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would the minister, since he is using the same old technique he did in the last session, he is willing to table letters that he has written, can the minister table on his own behalf or on behalf of the former Minister of Industrial Development any letters from the Federal Government or any official in the Federal Government which states specifically and clearly that there was, in fact, such an agreement to provide that 35 per cent subsidy? And would the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman), Sir, since he is so upset with leaks these days, undertake, if the minister can not do this, undertake to set up a committee of inquiry to investigate the leakage or wastage of that \$1,145,000 worth of the taxpayers' money in this Province?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. W. MARSHALL: Just before we call orders of the day, today is private members' day and I realize that there are private members' motions before the House that have to be considered, but there is also a bill, a Supply Bill, which must go through, as

MR. MARSHALL: members know by the end of March in order to enable us to pay the public bills. Now I would like to just put this to the House as government's intention and hopes that within the framework of regular hours that we can conduct the business of the House in a reasonable fashion. I know we will with the co-operation of members. I would just like to put this to the Opposition since they will be very concerned with the supply, if they would wish to, in the interest of getting the Interim Supply Bill examined to the extent that they wish to, we would be quite prepared today to go ahead with supply on the understanding of course that a Private Members' Day would be supplied to the Opposition, an extra Private Members' Day afterwards.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, one would think, Sir, that the Government House Leader would follow the tradition that is well known and well respected in the parliaments throughout the free world, a tradition that was observed and used by his predecessor, the present Minister of Justice and Education, and meet occasionally possibly behind the curtain, talk it over, have a coffee and talk it over and certainly not to come into the House and confront the Opposition with a proposal in the House, Sir. It is the first we heard of it, Mr. Speaker. Now the next thing they will be wanting to do away with the Speaker. This is the crowd that brought democracy to Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

But in the meantime, Sir, we are not going to give up Private Members' Day, Sir. We have already stated, and our Leader has stated outside the

Neary
MR. MARSHALL: House and inside the House that we intend to co-operate with the new Premier in every way possible. We intend to see that the gentleman is given a fair chance, that the hon. gentleman will - we were prepared to give him a week or two to get his legs under him and to see how he does, see how he shapes up. We are quite prepared to co-operate with the hon. gentleman but the hon. gentleman should tell his House Leader to follow the proper procedure and the traditions that are well known in parliaments and legislatures throughout the free world. And the hon. gentleman need not have any fear about his Interim Supply Bill, and the Social Assistance recipients in the Province will get paid, thanks to the Opposition. The civil servants will get paid thanks to the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Order, please! I just want to point out that this is a procedural matter where the hon. gentleman to my left has asked a question to the hon. gentleman to my right and should not develop into a debate or anything of any great length.

MR. NEARY: Well, just to bring it to a close, Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to give up Private Members' Day, and the hon. gentleman will have to -

PREMIER PECKFORD: We do not want them to give it up.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman need not threaten the Opposition. There need not be any threats.

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

I think the point has now been clarified. The point has been made and it being Private Members' Day, so as not to encroach upon the private

MR. SPEAKER: member's resolution I should call that. Now if the hon. gentleman wishes to conclude in a sentence or two, but the matter certainly must not be allowed to develop into a debate.

MR. NEARY: What I was going to say -

MR. MORGAN: Control yourself, boy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted so rudely again by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), who is becoming an embarrassment to the administration, two premiers now, what I was going to say, Sir, is that the government has until Friday, I believe it is, One o'clock, I believe, the House meets.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not asking you to give up Private Members' Day, let us clear that.

MR. NEARY: Well that is what the hon. gentleman inferred.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes he inferred that. Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: What we are saying is that if you today agree to allow Interim Supply to go through we will ensure that another day, that would normally be the government's day, will be the Private Members' Day. In other words perhaps next week there will be two Private Members' Days.

MR. MARSHALL: It is up to you.

PREMIER PECKFORD: But you are not giving up a day.

MR. NEARY: That sounds like a reasonable proposal and we would have been very glad to take it under advisement if -

PREMIER PECKFORD: We do not want you to -

MR. NEARY: If the hon. Premier will allow me, if we had to have advance notice and not just have it flung at us across the floor of the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is not one on which advance notice is really necessary because it is such a reasonable proposal. I mean how could anyone - we are not asking -

MR. F. ROWE: We plan our day you know.

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

MR. NEARY: Let me finish, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the government has until one o'clock, I believe the House meets in the morning on Friday from ten until one, they have until one o'clock to get their Interim Supply and I would suggest to them, Sir, that they have to take their chances.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion no. 11.

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order here, I think that when the debate adjourned

PREMIER PECKFORD: on this motion that I had adjourned it as Minister of Mines and Energy. I am now relinquishing my opportunity to speak so that the Opposition can have an opportunity to debate on this very important issue and to show this side's co-operation in making sure that the functioning of the House resumes in a very normal, sensible manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for
(Mr. Ottenheimer) Terra Nova.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too bad the campers cannot see you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Premier for giving me this opportunity to speak, but I want to thank the hon. House Leader mostly because without his intercession I would not have made it at all this afternoon to talk on this very important matter, this most vital matter, this motion that is now before the House, probably one of the most important motions ever to come before this House, and I am sure, one on which both sides of the House must agree. The motion, Mr. Speaker, is concerned with the unemployment problem in this Province today. It shows the concern of members on this side for this tremendous problem that we have in the Province today, our number one problem, unemployment. It shows our interest, it shows our concern, it shows our desire to try to do something about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to enlighten the House as to what the motion is all about, because I think it was some time before Christmas that we looked at this motion. First of all, it just states the problem of unemployment and talks about the thousands of people in this Province who cannot find jobs and then expresses our concern and our desire to do something about it. And the suggestion is that "Be it therefore resolved

MR. LUSH: that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to hold hearings in a wide variety of areas of Newfoundland and Labrador for the purpose of obtaining the ideas of a large cross-section of the general public including representatives of labour unions, business associations and the academic community as well as interested individuals regarding the development of job opportunities in this Province." Then it goes on to say that the committee make recommendation as to what we can do to come up with a clear plan for development of jobs in this Province, and it suggests, of course, that there be a joint effort between the provincial government and the federal government. So, Mr. Speaker, it is just not merely talking about the provincial government's role here, it clearly indicates and clearly points out that we believe that the federal government have a role to play in creating jobs in this Province, have a role to play in minimizing, lessening the unemployment problem in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, certainly it is one of the most important motions ever to come before this House of Assembly and one with which all hon. members must agree - a tremendous motion. And, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that we can all agree to set up this Select Committee so that we can do something about that problem in this Province, that number one problem.

Mr. Speaker, for six or seven years now this provincial government have been talking about the future of this Province. Indeed, they came into power with great plans to develop this Province. They talked about the great future prospects based on the full development of our natural resources, resource based industries. Certainly it rings a familiar note to all of us here in this House. And they talked about the great public debt at that particular

MR. LUSH: time: and they talked about the absolute and total financial and economic mess into which the Liberal Government of the day had recklessly, carelessly and negligently plunged this Province. That was the kind of talk that was going on, Mr. Speaker, six or seven years ago. Well, this administration, this new government came into power offering new hope, new aspiration, new ambition to the people of this Province, offering them a complete and total realization of our heretofore

MR. LUSH: frustrated and unrealized dreams. They convinced our people that we were on the verge of a major breakthrough, they convinced our people that they were going to be the salvation of this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province are still waiting, they are still waiting, they are still waiting for action, they are still waiting for the development, for that great development to take place, they are still waiting for that major breakthrough and yet in 1979 we still hear about plans for the future. After seven years in office this government is still only in the planning stages, still in the planning stages to provide jobs for our people. It is always, Sir, the next five or ten years down the road and we can never seem to arrive at the first five years, these five year plans for the development of the Province and we do not seem to get anywhere. Over the last couple of years they have talked about a lot of resources that are going to hold great hope for Newfoundland in the future. Talking about the oil and gas, Mr. Speaker, that is the great swan song now, the oil and gas and the future prospects for that to the economy of this Province. And to that, of course, we add the hydro development, our great hopes now have been pinned on the development of the Lower Churchill. And, of course, they have talked about the fishery, the great future that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will have in the fishery. Well, Sir, somehow they believe that these things are going to develop. We have got those natural resources - hoping to have oil and gas - but we have got the hydro potential and we have other natural resources and somehow they figure these things are going to get developed. They do not know how. They do great talking about all of these natural resources and the great abundance of natural resources that we have yet they are not developed, but somehow they think they are going to be developed. It seems as though they lack the know-how, it seems as though they lack the initiative, it seems as though they lack the vision of developing these tremendous resources.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, that is their belief no doubt, that is their philosophy. They believe in the future of this Province, the development of our natural resources but as I have said they cannot somehow get around to developing these natural resources. They do not know how to do it and it seems as though we do not know when they are going to be developed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe in the future of this Province but philosophy and beliefs are one thing, and hope and aspirations are certainly worthy characteristics, but philosophy and belief, Mr. Speaker, must be translated into action if our hopes and aspirations are to be realized. So after six years in office, seven years in office what is the reality in Newfoundland today? What is the reality in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador today? What is the record? What is the performance of this group of people that was going to be the salvation of our Province?

