

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I rise not to make a ministerial statement, but I do not think it should pass unnoticed that today is the 28th. Anniversary of our union as as Province of Canada. I do not have a resolution prepared. I am not sure that one needs to be prepared at any length. But perhaps the Premier might like to move an appropriate resolution which I could second simply to note the fact that this is the 28th Anniversary, as I say, of the consummation of the union, and that the union I think has been a happy and successful one, although we should not think for a moment there have not been or there are not difficulties between the two partners to the union. But I do not think the matter should go, Sir, without some recognition and some notice by the House of Assembly. And if the Premier would like to move the appropriate motion, take the appropriate action, I would be quite happy to second the motion so that the House could record the anniversary and we could then go on with the other business of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what motion exactly would be in order other than that it is the anniversary and to take note of it itself. We all know the benefits that have come from Confederation and we all know some of the frustrations. We know the difficult time our country is going through now in many ways, economically and because of the recent Quebec election and so on. But as far as our Province is concerned we have been the beneficiaries of the union with Confederation. I think all members of this House are cognizant of that fact, and certainly to pay recognition to it at this time. I do not know about a formal motion, because I do not know exactly

Premier Moores.

who it would be directed at or what purpose it would serve, but certainly to pay recognition to it as the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested, but certainly to pay tribute to the events, Sir, I would only be too glad to.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the extension of the caribou hunting season for residents of the Labrador Northern zone from April 16 to April 30. This change has been made in response to a telegram of March 30 from the community council of Nain in which they request an extension of the hunting season to April 30 in view of the unusually mild weather conditions which have made travel by snowmobile extremely difficult with the result that many residents have been unable to reach the main caribou herd.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the news. I asked a question in response to a request from the council in Nain and the people of Nain. It is not only for the people of Nain, but all along the Coast people travel long distances. Caribou is a fundamental part of their diet. It is in fact an essential part. The coastal people often do not have meat for much of the year from now until June, and caribou supplies are a staple diet. I welcome the announcement. The people have to travel long distances, up to 600 miles by snowmobile, to get the caribou and so far they have got only 150 out of the usual 2,000 they get out of the very large herd, the 150,000-175,000 caribou herd which migrates between Quebec and Northern Labrador.

MR. STRACHAN: I welcome the minister's statement and can thank him on behalf of the people on the coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the Harmon Tenants' Executive Committee. The prayer of the petition reads; "We the undersigned, as members of the Harmon Tenants' Association in the town of Stephenville, in the Provincial District of Stephenville, do hereby say; "WHEREAS the Premier of this Province stated on November 5, 1975, that the Province would compliment Ottawa's attack on inflation by co-operating with Ottawa in their programme of controls:

AND WHEREAS rent controls is one area pinpointed by the Premier in his statement;

AND WHEREAS the Harmon Tenants' Association feel that with the depressed economy of the Stephenville area at the present time the tenants could not withstand the burden of a 35 per cent and upwards increase in rent;

AND WHEREAS very few tenants will be able to adjust their earnings to accommodate a 44 per cent increase in rent at this time of controls on wages;

AND WHEREAS the Committee cannot agree with the operating expenses for this area of concern under the jurisdiction of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation as presented by the minister to justify these increases;

AND WHEREAS the Committee cannot accept the fact of this large an increase at this point in time; we hereby petition the House of Assembly to order said rental rates charged by Newfoundland and Labradro Housing Corporation to be frozen or these rates to not exceed the allowable 10 per cent federal guideline. The Committee request that the proposed increases be held back until such time as the economy of the area could bear them, or in lieu of this, to have

MR. MCNEIL: the increase spread out over a longer period of time so to make them somewhat more bearable."

Mr. Speaker, in questioning the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on the procedure for granting approval, the minister stated that the rent increases did not have to go before the Cabinet for approval. He also stated that the only recourse the tenants had was to meet with the minister, which he has already done. But, Mr. Speaker, the minister did not meet with the Harmon Tenants' Association to hear their case. He met with them to tell them they had two choices, pay the increase or move.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the minister reconsider the proposed rent increase and to show a little understanding for the people of Stephenville who live in their housing units. The minister's department should set the example and stay within the suggested federal guidelines.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition so ably presented by my hon. friend from Stephenville, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, just to summarize the prayer of the petition I think what the petitioners are asking for is to have the increase rolled back and brought within the federal wage and price guidelines. That is one alternative. The other alternative is drop it altogether, forget about it, have no increase while they are having their economic problems in the Bay St. George area. The other one is to spread the 35 per cent or 40 per cent over a longer period of time. Now there are three choices and they all strike me, Sir, as being reasonable proposals, very reasonable indeed.

I am surprised to hear the member who just presented the petition say that the minister went to a meeting in Stephenville with the Tenants' Association and told them they

MR. NEARY:                   either had to accept the upwards of 35 per cent increase or get out. That is pretty harsh, Mr. Speaker. Pretty cruel, I think.

MR. DINN:                   Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:               Point of order.

MR. DINN:                   Mr. Speaker, first of all I did go out and meet with the Tenants' Association of Stephenville, I did speak to them about -

MR. ROBERTS:               Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:               Make your point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:               The hon. gentleman will have to either state a specific point of order. If it is a matter of explaining, then obviously he will have an opportunity in speaking on the petition. At this particular juncture the hon. minister is recognized specifically on a point of order.

MR. DINN:                   Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:               Mr. Speaker, I understood the hon. gentleman, Sir, who presented the petition to say that the minister took this arbitrary decision and, in a very cruel way told the people if they did not like it to get out, clear out. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that is an indication of the arrogance of this administration.

MR. SPEAKER:               Order, please!

I must point out to the hon. the member for LaPoile that he is required to keep his remarks to speaking to the material allegation of the petition which is, as I understand it, relief from rent increases, but not enter into debate.

MR. NEARY:               So, Mr. Speaker, it would strike me, Sir, that the people who signed the petition, the Tenants' Association, the people who live in the apartments on the Harmon Corporation have no recourse to appeal.

MR. NEARY:

The minister apparently has the final word. The minister does not even ask his colleagues if he can impose rent increases on the tenants in the Harmon Corporation. They cannot appeal to the Newfoundland Tenancies Board because the Newfoundland Tenancies Board does not include the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and the St. John's Housing Corporation. So they have to appeal to this House, Mr. Speaker, and that is what the petitioners are doing in this petition.

I saw the Premier paying attention to what my hon. friend was saying there in reading the prayer of this petition. Sir, it seems to me to be a very reasonable request indeed and I certainly hope that the minister and the government will reconsider this matter and either wipe it out altogether while they are having their economic problems out there, roll it back to the wage and price guidelines, or spread it over a longer period of time. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition that is presented by my hon. friend, and particularly in view of the fact that we are looking at thirty-three, I believe, or thirty-five to forty and better per cent increases in that area. I think it is a well known fact, Mr. Speaker, that all of this Province and some of Canada, at least at the bond market, is looking at the Stephenville area at this moment. This is indicative of the fact of the kind of pressure that these people and others are under as they live in this community. The uncertainty must be tremendous. There is some question, rightly or wrongly, among responsible people in the community that the operating expenses of, I believe, \$200,000 a year that the minister is alleged to have mentioned of a deficit, the position is being questioned. The people are questioning the figures. It is as simple as that. I am sure the minister can appreciate that.

Whether the minister said what he is alleged to have said, "Like it or lump it," or words to that effect, I am not prepared to say because I do not know. But we have a very special case here

MR. NOLAN:

and this is the prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, a very special case. The special case is we have people who are working two weeks and off for two. We have people who do not know if they are going to be there six months from now, or not there. They have families, they have children, and they are living in rental units that are to all intents and purposes operated by, financed by, government. Now there is sometimes a tendency to look at those things operated by government as being something apart and separate, and in some ways it is. And often times the reason that it is is because of the politicians on all sides.

Now then I believe there is a special case here that we have to look at, and this is why I rise to support this petition. These people are in a very difficult position. I believe many thousands of people in Newfoundland are in a difficult position right now with inflation and so on the way it is, constant rising of prices in almost everything imaginable, particularly necessities, housing, clothing, schooling, light, heat and so on. So surely there must be a way - it is not beyond the wit of man or the minister and his officials - to find a way to at least attempt to graduate - if these people were saying a flat no, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister might have a case. But they are not saying that. What they are saying is, Is there not a way other than this hatchet approach, the guillotine approach, thirty-five, forty per cent. Here is your notice, you like it, get out. You know, thirty-one April, out or is it thirty days in April? Thirty days hath September, April, June and November. Yes.

So therefore there must be a way surely to graduate this. I mean, is ten per cent permissible? Would ten per cent be acceptable to graduate it, to grade it in rather than one savage slice that I feel is going to hurt these people in many, many ways socially in that area. And I do not believe frankly, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is insensitive to the problems that are out there, and that is why I rise now and say the things that I do in support of this petition to get him to respond as I know he will.

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



MR. FODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am in a sort of a difficult position here in speaking to this petition because I happen to live on the Harmon Complex and I guess I am the oldest resident on the Harmon Complex having lived there ten years. Now I am not standing up to complain about my rent. But I am standing up to support the petition for the people who do live on the base. First of all, in the ten years that I have lived there I have looked at

Mr. J. Hodder:

the financial statement and it works out to somewhere around \$77 a month which is budgeted for the maintenance of homes. Now I lived there for ten years and I would say that that should arrive somewhere around \$10,000 that should have been spent on the particular building that I am in. And that particular time in ten years the house has not been painted inside. There is a provision that says in our lease that we are not suppose to paint it unless we paint it the proper colours; I have broken that one. The maintenance has been, I suppose, around \$300. Maybe the rents are reasonable at this time, but the rents went up in 1974, I think that if the government had seen fit to raise them a little bit by a little bit since that time there would be no problem at this time. I think if the government would implement some sort of a programme so they would go up on a gradual scale, I think this would satisfy the tenants of the Harmon Complex. But at the same time to get a 30 per cent to 40 per cent increase all at one sum, with the economic condition of Stephenville right now and the uncertainty in Stephenville, is terrible.

Now I would like to mention something else: there was also a threat issued in my mind, and I am not reading from a letter but I am reading an accurate quote, and this is a letter sent by the Harmon Corporation to tenants who did not return their leases. It says, "We would like to remind you that we should have your signed supplements in our office by March 31 - that is today - 1977 or we will assume that you will have vacated your apartment by April 30, 1977." In other words, there has been a letter sent to all the tenants, "Either get the leases back which this negotiation is going on, or else get out, or else we assume you are going to get out. Well, I have not sent my lease back so I expect that next month that myself, my wife, and my kids will be on the street, if the tenants decide to burn their leases tonight I intend to see that mine is burnt too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

But there are some other things; there are figures which are put out, building maintenance \$419,603, that is the \$77 a month for each apartment that we are talking about. You know, that means that every house is getting that amount of money - that is not so; painting, \$140,688 in the financial statement; it works out to something like - they applied paint, they did paint the outside of the houses once in the ten years I have been there, that works out to \$130 a gallon applied, you know, that was the figure works out when you work out the number of units and the amount of paint and everything else.

And all I can say is that when the minister goes out and speaks to a group of the Harmon Tenants' Association and tells them ~~if they do not like it, if they do not like the heat they can get~~ out of the kitchen, well then that is just not acceptable, that is not negotiation, I think that is despicable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Well said, 'Jim'.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this petition some of the conversation I had with the Tenants' Association was relayed by the hon. member who presented and who did, in my estimation, a very good job. I did give them some options however, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to put on the record of the House. Number one is, I said to them if there were people in the Harmon Complex that were having difficulty and that were not making the wages so that they could afford the rental increase, that if they made application we would attempt to get them on some sort of a subsidy programme. So that the people on the lower income scale would be looked after in that sense, if we can get that programme for them.

The other thing was as quoted here on some of the costs; the costs that were mentioned in the information that I gave to

Mr. Dinn:

the Tenants' Association was an average cost per unit, I think for example, is \$77. Mr. Speaker, there are some people in the Harmon Complex who can afford this rent increase to my way of thinking, and to me it is criminal to ask the people of Newfoundland to subsidize those people. So I put the thing to the tenants that if there are people who are in a financial bind that we will attempt to do something for them. And that is the position that we laid out at the Tenants Association meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Burin-Placentia West.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition because I have a certain number of families in the same situation where their rent is going up from thirty per cent to forty per cent, I understand. Mr. Speaker, the houses I refer to were built for the new industry and there are a lot of people who are working on the shipyard living in those units and those houses, and the thirty per cent to forty per cent seems an awful jump at once especially for those of them who are unemployed. Carpenters and that who have been laid off at the shipyard - that uncertain industry that we have there - and I have had legitimate complaints. But I would like for the Premier of this Province, the leader of the government, if he would pass his remarks on this because when inflationary measures were introduced at Ottawa he lost no time in getting to the television to agree with everything, wholly and solely and I would like for him to give his opinion of this thirty per cent to forty per cent jump on those unemployed at Marystown or Stephenville or elsewhere.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition and in so supporting the petition I might say that I am very surprised that the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, who has got such an impact on so many people in this Province have not to this point - their operations, their dealings with the people in this Province have not come before this House either for congratulations for the way they operate or for criticism. Mr. Speaker, it would be ridiculous, it would be blue-murder shouted here today if a private corporation in this Province decided to jump rent rates up by forty per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: It would be ridiculous. Well, it is downright disgraceful for the people of government to propose to do it.

MR. FLIGHT: This government, Mr. Speaker, jumped on the Price and Wage Control bandwagon -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks and to organize them in terms of the allegation of the petition.