Well I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we could take several measures or several yardsticks by which to measure the

Mr. Lush: performance of this particular government, and certainly, I suppose, there can be no better yardstick, no better measure than that of employment or the lack of it, unemployment. And it is a well-known fact to all members of this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that we have an outrageous level of unemployment.

Just look at some statistics, the motion states that since 1971 the unemployment rate in this Province has almost tripled. Now let us look at it in numbers, Mr. Speaker. In 1971, there were 13,000 people unemployed, 1971, 13,000 for a rate of 9.3 per cent. Now 9.3 per cent is certainly not a desirable level of unemployment, certainly not a desirable level of unemployment, not a desirable level of unemployment at all. And the Opposition of that day, these people, in 1971, I think just came. This was in February of 1971. Were this hon. group in or out then?

AN HON. MEMBER: When?

MR. LUSH: 1971, February 1971. out were they not? Out.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were not allowed in until 1971.

MR. LUSH: So the Opposition of the day they were criticizing that figure 9.3. Unreal, incredible. 9.3 per cent, Mr. Speaker, that was what the unemployment rate was then. The national unemployment rate was 7.0 in February of 1971.

MR. WHITE: Almost as high as it is now.

MR. SIMMONS: It is more than that now.

MR. LUSH: In February of 1978 - I will not quote all of the figures - In February of 1978, whereas in February of 1971 there were 13,000 unemployed, in February of 1978, 32,000 people unemployed, 32,000 for an unemployment rate of 17.6 per cent, almost double, Mr. Speaker, that of 1971.

Well, let us come to 1979 now after that blueprint for development. That blueprint for development that was going to create jobs for this Province, that was going to bring the level of unemployment down - when, five years? Five years, Mr. Speaker. We are almost a year into that mission and it has not gone down, but it has gone up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lush: It has gone up after that great blueprint, Mr. Soeaker, for development. So in 1979, in February of this year, we have 36,000 people unemployed, 4,000 more than a year ago, 36,000 people unemployed, 4,000 more than a year ago, 4,000 since that blueprint for development in which the government was going to attack unemployment, going to create jobs, and get the unemployment level down. It is up, Mr. Speaker. It is up. Eighteen point eight per cent. Eighteen point eight per cent. The national level, eighteen point eight.

MR. RIDEOUT: Ten per cent above.

MR. LUSH: Whereas the national level in the same period from 1971 to 1979 went from 7.2 per cent 8.8 per cent. Ours, this Province went from 9.3 to 18.8. And that is double the rate, more than double, more than double in terms of rate and just about triple in terms of the numbers unemployed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Disgraceful! Disgraceful!

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the great record, that is the great record for creating jobs for our people. Mr. Soeaker, can you imagine, can you imagine the reaction across Canada were we to have a national unemployment rate of 18.8 per cent. Could you imagine the reaction and the response right across Canada if we had a national rate of unemployment of 18.8 per cent? Can you imagine the reaction across Canada if this were the rate of unemployment in any other province in Canada?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: If it were in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, you name it. But somehow we feel because we have had an unemployment problem all through our history, somehow we feel that we have to accept that, our people feel that we have

MR. LUSH: to accept that level of unemployment. Mr. Speaker, I say there is no way that we have to accept that level of unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: And the complete unacceptability of that high level of unemployment must become a part of the conscience of this Province, it must become a part of the public conscience of our people, and we must ensure that it is. Our people should not have to accept that level of unemployment, 18.8 per cent. Outrageous! Criminal, Mr. Speaker. How the government can sit and still maintain their equilibrium and know that we have this outrageous unemployment problem in this Province, Sir, is beyond understanding.

MR. F.B. ROWE: There are only four of them over there listening, 'Tom' boy.

MR. LUSH: Yes, I am talking about this topic and nobody around, nobody around, nobody interested. That shows their concern for the unemployment problem, Sir. That shows their concern for that cancerous and malignant disease that we have around us today. It shows their concern, Mr. Speaker.

We have shown our concern by drafting this motion, Mr. Speaker, and trying to get action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: We realize the problems involved, but we are trying to do something about it. We are trying to make the government concerned and trying, also, to get our people concerned, because they must be concerned about it. The people of this Province must be concerned and they cannot accept this high level of unemployment. We cannot accept it.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, our people want to work. They want meaningful jobs, productive jobs. They do not want to be unemployed, they want to work. And it must be made clear, unmistakably clear that it is the job of the provincial government to see that they are given work, to see that they are given meaningful jobs, to see that they are given the means, Mr. Speaker, whereby to provide themselves and their families with a decent living. That is the least they can expect from their provincial government. That is the least that they can expect from their government, they will provide jobs for them.

The government, Sir, cannot continue to ignore this our number one problem. The government cannot shirk its responsibility in providing jobs for the people of this Province. Is the government not concerned over the terrible economic waste which is represented by the thousands of men and women who cannot find productive jobs? Are they not concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, the tremendous economic waste, the waste of human talent and human ability?

Are the government, Sir, not concerned about the frustration, anxiety and complete human misery which unemployment causes? Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the unemployed people of this Province are living. I really do not know how they are living. With inflation, and with the cost of living escalating the way it is, how can our people, these 36,000 people who are unemployed, come up with the money to provide the necessities of life - electricity bills, fuel bills, foods costs, clothing, education? Mr. Speaker, it takes all the initiative and all the financial ability of most members in this House to try and live. Now how about the people out there, Mr. Speaker, who have no jobs? How about the people out there who are unemployed

MR. LUSH: facing the escalation and
the cost of living day after day and no jobs?

Mr. Speaker, the negative
effects of this on our people are unspeakable,
unthinkable, absolutely disastrous!

Another statistic that
should illustrate the difficulty of the unemployed
in living: I mentioned about the escalation and the
cost of living. I think in the past two years the
cost of living has gone up by 20 per cent.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, think of the tremendous financial burden that this places on our unemployed - of course, not only our unemployed, but people on fixed income - but today we are talking about the unemployed; we are trying to make a case, a good case to get the government concerned about these thousands and thousands of unemployed people in the Province, the people, Sir, who are not only looking for a meaningful job or a productive job - they would just count their lucky stars to get a job. They would count their lucky stars just to get a job, to say nothing about meaningful, productive or otherwise.

MR. RIDEOUT: Tragic.

MR. LUSH: Sir, it is a terrible situation. And I ask again, Is the government not concerned about this problem? Are they not concerned about this malignant unemployment problem that is hanging over us? Are they not concerned about the cost of this in terms of economic waste, in human terms? - not being able to get a job, Mr. Speaker, not being able to get a job for which you have trained, not being able to get a job for which you have natural abilities, natural tendencies - not being able to get a job - it has had a tremendous detrimental and negative effect on people, destroying their moral fibre, Mr. Speaker, causing them to lose their initiative, and, what is worse, causing them to lose faith and confidence in politicians and in government. Because they see no concern, they see nobody illustrating any sympathy or having any concern for the problem at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today in this House to show that we are concerned. We have the opportunity to show that we want to do something together, co-operatively, for the unemployed of this Province by setting up this Select Committee to go out around the

MR. LUSH: Province and to get ideas from people from various walks of life to see how we can better develop this Province. That is what this motion is asking, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is asking.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the terrible and negative results of unemployment, it is unspeakable, and you have to experience it and feel it to know what it is like. And, Sir, we have thousands of people all around the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador who know what it is like, not from having read the book that was published last year by - Who was it? - the Commission for the Unemployed, or something?

MR. RIDEOUT: Burn Our Boats.

MR. LUSH: Burn Your Boats or Burn Our Boats. They know about it not from reading that although it is a good book, identifies the problem very well - they know about it because they are in the position, they are in the situation where they have experienced the frustration, the anxiety and the loss of dignity that goes with being unemployed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that this provincial government has failed to live up to their commitments and certainly failed to live up to the expectations which the people of this Province had of them. They failed to develop this Province, failed in their number one task, failed in their number one responsibility, that of providing jobs for our people, that of providing meaningful and productive jobs for our people. Now, Mr. Speaker, despite the high level of unemployment

MR. T. LUSH: and not wanting to sound like a prophet of gloom and doom, we have a fair amount of prosperity in our Province today, we have a fair amount of prosperity it was in the Speech from the Throne, in the Speech from the Throne the government made a great effort to show the prosperity. They talked about the increase in retail trade figures and they talked about the better educational opportunities for our youth and then they talked about the increase in refrigerators per capita and the increase in telephones and the increase in washing machines and automobiles. They talked about all of that to show the great prosperity that we are experiencing. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about that. There is prosperity in the Province. Some people have managed to scrounge the profits. The people working in big corporations and ripping off our natural resources some of these people have done well. But there has been a degree of prosperity, I suppose, right throughout the land, but, Mr. Speaker, it is a false prosperity. Our economy is not founded on a sound financial base, on a sound economic base.

MR. S. NEARY: Founded on hope.

MR. T. LUSH: Founded on hope, Sir. Much less than that, I would suggest. It is founded on UIC funds and that is a little better than hope. It is founded on UIC funds and on federal transfer payments and equalization grants and on Canada Works projects. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are all good things, they are all good things, thank God for all of them, but they are not things on which to build an economy, they are not things on which to create jobs, permanent, productive jobs for the people of this Province. I wonder where we would be today if we did not have those Canada Works projects? What would our level of unemployment be? What would it be? Mr. Speaker, the unspeakable, the incredible deprivation, unbelievable suffering if we did not have these federal works, these Canada Works projects.

MR. S. NEARY: Unemployment is starting to take us over.

MR. T. LUSH Uninsurance, unemployment insurance, Mr. Speaker, -
uninsurance does not make alot of sense.- unemployment insurance -

MR. S. NEARY: Do you know what they have done? They
have quadrupled, by the way. The brewer's retail licences and the
discos, the cabarets, and the taverns have quadrupled in the Province.

MR. T. LUSH: Is that right?

MR. S. NEARY: And unemployment has doubled.

MR. T. LUSH: Yes, well just to comment on that, Mr.
Speaker, I thank the hon. member for helping me along with that. Just
to comment on that, in terms of the gross provincial product. In terms
of the Gross Provincial Product, UIC payments made up close to eight
per cent of our whole economy last year or that is the figure. UIC
is coming, is close to making up to eight per cent of the whole economy
of the Province and that ranks just a little bit behind fisheries.
Take the fisheries from year to year, it varies, it goes between eight
per cent and nine per cent of the Gross Product and UIC right behind it,
right behind the fisheries. Sir, UIC is a large industry in this
Province and as I said before we thank God for it but it again emphasizes
the magnitude of our unemployment problem. It again emphasizes, as I said,
the magnitude of our unemployment problem and not totally because, as we
all know, a lot of our unemployed people are not on UIC, a lot of them do
not qualify. So the fact that UIC payments to this Province make up
eight per cent of the Gross Product certainly indicates the level of
unemployment in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we are
certainly - thank God for the fact that we got UIC but it is hardly the
kind of thing, on which to build a sound economy. And, Mr.
Speaker, another - talking about the economy - another distressing fact
about

MR. LUSH: our economy is the public debt. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I was not in this hon. House and sitting outside and listening to the then Opposition of the day talking about the public debt - well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the public debt at that time was but it was nowhere close to what we now have. I do not know whether any hon. members know what it was.

MR. NEARY: It was less than \$800 million. seven years ago and today it is \$2.7 billion.

MR. LUSH: I was going to say \$2.5 billion. I thought it was just about \$3 billion, just about \$3 billion, the public debt, Mr. Speaker. What have they got to show for it? That is the point, that is the point. Eighteen point eight per cent unemployed that is what we have to show, Mr. Speaker. That is what we have got to show for a public debt.

MR. NEARY: Twenty-three years, \$700 million. Six years, \$2.7 billion.

MR. LUSH: \$2.7 billion. Absolutely fantastic! Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that illustrates the mess that the economy is in. This illustrates the complete and the total failure of this government to do anything in the way of creating jobs for our people, a public debt of \$2.7 billion. Mr. Speaker, still hundreds of communities -

MR. NEARY: \$5,000 for every man, woman and child in Newfoundland. Even before they are born the children today are in debt \$5,000.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the magnitude of that figure is not at all within the comprehension of most people in this House, \$2.7 billion. It is too big, it is too large for us to talk about, too large for us to understand, if certainly not too large to talk about too large for us to understand, too large to comprehend, \$2.7 billion. But, Mr. Speaker, still with all of that

MR. LUSH: an unemployment figure of eighteen point eight per cent. And hundreds of communities in Newfoundland without public services, good road transportation, water and sewer services and one wonders if a lot of that money was spent properly whether we would not have more jobs today, if that money was spent properly if we would have that rate of eighteen point eight per cent as we now have, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, talking about the economy there is another point I would like to mention, a point that aggravates me and this is having to do with productivity. I want to say when I am talking here I am not talking about the individual productivity or the productivity of people in various industries and in the work force in Newfoundland, I am talking about the loss of productivity through strikes and walkouts in this Province and government completely complacent about it, doing nothing about it, Mr. Speaker, doing nothing to improve labour relations in this Province. I just want to quickly go down through a couple of statistics here and point out the magnitude of that problem here in Newfoundland, loss of productivity, man days lost. This is what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. In 1978 in Newfoundland with the smallest labour force in Canada with the exception of PEI, Newfoundland with the smallest labour force in Canada with the exception of that one province ranked fifth in man days lost last year, ranked fifth coming behind Ontario, Quebec, Alberta and B.C., these provinces with large labour forces. Let me give you an illustration. Newfoundland last year had 340,000 man days lost through strikes and walkouts as compared to 65,000 for Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia had a total of 65,000 lost man days.

MR. NEARY: And now they have an anti-labour man as minister of the department, a fellow who is anti-labour.

MR. LUSH: That is right. Well we have got to see, and this is what I am going to ask the minister now, to see what he is going to do about the situation because this number of lost man days caused this Province to lose a lot of money last year

Mr. Lush: in terms of money to the government itself, in terms of taxes, in terms of money to the employees, in terms of dollars to the employers. A tremendous amount of loss revenue as a result of these lost man days. And here we were, Mr. Speaker, fifth in Canada, fifth in Canada, 340,000, and yet one of the smallest labour forces, well the smallest labour force excepting or excluding P.E.I., 340,000 lost man days as opposed to 65,000 for Nova Scotia, 101,000 for New Brunswick. Now, Mr. Speaker, that will tell us the magnitude again of that problem, and again shows the fact that we have an unhealthy, an unstable economy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the new Minister of Labour and Manpower will look into this problem and get out there and get talking to unions, and get talking to the workers of this Province and find out what is wrong. If we need better labour legislation, let us bring it into the House. If that is the problem let us get out there and find out what kind of labour legislation the unions, and the workers of the this Province want. Because we cannot go on year after year having such a loss to the economy as resulted in these lost man days last year. And I would like to see the minister get concerned about this and do something. Get out there working with labour workers and with the workers of this Province to find out what the problem is. Let us get a good labour relations climate in this Province between the government, between business and between workers. That is the job of the Minister of Labour and Manpower. Let us see some activity. This is what the government should be doing. And, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to lose one single cent in this Province.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I am talking today about two kinds of loss of productivity, the loss that results from unemployment, and the loss that results from strikes and walkouts by employed people. Neither is desirable. And to get the economy of this Province moving we have to have both going, that is we have to have a larger number of our people employed and better labour relations in the Province so that

Mr. Lush: we can keep productivity ongoing.

MR. NEARY: We cannot accomplish that when the minister is anti-labour.

MR. LUSH: Well I would hope that the minister proves himself to be otherwise. I certainly hope so, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the reality of the situation. That is the reality of what is happening in Newfoundland today after seven years of office by this government. That is the reality, an outrageous level of unemployment, a stagnant and sterile economy, that is the results, that is the harsh reality, Mr. Speaker, of what has happened. But, Sir, it need not be that way. It need not be that way. We can turn things around. We can get the economy of this Province moving. We have to stop talking about philosophy and beliefs, we have been doing that, this government for seven years. We have to stop talking about the philosophy and the belief. We know all about that. What our people want now is action, immediate action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: That is what they want. They want jobs now. That is what they want, Mr. Speaker. And this is what the government have to do. It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to believe in the future of this Province, but it is another thing to perform. It is another thing to produce, it is another thing to produce the programmes -

MR. SIMMONS: Faith.

MR. LUSH: - in conjunction with that philosophy, with that belief. And that has been lacking with this particular -

MR. SIMMONS: 'Tom', faith without work is dead.

MR. LUSH: That is right, Sir. That is right.

MR. NEARY: Faith without good work is dead.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, I believe in this Province -

MR. R. MOORES: Promises, promises.

MR. LUSH: I believe that we can develop this Province. We have an abundant supply of natural resources. We have to develop these fully. We have to develop these resources to their fullest extent both from the primary sense and in the secondary section of it. This is where we got to start looking in -

MR. LUSH: developing, manufacturing our raw materials. We have to look into manufacturing. Too long we have been letting the raw materials slip out of this Province without considering secondary industry, without considering manufacturing. And, Mr. Speaker, I think if I had the time I could go into what we could do in the forestry and in agriculture. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is my pet topic, because agriculture is a big activity in my own district, the Terra Nova district. And, Mr. Speaker, it is in that area that I can see the the lack of initiative on the part of this government.

MR. NEARY: Do not let them turn it into a golf course.