MR. MURPHY: Finish a good thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I think we are intitled to look at the increase between thirty-three and forty-four per cent relative to the price and wage controls that we are living under. It is a fact that this Province was one of the first to go with price and wage controls. We did it so that our employees would come under wage control. We did it so that we would probably have a good excuse for cutting back on capital works and social services -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! While certainly a reference for comparative purposes with whatever percentage of an alleged rental increase, and whatever percentages might be permissable under wage and price controls would be understandable, the general area of policy of wage and price controls or any provincial federal agreement in that line is not part of the material allegation of the petition and I think it is stretching the comparative - the validity of a certain comparison beyond the point of allowable elasticity.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I will simply say, Sir, that in looking at the increase that Newfoundland Housing is proposing relative to price and wage controls that all we are doing, all we are doing is saying that we are prepared to subject our people to the benefits of - or to the crimes of price control and - wage control and prepared to deny them the benefits of price control. Why should

MR. FLIGHT: not the Newfoundland and Labrador

Corporation be subject to price controls?

MR. WHITE: Or come under the Landlord and Tenant Act.

MR. FLIGHT: Or come under the Landlord Tenant Act.

Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated that he offered the

people in Stephenville, anybody in financial difficulties,

that he would consider their case. Well then, Mr. Speaker,

I am aware of a lot of senior citizens, the senior citizens

in these complexes, and I am aware of a lot of senior citizens

in Newfoundland who are renting from the Newfoundland and

Labrador Corporation. They are on a fixed income, Mr.

Speaker, they get an eight or nine dollar increase in their Old

Age Pension, and the minute notification comes of that increase.

They are notified by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing

Corporation that their rent has just gone up. If they receive

nine dollars it is gone up three or four. Now, Mr. Speaker,

the excuse that is being used is that the rent is based on

income, and their income has gone up by nine dollars. But

the fact is - Newfoundland Housing Corporation knows it -

the fact is the cost of living have outstripped their increase

ten times,

MR. FLIGHT: and how the corporation can argue that their income has gone up by \$9 and therefore increase the senior citizens rent by \$3 or \$4 when indeed what has happened is that their income has gone down relative to their buying power? If there is any organization in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that can take a look at the situation that our senior citizens, our lower incomes groups are in and consider that in applying rent increases or helping them keep the cost of living down, it is the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that it is ridiculous and disgraceful for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to attempt to get an increase of forty-four per cent in rent from the tenants of those houses in Stephenville and I heartily support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition as presented by the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) involving 268 families on the Harmon Complex in Stephenville.

Mr. Speaker, last night I saw a number of people from the Stephenville area being interviewed on the programme Here and Now with respect to the increase, and I did not get the impression, Mr. Speaker, that those people were unhappy about paying an increase. One gentleman said he was quite prepared to pay an increase of ten per cent now, and maybe ten per cent later and so on, but I think the point that has to be made and stressed over and over again, Mr. Speaker, is that Stephenville is just not any ordinary part of this Province today. We have a situation where you have 7,000 or 8,000 people who are going through probably one of the most traumatic experiences they have ever had to face in their life. They are sitting there, they do not know what is going to happen to the Linerboard Mill



MR. WHITE: They are not sure if they are going to have an income next month. The mill is closed down from time to time, and then coupled with all that dealing with their families and all this trauma that they must be experiencing, along comes a forty per cent increase in their rent.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the government must realize that during the past few years they have been spending \$35 million, \$40 million a year to subsidize the Linerboard mill in Stephenville. If I heard the minister correctly last night he said they were losing \$200,000 a year on the Harmon Complex. Mr. Speaker, that is a small figure compared with the \$35 million to \$40 million a year or even more that we are pumping into the Linerboard mill. And I think if we as the elected representatives of the Province, and more particularly the government, were really fair to those people that we would at least put a freeze on all rental increases until some study was done to determine who could afford the rent at the moment and not leave the option of whether or not they could afford up to the people themselves to decide. And I think it would be a relief to the people in the area, Mr. Speaker, if there was a freeze put on this particular rental increase until at least the advisory report on the Stephenville Linerboard mill was in and we would see what was going to happen to that town. I support the petition.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in support of this petition and I do so, Sir, out of the firm conviction that I believe there is something special, and all of us know there is something special about the problems facing the Stephenville area today. Certainly it is one of the most economically depressed areas of the Province, and to institute a thirty-five, forty and I believe in some cases I believe up to a forty-four per cent rent increase overnight, without

MR. RIDEOUT: pro-rating it over a certain period of time I believe is criminal.

Another factor to bear in mind, Sir, is that the buildings that are being run by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation out in Stephenville were acquired without any mortgage whatsoever. I would assume the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation owns out right every building that they have out there. They did not have to borrow money to build them. They got them, I would understand, from the American people who were there, so I would assume there is very little capital investment, so all they have is the maintenance of those buildings. So to institute a thirty-five, forty, forty-four per cent rate increase over such a short period of time I believe is unreasonable and practically unbelievable. Sir, I support the prayer of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I rise too to support this petition presented by the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) I do not believe that the people of Stephenville are completely against a rental increase, but I certainly believe that they are against a forty per cent increase. And a forty per cent increase in anything, whether it is rent, heat, lights, gas or whatever, is a little bit much certainly in this day and age -

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Hear! Hear!

MRS. MACISAAC: - and certainly in the position that the Stephenville - Bay St. George area is in right now. And I believe that it is against all the guidelines,

Mrs. MacIsaac.

certainly against the anti-inflation guidelines, and I think that it definitely should be given some more consideration and probably with the idea of spreading it out over a year or a couple of years. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MACISAAC: - ten per cent, twenty per cent or whatever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word in support of the petition presented by my colleague and friend from Stephenville. The petition actually draws attention to the wider problem which a lot of people are facing in this Province right now, the difficulty of coping with the cost of living. And it was, of course, for that reason that we as a Province got involved with the anti-inflation guidelines, a wise move and a move that has had a lot of positive effects. Its affect is undermined brazenly when we have this kind of a rental increase. I realize that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing are not technically governed by the guidelines. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, they are governed by the spirit of those guidelines.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: They are not though, but they should be.

MR. SIMMONS: They ought to be. Who but a public corporation should be setting the example in terms of restraint, in terms of not socking it to people? Mr. Speaker, we are almost inclined to ask, What masochist, what sick joker dreamed up this malicious scheme - 44 per cent, outrageous!

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have said most that needs to be said about the rental increase. It is a shameful thing, and my biggest disappointment this afternoon was that the minister associated himself with the increase. I would have hoped that

MR. SIMMONS.

he would have said that he would do something, that he was surprised to hear about it, and that he would do his best to undo it. I heard with interest his comment that if anyone is having financial difficulty he would do something. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that could be interpreted as an undertaking that there will be no increase. Because every person in those leases, Mr. Speaker, every person is having financial difficulty, and the sooner the corporation realizes that the better, and the sooner the minister gets the message the better,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have spoken in support of the petition which was presented by my friend from Stephenville, and I do not wish to go over the points that they have made, but I do want to say I think they have made some excellent points and made them in excellent fashion. My friend from Stephenville may not speak in the House as often as some others of us do, but when he speaks, Sir, he speaks with effect and with reason and with eloquence. I find it conspicuous that only the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the gentleman from Pleasantville, has spoken from the other side, Sir. I am not sure what that means, but I do find it a matter of comment, and I must say I interpret it to mean that nobody feels that they can counter any of the points or have anything to add to the debate. To me, Sir, the discussion has brought out two points. It seems to me that the point raised by this petition of the tenants on the Harmon complex really can be summed up in two words, sensitivity and integrity. The sensitivity, Sir, is the sensitivity of a Crown corporation - well, why call it a Crown corporation? It is the minister, Sir, who has approved these increases. He may or may not have initiated them, but, Sir, they are effective only because the minister has done it.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister shakes his head, Sir.

I say, Sir, the minister is wrong. They are effective only because the minister has approved them. If the minister had not approved them, then they would not be in effect. That is straightforward and simple.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the NLHC is a Crown corporation. It answers through the minister to this House, and it answers to the minister. And the minister - I doubt if he is a director of it - but certainly the minister controls that corporation particularly in a matter such as this that is entirely within the provincial purview. It does not even have the CMHC involvement. But, Sir, it is a matter of sensitivity, the sensitivity of a minister, a corporation, a government, that does not take into account the very traumatic times in which the people of Stephenville are living. And we cannot debate it now. We cannot go into now. But let it simply be recorded. Every hon. member in this House knows full well that the people in Stephenville are living under the threat of economic extinction. They are living under a sword of Damocles. This advisory committee may or may not produce a report shortly. And the Minister of Finance has said

MP. ROBERTS:

in semi-mysterious fashion that the budget of the Province in effect depends on the fate of the Stephenville linerboard mill. And the government are so insensitive, Sir, the minister is so insensitive, that he is not even taking that into account. He has put in a swingeing forty-four per cent increase. The other word I would use, Sir, is 'integrity', not the minister's integrity but the integrity, Sir, of a corporation. They have produced some statements. I have copies of them here. Some of my colleagues have commented on them. The financial statements, Sir, apparently do not stand up to scrutiny. There are very legitimate and real and proper questions. The minister has advanced these statements in support, these financial statements, in support of his decision to implement these rent increases. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very real question of the corporation's integrity. The tenants there have very real questions and they are obviously entitled to more consideration than they have had from the minister in a very brief meeting, whatever the actual length of time.

So I suggest, Sir, to the minister that he should go from this Chamber and immediately instruct the Housing Corporation to postpone these rent increases, or to reduce them to a reasonable level, in the spirit if not the letter of the anti administration regulations, of say ten or twelve per cent. And the petitioners have said they will gladly—maybe not gladly, but they will willingly pay those increases, and the the minister then send out to Stephenville and hopefully go himself to sit down with the tenants and say, "Here are the statements. Now if you have questions, let us get to the bottom of them." Why does it cost so much to paint? Is the money really being spent on paint? All of these very relevant questions, very relevant to the very large operating deficit which according to the statements the corporation now runs up in their operations at Stephenville and which the minister uses as his crutch to defend his decision to raise the rents.

I think, Sir, that the minister's position is one of insensitivity to the legitimate and proper needs of the people of Stephenville and the people who live in these apartments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is now in my opinion getting into the area of debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, thank you, Sir. I am grateful to Your Honour for bringing me back on the straight and narrow path. Let me simply say, Sir, that I think the matter is one of sensitivity and of integrity for the reasons which I have given. I support the petition. I urge the minister to take the action I have outlined.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other speakers on that petition I have another petition on a separate subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have leave to revert to petitions? Agreed.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which I am pleased to present on behalf of over 500 residents of the Bay d'Espoir area. Every community is involved in this petition, Conne River, Morrisville, Milltown, the Head of Bay d'Espoir, St. Veronica's, St. Joseph's, Swanger Cove and St. Alban's. This petition, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps one of the most significant petitions that has ever been presented in this House. It is significant for two reasons. First of all for the subject, which I will come to in a moment. And secondly, it is significant because of the method in which this petition was put together and the signatures were affixed.

This is not one of those petitions which is circulated door to door and people sign them in that fashion. This is a petition which was signed after a large number of people came together to talk about an issue that was on their minds. And the petition was the spontaneous outgrowth of that particular meeting. I make that point, Mr. Speaker, because it is not a case such as many of us find ourselves in where we are asked to sign petitions and we do not have any particular reason not to so we sign them. This is a case where every individual who signed that petition had travelled from their homes and their various

MR. SIMMONS:

communities to attend a meeting to talk about the very subject of that petition. I would therefore submit, Mr. Speaker, that every signature affixed represents the very deepest feelings on this subject of the people who signed the petition.

The subject, Mr. Speaker, is the subject of unemployment and the desperate economic conditions which prevail in the Bay d'Espoir area. I talked a couple of days ago with a senior official of Canada Manpower, and I was told that of a work force of just over 900 people, about 925 or 930 people, 604 people from the Bay d'Espoir area are registered with Manpower as being unemployed.



Mr. Simmons:

Two out of three have registered as being unemployed, Mr. Speaker, and that is not at all the full picture, because I would submit that there are some people who would be available for work if there were work opportunities, who would then come forward and register themselves but have seen the futility of doing so, and therefore have not even bothered to go through the motions, 66 per cent registered. I would submit that the realistic, the real unemployment figure, would approach 75 per cent of the working force of Bay d'Espoir. There are other areas of this Province, Mr. Speaker, where the story is as grim or nearly as grim.

The meeting I referred to, Mr. Speaker, was held in St. Alban's two nights ago, Tuesday night. One day last week I got a call from three men - three individual telephone calls - out of work, who said "Would you come down and have a meeting we want to talk about unemployment?" I said, "Of course I will, but I want to make sure that in addition to the unemployed people, who are the direct victims, together with their families, the direct victims of the unemployment situation, I want also the employees; the housewife, the high school student, the employer, I would like them all to come." And so I wired telegrams to the leaders of various community organizations and asked them would they come, bring their executives and pass the word that others would come.

The result, Mr. Speaker, was that the night before last in the Parish Centre at St. Alban's we had 550 people, There are only 6,000 people altogether in Bay d'Espoir counting men, women, and children. We did not have any bands to attract them, such as we do during election campaigns. There were no -

MR. ROBERTS: Harry Hibbs was not there?

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: Harry Hibbs was not there?

MR. SIMMONS: No, we did not have Harry Hibbs or any of the bands, we did not have -

MR. NEARY: What about Jack White?

MR. SIMMONS: We did not have any special speaker, no Jack White, Mr. Speaker, All we had, and this was enough, what we had, Mr. Speaker, were 550 people who had a very real concern. And I will say for the government, Mr. Speaker, that there was no particular flak about what the government had done or had not done, I did not particularly mention it, I do not think any speaker did, and we had, Mr. Speaker, eighteen speakers at that meeting, eighteen speakers, because the speakers were all from the floor, people were invited from the floor to get up and state their ideas, and that was the whole purpose of the meeting. We had a shorthand girl there take down the ideas, and in time a group that has been formed will be making proposals to government.

Mr. Speaker, the real point that I want to stress at this time is that people in the local areas of this Province are willing to do what has to be done, and they are waiting, Mr. Speaker, for some leadership. They are waiting desperately for some direction, for some leadership in terms of coming to grips with this very, very desperate, disasterous, economic situation we are facing, and nowhere is it more desperate and disasterous than in the Bay d'Espoir area.

The prayer of the petition then, Mr. Speaker, is that all agencies concerned and, insofar as we here are concerned, the House of Assembly and the government would take all possible steps to combat unemployment. This is a prayer from 550 people. It is a prayer which reflects the deepest wish of every person in Newfoundland and Labrador. Three years ago at the government's authorization there was a study done by the Research and Productivity Council of New Brunswick in terms of development opportunities in Bay d'Espoir, It contains a wealth of ideas that the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development ought to be looking at, It has been in the department now for three years, and as the Premier said in announcing that study in November 1973, he saw the study as an important

Mr. Simmons:

first step to the full development of Bay d'Espoir.

I say to him now, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my few comments on this petition, that now, three years and three months later, the time has come for the second step, to implement some of the ideas in that report which would create a number of job opportunities.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that this subject today, so important as it is, will receive the endorsement and the active support, the vocal support, of every man and woman in this House. And I hope, in particular, that the Premier, who has been closely associated with the instigation of the report that I mentioned on possible development opportunities in Bay d'Espoir, will rise in his place and tell us in particular when he intends to take the second step. Because the report contains a number of -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out to the hon. gentleman that the five minutes have expired, and it would have to be by leave that the hon. gentleman can continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SIMMONS: Just one sentence, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no leave then the hon. gentleman is permitted to bring his sentence to a conclusion.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, well that is about all I want to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the report contains a number of recommendations, very specific ones. It looked at areas and said, Look, this area is not a viable area; it is a pipe dream forget it. Then it took another area and said, Here is a possible area to create some jobs. And it totted up altogether about eight to nine hundred jobs that could be created with various sensible proposals, and then made about twenty-five or twenty-seven recommendations to government as to how these could be implemented. None of these have been implemented to date, but I hope the Premier today will indicate when that important second step can be taken so I can inform the people of Bay d'Espoir, who will be most happy and most willing to co-operate with the Premier and his administration in getting the economy in Bay d'Espoir turned around again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the petition that was so ably presented by my colleague. I must say that while the member was speaking that ministers were yawning or out of the chamber, or one of them was asleep. And I feel that this perhaps is the most crucial problem that faces Newfoundlanders today. And when my hon. friend cannot get leave to finish his petition on such an important thing as unemployment in this Province, then there is something wrong with the government over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Now I happen to live - this upsets me - maybe you may think that what I say does not come from the heart, but I represent a district where we have the same situation, and I know the type of suffering that is happening in that district now, the district of Port au Port, particularly the Peninsula part of that district. As far as that part of the district is concerned, Labrador Linerboard closed a year ago when the woods operation ceased, and these people are living from hand to mouth. There were 150 people more on welfare at Christmastime this year than there were last year. That is 150 families, large families, families who were coming to me to go to St. Vincent de Paul to get clothing for them, and yet the members on the other side sit there and yawn and read their newspapers. Well that is just fine -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: - because if that is the way you think about unemployment then it is time that we had an election and had it soon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would ask the hon. gentleman to develop his remarks into terms of the allegations of the petition.

MR. HODDER: Thank you, Your Honour.

Mr. Hodder.

Mr. Speaker, there was a make-work project in my district to help the unemployment in the district. It was done by the Department of Fisheries. One of my constituents who was unemployed got work on that make-work project. He was on welfare. He got work for four weeks. At the end of four weeks the job was over. That was the make-work, the answer of the hon. crowd on the other side to the -

MR. PECKFORD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order .

MR. PECKFORD: We have tried to be flexible over here as some of these petitions have come forward, and to give hon. members on the other side an opportunity to fully support and expand upon their ideas as it related to the material allegations of the petition. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member now speaking is talking particularly about the unemployment situation in the Port au Port Peninsula, which I am sure is very serious and which all hon. members can voice for their own constituencies. The material allegations contained in the petition are relevant to the unemployment situation in the Bay d'Espoir area and so, therefore, I would say that the hon. member should keep his remarks to the unemployment situation as it relates particularly to the Bay d'Espoir area to which the petition addresses itself.

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

MR. ROBERTS: To that so-called point of order, Mr. Speaker, which I submit was no point of order but instead an intervention in the debate, a proceeding which is not allowed in a discussion on petitions, Sir. The hon. gentleman from Port au Port is speaking in support of the material allegations of the petition. In so doing he is referring to a situation with which he is familiar by way of analogy, by way of reference and that surely is in order.

If hon. gentlemen on the other side, Sir, are so ashamed of the make-work programme which has been their only response -

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

I would think the hon. the Leader of the ~~Opposition is straying beyond the point of relevancy.~~

MR. ROBERTS: I am grateful to Your Honour, Sir, it is difficult to resist temptation such as given by the hon. gentleman from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford). Sir, the hon. gentleman from Port au Port is speaking in support of a petition. In so doing he is making reference, a technique which is allowed in debate and in speaking in support of petitions. He is not straying from the material allegations but, Sir, if one is not allowed to refer to similar or like situations then presumably all that would be in order on a petition would be to stand here and say, Mr. Speaker, I support the material allegations of the petition which are A,B,C, D,E. And if that is all that is permitted then, Sir, the procedure on petitions in this House for the last 140 years, thirteen of which I can attest to with personal knowledge, that whole procedure has been wrong and against the rules.

I submit it has not been wrong and not against the rules. You are not allowed to speak about anything other than the petition, of course, the material allegations in it, but, Sir, you are allowed, surely, to refer, to incorporate by reference other facts which relate to the material allegations of the petition as long as you are not straying into the area of

MR. ROBERTS: debate. I submit the point made by my hon. friend from Port au Port is in order and that he should be allowed to continue, Sir, to continue the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: There is no doubt that an hon. member must not enter into debate and that he must confine his remarks to the material allegations of the petition. It has been and is as I understand it, the general practice and understanding of that term 'material allegation' that one may not develop ones remarks, the subject matter of ones remarks, on to something which is not the material allegation.

To take a matter such as unemployment, the material allegation of this petition - as I understand it it is asking for measures to relieve the unemployment incidents in the Bay d'Espoir area - To make, for comparative purposes, reference to unemployment in another nearby area in the same Province and to do this in the spirit of comparison would not, in my opinion, go outside of the area of material allegation as we have practiced it under the heading of Petitions. I would ask all hon. members to endeavour in their own remarks to bear in mind that when these matters are made for comparative purposes then it is for that purpose and in order to strengthen or substantiate their arguments on the actual allegation of a petition.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to point out that the unemployment situation in the particular area is so bad. I think that I would never encourage anybody to take welfare, but here was a person who worked for four weeks and now, because he worked for that four weeks he must wait two weeks in order to go back to welfare because he cannot get UIC. The job did not give him UIC. That is the type of situation that is happening.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I would invite any hon. gentleman on the other side to take a tour of the district and go in and see some of the suffering that is there at this moment that was not there a year ago and was not there two



MR. HODDER: years ago.

Now I do not care what the statistics say and I do not care what the flash sheets say, I am just saying that this is a serious problem in this Province and I think it is one that every member of this House should be concerned about and every member of this House should be doing something, or trying to do something. We are the Opposition, we are pointing it out to you, I would like to see the government take some concrete steps to help areas such as Port au Port and Bay d'Espoir. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the petition presented by my colleague the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmonds). In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important matters which has come before the House in this session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPTAIN WINSOR: There are areas of this Province where we have a very sick economy and so sick, Mr. Speaker, that people are very much concerned. When the hon. member tells me that within a very short notice that the 500 or more people would gather in any community and show their concern for the unemployment, Sir, I think that is one matter for which the government must prick up its ears and take note.

MR. FLIGHT: It will in a couple of years time.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Because, Sir, what applies to Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is applicable to a great number of districts in this Province.

And now as Spring is coming on, or Spring is here -

AN HON. MEMBER: Spring has sprung.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: - people are very much concerned because there is very little construction work going ahead, and of course -

AN HON. MEMBER: No prospects.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: There is no prospects, there is nothing on the drawing board that we hear of and people are very much concerned. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that any member in this House today who fails to get up and support this petition will show a lack of concern in my opinion for the grave problem we have, unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Well, Sir, I pray almost every night that this year there be a good fishery in Fogo district because, Sir, if there is not then I feel very sorry. I am quite concerned for the people who have to trust to that industry because there is certainly no other source of employment whereby the people in that district can make a living and support their families.

Mr. Speaker, as I reiterated first, I think this is a very important and serious matter and I would like to see every member in this House stand in his place and support this petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleagues, would like to stand and support the prayer of the petition, signed by over 500 people from the Bay d'Espoir area with respect to the lack of work in that particular area of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know the unemployment situation in this Province is not confined to the Bay d'Espoir area of Newfoundland but to every single area of the Province. My own area, Mr. Speaker, which I consider to be one of the most economically sound areas of Newfoundland, is feeling the pinch at this time of year as well, and the number of calls and letters from people looking for jobs has increased substantially over last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that we even know how many people are out of work in this Province. The unemployment statistics that we have shows that there is about seventeen per cent of the people out of work, about seventeen per cent. But I read, Mr. Speaker, a Hansard from the House of Commons in Ottawa yesterday quoting the Leader of the PC Party of Canada -

MR. NEARY: Joe who?

MR. WHITE: Joe Clarke - Joe who? - saying that there was thirty-one per cent of the population of Newfoundland out of work, or of the work force in Newfoundland, thirty-one per cent of the people were out of work.

The Leader of the NDP Party in Canada, Mr. Ed Broadbent, who also spoke on that debate in the House of Commons, said there were thirty-five per cent of the work force in Newfoundland out of work. So I am not so sure that we even know, Mr. Speaker, how many people are out of work in this Province. What we do know, according to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, who quoted figures from the Canada

MR. WHITE: Manpower Office, that two-third of the people in the Bay d'Espoir area are out of work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about the only thing that is keeping the people of this Province, I submit, from rioting in this day and age is the fact of unemployment insurance and welfare benefits. If we look back, Mr. Speaker, to the depression years? in the early thirties, and we remember the storming of the old Colonial Building in St. John's, we know how bad it was back in those days and I submit it is just as bad today except there are more benefits to sustain the people and in some ways to keep them quiet.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see some action with respect to jobs in this Province, at least see it talked about, and that is something we have not seen so far in this House of Assembly since the House opened, and if we cannot find jobs at least talk about it and see if we cannot come up with some alternatives to the serious economic problems that confront this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the prayer of this petition. I think it is shocking that two-third of the people in the Bay d'Espoir area are out of work. But the situation is similar to many other areas of this Province. We have situations all around the Island and in Labrador, even in Labrador West, where traditionally the employment has been 100 per cent, this year there are almost over 1,000 people in Labrador City and Wabush who are out of work.

MR. STRACHAN: in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay-central area the situation is desperate, The business men are facing terrible odds, there is a malaise, an illness, a sickness right across the Province where people are feeling there is little leadership, little action in the attempt to try to get the Province going, that people who are supported purely by unemployment or welfare, and many people now find that it is even extremely difficult to get unemployment, to qualify for unemployment, and have to go on the welfare people who have never been on welfare in their lives. And I think the whole thing leads to lack of leadership and lack of response of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. gentleman is straying beyond the interpretation of the material allegation.

MR. STRACHAN: I thank the Speaker for his ruling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN: The allegation anyway of the petition is correct. The fact is that there is a tremendous malaise in this Province concerning the unemployment and I call upon the government to take action and try and get something done about it and try to get moving, especially since we should be starting to gear up this year, gear up in the next month or so to get the economy of the Province going. I whole-heartedly support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise to support the prayer of the petition, particularly -

MR. ROBERTS: You know nobody on the other side has spoken. Not a minister concerned -

MR. NOLAN: - particularly when in view of the fact that you have such a high percentage of the people in that district

MR. NOLAN: who are and are willing to admit and state publicly that they are unemployed. Now what does this mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that we have a large segment of the population in that area, and others as well, as has been indicated, who find themselves in a position that is foreign to them. Unemployed, dependent therefore on welfare, on unemployment insurance or some type of social benefits which, as even members on the opposite side of the House have on more than one occasion admitted, saps initiative, takes away the pride of the people and so on. Now here we have a situation where it is no longer acceptable in this Province or anywhere else for that matter, for me to stand up and blame the Minister of Consumer Affairs or the Minister of Consumer Affairs to hurl insults at me. The people in this Province are fed up with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: The problem is too important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: Ah, they can joke if they want to, Mr. Speaker, but this is no joking matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order, please! I must ask hon. members not to interject and for the hon. member to continue with his remarks.

MR. NOLAN: In Bay D'Espoir, Mr. Speaker, as well as other areas, you have people now, as has been referred to in this petition, they are leaving their families and leaving their homes as they did historically in this Province, to populate Boston, Toronto and so on. They are leaving. What hope are we holding out for the young people coming out of school this June, from technical colleges, from the university or grade schools? The problem, and it is voiced in this

MR. NOLAN:

petition, Mr. Speaker, is what has happened or a number of things. One, there seems to be a situation whenever you raise a problem in this Province now for some people to say blame it on the past administration, if that one does not fly you blame it on Ottawa, but you never accept the responsibilities of leadership which you have accepted -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. gentleman's remarks are straying somewhat.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, I certainly appreciate that and I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to conclude by saying, Mr. Speaker, that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, would it be unusual for to ask for a little silence?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. members are asked to allow the hon member to continue without interruption.