MR. LUSH: It is in this area that I can see the real lack of interest in agriculture.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, sometime last year, I believe, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture announced a policy of self-sufficiency in agriculture, again, Mr. Speaker, one of those announcements, one of those announcements with no meaning to it, no sincerity to it, because I see no activity in the Terra Nova district that would illustrate that the government is really intent on making this Province self-sufficient with respect to agriculture. And, Mr. Speaker, it can be done in certain areas. It can be done in certain areas with the right programmes and the right encouragement from government.

In 1972, just to illustrate again one of the great things they were going to do for farming, along with all of the other great plans they had, they were going to set up four farm equipment banks throughout the Province strategically located so that farmers, of course, would not have to invest in buying equipment, they could borrow or rent the machinery,

MR. LUSH: put it in, as I say, strategic agricultural areas. Nothing happened - another one of the great plans that went down the drain. Nothing happened on that, Mr. Speaker.

Forestry - again an area, Mr. Speaker, where we are not developing that industry to its full extent. The potential for small sawmill operations in this Province is not being realized at all. What a frustrating experience to try to set up a sawmill, to try to get cutting permits and sawing permits! It takes ages to try to get these things.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the areas that we can get into, some of the areas that this provincial government can get into, some of the areas in which they have been giving lip service in the past. To develop our natural resources, we need a stronger, more effective forest management programme. And this is something I hear the government give lip service to, but I see no real effort, no real attempts at developing a good forest management programme. I see no evidence as I drive throughout this Province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these are areas in which we have to do more work.

Again, self-sufficiency in the forestry business in terms of local demand for construction materials - how close are we to that now, Mr. Speaker? How much of the construction materials, the lumber and this sort of thing, do we import in this Province today, bring in for our own local needs? How much do we bring in? I would suggest it is a pretty high percentage, lumber that we bring into this Province. It is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that this should go on. And I have people in my district, sawmill operators who cannot get a permit to operate.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now!

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, there are all sorts of areas, there are all sorts of things that we can do in the area of natural resources to get this Province moving.

I could talk of tourism.

My time is just about up, but I do want to comment on tourism. This was another big area, this was another pet peeve of this group of people when they came to office. They were going to develop tourism. Well, again, I can only use my own district, I suppose one of the best areas in the Province for the development of tourism.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. LUSH: All of the communities adjacent to and surrounding the Terra Nova National Park -

AN HON. MEMBER: Beautiful!

MR. LUSH: - a beautiful area - boating, just about anything you could name down in that area can be done in

MR. LUSH: all seasons, really, and yet there is no infrastructure there, no facilities provided. I can name you areas down from Port Blandford down to Winterbrook, not a picnic site, not a camping ground. They have to provide the infrastructure, Mr. Speaker, public services, roads, water, sewer, if they want to develop tourism. So far, this has been completely neglected with respect to Terra Nova, the district of Terra Nova. They have done nothing, Mr. Speaker, to develop the tourism of the area, other than that which was done by Parks Canada itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Government. If they want to develop tourism, let us not talk about it, let us get down to action and let us carry out the recommendations, Mr. Speaker, of this motion, a motion that shows the interest and the concern of the group of people on this side of the House, that shows our interest and our concern about alleviating the unemployment problem in this Province, in asking that a select committee be set up so we can go out there and find out what the potential of each area is, get ideas from people from all walks of life and to put that together with some recommendations that we can go to Ottawa with as well and get their support; because, as I said before, this motion also suggests and implies that the Federal Government also has a responsibility here. But it certainly must be the Provincial Government that has to get down to business and initiate this kind of action so that we can make the proposals to the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I support this motion and hope that all hon. members will support this magnanimous motion. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this resolution. Certainly as Minister of Social Services, I suppose probably one of the ministers on this side that should be most concerned with unemployment, although all of us are, and I listened with interest to my hon. friend opposite as he recounted the bad things about unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that everyone in this Province would agree what unemployment is and what it does to people, especially if they are allowed to be unemployed for very long. Certainly I do not think my hon. friend has to try to convince us of the bad effects. What I was more interested in hearing him say was what this Government should do in terms of stamping out unemployment as if there were some magic answer, as if by simply pulling some strings you solved the unemployment problem, and it almost sounded like that although I am sure my hon. friend does not believe that it is that simple and indeed any more than I do, any more than we do on this side. I think I have to say to him that there is a whole host of reasons for the unemployment situation in this Province and, while it might be politically wise if you sit on that side of the House to blame this Government, we are simply kidding ourselves, Mr. Speaker, if we honestly believe that a Provincial Government in this Province at the present time is responsible for the state of unemployment in this Province.

I am sorry that I did not hear any definitive proposals as to how to create jobs. My hon. friend talked about tourism. There has been more done, Mr. Speaker, in seven years by this Government in tourism than was done in twenty-three by the former government, while even at this present time he probably has to

March 28, 1979

Tape 547

GH-3

MR. HICKEY: preach to some of his own
colleagues to convince them that tourism is even worth
talking about, but we have heard from time to time from
hon. gentlemen opposite that tourism is foolishness, the
height of foolishness.

 Yes, Mr. Speaker, I really
am interested in making a few suggestions and making a few
points.

MR. T. HICKEY: I am not interested in sparring with anyone this afternoon but if anyone would check Hansard they will find out who said what in the last few years.

MR. F. WHITE: Read your leadership speech.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, you know, it is all right for hon. gentlemen opposite, because they sort of smell a Provincial Election, to get on with this foolishness and hogwash about blaming this Government for the state of the unemployment situation in this Province. But you know, Mr. Speaker, people are a little too wise today, they are not swallowing this jargon that comes across to us from the other side.

My friend from Terra Nova, whom I have the highest regard for and respect for, talks about Canada Works as if Canada Works, Mr. Speaker, was a blessing. I say to you today that Canada Works is a band-aid approach to unemployment in this Province. Canada Works helps, of course it does. It helps, Mr. Speaker, in what way does it help? It helps to take our people and guarantee them unemployment insurance and that, Mr. Speaker, is the policy of the National Government. That is the policy of the Federal Government.- put as many people on unemployment insurance and everything is fine. My hon. friend surely realizes that in many of the areas where we can create thousands upon thousands of jobs in this Province we are held back because of the lack of definitive action by the Federal Government in Ottawa. Why does not the Federal Government of Canada, instead of their band-aid approach through LIP grants, grants and flip grants and every other kind of a grant, why do not they take some definitive decisions in energy? Why do not they take some definitive decisions in fisheries?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. T. HICKEY: Why do not they take definitive decisions as they have, in fact, in other regions, for other regions of the country, why do not they do it with regards to Newfoundland and allow us to determine our own destiny, develop this Province, create jobs and put

MR. T. HICKEY: our people to work? Why do not they do that?

MR. FLIGHT: They can not trust you.

MR. T. HICKEY: They can not trust us! Well, of course not, no. Well, maybe we will be able to trust Joe after the 22nd of May.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Joe who?

MR. T. HICKEY: You will find out who Joe who. Mr. Speaker, I thought that might warm hon. gentlemen up because they do not want to even think of the prospects of the 22nd of May. Mr. Speaker, let us face it, let us be honest with one another. Let us be honest with one another, Mr. Speaker, you know the day is gone when you just stand in this Assembly and make a great speech and not even believe what you are saying. Why do we not just get up and sort of tell it as it is, not just kid with one another and try to hoodwink the voters because there is a Provincial Election somewhere near in the next two years?

MR. SIMMONS: Tell us about the Civil Service now.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman need not torment me about the Civil Service, I said what I wanted to say about the Civil Servants. I do not make any apology for it. I do not apologize to anybody.

We also know the outcome of the Leadership Convention and that salts away and settles the question of the Civil Servants and many other issues that I might have talked about. But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we can, you know, drag in all the red herrings we will while someone is trying to make his speech. It will not deter me from saying what I have on my mind. And let hon. gentlemen opposite - I know, I know and I feel for them, I really feel for them, they are in a bit of a dilemma having a Prime Minister in the country like Pierre Elliott Trudeau whom they have to try to go out now and defend, I appreciate the dilemma they are in but they must face the facts; they have to go out and defend him I suppose. Well you know, he is indefensible, he is indefensible. Let us face it, Mr. Speaker, a man who sets as his

MR. HICKEY: Separatism in this country
that any single Canadian -

MR. SIMMONS: What do you think 'Joe' will do about it?

MR. HICKEY: - by feeding Quebec out of his hand.

We will find out what 'Joe' will do after the 22nd. He cannot do very much because he is like the fellows over there - all he can do right now is talk - but after the 22nd of May, Mr. Speaker, he will be able to start acting.

MR. FLIGHT: He can run into a bayonet.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know that is an honourable kind of accident to run into a bayonet, but what 'Pierre' is going to run into on the 22nd is not going to be any accident, it is going to be very well designed by the people of this country.

MR. SIMMONS: His just reward.

MR. HICKEY: That is right, his just reward.

That is well put. Mr. Speaker, very seriously, the unemployment situation in this Province surely makes no one happy, makes no one content. I noticed that while my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was speaking, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) reminded him - and properly so - reminded him that despite the fact that we have a very high rate of unemployment in this province retail sales are at an all-time high.