MR. NOLAN: Especially some of my own crowd.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. gentleman does not -

MR. NOLAN: Yes, I agree. no mis-mash about me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: We do not talk half as loud as you do, 'Lundrigan'

MR. ROBERTS: Why do you not say more?

MR. NOLAN: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the guts of this petition is hopelessness. No dream, no future, people do not know what to look to. They are not worried just about themselves but their families and everything that they have worked all their lives to try to sustain. And we must address ourselves to this, Mr. Speaker. It is difficult to realize now what one thing has come before this House of Assembly since we have met that is going to face up to answer the problems, the major one that we have in this Province today. It is largely ignored.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from St. George's.

MRS. H. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I stand to add my support to this petition. When 550 people gather on short notice to express their concern about the unemployment situation and who offer suggestions to help relieve it, I think it should certainly not go unheard or unnoticed. People all over the Province are crying for jobs, and they do not want to be on unemployment insurance, they do not want to be on social assistance, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. H. MACISAAC: - they want to work for a living. And it is up to each and every one of us as members of the House of Assembly to do our part to see that some form of employment is created for those people, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. H. MACISAAC: - to make it possible for our young people to stay in the Province and work as their parents did. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, without any reservation whatsoever I stand to support this petition and to support it whole-heartedly. I agree with my colleague that you just cannot define the topic or the ramifications of unemployment to one specific area of the Province. For instance, in my district of Carbonear, in the Harbour Grace Manpower nucleus, and I understand Manpower divided the Province up into sections according to office, I have two areas of my district which are what they call 'chronic unemployment areas'. And if this government, and I do not want to advance into the realm of debate, but if this government was going to do anything about unemployment it would have done it in the last few years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman clearly stated his wish to stay within the provision of a Standing Order, but did not in fact stay within his own desire.



AN HON. MEMBER: Heed his own words.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: My apologies to you, Sir, and to this hon. House for straying.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, unemployment is a problem, and this government, the administration, has to deal with it adequately. And certainly, in my opinion, they cannot look to the Federal Government and blame them for not aiding unemployment. For instance, I have some figures here, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit, that this year in the Local Initiatives Programme, LIP, and the Canada Works Programme, in my district alone those two programmes allocated just under \$600,000 or almost 35 per cent of the total amount of the job creation programme that this government put into activity for the whole Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: So if this administration cannot blame Ottawa, and based upon those figures they obviously cannot, then who can they blame? Certainly I do not feel reluctant at all, Mr. Speaker, to say that this administration is responsible for not doing anything about unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must insist that the hon. gentleman obey the rule which specifies that there must be no debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker - Thank you - in conclusion I would like to support this petition.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: My colleague from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) is doing, I believe, a tremendous job of lending support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Lending support, Mr. Speaker, to one of the most important and serious issues we have discussed in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is your point of order about?

MR. SIMMONS: And, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the Minister of Industrial Development, the member from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), for some reason has undertaken to interpret his train of thought, to harass and interject, and there is no need of it, Mr. Speaker. This is a subject we are all interested in. And certainly goodness he can either get up and participate and support the petition or keep quiet, and let members who have the concern for their members -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - to do so.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am not belittling or chiding or anything the hon. member from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) - the two gentlemen here the Leader of the Opposition and his colleague to his left -

MR. SIMMONS: Stick to the point of order. Stick to the point of order now!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, is there any way to deal with that ignoramus from that particular community?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: I would require the hon. member to withdraw the term 'ignoramus'.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to call myself a liar and withdraw the particular term. But, Your Honour, I am suggesting that the hon. gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) is making a point. As a matter of fact I sort of felt that he was maybe in order to attack the government, if he feels like it, attack the federal government, attack any government. But his two colleagues are not being serious in listening to him. They are playing their petty little games and I consider that they are interfering with the rights of the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) has once again indulged in one of his favourite tricks of trying to disturb and provoke the even tenor of the House by unparliamentary and improper remarks. There has been nothing said, Sir, by anyone on this side that was in any way out of order, I submit. The hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), Sir, insists upon displaying his ignorance of the proper parliamentary procedures by shouting across the House rude and insulting remarks which he may or may not believe. But all I can say, Sir, is that he is out of order to do so, and he is even more out of order to do so in allegedly speaking in reply to a point of order. And we expect better than that, Sir, from a man who has the dignity of a minister of the Crown and who has served, as he has reminded us on innumerable occasions, in another place until the voters, Sir, relieved him of that responsibility.

MR. ROBERTS:

But, Sir, there is no point of order made by the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). My friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has made a perfectly valid one in my view and I suggest-or submit, Sir, that the gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) should be allowed to finish his remarks without the rudeness of the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The point of order is whether the hon. member has the right to be heard without interruption which he obviously does. The hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) if he has not concluded his remarks is now called upon to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. For fear of causing any further indignation to the House I would like to close by saying that unemployment in my district is a very serious problem, one that requires immediate attention, and I do not believe that this government has done all it can do to alleviate it. I support this petition whole-heartedly. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of the petition. I think it is significant, Sir, that there have been seven or eight or ten speakers. I have not been keeping track of them, but all have come from this side of the House, Sir. Nobody on the other side is concerned enough obviously to speak on such an important matter as a portion of the Province where 600 out of 900 able-bodied men and women, two out of every three, are registered as looking for work, Sir. If that is not a serious situation, then, Sir, I do not know, I cannot conceive of anything that would possibly require the intervention of the government if that does not. And it is significant, Sir, that not a minister - there have been two, four, six, eight, nine of the hon. ministers in the House for part of this

MR. ROBERTS:

discussion, Sir - not one of them has seen fit even to stand to comment upon it.

Mr. Speaker, you could only view the situation in Bay d'Espoir, I submit, in the total provincial context. The people in Bay d'Espoir have asked for government action. Mr. Speaker, it is not irrelevant, I would hope, to note that in the Province right now, according to the government's own figures, we have 30,000 people out of work. And that is not counting the 30,000 others who have dropped out of the work force since last July. So out of a work force of 200,000 last year we have 145,000 employed now. Sir, that is close to the thirty to thirty-five per cent figure that Mr. Clark and Mr. Broadbent at Ottawa have talked about. The welfare, able-bodied relief, the final resort, the place where you go when you ~~have no other means of income; the sort of situation that confronts~~ so many of the constituents in the area represented by my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), it is up by thirteen per cent, Sir, in January 1977 over January 1976, up thirteen per cent, Sir, from 9,400 families - at what? - five to a family, that is 50,000 people. And it is up now to 10,600 families, 54,000 or 55,000 people living on welfare alone. And not a minister, Sir, not a minister - the Premier cannot even stay in his seat to hear the discussion - and not a minister rises.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The people of Bay d'Espoir, Sir, and the people of this Province are entitled to better than that. They have signed this petition, five hundred and some come out on short notice to a meeting, not a great public meeting for political purposes or for entertainment, but a meeting, Sir, to talk about a problem which they obviously take with the greatest of seriousness. And, Sir, not only do the people of the Province deserve ministers to speak in this House to outline the government's concern and the government's action, but, Sir, they deserve some concern and they deserve some action, and I submit they are getting neither.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is getting into the realm of debate which is prohibited under the support of petitions, outlined in Standing Order 90, on page 47. So I submit that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is definitely getting into the area of debate and therefore should be restrained.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: The point of order raised by the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), the Minister of Mines and Energy, you know, can only be viewed as another attempt to interrupt what is, I believe, Mr. Speaker, a very excellent point being made by my colleague. The temptation is there, Mr. Speaker, though my colleague has not yielded to it, the temptation is there to get into debate on this matter because it is the only opportunity we have. The government will not let us have a debate on unemployment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The actual point of order was an allegation that the Leader of the Opposition was entering into the realm of debate. I am not at this time prepared to rule the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks out of order. It was a borderline situation, I would ask him in continuing his remarks to bear in mind the actual stipulation of the Standing Order prohibiting debate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I shall of course endeavour to do so in the spirit that to err is human, to forgive is divine. Mr. Speaker, I obviously was a little strong, or a little heated, but it is a subject on which I feel very strongly, Sir. The people in Bay d'Espoir are concerned, and anybody who is the least bit knowledgeable about the affairs of this Province, Sir, who travels about at all must realize it is the most compelling fact that we face today, Sir, in this Province, I think the word used, I think it was my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) malaise, the growing malaise that is spreading throughout this Province and to be greeted by an attitude of the ministry which can only be compared to the late Queen of France, Marie Antoinette, who is alleged to have said, "Let them eat cake," shortly, Sir, before her head was sacrificed up to a greater cause than that of cake eaters.

Mr. Speaker, the ministry have made no response. I ask them now, in speaking in support of this petition, the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), Sir, to tell us what jobs his departmental efforts have created, and the gentleman from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), and the gentleman from St. John's Centre, and above all the gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. Brett), the Minister of Social Services. We cannot debate that make-work programme, Sir. We will if ever

MR. ROBERTS: they have the courage to call the estimates of that minister's department and I, Sir, would like to do it for the sorts of reasons my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has raised, Sir, and I could raise others of the most ill-conceived and badly administered programme we have ever seen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: Whether or not the make-work programme that has been announced and that is now into operation by this government is good, bad or indifferent, and to continue to debate the merits of that particular programme, in my opinion, I suggest, Your Honour, does enter the realm of debate in criticizing the government on these make-work programme, and I think that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has had sufficient flexibility in his support of the petition to get his point across without having to get into the areas that he has now gotten into.

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

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Sir; I first of all submit that while the hon. gentleman did not mean to be offensive to Your Honour he was very offensive to Your Honour by saying that I had, I think these are his exact words, "Sufficient flexibility." Sir, that is a matter for Your Honour to determine.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to debate the make-work project, the lack of make-work projects, whatever the phrase is, but I am not allowed to, but surely it is relevant to the material allegation of a petition of 600 people who are out of work and looking for work to say that the government have not made an adequate response, Sir. I could draw it particularly to the Bay d'Espoir area. I know they have not made an adequate response to the Bay d'Espoir area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I was trespassing into the field of debate. If I was of course I apologize and



MR. ROBERTS: I shall endeavour to refrain from it. It is difficult, Sir, on a subject such as this but I can only say, Sir, to the gentleman from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) a rhetorical question, Sir, Where is Mr. Leo Barry now that we really need him?

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order; as in many cases like this, there is a borderline. The Chair has certainly a responsibility to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Order please! The Chair has a responsibility

*Mr. Speaker*

Mr. Speaker.

to enforce the rules, the Chair has a responsibility to do so in a manner which is cognizant of hon. members' freedom of speech within the rules and also I would think of the expression of citizens as related in petitions, and to endeavour to meld these together. I think in the specific instances or sentences of specific criticism of a government programme in that in those remarks and in those sentences they were debate, and they were out of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And if I may draw my remarks to a close,

Sir, I support the petition. I think it goes to the heart of a - not just a very important matter - but the most important matter in this Province today. I regret that we in the House have been given no government programme to deal with it. I regret that the people of the Province have been given no government programme, and I regret even more, Sir, the lack of concern. I said in speaking in support of an earlier petition, there was a question of sensitivity, and I believe it was. I submit, Sir, that the government's attitude in this matter is one of insensitivity, and I think that, too, Sir, speaks for itself. I support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I just got a word or two to say. I sort of welcome the opportunity to say something. The thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that this thing is being entered into in an almost informal debate, a matter which is of urgent importance. I feel just as strongly as the members in the House who have spoken to date about the unemployment situation in this Province. I have been a spokesman about unemployment

Mr. Lundrigan.

and the unemployment problems since I have been in politics, and years before. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is getting at the heart of some of our problems, and it is the role of an Opposition to come forward and suggest to government that we have a problem, and to present their recommendations. This is the first time that the Leader of the Opposition has got beyond the coloured television sets, and his scandals -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask the hon. gentleman to respect the rule of material allegation as so ably expounded by the hon. gentleman to his left a few minutes ago.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I commend Your Honour on being so perceptive about my remarks. I am just trying to suggest, Your Honour, that the Leader of the Opposition, if he were taking the proper initiatives as the Leader of the Opposition, should be using all means of debate at his disposal, including Interim Supply and the Throne Speech, to present to the House some of his recommendations about the problems confronting this particular Province.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would love nothing better than to enter into debate with the gentleman from Grand Falls if only we could entice him into a debate on the merits of some point, Sir. I would submit that it is not in order in speaking on the material allegations of a petition to read what the hon. gentleman doubtless believes to be a lecture on the duties of the Opposition, Sir. He was in Opposition himself for awhile, and his conduct there speaks for itself. It led to his defeat at the polls in short order. But, Sir, it is surely not in order in a discussion on a petition. If it is in order, if Your Honour so finds, then I would like nothing better, Sir, than to enter into the debate, because I think, Sir, that we on this side have

Mr. Roberts.

very strong views about the role of Opposition just as we do about the role of government and the hon. gentleman's failure there, too, Sir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

Your Honour, the Leader of the Opposition has just spent ten minutes wrangling on about the particular petition, and he has been challenged on several occasions about the relevancy to the particular petition. And he defended on a number of points of order and threw his little slurs across the way, and I suggest, Your Honour, that the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition that I was petulant and childish has no relevancy to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

~~The specific point of order as I recall it~~  
was to the effect that the hon. gentleman was speaking on the role of Opposition rather than on the material allegation of the petition, and he must confine his remarks to the material allegation of the petition as that has been interpreted in our practice and in the precedent which allows certain points for comparison and illustration. So I would just point that to his attention and ask him to govern his remarks accordingly.

The hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that I welcome the opportunity as being presented by the petition from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to pass a few remarks about the state of the economy and particularly the unemployment in his region. I would have expected the hon. member, if he were diligent and concerned and really genuine about the conditions of unemployment in his region, to have taken the opportunity to present to me or to any member of the government, to any minister where there might be a relevancy, the suggestion that were forthcoming from the particular -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wanted in this House earlier this afternoon as the record will show to take another three or five minutes. The minister is one of the people who would not let me

MR. SIMMONS: pass on those suggestions would not allow me leave. Mr. Speaker, if the minister wants to debate that idea I will do it at any time. I will say to him, he has all the suggestions that came up the other night in the report of the Research and Productivity Council which has been sitting in his department since January 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

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

I cannot see that there is a valid point of order there. I will now draw to hon. member's attention that the rules on the petitions are quite precise. In this Legislature I have always personally regarded it as one of the important fundamental rights of citizens and the duty of members when

~~speaking thereto to bear that in mind. If and when the procedure~~

becomes so entangled, and with numerous interferences and objections and points, and the House is then led into debate, is, in fact, in a situation of debate where that is not permitted, and if hon. members when this is drawn to their attention will not at the Chair's order so regulate their remarks as to bring themselves within the rules, then I think I have no choice than to call the next routine order of business.

It is not something which I would <sup>not</sup> wish to do, but it something which I think that I would have little choice but to do, if the rules which are relevant, and the courtesies which have traditionally been extended are no longer observed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the hon. gentleman's lack of eagerness to present to us before he got up on his petition, his suggestions that he had. I was not aware until I came into the House today that he was presenting his petition so I could very properly analyze the recommendations and suggestions

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

to give a legitimate response. But I want to take issue with a couple of points that were made, Your Honour. Number one is the -

MR. SIMMONS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to interject. I want to listen to the minister, what he has to say on the petition. And I believe it is an important issue. I think it is unfair and also quite irrelevant that the minister should be pursuing the subject of my diligence or lack of it. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, in giving him a copy of the report if he cannot find it. It has been in his department for three years. But I do have a copy I can give to him. And it contains the suggestions he wants. There is no precedent in this House, Mr. Speaker, for a member having to discuss the subject of a petition with members of the House before he brings it into the House. And I have done today what other members have done over the years in this House. I have come in and presented my petition in the proper order.

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

Order, please! There is no point of order. The hon. gentleman was entering into a debate. It is a difference of opinion on this matter. But I am not aware that there is a specific point of order which the Chair can rule on.

The hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, two or three comments. First of all, I would like to disassociate myself from the gloom and doom and the hopelessness kind of syndrome which seems to manifest itself in the comments which were made about the petition. And I believe myself that comments which are made such as the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) made about the hopelessness and the gloom and doom is one of the causes of some of the economic problems we have in this Province. Number two, I take issue with the comment

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

that is being made that there is no relevancy between the economic position of our Province today and the national scene. The member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores), a young member who is aspiring to be a great parliamentarian - I encourage him along these lines - certainly has to be aware of the fact that a significant proportion of the economic problems we suffer in our Province today, and in any other area of the Province that has regional disparities is a result of the fact that we have a relatively unhealthy economy across this whole country. If members take the time to read, and I am sure the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I do believe now the hon. gentleman is entering quite specifically into an area of debate. And I ask him to keep his remarks within that definition of material allegation which has been used in the House.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of Your Honour's insistence about the relevancy of debate, and looking at what happened a minute ago I see no purpose in trying to pursue any further remarks on the petition. I regret that because I feel that I am -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please! On behalf of the House I shall have to use any arguments put forward by hon. members and my own knowledge of the rules and my own judgment in my application and enforcement of the rules and on behalf of the House I will have to and do ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his latter remarks in that in my opinion they were a reflection upon the authority of the Chair which is the authority of the House. And it is in that it is the authority of the House that I ask him to withdraw those remarks.



MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I guess the proper procedure - and this is the first time I have done this since standing in the House-is to withdraw, I suppose, the relevant comments - that is without qualification-and I have to do that. But, Your Honour, again I am not allowed to pursue it, but I find some restrictions on me as a member of the House, Your Honour has referred -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: His Honour is not interferring - Your Honour has referred to the freedom of speech, I am trying to place in a broad context the remarks of hon. members across the House, and I find that the rules do not permit me to do so. That was the reason for my remarks. It is not a reflection on Your Honour, I listened to remarks about my political future, my political past, and all kinds of petty remarks, I am trying to be responsible and place the petition and the remarks in a broad context. Your Honour says that is not permissible, and if that is not permissible then I discontinue my remarks, and that was the reason for my reflection if Your Honour so interprets it, on the Chair.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit to Your Honour that the hon. member from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) has not withdrawn, and Hansard can show this, Sir, has not withdrawn his remarks. He merely got up and gave an excuse for disobeying the Chair. And I would submit to Your Honour that now that Your Honour has made a ruling that Your Honour insist that the member from Grand Falls withdraw his remarks with no strings attached.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of privilege brought up by the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is, in my opinion, a valid one. I do not have the exact transcript, nor did I write down what the hon. member said, nor do we have the parliamentary secretaries here, and

Mr. Speaker:

it is not my wish to, unless necessary, to adjourn the House, I did, however, understand his remarks and I can well understand - I can understand, I cannot condone - but I can understand when an hon. member is cut off that he can react in that matter and may think he has been treated unfairly, and obviously that is every hon. member's right to think what he wishes. But the only things obviously that I can take note of, and I am entitled to, is what is specifically said. And, in my opinion, the hon. gentleman's remarks were of such a nature which would undermine the authority of the House, and I would ask him therefore to unequivocally withdraw them and the matter can then be terminated and we can continue to whatever comes next.

The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That was my interpretation of what I had done,

~~If I have not done it then I will so do as Your Honour has directed~~  
whatever that means.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It certainly -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair is now - it is not my wish, and it is not my intention, and indeed it is not my right to enter into debate with the hon. gentleman. I do not do so, yet I do not either leave when it is, in my opinion, the authority of the House has been challenged, then I cannot allow that to go. And it is not my desire to protract this matter whatsoever, but I do require now from the hon. gentleman, and this is the last time I will require it and if he does not do it now I will have no choice but to do what the Standing Orders request me to do, and that is to withdraw unequivocally without further comment.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, that was precisely, and I apologize to Your Honour for maybe -

AN HON. MEMBER: Without comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the least I can do is have the courtesy of speaking in silence on a matter which is relatively important. Your Honour has suggested that I challenge the authority of the Chair, Perhaps my tone has not communicated my apologies to Your Honour. I suggested in my previous remarks, Your Honour, that I withdraw precisely along the lines that Your Honour has suggested. And that is exactly what I do, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter is disposed of, I note and the House notes the hon. gentleman's withdrawal and that in fact does terminate the matter.

The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I stand and support the petition presented by the member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, Sir. My understanding of the petition, Sir, and the way that the member presented the petition, that the movement in the Bay d'Espoir area was purely a spontaneous movement. And it should be a warning, Mr. Speaker, it should be a warning to the administration that not only are the unemployed in the Bay d'Espoir area getting restless, but the unemployed throughout the whole Province are getting restless, and they want action, they want action

MR. NEARY: from their government, Sir. Mr. Speaker, five hundred and fifty men, women and children attended a meeting in Bay D'Espoir in the parish hall- In St. Albans was it?

MR. SIMMONS: In the parish center.

MR. NEARY: In the parish center. And they came there for one reason, Sir, and one reason only, and that is to communicate to this House and to the administration that these people did not want to accept unemployment insurance benefits. they do not want to be forced to go on welfare, they want to work. These people are eager and willing and able to work, and they want jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been here in this hon. House, what - since February is it? February 2nd I believe

~~it is. We have been here now almost - well over two months~~  
and we have not yet, Mr. Speaker, seen one sign of a plan produced by this administration to provide long-term employment for our people. We have massive unemployment in Newfoundland at the present time. I would think in the Bay D'Espoir area, from the figures that have been given by the member, that unemployment in that area is somewhere up around seventy per cent, a minimum of seventy per cent. In some communities in Newfoundland it is ninety per cent unemployment.

And, Mr. Speaker, the figures that are given out by Canada Manpower - not by Canada Manpower but by Statistics Canada, I do not know how they are arriving at their figures, how they are manufacturing the figures, but I would think in this Province at the present time, Sir, that we have about 64,000 Newfoundlanders registered with Canada Manpower who are unemployed, massive unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the people in the Bay D'Espoir area are becoming cynical, disillusioned, disgruntled, discouraged and disappointed with the administration? Mr. Speaker, I think it is shameful the way - the reception

MR. NEARY: that this petition has gotten from the ministry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must ask the hon. gentleman to avoid debate and to confine his remarks to the petition allegations. Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all in supporting the prayer of this petition, Sir. It is a good petition. It is a sign, and should be a warning to the administration, Sir, that the unemployed in this Province are getting restless and we are going to see more of this in the future. And our people want to work, they want jobs, not unemployment insurance or welfare. I believe that the administration would be well advised, Sir, to take note that this may be only one of many petitions that we will see presented in this hon. House on this very serious problem in the future.

And before I take my seat, Sir, I want to congratulate all those on this side of the House who have participated in supporting the prayer of this petition. It has been an excellent exercise, Sir, one of the best things that I have seen happen in this session of the House to date, to drive home, to rivet home, the problem of high record of unemployment in this Province. And I also want to congratulate, Your Honour, for the way that, Your Honour, handled a very delicate situation because when you are talking about unemployment, Sir, it is bound to get a little bit heated once in awhile and I must say that Your Honour has done a fine job throughout this whole discussion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to the support that has already been given to this petition.

MR. FLIGHT:

I cannot think, Mr. Speaker, of a more important petition that has been presented to this House, I cannot think of anything that would warrant debate anymore than the unemployment situation in this Province does today. Unemployment Mr. Speaker, the level of unemployment in the districts referred to in this Province is, Mr. Speaker, destroying the self-respect of Newfoundlanders. That petition was presented out of resignation and desperation and that desperation is going to manifest itself all over this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how I could stand here and be relevant to supporting a petition if I were permitted to look at why the high level of unemployment is in this

~~Province today. The only employment, Mr. Speaker, that~~

I witness in this Province over and above civil service, over and above the paper companies and the fishery is the make-work programmes by LIP and now Young Canada Works, and Canada Works

MR. FLIGHT: very disappointed and I expected, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Rural Development stood that in supporting the petition he would point out the jobs created by his department over this past three or four years.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: There is a job waiting for you.

MR. FLIGHT: I think he should have. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the reason the people in Bay d'Espoir - five hundred people attended a meeting and says we do not have work - is because the job creation programmes of this Province have not worked. Rural Development is not creating the jobs that they were intended to create. If they had we would not have had those kind of meetings because Bay d'Espoir is an area that would have been dependent on the natural resource development of this Province and it has not happened.

Mr. Speaker, in the fifties and sixties when there was a very low unemployment situation in this Province, a great deal of our people were working for companies and they did not realize they were paid out of the public purse. They did not realize that they were working for the Government of Newfoundland but they were. The 3,000 or 4,000 employees that the Lundrigans had and the Goodyears had and all the construction people building roads and bridges and schools and electrification programmes were, in fact, being paid for by the Newfoundland Government. And this administration must have realized, any government must have realized that when they cut back on the essential services of this Province, when they cut back on public works they would create massive unemployment and that is basically our problem, Mr. Speaker. The fiscal policy of this Province is not in keeping with creating jobs for our people in this Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Well said.

MR. FLIGHT: When this House of Assembly and this administration

MR. FLIGHT: decided to go with the price and wage controls situation then they accepted the price and the price would have been to cut back on public works and on cutting back on public works they knew full-well they would be cutting back on the employment level of this Province.

When we committed \$250 million to get into BRINCO, to buy out BRINCO, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order please! A point of order please! I do believe the hon. gentleman now is stretching beyond reason the concept of material allegation.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I will abide by any suggestions or rules that you would lay down, Sir. I am just simply suggesting that in terms of employment, Sir, if the funds that have been allocated this past few years through various projects had instead been allocated to creating employment in this Province then the result of that employment might have put us in a position to spend the money when we were ready, to spend it in the way it would have best suited Newfoundland. We could have put the gigantic amounts of money that this administration have put into - when we were ready, when we had indeed created the kind of jobs and developed our basic and natural and local resources.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and I submit to government that if they are to deal with the massive unemployment we have then they are going to have to change their tactics and their emphasis is going to have to be on putting their money into resource development and they are not doing it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Not just talk but the money.

MR. FLIGHT: Not just talk, the money, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition of my hon. colleague, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

Mr. Speaker, the moral fiber of our Newfoundland people is being strained so much that they are now starting to tear away at the seams. The people in Newfoundland do not want to be reduced to social welfare or UIC. They want work. Sometime ago the Premier mentioned that the blueberry industry would be stimulated to provide employment to many people who are out of work. Mr. Speaker, if the unemployment rates keep increasing as they are there will be a one to one ratio, one blueberry for every one person unemployed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the government has done enough to curb this high rate of inflation and I would suggest that the government take a much more serious approach to this whole unemployment situation.

I support the petition presented by my hon. colleague, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I too rise to add a few words of support to the petition presented by my colleague from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir—believing as I do, Sir, that that is probably the most important petition presented to this House of Assembly this session. All the speeches, all the remarks that have been made by people on this side of the House and indeed, Sir, the Prayer of the Petition itself, I believe, should

MR. RIDEOUT: suggest to each of us here that there certainly is a cancer eating away at the fibre of life as we know it in this province.