MR. SIMMONS: Thanks to the Feds.

MR. HICKEY: Thanks to the Feds. That is right. Thanks to the social programmes.

Mr. Speaker, I should be the first and, indeed, I am the first minister to stand on my feet here and hail the necessity for social programmes, good, well-devised social programmes to help our people who through no fault of their own are not employed, cannot take care of

MR. HICKEY: themselves and their families.
But, Mr. Speaker, to get up here and to support the band aid approach of Canada Works in its many, many forms, whilst at the same time acknowledging the failure of the Government of Canada to take, as I said, decisive action in a number of resource areas, just makes no sense. Just makes no sense! We are just kidding one another. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen who say this do not believe it themselves. They are making political speeches as if there were an election on. My colleague, the hon. the Premier, has not called one yet and I have heard more political speeches in the last two days than I have heard in five years.

Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen are well aware of the problems of unemployment and the root causes. Let me read something for them from the resolution. There are some things in it which are like motherhood. "And whereas the resources already known and available to our province could, if properly used and developed, provide stable, full and permanent employment to everyone in the growing Newfoundland and Labrador labour force." Ah, Mr. Speaker, is that not a fantastic statement? Are they not wonderful cliches?

MR. R. SIMMONS: But you believe them.

MR. HICKEY: And who is saying it? Yes, of course I do.

MR. R. SIMMONS: So do we.

MR. HICKEY: But coming from the hon. gentleman opposite who sat with an administration that gave away the resources of this province, that we have had to buy back with the taxpayers' money, is to say the least a little bit hypocritical. A little bit hypocritical, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SIMMONS: You came in at one o'clock this afternoon to apply for Mr. Nutbeam's job.

MR. HICKEY: Let us face it - Ah, never mind
Mr. Nutbeam.

MR. NEARY: If you would like to talk about someone -

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What about Mr. Nutbeam?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: What about Metro Engineering?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: We will not worry about Metro
Engineering either either. The hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am not sure
if the hon. gentleman hears me.

MR. HICKEY: I am sorry, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to call to hon. members'
attention that every hon. member has the right to speak
without interruption. While certain interruptions are at
times almost natural in debate, there is no doubt that when
they progress to a certain point it is a common cause of
disorder in the House. I would point that out and ask hon.
gentlemen not to interfere and to state their differences
and opposition to an hon. member's opinions when they, in
fact, speak on the matter themselves.

Hon. Minister.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honour. Thank
you very much. I apologize. I did not hear you. Let me
offer some help, some assistance to Your Honour because I
understand under the rules I can demand to be heard in silence
and I now so make that demand. If my hon. friend wants to
talk about Mr. Nutbeam and Metro Engineering and anybody
else, let him. Let them. And, as I say, put up or shut up,
I am not going to be browbeaten by those silly, stupid,

March 23, 1979

Tape 549

RT-4

MR. HICKEY: cynical comments. Let me continue,

Mr. Speaker, along the lines that I was.

The people

MR. HICKEY: who now tell us that if we were develop in an orderly fashion the resources we have in this Province, you know, there would be full employment tomorrow morning or next month or next year, are the same people, Your Honour, who gave the resources of this Province away that this administration had to spend seven years taking back and buying and back and we do not have them all yet. Those are the same people now who have an instant answer to the unemployment situation. How stupid do they think our people are? Surely they know they are not going to convert anyone on this side, but they must literally think that the people, the taxpayers, the electorate out there from this Chamber, are stupid.

Now let me remind hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, they have become of age. The electorate of this Province have become of age. The days when you hoodwinked the electorate are gone, long gone; so, you know, we should cut out the nonsense. We should cut out the nonsense about blaming somebody for the state of unemployment in this Province, Mr. Speaker, when unemployment is rampant in every western country in the world.

MR. NEARY: But not to our level.

MR. HICKEY: No, not to our level, thanks to whom? Thanks to the man up yonder which we will take care of on the 22nd of May. Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: Did you vote for the Churchill Falls bill that was in the House?

MR. HICKEY: Did I what?

MR. NEARY: Did you vote in favour of the bill for development of Churchill Falls when it was brought into the House?

MR. HICKEY: Ah, my hon. friend thinks he is on to something. Would you say it again?

MR. NEARY: I have got a beautiful memory.

MR. HICKEY:

Yes, would you say it again?

SOME HON. MEMBER:

When you voted against Come by Chance.

MR. HICKEY:

Would the hon. gentleman ask me that question again?

MR. NEARY:

I remember and so does the hon. gentleman.

MR. HICKEY:

Let me respond to that, Mr. Speaker. I well remember - whatever God blessed me he blessed me with a good memory - I well remember the Churchill Falls, the infamous legislation as well as I remember the Come by Chance, the ERCO, the Marystown Shipyard and a good many more, Mr. Speaker, when we voted in principle for any kind of development in this Province to create jobs - in principle, we voted in principle. Why does the hon. gentleman not get Hansard and he will find out that as a three-man Opposition, just even as a three-man Opposition, Mr. Speaker, we were quite prepared to support the Government with any measure to create jobs as long as it was for the best interests of this Province and as long as our resources were to be put to the best use for the benefit of our people.

But there were many sections of the Churchill Falls - many areas of the Churchill Falls deal that the Opposition took a very firm stand on.

MR. NEARY:

You stood to a man in favour of it.

MR. HICKEY:

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, we stood to a man there was that many of us at the time.

Let me remind my hon. friend what we did not support about the Churchill Falls. We did not support anything about the Churchill Falls agreement which gave preference to the people of Quebec for employment opportunities in Labrador, which gave preference to Quebec companies for the purchase of materials and services for

MR. HICKEY: Labrador, Mr. Speaker. We did not support that. Indeed we were not told it, Mr. Speaker, but it is in the contract. It is in the contract, Mr. Speaker, and I can produce it in this House - a section which says "preference to be given to Quebec workers", "preference to be given to Quebec firms for the purchase of goods and services in the development of the Churchill Falls". We were hoodwinked, Mr. Speaker, we were not even told it. I was one of the members of this House who went to Labrador with the late Honourable Mr. Strickland who is gone to his just reward and the member for Fogo, Captain Winsor, who went to Churchill Falls because we kept insisting as an Opposition - we kept insisting as an Opposition that Newfoundlanders should get fair and just treatment, should indeed get first preference. Finally, the Premier of the day decided that is the way we can chop those fellows up over there - is to put them on the Government aircraft and send them to Churchill Falls for a week and it is that cold up there maybe they will lose their voices.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I went to Churchill Falls and I represented the Opposition in that select committee, but what did we find? We found discrimination all over the place, absolute and total discrimination in the most subtlest form where Newfoundlanders were deemed to be unacceptable because their work was not acceptable. They were laid off, fired or laid off, and then the Quebecers were brought in.

MR. WOODROW: How about the situation in Labrador City today?

MR. HICKEY: I did not remember telling my hon. friend that I wanted him to ask me a question. When I want to do that, I will see you out behind the curtains.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, you know, let hon. gentleman say what they want to and let them raise the Churchill Falls issue or any of the rest of them. We -

AN HON. MEMBER: You did not bring them up, the hon. gentleman did.

MR. HICKEY: I did not mention Churchill Falls. No, no, I mentioned energy - I mentioned - I never mentioned it to - I never mentioned the phrase Churchill Falls, Mr. Speaker, the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned that.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains - the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government if they took the right decisions could turn this Province around in no time flat. It could allow this Government,

MR. HICKEY:

any government to create jobs starting right away in the fishery, in energy, in forestry, in a whole host of areas.

MR. FLIGHT: There is no forest management. They have \$236 million and they do not know what they are going to do with it.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, is that right? I just heard my hon. friend say that there is no forest management.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: You know, Mr. Speaker, that is really laughable because there was not even the resemblance, Mr. Speaker, of a forest management programme until this government took office.

MR. MOORES: There was not even a forestry department.

MR. HICKEY: My hon. friend here, my colleague who is the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture stood in his place right there a few years ago and piloted through a piece of legislation, the first of its kind in this Province to secure forever the forests of this Province for our people. Nothing done by the former administration in twenty-three years that even went close to it and yet we hear nothing in forest management. It is a wonder my hon. friend did not talk about all the great strides that the former administration made in mining. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, no control, certainly not the best deal for our people. My colleague who is now the hon. the Premier brought in legislation -

MR. SIMMONS: Do not swallow so hard when you say that.

MR. HICKEY: Oh well, Mr. Speaker, I will let that pass. It is not even worth commenting on. Brought in legislation, Mr. Speaker, to again give to our people what is rightfully theirs from the mining projects in this Province. How many moves, Mr. Speaker, has this government made to get the best results, to get back what we have been losing for so many years because of lack of legislation, because of lack of proper planning? How many? The list is endless. And yet in the very vital areas where we could be creating jobs, thousands upon thousands of jobs, where the federal government has control, when we ask them to allow us to determine our own destiny, to allow us to develop our resources in a proper and orderly way even within their standards, subjected to their standards, and what answer do we get? Certainly not the

MR. HICKEY:

same answer, Mr. Speaker, that is given with regards to oil and gas as it is brought across this country. I do not see the Prime Minister create a corridor through the great province of Quebec to allow us to sell our energy down in New York.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are negative.