MR. LENDRIGAN: Yes, you see it right now.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is exemplified by the Minister of Industrial And Pural Development. It is exemplified by the minister, Sir, because it is the minister's department that should take the lead in this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. gentleman is quite definitely in the area of debate. The material allegation of the petition in case hon. members have forgotten is - I will have to complete - is the relief of a high instance of unemployment in the Bay D'Espoir area and certainly references to unemployment in other areas, logically related to things, or in comparison are permitted. But I think the hon. gentleman was in debate with the hon. minister.

MR. RIDEOUT: I thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, but it is so easy to fall by the way when one looks at the minister from Grand Falls. Of course it is better to look than be looking at the Premier's seat, which is vacant. I just want to say, Sir, I supported the prayer of the petition and we have been called in this province to be more productive but, Sir, we cannot be productive unless we have jobs. People all over this province look at the District of Baie Verte - White Bay as being economically well off. But, Sir, we have our pockets of unemployment too just as they have them up in the district represented by my friend in Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir.

Only for LIP, Sir, I do believe that this province, this year would have been worse off economically than any other year in decades. We still have serious unemployment problems despite the efforts of LIP, despite the weak efforts of the \$2 million government job creation programme which did not show its face at all in places like Englee, and Bide Arm where you have 75 and 80 per cent unemployment rates. So, Sir, the people, when the people come together sort of on the spur of the moment as they did out in Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir a few days ago, when they come together on the spur of the moment as they did in my friend's district. I believe it tells a story, a story

MR. RIDEOUTT: that we are going to hear more of in this House, story of frustration, Sir, a story of concern. Those people are looking to the government to provide some sort of leadership and to get this province back on the road to economic recovery. I say to the ministry, Sir, I say to the ministry, 'For God's sake, heed the voice of the people.'

HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Burin Peninsula.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my support to this very important petition, being presented in the House today. Like other members on this side have said, it is probably the most important petition that has come into the House. The people of Bay d'Espoir, the prayer of that petition, Mr. Speaker, is the prayer of most of Newfoundland today. It is their greatest interest. If the prayer of that petition can be answered, Mr. Speaker, we will, we might avoid - further avoid bankruptcy, and the province may come back into its own.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I will be relevant, and I think I am, but if I am not I will surely bow to Your Honour's ruling, but I say this afternoon in this House it is a sad for Newfoundland. I cannot refer to something previously brought up here, but when I look across the House and see a government that the people of this province have put their trust in, and the Opposition carrying out their duty, the voice of the people which has just been stated. I see it at times that the government side has gone down to nine members. The Premier has not been in here two minutes or three minutes -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. LUNDPIGAN: I have the greatest respect for the hon. gentleman. I know he is meaning to get involved in meaningful debate but right now he is certainly irrelevant I would like to later on recognize that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister's point is a valid one and the hon. gentleman have strayed somewhat from the subject at hand. The hon. member

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I should not be breaking the rules of the House. I have been here a long time. A couple of months time I will be here for twenty-five years, so I really should be ashamed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I should be ashamed of myself. I am serious and I am sincere when I say I am very sorry to cause Your Honour to have to call me to order. And I will try to abide by it and stay in order.

The people have asked that this House would give consideration to the serious unemployment in the Bay d'Espoir area. Mr. Speaker, I am meditating because I am trying to stay in order, my good intentions.

I wonder if I am in order, Mr. Speaker, if I just support this petition and say the other side of the House has not shown any interest in this petition since I came in. I heartily and sincerely support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I too want to support the prayer of this petition. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that a few days ago I was reading in Hansard - I asked a question last year of the minister and it ended up on the Late Show, a five minute debate with the Minister of Rural Development. One of the questions that I put then was; as a stop gap measure would it be possible for the administration, the government, to carry out some programmes such as LIP? In his response the Minister of Rural Development called LIP a joke and referred to Dave Rooney as the - you know, who is he and all that sort of thing. But I was very -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member, I know he is having - he is a new member like all of us and he wants to participate in matters like that but he has got to be fair in his comments about what hon. members say. I have never referred to LIP as a joke. I have

MR. LUNDRIGAN: suggested, and I wanted to say it this afternoon in part of my remarks, that it is not a solution to the economic problems in this Province.

MR. CALLAN: A stopgap. Did you hear of the word stopgap?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And I certainly never referred to the hon. member for Bonavista - Trinity Conception in any derogatory manner.

MR. CALLAN: I will get Hansard for you.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that so-called point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: There is no point of order, Sir. That is surely at best an intervention in the form of debate. It is a difference of opinion between what was actually said. My friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has referred to a Hansard, a statement.

If the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan)

does not particularly agree with that then surely in due course in debate he may raise the matter but not as a point of order, Sir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: There is no need to debate a petition.

MR. ROBERTS: We are not debating a petition.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not aware that there was a breach of order. The hon. member is however requested to bear in mind the requirement to speak on the material allegation as our practice has identified that.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well actually what I was about to say before I was interrupted is that I was very happy, The Cabinet came together several months ago and for two or three days marathon Cabinet meetings were held and out of that, as I saw it, came the idea to spend \$2 million in this Province through programmes similar to LIP. So I am glad that I raised the thing last year and that the

MR. CALLAN: government at least felt that well at least it is a stopgap measure.

Mr. Speaker, Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is not the only area of this Province where the people are concerned about unemployment. Last Wednesday night I was in Arnold's Cove to a council meeting where they were talking about the area and the economy of that area. Saturday afternoon at Come By Chance there was a meeting of municipalities, including the Mayor of Clarenville, and other municipalities in that general area. People are very concerned and very - you know, they are wondering what is happening and where to go.

I agree with former speakers, that if it were not for these stopgap, make-work programmes such as LIP, and even though the \$2 million spent by this administration, that there would be a bad scene indeed in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that I could say about the refinery and you know why it has not restarted and what have you. But, Mr. Speaker, all I need to say is that I thoroughly support the prayer of that petition and I hope that the administration, that Rural Development will develop the rural areas of this Province. To me Rural Development means developing the rural areas. I have not seen it except through LIP programmes.

MR. CALLAN:

I hope that the minister will come up with something that will develop the rural areas of this Province and in so doing provide the employment that people so badly need. I thoroughly support the prayer of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. E. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and support in principle the petition as presented here this afternoon. To be quite frank, in my term of office, since the ten years I have been a member I never found the time so difficult to find employment for many of the constituents of my district. I happen to know practically, I would say all of the large construction people, myself personally and I have had the opportunity from time to time to call them up behalf of the constituents looking for work. And what I have found to their grief and to mine that not only have they been unable to take on any new employees but they are finding it difficult now to maintain what you might call their regular staff, their full-time employees and that they are facing this Summer with many doubts. Many of them, unless something can be done, many of them are not going to be able to keep on their regular and full-time employees. I am sure I do not have the answer to this problem. And we do trust that the Minister of Finance when he presents his budget will be able to provide some relief -

MR. NEARY: If he ever presents it.

MR. DAWE: - in the Summer and in the months ahead. I know we happened to be at Confederation, we entered into a period actually when there were so many needs in this Province and most of these needs in the manner of capital works have been completed. All we have to do is look out through this building here and just look around at what we can see in this particular mile or so in the radius of this building, what

MR. DAWE:

employment was generated by the public work we see around this building. But as I say I do not know the answer, Mr. Speaker. Housing is one particular area where immediate employment is generated and practically every sector of the economy benefits. There are roads to be built. And there is money that could be put into the fisheries. But with regard to rural development I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I happen to come from a family who have been associated with more products, what we call rural development, than any other member of this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: Including the minister, including the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: - of this House. And all we have to do is look around today, anyone who has been familiar with this, just mention the cooperage industry of this Province. Years ago many, many men found employment in the woods cutting logs, making boxes and barrels and what have you, all associated with the fishing industry. Today this is all going out by paper carton. We happen to be over there in the salt business. All that is being used now as containers are plastic bags from Montreal. Then you have, anyone who has been associated - look around the stores years ago there was a large industry in time, tin ware industry of this Province, buckets, galvanized buckets and this sort of thing. If you go into a store today all you see is plastic, plastic products are replacing a lot of the products that years ago were made in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Cluttering up the countryside.

MR. DAWE: But, Mr. Speaker, I have no constructive solution to make. But I would like to share with all the members of this House the concern of the members, and the constituents of my district that employment



MR. DAWE:

is a very serious matter. And I do trust, as I say, the Minister of Finance and the government who are the leaders of this Province today will be able to bring forth some measures in the next month or two so that, at least, some confidence can be re-established with these people. They are getting desperate. A lot of them now realize that their unemployment benefits are just about run out or are running out and they have nothing to look forward to this Summer.

So I do trust, Sir, that this petition will be received by this government in the spirit in which it is brought forward and we look forward to some constructive measures in the months ahead.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

o o o

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Before we go to Question Period maybe we should do the Late Show?

MR. SPEAKER: Before we do that I should announce the three measures, the subject matters which will be debated at 5:30, and they are in the order in which I read them, (1) Notice given by the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Finance, the subject matter-the provision of a detailed budget of Memorial University to the House of Assembly. (2) Notice given by the hon. member from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, dealing with the Carbonear water construction, completion thereof. The third item, notice given by the hon. member from Baie Verte-White Bay arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Health, the subject matter-appointment of issuers of marriage licences in the Province.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to ask the question about the seal hunt, but in the absence of the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Fisheries, I will have to forebear, so let me ask one of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Sir. Would he be good enough please to tell the House why he approved the rent increases at Stephenville, which were subject to comment on a petition, at Labrador City and at Marystown?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me that question. Number one, to make the point relatively clear, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has the authority to increase rents to recover operating costs. In 1975 they requested of the government, or they were about to increase rents, at that point in time the government disallowed the rent

MR. DINN:

increase, or requested that they not increase the rents.

Subsequently in 1976 they made another application.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: An election year.

MR. DINN: Subsequently in 1976 they made another request, At that point in time the government turned them down, and made a request of them to provide -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - the operating costs, as they had an obligation to charge rents to recover operating costs. Subsequently they did that and government then gave them the authority, or gave them the approval to increase the rents which under the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Act they do not really require, but they came to government at that point in time and we gave approval of that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister did not answer my question. But I wonder if he would answer this one, Sir. Was the minister informed in advance of the rent increases in Stephenville, Marystown and Labrador City, and when I say 'in advance' - Labrador City, maybe Labrador West, I am not just sure where the units - there are units in Labrador City. I was just looking the other day - when I say 'in advance' I mean in advance of the announcement or the communication of the tenants of the decision to increase the rents?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: What action did the minister take then with respect to the advanced information which he was given?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as I had previously said I requested the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to provide me with the detailed statistics with regards to the past and 1976 as to their operating revenues and operating costs.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: When was the minister informed, and I will ask, if I might, a second supplementary at the same time, Sir. Will the minister agree to allow these figures to be examined by a select committee of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: Why not?

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. minister tell the House if it is correct that the hon. minister told the tenants in the Harmon Corporation in Stephenville either to accept the 35 per cent to 40 per cent increase or get out? Is that a correct statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as I previously said, I said many things at that meeting. One of the things I said at the meeting was that if there were people out there suffering financial hardship if they would make a request to me or to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation I would endeavour to get some assistance for them by way of rent subsidy.

MR. DINN: I did actually say at the meeting that they had other options and one of the other options was if they were unhappy in the accommodations, which some of them said they were, then they had the option to leave.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the original question. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Would the minister tell the House if he has any figures to show just how many people who live in the apartments are employees of the linerboard mill in Stephenville, and how many people are undergoing hardship because of this thirty-five to forty per cent or will undergo hardship because of this thirty-five to forty per cent increase in rent? Does the minister have any figures in front of him?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the exact figures as to how many people are out there working in the Labrador Linerboard mill. I think it is of the order, and I am subject to looking into the detail, of 200 of the 487 I believe.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. member for Conception Bay South for one final supplementary and then I will recognize all members with other subjects.

MR. NOLAN: All right. It is just one final supplementary. What, if anything, does the minister plan to do now regarding this situation, and if they have to apply for a subsidy will it apply only to those who are working at the linerboard mill?

All will be - I would think the same opening was granted to all tenants of the corporation, is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. The exact thing that I said to them out there was that anyone in the Harmon Complex, in the rental accommodations, who are having financial difficulty and who would make an application to me, I would endeavour to look

MR. DINN: for assistance from the Federal-Provincial Rent Subsidy Scale Programme to get them under that and if not we would attempt to do something ourselves.

AN HON. MEMBER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that I would not hear any other supplementaries now, but that does not mean that later on there may not be an opportunity because I presume other members have other subjects.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Would the minister indicate what the department's -

MR. ROBERTS: It is 'Jerry's' day in the barrel.

MR. SIMMONS: He has a lot of days in the barrel. Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate what his department's policy is now, the government's policy, with respect to the incorporation of small communities. There has been a freeze on it for some time. Communities like Grey River, St. Joseph's, St. Veronica's are desperately wanting a mechanism and is the minister going to allow that mechanism to be set up now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at all requests for incorporation at this point in time. We have, indeed I have certified one community to this point in time.

MR. SIMMONS: Buchans you mean?

MR. DINN: No, no, not Buchans.

MR. SIMMONS: Can the minister indicate the community?

MR. DINN: No, the Community Council of, I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I am subject to correction again, Brig Bay. I am looking at others and if they meet the criteria as set up with respect to the Community Councils Act then we will have a serious look at that and hopefully get on with the incorporation.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary - the original questioner.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Royal Commission, the Whelan Commission, was it? Yes. The Whelan Commission recommended against the incorporation of small communities. Is the minister saying in effect that the department is not accepting that recommendation - and I do not advocate it does, either - and that it is allowing the incorporation of small communities, all things being equal? But what I really want to get at, I guess, my question, Mr. Speaker, and I will put it before the minister answers, if I may. Are there any very strigent terms of reference other than the normal requirements for the incorporation of small communities? And to say it yet one other way, could a community like Grey River, for example, if they meet the basic requirements under the act could they expect to get permission to incorporate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not particularly aware of the Grey River application.

MR. SIMMONS: No, there is no application.

MR. DINN: So they do not have an application in. It is a hypothetical question and so until they meet the requirements of the Community Councils Act to get set up

MR. DINN: then, you know, I could not comment on it.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. SIMMONS: I am not interested in playing games with this.

My Grey River example was an example. It was not a hypothetical question at all. I put it as an example. What I am really asking, and I would like a clear answer if we could have it, is whether there is in any way a partial freeze or any kind of a freeze on incorporation of small communities now, or if we are back to square one, if you like, where we were about three years ago, where communities can apply and given that they meet their various requirements they are going to get approval. The application is not going to be frowned on or discouraged by virtue of the fact that it is a small community of itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, if small communities make applications and meet all of the requirements of the Community Councils Act with respect to getting the numbers of people out to meetings, meeting the fifty plus one requirement, voting in favour of, etc., then they will make their voice known to me through the appropriate channels and then, under section five I believe, the minister may issue a certificate of incorporation.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister was doing great until

he got to the last sentence where he said 'the minister may'

I wonder would the minister indicate to the House, without qualification if he could, whether the freeze has been lifted that was clamped on incorporation of small communities some years ago, for the freeze has indeed been lifted. I have communities in my district which very much want to make application. They do not want to go through a futile exercise. They want to get incorporated and can I



MR. SIMMONS: indicate to them that it is now the department's policy that there is no freeze on the incorporation of small communities?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there is no freeze with respect to incorporation of community councils other than the freeze that the minister may sign a certificate which also indicates that he may not if, for example, they do not meet his requirements.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementar. A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I presume everybody is standing on supplementaries. I will hear one additional one from the original questioner, then some additional ones, The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan).

I will hear the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate what requirements under his freeze, the minister's freeze which he just made reference to, what requirements might preclude a community from being incorporated. I believe, Mr. Speaker, as a preamble: This is an important question because communities do not want to go through a futile exercise, and could the minister indicate what conditions under the terms of his, the minister's freeze, what conditions communities might have to satisfy to get incorporated other than those laid down in legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is almost an impossible question to answer but just to give an example; for example, the area known as Airport Heights, for example, I would not approve as a community council because under the Henley Commission Report - we are going through that - it has made recommendations. It does not recommend that Airport Heights be a community council. We also have the Whelan Royal Commission Report that we are going through right now, where there are circumstances that indicate to me that they

MR. DINN: do not conform to the Henley or Whelan, which we have not accepted or rejected yet, then that as an example would be a place where we would not incorporate as a community council.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) rising on a supplementary? One supplementary from the hon. member for LaPoile, one from the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and then other hon. members on other subjects.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that Burnt Islands, in the electoral district of LaPoile, have met all their requirements of the law. They have had their meetings. They presented a petition to the minister. They have fifty plus one, I think they probably have sixty-five per cent of the eligible voters voting in favour of the town council; could the minister tell the House what is holding up their certificate of incorporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) today, hopefully it will be one of our success stories with regards to incorporation as a town council.

MR. NEARY: When?

MR. DINN: As soon as is humanly possible under the conditions we are working now.

MR. NEARY: Tomorrow?

MR. DINN: Not tomorrow. As the hon. member well knows, Mr. Speaker, it has to be approved by an Order-in-Council and I just have not had the opportunity to get around to getting the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

etc. and I have not -

MR. NEARY: It is on the list.

MR. DINN: It is on the list.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize the hon. member for Eagle River on a supplementary and then other hon. members on other subjects.

MR. STRACHAN: The minister indicated that he had incorporated the community of Brigg Bay and that other communities would be incorporated. The community of Rigolet and Charlottetown on the Labrador Coast have had their incorporation papers in for two years and everything has been met. But in Rigolet they have ninety-three per cent of the people, ninety-three per cent of the people wish a community council and it has been rejected totally for the last two years. If he is prepared to incorporate one community, can he now say that he is prepared to incorporate these two communities now who so desire it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am not fully conversant with the actual number of people that voted for incorporation up in Rigolet with respect to community council. But there are several communities that are on the drawing board now, shall we say, and we are hoping to get some of these communities incorporated. But I cannot make a definite statement about Rigolet or any other specific one right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South followed by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. And I do not expect an accurate answer necessarily on this now because I did not give the minister notice of it and I should, in my opinion. But the question is really one of information and that is, with the number of notices and papers in St. John's and

MR. NOLAN:

other places about default on mortgages and houses up for sale, I am wondering if the minister could endeavour to find out for us, is the mortgage default ratio higher in Newfoundland then, say, any other province in Canada or in the Atlantic area? And how serious is the situation right now that the minister may be aware of whereby he could enlighten the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information, obviously, available to me right now. But I will endeavour to get it for the hon. member.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. minister then tell the House if Metro Engineering that is putting in water and sewerage in Pouch Cove and Torbay, if the bond holders have been called in to rescue the operation that there has been a number of complaints -

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is getting up on a supplementary which had to do with the rate of default on mortgages in the Province. And his supplementary as I understand it to date has to do with a water and sewer project in Pouch Cove by a certain contractor. And I fail to see the relevance between default on mortgage payments and a job in Pouch Cove on water and sewer, hence I would suggest that the supplementary is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the extent that I heard the question I am not aware of the relationship. I have not heard the whole question and it may well be that the next part would have shown a relationship.

MR. SPEAKER:

That I do not know. But I would suggest the hon. member continue with his question and then we will proceed.

MR. NEARY: Well I am asking the minister, Sir, if there are any complaints or investigations going on in connection with the installation of water and sewerage in Pouch Cove and Torbay by Metro Engineering?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult question to answer - are there any complaints? When a water and sewer system is being installed there are complaints from all over when -

MR. NEARY: Is it being investigated by the officials of your department?

MR. DINN: If that is the specific question, Mr. Speaker, then the answer is no, it is not being investigated.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. In the financial statement which he gave the Harmon tenants, he mentioned \$116,992 for administration costs. Are these administration costs for the Harmon complex or are they administration costs for the whole West Coast?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I will have to look that up. \$116 thousand -

MR. HODDER: \$992.

MR. DINN: For a year?

MR. HODDER: That was in the statement.

MR. DINN: I would assume that it is for the people working out at Harmon in Stephenville.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: If it is for the people working out of Harmon, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HODDER:

how are their salaries divided since they also administer Harmon and administer, say, the district of Port au Port right up, and St. Georges, and all the other districts? How was the salary split to make this administration cost \$116,992?

MR. ROBERTS: Why should the Harmon tenants pay it all?

MR. HODDER: That is another one.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: As I said,

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I assume that it was for the people, for the group of people working out there. If the hon. member would like for me to look into it for him.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. HODDER: Would the minister explain why the financial statement which was given to the Harmon Tenants' Association showed a deficit in operating costs on that particular financial sheet, which was the reason for raising the rents, but yet the minister cannot tell me whether the administration costs which are \$116,992 are for the whole of the West Coast or for Harmon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: What sort of a financial statement? Could the minister enlighten me on this, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon minister.

MR. DINN: I already said, Mr. Speaker, that I would look into it for the hon. member and get more detail for him if he wishes and provide it to him.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the Leader of the Opposition for a supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: My supplementary grows out of the minister's answer. Could he tell us what other units throughout the Province are going to have these rent increases applied to them?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as I said to the hon. Leader of the Opposition earlier today Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has the authority to increase rents to recover operating costs and if they wish to do so -

MR. ROBERTS: It does not answer the question.

MR. DINN: they do not have to inform me.

MR. ROBERTS: Answer the question.

MR. DINN: And if they are courteous enough to do so then I will inform the hon. member.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, can the minister - you know he is dodging his responsibility - but can he tell us whether he has been informed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation of their intention - forget whether they are seeking permission or not - of their intention to apply rent increases to any areas aside or in addition to Marystown, Labrador City, in the district of Menihek and the Harmon Corporation?

MR. DINN: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Not to his knowledge, you know what you have been told.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question for the Minister Housing. In his answering one of the original questions he indicated that if there was financial suffering, if he was aware of financial hardship being suffered by the tenants of Newfoundland Labrador Housing in Stephenville that he would recommend consideration. Now does that apply to tenants of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing anywhere in Newfoundland that are suffering financial hardships?

MR. RIDEOUT: A good question.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in a lot of areas in Newfoundland where Newfoundland and Labrador Housing have subsidized rental accommodations they are under that programme now. But what I did say to the people out in the Harmon Corporation was



MR. DINN: that I would attempt to get those people who are having financial hardship under that programme.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. McNEIL: Could the hon. minister indicate the financial salary that you would be setting assistance on? Like what salary would the person get financial assistance from your department? Would it be \$5,000, \$10,000?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: It is a rent subsidy scale that the federal-provincial government has and it would be under that scale. And it goes up to something like, I believe, \$8,500 or \$9,000.

MR. ROBERTS: The whole rental scale.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. CALLAN: This is also for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could the minister inform the House how many incinerators were manufactured in this Province last year? These are the burning garbage incinerators.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have listened very quietly to the questions today and I have for the last number of weeks and I think that the hon. member now, like several of the hon members, is straying to the very specific, technical kinds of questions which are certainly not within the Standing Orders of our House to be relevant. They should be put on the Order Paper.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: It is entirely a function of the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, order!

MR. ROBERTS: It is entirely a function of the Chair as I understand, Sir, to rule whether a particular question is

MR. ROBERTS:

in order under the Standing Orders. And more importantly, because Standing Orders, of course, are but broad statements of principle, whether the particular question falls under the rubric of the various precedents that have been developed. An hon. member may, as the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls has, raise a point of order as to whether a specific question is in order. But, Sir, I would submit that somewhat irregular because the Standing Orders say quite specifically that the minister is not required to answer a question. So if a minister feels, as perhaps the hon. gentleman from Pleasantville does, that he does not have the information to answer a question then he should surely just stand and say "Mr. Speaker, I do not have that answer, but I will get the information or I will take it as notice" or whatever the answer is. But this

MR.ROBERTS: Is one of the few cases, Sir, to my understanding of the situation, where the interposition of the Chair does not await a point of order. Some others are a flagrant breach of privilege or a flagrant breach of the rules of debate, but generally the Chair's initiative awaits the entrance into the debate of an hon. gentleman to raise a point of order. On the question of Questions, if the Speaker allows a question to be put then surely it is proper for it to be put and the minister may or may not answer, a right specifically reserved to him under the Standing Orders of this House.

MR.SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR.LUNDRIGAN: On that point of order. Perhaps we have two points of order, or one if ruled on might eliminate the second one. My point of Order was the fact that according to my understanding of the rules the hon. gentleman is asking a question which is a very specific statistical kind of question which is the reason for the Order Paper. That was the reason for my point of Order. The Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that a member does not have the right to make a point of order that it should be conditional upon the interjection of Your Honour. I am of the opinion from watching Your Honour's excellent performance over a period of months and so on, Your Honour, that Your Honour expects hon. members to raise a point of order should there be a consideration along these lines.

MR.SPEAKER: The point of order I think has been well canvassed and very helpful views presented for the Chair's consideration. The basic point of order was whether the question was, in fact, in order because of this nature. As I recall the question it was the number of incinerators dispensed by the department. That became related to another point and a secondary point that there was some difference of opinion whether the hon. member - I do not think the question was whether he had a right to but to whether it was usual. Certainly any hon. member does have a right to draw what he considers to be a breach of order to the Chair's attention.

MR. SPEAKER: The specific Standing Order 31(a) says: "The Speaker shall disallow any question which he does not consider urgent or of public importance." Obviously if the qualification public importance were not there the matter would be quite different. In other words, questioners, hon. members asking questions, are not restricted to questions of urgency but <sup>of</sup> public importance. That, of course, is a quite broad term. It may well be that if rules are ever redrafted, ~~it may be and may not be~~ Hon. members might want to give some consideration to ~~that~~. But it would be very difficult for me to state that it is not, ~~that is not~~ a question of public importance. So, I do not rule it out of order.' I do not think I am in a position to say that it is not a matter of public importance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. minister, if he was going to answer, then I should recognize him before the next questioner.

MR. DINN: If the question is how many incinerators were manufactured, as I understand the question, I have no idea Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A Supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Could the minister indicate how many incinerators were imported in this Province from outside, last year?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea how many incinerators were imported in the Province last year.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile. This will be the last question.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell the House the nature of the complaints in connection with the installation of water and sewerage in Pouch Cove and Torbay, where the complaints originated, the nature of the complaints and so on?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, all I indicated is the hon. member for LaPoile was, whenever there is a water and sewer system put into an area there are complaints.

MR. NEAPY: From where?

MR. DINN: I am not aware of any complaints in Pouch Cove.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! It being 5.30 pm motion to adjourn is deemed to be

MP.SPEAKER: before the Chair. The first matter for debate is the subject matter of Memorial University's provision to the House of Assembly of a detailed budget. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MP.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, after several years of carrying on diplomatic relations with Memorial University

MR. NEARY: to try and persuade, Sir, those in charge of the university to give this House an accounting of their spendings.