MR. HICKEY: That is negative all right. There is nothing more negative, Mr. Speaker, than one who stands in his place and blames a government for unemployment at the rates of unemployment that we have got and says in so many words that this government has done nothing in seven years when the opposite is true.

MR. FLIGHT: There are fifteen more commissions, nine enquiries and 14 internal enquiries.

MR. HICKEY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about enquiries and commissions. Who are the people who stand in this Assembly and demand above anything else yet another enquiry, another commission? And my hon. friend now has the audacity to talk to me about enquiries and commissions whilst at the same time, Mr. Speaker, their answer to the unemployment, the grave unemployment situation in this Province is yet another enquiry by another name, a select committee to go around this Province, to hold hearings it says. What does it say, Mr. Speaker? It should be read into the record anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: Perhaps it is in the record.

MR. HICKEY: Yes it says that a select committee of this House be appointed to hold hearings in a wide variety of areas of Newfoundland and Labrador for the purpose of obtaining the ideas of a large cross section of the general public including representatives of the labour union, business associations, the academic community as well as interested individuals regarding the development of job opportunities in this Province.

The party on the other side of the House, Your Honour, is simply telling the electorate of this Province they have no plans to create jobs, they have no answer to the unemployment situation in this Province.

MR. MORGAN: That is right. Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: We do not need a select committee let me tell them. We know what we want to do. We know exactly where we are going to create jobs and we are asking Ottawa to allow us to do it and we will after May 22.

MR. T. HICKEY: But hon. gentlemen opposite, hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, and this must be classic. It must be really classic to find an opposition, instead of standing in their place and telling us how to create jobs in agriculture, how to create some more in forestry, what to do in mining to create yet some more, how to develop the fishery to create another thousand jobs? Do they tell us that? No. Not a suggestion, not one syllable of a suggestion whereby some jobs can be created and then, Mr. Speaker, the party who aspires to govern this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Vote John Crosbie.

MR. MORGAN: Order! Order! Mr. Speaker.

MR. T. HICKEY: I did not ask for anything from the peanut gallery, Your Honour, I asked to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Cross) Order, please! The hon. member asked to be heard in silence.

MR. T. HICKEY: And then, Your Honour, not having made a suggestion of how to create one single job at least I will say to them, I appreciate them for one reason, they are honest enough to tell the electorate through this Assembly, through the media that they have no ideas of creating employment in this Province that the only answer they got to the unemployment situation in this Province is to go out all over this great Province and ask the people, "We have a problem, how are we going to solve it? What are we going to do?"

MR. MORGAN: That is what they want, yes.

MR. T. HICKEY: "How are we going to create a few more jobs in forestry? What can we do in agriculture to create a few more jobs? Mr. Speaker, let me tell my hon. friends opposite we have been here seven years, we know what we want to do, we know what the answers are. We can not do them all over night and a lot of them we can not do as long as the Federal Government has got us and will hold us at the poverty line in this Province

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. T. HICKEY: because they do not have the guts enough to take a few decisions. That is why Trudeau talks about national unity. The greatest thing as I said before on his plate today is to repatriate the Constitution so he can feed Quebec yet something else, to give them special status right across the line. It started out, Mr. Speaker, with bilingualism, biculturalism, but it is not any more. It is economic now. It is social now. It is everything now. You name it in Quebec now and they are going to give them special status, a special situation in total at the expense of the rest of the country and, Your Honour, I suggest to you at the greatest expense to this poor Province, at the greatest expense of all, our own Province.

Let me say to my hon. friends, if they want to make a contribution, if they want to make a contribution to the unemployment situation of this Province let them come forward in this House with some constructive ideas as to how to create jobs. We would gladly listen, we do not feel we know it all, Mr. Speaker, we have never indicated that. We have always said we were ready to listen to constructive ideas and proposals. We have yet to hear any. And here is the party who feel they are on the brink of the possibility of forming a Government and we still have not heard anything -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. T. HICKEY:

I am glad my hon. friends agree that

they are on the brink

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are a total diaster.

MR. MORGAN:

You are on the brink of losing a leader right now, I would say.

MR. T. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, if that is contribution they could probably - the best possible contribution they could make - they could make to the unemployment situation in this Province is to get their heads together and to lobby with the Prime Minister and tell him the facts of life.

Number one, we have not received the just society here that he talked about in '68, we have yet to see it, we are still looking.

MR. T. HICKEY:

Number two, to forget Quebec and treat it the same as any other Province in this country and time and only time will heal whatever separatists' wounds are there and if it does not, if it does not, Mr. Speaker, than so be it for let us face it, if the Prime Minister thinks he is kidding anybody when he talks about using force if necessary does he really think anyone is swallowing that. You do not keep anybody in this country against their will, Mr. Speaker. If the majority of that Province wants to get out they will get out.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let them convince the Prime Minister that before he talks too much for too long about national unity let him borrow something from the missionaries that go to the third world countries. Let him borrow something

MR. HICKEY:

from the missionaries that go to the third world countries to convert. Mr. Speaker, what they do before when they try to convert the people, they feed them. Let the Prime Minister start in feeding the people of this Province, not with hand out and band-aid programmes like Canada Works, no. By some real decisions, Mr. Speaker, to allow this government and our people to determine our own destiny, to create our own jobs. Let the Prime Minister address himself to that question. And when we are fed, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: Sit down boy, sit down 'Tom' boy.

MR. HICKEY: - when we are fed, then and only then let them talk national unity to us.

MR. MORGAN: Sit down, boy! No, 'Tom' you carry on. You have lots of time yet. I told the guy who is sitting over there. You carry on.

MR. HICKEY: Is my time up, Your Honour?

MR. MORGAN: No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: You have fifteen minutes yet. Carry on, you are making a good speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Sit down boy, sit down 'Tom' way.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, it is my friends who wanted me to sit down.

MR. MORGAN: No, that friend over there on his feet asking you questions.

MR. HICKEY: I see.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister has fifteen minutes left.

MR. MORGAN: I had a good film the other day about the leader, Billy Rowe, a good film on him. I will show it to you one of these days.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks by saying -

MR. MORGAN: It is a very worthwhile film, I will tell you right now.

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

MR. MORGAN: Sorry, colleague. Sorry, colleague.

MR. HICKEY: Let me conclude my remarks by saying to hon. gentlemen opposite there are no ready solutions or instant solutions to the unemployment

MR. HICKEY:

situation in this Province. And hon. gentlemen, Your Honour, on the other side know that just as well as we do. Let them at least be honest with themselves and the people of this Province by not standing here and making it sound or making it look as though here is a government who has done nothing in seven years. If we want to start cataloguing, Your Honour, what we have done, and how hard this government has worked to set its own House in order having received it in such a state of shambles in buying back the resources, in taking back the resources, in getting ready to turn this economy around. Let hon. gentlemen get up and acknowledge that, Your Honour, and I suggest to them that the electorate will be much more ready to receive whatever else they might have to say whenever an election may come. But to try and hoodwink them, Your Honour, is not the answer anymore, Your Honour, than the answer to the unemployment situation is to go all over this Province and hold hearings. It would serve no useful purpose, Your Honour.

That is why my colleagues and I on this side of the House will not support this resolution, cannot support this resolution. Because to support this resolution is nothing more than an acknowledgement that we have no ideas to solve the unemployment situation, that we do not know what we are doing. That is that state of the party opposite and that is too bad, Mr. Speaker, because that is a great party opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: And let us face it, Your Honour, we need the two party or three party system in this Province.

MR. MORGAN: The NDP will take over the next opposition.

MR. HICKEY: A great party unfortunately in very bad shape and that does not make myself or anybody over here happy.

MR. SIMMONS: You have nowhere to go you mean.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the time to go into that kind of a dissertation because I can tell my hon. friend I do not know where I will go. I will go wherever the good Lord sends me but I know that I am in good hands with the Lord at least to the extent he will never send me that way. It is not the nature of the beast, Your Honour.

MR. HICKEY:

So you see, Mr. Speaker, it would serve no useful purpose to set up a select committee. That is why we cannot vote for it on this side. And it is a sad commentary as I said that at a time when hon. gentlemen opposite feel they are close to a provincial election - I do not know what election they are talking about, I have heard nothing about it but they obviously from the tenor of their remarks, from their performance in the last couple of days, they feel that they are getting close to a provincial election. Now let me say to them that it is a sad commentary and if the idea was to demonstrate to this Province and its electorate that they are ready to form a government, then, Mr. Speaker, I would say to them that they have failed miserably because on maybe one of the most important issues facing this Province and our people today they have demonstrated clearly they have no views, they have no propositions, no proposals, no answers and at this late stage since 1975 the last election at this late stage when they should have a blueprint for the future, when they should have a blueprint for unemployment, when they should have a blueprint for everything else affecting this Province by way of government, when they should have a blueprint, a master plan, they have nothing. They want to go out in one of the most critical areas facing our people and

MR. HICKEY: ask the people what to do, and I say 'God help them', Mr. Speaker. 'God help them', I did not think they were in as bad a shape as indeed they. So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support this resolution; therefore, I will have vote against it. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Cross) The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my first words are those of congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as Deputy Speaker. I wish you well in the office and you can be assured of our co-operation on this side of the House and I believe the co-operation of the whole House for that matter.

My second words, it being the first opportunity to speak since we met here a day or so ago, my next words are those of congratulations to my good friend and the new Premier, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford). Indeed I noticed his mother in the gallery some time ago. I believe she has gone since then but it was certainly good to see her once again. She, over the years, has been extremely kind to me. Indeed, she has the reputation for being the first person who took me into the Hoyle's Home. I may wind up there again yet, but the first time bed and breakfast were with her compliments some years ago. I do congratulate the Premier. As my colleague from Lapoile (Mr. Neary) reminds me, I did hire the Premier in another capacity back in 1966. Indeed, I hired him twice as I told the House before. I hired him once as a teacher, one who exposes the truth, and I hired him secondly as a painter, one who covers up. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that he was much better at the first than he was at the second and I would hope that that continues to be the case in his new job. On that point, I was encouraged by the approach he took today to the

MR. SIMMONS: question I put to him about the engaging of a consultant by the former Premier and we are looking forward with great interest to the details which he will provide the House with in due time, but that is quite off this subject.

Mr. Speaker, until the previous speaker, the Minister of Social Services, spoke, the now Premier had been the only speaker in this debate, not in his capacity as Premier but in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown. and Minister of Mines and Energy. I took the trouble during the past few minutes to glance over the Hansard of the Premier's speech in his capacity as Minister of Mines and Energy, since he had been the only one who had spoken in this debate, and particularly since he spoke he has become the Premier, just to see what he had to say on this very important subject. And just to refresh the memory of the House, he spoke for a half-hour or forty-five minutes, or something less than forty-five minutes, because he had time available to him in two capacities today. First as an ordinary member he had a few minutes left, but then I am sure that although he started the speech as minister, having become Premier during the course of the speech, he would have been accorded the ninety minutes that he is entitled to in his new capacity. So, he had ample time to address himself to the most serious problem facing this Province, that of unemployment. And yet he chose not to speak on the subject at all today and so I refresh the House's memory on what he had to say when he did speak on December 6; and it is very easy to capsule because he spoke at some length on the railway in response to some comments my colleague from Lapoile (Mr. Neary) had raised about the meeting the previous night and there was quite an exchange about who was at the meeting and how many Liberal M.P.'s and so on and so forth, not directly germane to the subject of employment, but I suppose one could argue if one extended tangents

MR. SIMMONS: long enough that the railway has an employment impact on the Province. It has nothing to do with the present Government's initiatives in terms of creating employment, which is the brunt of this particular resolution, and then having exhausted that subject at some length, he went on to

MR. R. SIMMONS: The subject of Lower Churchill development and again, obviously, that project has employment implications for the province but that was not the import of what he had to say on the Lower Churchill. The wrangle is whether or not he was talking to Mr. Gillespie, or Mr. Gillespie was talking to him. And on that note he ended his speech and adjourned the debate on December 6th. So, we have not heard a single word from the Premier on the subject of this resolution and now, of course, today he forfeited his opportunity to continue speaking and so we will not hear from him in the course of this debate on the particular subject. Indeed, on December 6th he never did commit himself or his colleagues on his side of the House to any position on the resolution and with some difficulty we did determine today from Number 24 that they do have a position, at least he has a position on the subject of the resolution. We hope that, for the sake of the people, it is his position only. I would expect that his colleagues when they get up will renounce his position on this particular resolution. I fully expect that, as they have wanted to renounce his position at the leadership convention about what to do with civil servants. And that has employment possibilities, Mr. Speaker. Unemployment possibilities. It would certainly open up some new jobs, would it not, if we took the recommendation of Number 24 and fired all the people who did not kiss the 'bible of Toryism' every morning, who did not salute the Tory flag every morning, did not read an oath of loyalty to the Tory party every morning. That is what he wanted, Mr. Speaker. That is what he wanted to do. That was a condition of employment. And then, Mr. Speaker, in the next words he has the gall to stand there and say, "We do not want to ask the people." Why a select committee? Why let the ordinary people - Why let the thousands of

MR. R. SIMMONS: people in Newfoundland who are suffering because of unemployment - Why ask those nincompoops, he says, what the problem is here, how to go about solving it? He says, how would they know. We know the answers, he says. We, the Government, we have the answers. If they do I wonder why they are not doing something about them. But the gall, Mr. Speaker, the unmitigated gall, to stand there today and without blinking an eyelash, he suggests that the people of this province should have not input in an employment strategy for this province. He suggests, in effect, that, 'We have all the answers.' Well, he may think his crowd has all the answers. I want to say that we do not feel for a minute that we have all the answers.

If he wants to talk about ideas, the last time, I believe, I spoke in this House I put forward - not the last time, but when we talked some time ago on the Budget of last spring - I put forward some particular ideas - I happen to remember this because I came across some notes only this afternoon - some particular ideas adapted from the Nova Scotia situation under the former Liberal government there, of job creation possibilities. I put forward three particular ideas: one relating to youth employment, and the other two relating to regular adult employment. Three particular possibilities.

But it is easy, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to stand, as he says himself and as he does so well himself, and wave your arms and rant and roar, and point the finger to this side and say we have no ideas and we are bankrupt over here, and that kind of nonsense. None is so deaf as he who will not hear. We will give them ideas, Mr. Speaker, except I am sure now after hearing Number 24 whether or not any ideas are needed. I heard him say, Mr. Speaker, quite clearly, "We got the answers." So, I

MR. R. SIMMONS: I want to say now, Mr. Speaker, through you to the people of Newfoundland, you do not have to hold your breath much longer. Number 24 says the Government has the answers. So, any day now, Mr. Speaker, there is going to be full employment.

MR. NEARY: The Public Service might be cleaned out, but they all might be fired.

MR. R. SIMMONS: The only people, Mr. Speaker, who should be concerned now as a result of the Minister's speech a moment ago is the Civil Service because that is the only group he did not promise employment for. He went on record as standing by that despicable comment he made about civil servants at the leadership convention. He went on record on that point. I presume that he is saying in effect that if he had the chance he would still fire them all. So, with that one exception, the civil servants of this province, he has jobs for everyone. He has the answers, Mr. Speaker. He said it this afternoon. He never said, 'We are struggling with it.' He never said, 'It is a difficult problem.' He never said, 'We have some ideas.' He said, "We have the answers." And he suggested it would be a futile effort to strike a select committee. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is a select committee? It is not

MR. SIMMONS:

a mechanism, a piece of machinery, an idea to give another judge and a half dozen lawyers a job for a year or two. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about a select committee of this House. We are giving the government a proposal to put the members of this House on both sides to work more effectively than at present. We are prepared to serve on that committee. And I take it from talking to some of the government backbenchers -

MR. J. CARTER: Who is going to be on that select committee?

MR. SIMMONS: Well at least, you know, we have to work with what we have. We might even wind up with the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) for that matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is morbid.

MR. SIMMONS: No. Now fellows do not be unkind to my friend for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

MR. F. ROWE: He is ours now.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes he belongs to all of us now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: He aged some though.

MR. RIDEOUT: What did he say about "Brian"?

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, the bloom came off that rose some fast. I say for my friend I do not know why my fellows are so unkind to my good friend from St. John's North. If he did not exist we would have to invent him. We really would.

MR. RIDEOUT: I thought he was going to be in the new Cabinet.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker. Now look the innuendo from the backbench over here is disturbing. To suggest that my hon. colleague over there would go in the Cabinet. He is concerned about the company he keeps you know, Mr. Speaker, and he is particular and there are some people he would not sit with not even at a Cabinet table.

MR. FLIGHT: The Energy Minister's house boy.

MR. RIDEOUT: He is going to stay in his savoury patch.

MR. NEARY: He belongs to all of us now.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, yes. Mr. Speaker, I wish Number 24 would realize his number is up.

MR. J. CARTER: Let us hear it from the ex-chairman.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, Mr. Speaker, now there is a sore subject. How could a member like the member for St. John's North being aware of how the government has destroyed the Public Accounts Committee even joke about the subject. He knows about the cover up going on in Transportation. He knows, Mr. Speaker, why the Committee was destroyed in the first place and if he is not sure the confirmation is in this report tabled here yesterday. The Auditor General now says what I said a year ago. The Public Accounts Committee, Mr. Speaker, destroyed and silence is consent I say to the member for St. John's North. By his silence he has acquiesced. He has allowed the government, the administration to participate in a cover up of what is going on in transportation and he is silent. So he is a part of it.

MR. RIDEOUT: He did not make Cabinet now he is sore.

MR. NEARY: We have a man to take care of him next time around.

MR. SIMMONS: We will make a case of him next time I will tell you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, number 24. I wonder could number 56 be -

MR. RIDEOUT: Be quiet.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, look it is not often I confess publicly for my misdeeds but I want to apologize to the people of Newfoundland, the readers of our great daily paper, the editor and publisher of that paper, The Daily News -

MR. MORGAN: The Liberal candidate.

MR. SIMMONS: We will know at eight o'clock tonight whether he is a Liberal candidate or not. We have two good men in there. One of them will win. But I want to apologize to the people of Newfoundland for participating in somewhat of a misrepresentation, albeit it done in fun. But you know there was nothing that gave me such job in the morning or perhaps from reading the paper itself as to taking the scissors and cutting out a little ballot and taking my pen -

MR. NEARY: I must say the team worked pretty effectively.

MR. SIMMONS: It was encouraging I must say. The rumor that he brought 400 copies of The Daily News is not true. He did not know he had so many friends.

MR. NEARY: Especially on this side of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Every -

MR. MORGAN: You have one good friend your own leader .

MR. SIMMONS:

We certainly have.

MR. MORGAN:

He is a good friend of mine.

MR. SIMMONS:

He is certainly a good friend of yours.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, a very good friend.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, a very good friend. He will do anything that is honourable for you, anything that is honourable for you and he will be out of jail a lot longer than you will be, a lot longer. He will still be free when you are in jail.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I will have to ask the hon. gentlemen to stick to the subject.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for restraining No. 56, Mr. Speaker. I wanted really to talk about No. 24, not talk about him because I do not have the time on the subject but to respond to a subject he was talking about, Mr. Speaker, a minute ago, this Churchill Falls thing. How many years ago is that? Is that -

MR. NEARY:

That was back in -

MR. SIMMONS:

So many years ago now - you know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wish that instead of in this partisan forum where too often it is my party right or wrong, I sometimes wish that we could just lift ourselves or at least two or three or four on given occasion out of this and put us into a proper debating situation where a person was scored on the merits of what he was saying. Today, Mr. Speaker, if that were the case, No. 24 would have been in some real trouble in terms of getting a decision in his favour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Churchill Falls, Brinco, these many years ago, eons ago - I am not talking now, Mr. Speaker, about a Cabinet directive of 1978 or 1976 two or three years ago - I am not talking about that - and I am sure No. 24 will tell us if that was a matter of principle too when he decided in favour of Mr. Nutbeam's \$110,000 salary a year,

MR. SIMMONS: but, Mr. Speaker, he is talking about Churchill Falls and as soon as he is reminded that he voted for it, he says "Oh, yes", but that was different you know. That was principle. Oh, yes, that was principle because he said and I quote him, "We were prepared to vote for anything that was in the best interest of the Province". Now, Mr. Speaker, it does not take a very intelligent mind to construe from that that he implied that his vote for Churchill Falls, for Brinco, was a vote in the best interest of the Province. If that is the case, what is all the bellyaching about over there? What is all the bellyaching about? You cannot have you cake and eat it too, Mr. Speaker, or go a little further where he pleads at one point, having said that he had a good memory and that he was wide awake when he made the vote and all that - cast the vote - he then said "We were hoodwinked". "We were hoodwinked", he says. Will he, gracious man he is No. 24, agree that if he was hoodwinked perhaps some people in the government of the day were hoodwinked, like the present Minister of Justice who voted for it on the government side, like the present member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), then the member for White Bay North, who voted for it on the government side. Were they hoodwinked too? Were they hoodwinked at the time too on the Churchill Falls deal, when as a government member, the member for St. John's North voted for Brinco. Was he hoodwinked as No. 24 was.

AN HON. MEMBER: St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. SIMMONS: I mean the member for St. Mary's - The Capes who was the member for White Bay North at the time before he did his Damascus road trip in reverse. Was he hoodwinked too? Will he allow that possibility? And if so, if he will allow that, will he allow that certain other people like

MR. SIMMONS: the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe), the member for Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts), the member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor), the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning), will he allow that perhaps they were hoodwinked too?

I say, Mr. Speaker, they cannot have their cake and eat it too. They cannot argue both sides of it. Anyway, enough on Brinco. We have, Mr. Speaker, - if they want to talk about Brinco, they want to talk about past decisions of which I particularly was no part but I am still prepared to talk about it and defend, defend the merits of it. I will not defend the indefensible. I will tell you this though, Mr. Speaker, if you want a parallel, I was not in Cabinet. I was not in the House of Assembly in the 1960's when the Brinco thing was put through this House or when it was put through Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: Neither was anybody in this House except the present Minister of Justice. He was the only one in the Cabinet. The only member of this House at the present time who was in the Cabinet when these deals were made was the present Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I thought they were made in 1963

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they were not. The hon. gentleman helped negotiate the deal. All your criticism should be directed that way and not this way.

MR. HICKMAN: You have to make up your mind. I never sat in this House with the hon. gentleman from St. Mary's - The Capes

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was in the Cabinet when that deal was made. The hon. gentleman helped pilot it through the House. No other city member in this House at the present time.

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

MR. SIMMONS: It is called a ventriloquist act.

My Friend

MR. R. SIMMONS: from Humber Valley (Mr. House)
gets all disturbed if I use a little ventriloquism here and -
It appeared to you as though the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)
was speaking that time.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared -
I was not here as a member but I am prepared to talk about
Brinco, a past decision, if the Government will agree to
talk about some other past decisions. I have mentioned
just one today, Mr. Speaker, the one about Mr. Nutbeam they
can hang on the former premier. They say, in associations
nothing is so past as a past president. Mr. Moores is
shortly going to find that nothing is so past as a past
premier, and as that great candidate in the leadership,
Mr. Ken Prowse, said, "When the rats leave the sinking ship
there is really " - I forget the rest of it but I am sure
you get the import of what he is saying. But he will find -
Mr. Moores will find that there is nothing quite so past -
I am sorry, the member for Humber West (Mr. F. Moores) will
find there is nothing quite so past as a past premier when
people start disowning him and blaming things on him because
he happened to have a brother-in-law who needed a job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one
thing, and I think in that he was indiscreet, very indiscreet,
but the indiscretion was somewhat complicated and condoned
by every member of Cabinet in December 1976 who voted for
that rather cozy arrangement, an arrangement that was then
ongoing for three months, Mr. Speaker. Think about all the
employment in relative terms we could create on the basis
of \$110,000 a year. How many people in my district would
like to have a job at one-tenth that particular salary
spread over a year, or even five thousand for half the year
so they could draw down their Unemployment for the other

MR. R. SIMMONS: six months if they could not get a proper job. You could create a lot of seasonal jobs with \$100,000, \$110,000. And what happened? We have a premier shelling it out to his brother-in-law without any benefit of tender, without even any recognition that the law exists. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have a Cabinet that condones that, that approves it, that approves it three months after it is ongoing and then it is allowed to go on, not for a week or something just to clew up whatever he is doing, not for a month but is allowed to go from December 1976. It has been started now in September 1976. It has been allowed to go on to December 1976 with Cabinet's approval. With the approval of the present Premier, with the approval of the Minister of Fisheries. I could name some other people, Mr. Speaker, who were present at that particular Cabinet meeting. Approved by these people and it went on, Mr. Speaker, through December 1976 to the end of the fiscal year March 1977 and through to the end of the fiscal year March 1978, and may well have gone on beyond that period. We have it from the Premier today that it is not going on at this present time in March 1979. But whether it was terminated yesterday when he found out about it or terminated the day the former premier left office last week, we do not know, but we do know that it went on for at least nineteen months, and during sixteen of these months the members of the present Cabinet with the exception of four who were brought in, what you call re-cycled new faces - who were brought in this week - with the exception of these four these people were aware, Mr. Speaker, for sixteen months of the nineteen that this man, a relative of the premier, was being paid in contravention of the Public Tender Act, an amount equivalent to \$110,000 a year. That could create a few seasonal jobs.

MR. R. SIMMONS: At least the Government of Canada when it lashes out \$110,000 for Canada Works spends it on Canada Works. It does not spend it on 'Nutbeam works'.

MR. S. NEARY: And what was his job? To advise the Government on urinals, on local privies and sewer lines.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Opening up -

MR. S. NEARY: Opening up of privies.

MR. R. SIMMONS: I could see, Mr. Speaker, with their record on Come by Chance and Lower Churchill and the steel mill at Octagon - I could see that they would need an adviser on closing down things; I am not sure they needed one on opening up things.

MR. RIDEOUT: How to open the R.C. Brett Bridge. They had to know how to do that.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER: They had to know how to open the R.C. Brett Bridge.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. S. NEARY: They did not know how to flush a urinal, they had to get an advisor.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps, I at this point should move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 P.M.