I think the time has come, Sir, for a showdown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We have been very fair with the university people, Sir. We have been very reasonable and we have been very flexible so far in this matter, but we have met with complete failure in getting the co-operation of the university on their spending instead of giving them a blank cheque every year. Mr. Speaker, the fact that this House, which provides legislative authority for the university budget, have not been able to get an accounting from the university on how they spend their money \_\_\_\_\_ just goes to show, Sir, how weak and ineffective the House of Assembly really is, and the lack of courage on the part of the members must be a great disappointment to the ordinary people of this province. Those of us, Sir, who occupy seats in this hon. House are supposed to represent the highest authority in this land but, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the majority of us want a detailed accounting of MUN's budget, these educational bureaucrats, Sir, have refused to budge and we keep on year after year assigning millions of dollars to the university on a blank cheque basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we found out what is being done with the funds we provide to Memorial University around this time every year. It is high time for us, Sir, in this House to show the people of this province that we are not a helpless group of individuals caving in every year before the demands of the university for a blank cheque. Before we give them any more money, Sir, they must give us a detailed budget, the same as every other government institution and government agency and Crown corporation does before their budget is approved each year. Mr. Speaker, the argument of invasion of academic

MR. NEARY: freedom is a phony argument, it is a red herring and it no longer has any credibility. We have gone through great pains in this House, Sir, to protect academic freedom of the university, and we are all getting fed up with having this issue trotted out every time we ask for details of procedures, for instance, of purchasing and awarding of contracts for goods and services at the university, salaries paid to administrative staff, travelling expenses and dozens of other items, Mr. Speaker, that have absolutely nothing to do with what is taught at the university.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning we have been very kind and gentle to the university on this matter. We have been most co-operative and agreeable even though the president of the university public showed his contempt for this legislature by going out and telling the public that they would give the details of the budget to the press but they would not give it to the members of the House of Assembly. If they continue to refuse to co-operate with this House, Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest that we ask the Auditor General to assign one of his senior staff to the university to supervise the spending of money that is given to them by this hon. House. Now, Mr. Speaker, this may seem like a drastic measure but in my opinion, Sir, it is the only way to bring the university bureaucrats to their knees and to their senses, and to the realization that all we are doing in this hon. House is our duty to the taxpayers of this province by asking them to give us the information so that we may be able to pass it on to the people of this province, to give us some detail, Sir, of how they spend the taxpayers money over at Memorial University.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. GOODY: Mr. Speaker, I am in a rather difficult position on this particular item because I find myself debating the measure with the hon. member from LaPoile while I sometimes feel that I should be seconding his motion. I quite honestly share his -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: I quite honestly - it does feel that - I share his frustration and as a matter of fact I have been a lot closer to it during the past few years than he has.



Mr. Doody:

There is no question at all about the fact that the administration of the University are reluctant to the point of complete refusal in providing us with the breakdown of items as the hon. member has indicated. We have had during the past several years a budget from the University which has been available to the House in which the administration refers to as a budget, but which in effect is really the estimates of expenditure for the various faculties or divisions or departments of the University, it is not the sort of breakdown that the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is asking for. He, I think, is referring to a specific breakdown, the amount of money that is spend in salaries, the size of the salaries, the numbers of hours that are worked, the numbers of people that are on staff, the numbers of people who are in the various faculties or disciplines, and this information has not been forthcoming and the academic freedom question is the one that is always used as the reason for not bringing it forward. We are told constantly that once we start dictating to the University, how many people that they are to have in the Faculty of Education or the Faculty of Business School or what have you then we are, in effect, telling them what emphasis they should put in what areas and so on, and that is where the breakdown occurs.

The Board of Regents of the University which are partly elected and which are partly appointed by government are supposed to and I would hope do get into the sort of detail in examining the financial affairs of the University that the hon. member alludes to. I sometimes have some reservations about that as well, I am not all that satisfied that they have access to all of the information that I would like to have. But the fact remains that it part of their job.

The allegations of the purchasing and awarding of goods and services, I have recently had occasion to write the University on that particular subject, and I got a very comprehensive reply

Mr. Doody:

from the President who pointed out to me that goods and services are awarded by tender at the University whenever it is possible, and he cited several examples when it had not been done, but in these particular cases the President showed reasons why a particular company was the only company that could perform the particular service that was required. And that the explanation was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: I will certainly have it here in the House when we get into the major estimates on the University, and I can refer to it. I am not sure whether I will table it or not, but I will refer to it.

Another question that I raised with the President recently has been the allegation that the first classed compartments of the airlines are usually full of university professors and the government people and others are all sitting down in the economy section. The President of the University alleges and I believe him that none of these people who travel first class do so at the expense of the University, if they are in first class they are going there because they are being on some committee or working for some foundation, their fare has been paid by an outside agency, and it is not a charge on the University. That is a small detail but it is one which I think should be brought forward because it is a point that has been raised many times.

As to our success in getting a more comprehensive breakdown of the budget this year, we are certainly working on that, we are requesting it, and we are trying to get it. I certainly hope that we do get it, and I am sure the Minister of Education would be a much happier man if he it available during his estimate debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) wishes to debate with the Minister of Municipal Affairs the matter relating to Carbonear water construction.

The hon. member from Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have been informed by the Speaker that there are certain limits to my debate today because of the sub judice rule and I would want the minister to bear that in mind as well that it confines the area on which I would like to debate cannot.

My question to the hon. minister on Tuesday of this week was one that I did not ask for the good of my health, and I would hope that he realizes that, I asked it because of the importance of the matter in relation to the effect that it will have upon the workers, some thirty-five of them, and their families, and the desperate need for water in Carbonear. The question related to the need for the restart of construction on the water main in that community.

MR. R. MOORES: Notwithstanding the reasons why the construction has stopped, the minister, I thought, was quite evasive in answering my question as to when it would restart.

The town of Carbonear, because of the great demands on its water supply by the fish plant, the meal plant, and the new hospital, requested funding from the administration to put in a new water main, increasing the size of the water main from its old eight or nine inches to the present eighteen, which of course in turn increases the volume of water that can be displaced to the town. Last year, due to no fault of the town's, and to no fault of the workers involved, that project had to be stopped.

Now what I would like from the minister today is that he be specific and say that the water main, the restart of the construction, is going to be this month, next month, or not at all, primarily because of the need involved and secondarily because many workers, who had worked on the project last year want re-employment. So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would be kind enough in view of these limited remarks, I would like to be more extensive but cannot be, would you please tell me if you are going to recall tenders? If you can recall tenders? If you can and if you are, when, and when the people of Carbonear and me and the House, can expect a restart of this programme?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point that the hon. member for Carbonear made when he thought that I was being a bit evasive to his question earlier this week, I would assure him that if I could have been more explicit I certainly would have, but as he has been made aware by the Speaker, this is a case that is sub judice right now.

There is approximately fifty-two per cent of the system in Carbonear completed. We have, the Department feels, enough money to complete the project, and we hope to get

MR. DINN: that project completed. We are working towards that end, Mr. Speaker, and bearing in mind also the employment situation that we would like to see something done there. We would certainly like to see the system completed and we are working towards that.

The remainder of the money for the project, Mr. Speaker, is tied up at this point in time.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no quorum in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A quorum call has been requested.

MR. SPEAKER(DR. COLLINS): I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just to conclude, we feel that the department has enough money dollar-wise to complete the project in Carbonear. We are working towards getting that project restarted again and we would like to think that it would be completed this year, but as I said before we at this point and time are not in control of the funds. As I said, writs have been issued and we are attempting to clear up the situation and hopefully, as I said, the department and government and I am sure everybody is hoping that the Carbonear water project will be completed in 1977.

MR. SPEAKER(DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay wishes to debate with the Minister of Health the appointment of the issuance of marriage licenses in the province.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I asked the Minister of Health what procedures were used by him and his officials to appoint issuers of marriage licenses in the province. Now the minister's answer to my questions at that time, Sir, to say the least were unsatisfactory because they left more questions dangling around in the air than he actually answered. Issuers of marriage licenses were originally appointed, or some issuers of marriage licenses were originally appointed all across this province in 1975. The act then of course was under the administration of what is now the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment. The act was later, as I understand, transferred from that department to the Minister of Health and of course, Sir, it was then that the problems began for those who had originally been appointed.

There was a letter sent out from the Registrar of Vital Statistics saying that in early 1975 - this was sent to

MR. RIDEOUT: people who had been appointed." In early 1975 you are advised that you had been appointed as a marriage licenser." Now, Sir, that says you are advised that you had been appointed. And the minister tried to squirm around that in the questions the other day saying that they technically were not appointed, but the letter says that they had been appointed. It goes on to say that the act had been transferred and that there had been a delay in setting up the act, in setting up the administration and so on, and that the act had undergone review and some legislative changes, as indeed it did, I believe, during the last session of the House. So that those people who had been appointed were asked to send back their material and the forms that had been sent out to them.

Now, Sir, the question is, why were not all those who had been originally appointed in 1975 asked to send back their material? Some of them were asked, I know that, but I also know that some of them were not asked. Some of them told me themselves, who were appointed originally and who were reappointed last fall, that they had not been asked to send back any of their material. I had correspondence with the minister on this late last fall, and the minister told me that some people were given the understanding that they had been appointed but it was incorrect. Well, Sir, the letter from Mr. Dewey that went out last fall does not say anything about a misunderstanding. It says that indeed they had been appointed.

MR. DOODY: Mr. who?

MR. RIDEOUT: Not Doody, no. The man down in the Registrar of Vital Statistics.

MR. DOODY: I just wanted to make sure the member was not blaming it on me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Common law now so you do not need them any more.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, common law. So those people, Sir, were sent

MR. RIDEOUT: their licenses, they were sent all, the licenses that they were about to issue, they were sent all the credentials. The minister knows that. So it is no good of the minister saying other than that. Now the minister said that magistrates and clergymen had been consulted in the appointment of those people, the issuers of marriage licenses, they had been asked for recommendations and then in his answer he said others had been consulted. And in fact reading through the Hansard I notice he mentioned some members had been consulted. Well, I for one had not been consulted. I do not know of any other people on this side of the House had been consulted. I assume that only government members were consulted. And when the minister said others, what others did he mean? Did the minister mean members on the government side as well as defeated Tory candidates? Were those people consulted? I would assume so. They are indeed others, whether they are vital and alive or not is something else.

My understanding, Sir, is that all those who were appointed, originally appointed in 1975 were appointed on the recommendation of magistrates and clergymen. My question to the minister is what was wrong with those people? Were they not good enough for the Minister of Health? They were good enough to be recommended and appointed and sent out marriage licenses and so on by the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment. What was wrong with those original people? Why were some of them reappointed in 1976 when the minister took over? Why were not all of them reappointed? That is the question, Sir. That is the obvious question. The obvious answer may be that those reappointments



MR. RIDEOUT: came after the election of 1975, and that some of those original appointees had in that time, fortunately or unfortunately, depending on the system we live in, showed their political colours. Now that is the principle that is involved, Sir. I have nothing against the people who have recently been appointed. As far as I am concerned they will probably do a good job. But the principle is that people had originally been appointed, they had been sent the licences, they had been sent all the credentials and then the rug was hauled right out from under their feet and the minister went to work and appointed more people on the recommendation of people other than magistrates and other than clergymen.

That is the question that I want to ask and that is the question that a lot of people, not only in my district but in a number of districts from talking to my colleagues, have been asking their members.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Gushue family law study, which was commissioned by the past administration, and the report was received by the past administration — I do not know how many years they had it in their possession — one of the recommendations which was made in that study, based on suggestions from the various denominations in Newfoundland, was that it was time for us to introduce a marriage licence system in the Province whereby people purporting to be married would go to an independent marriage licence issuer, obtain a licence before approaching a clergy man to be married.

In 1974 this government, a great government of reform, brought a bill before this House and the bill was passed, the Solemnization of Marriage Act, which eventually became law. The Department of Provincial Affairs, as we knew it then, was

MR. H. COLLINS: responsible for the implementation of the act and supervision of the act.

That department contacted various magistrates possibly all of the magistrates, I really do not know\_ across the Province, asking for recommendations of people who might be considered suitable for appointment as marriage licence issuers in the various communities across the Province. Other people were contacted. There was discussion with clergymen. There was discussion with people I suppose of all walks of life. I do not recall saying a couple of days ago that members were consulted. But I can say that on that side of this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, a lot of suggestions were made.

Anyway, to carry on with what happened, shortly after the bill was passed we were about to proclaim the act when the licencers were put in place. I received, as Minister of Health-and I do not know why that was at that particular time, possibly because of the Vital Statistics Division\_ there was some indication that this should be in the Department of Health, and the government then through Order-in-Council transferred the responsibility for administration of the act to the Department of Health. Subsequent to that I received a request from all of the - yes, I am pretty sure\_ all of the denominations in Newfoundland that they had some reservations about some sections of the act. And one of the first things I did when I moved to that department was to convene several meetings with the various denominations, individually and later collectively, until we ironed out what they thought and what we thought should appear in the act and of course an amendment had to be brought in. That amendment was brought in in the last session, last year.

After that was done, to the satisfaction of all of the people involved, we went about selecting marriage licence issuers. In the meantime, in the Department of Provincial Affairs some people apparently had been sent kits and had been appointed by whoever, I do not know who it was, had been appointed as marriage

MR. H. COLLINS: licence issuers. But not properly appointed, Mr. Speaker, because the appointment requires the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and maybe this is where the confusion arose. Anyway, when we went about the business of getting the issuers in place, and we were looking at the need for about 300, 350 people, we approached the magistrates again and we obtained some lists,

Mr. H. Collins:

and there was never any indication to the magistrate that his recommendation was going to be accepted. I am sure the magistrates were too sensible to suggest to a person who they might have approached that they were going to be appointed. When all of those names were put together, Mr. Speaker, and we looked at the representation, and we had to look at the representation in terms of the, to some extent, religions in the community, the geographic representation and so on and so forth, we came up with all of this and took it to the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, had it all done properly and so on, and then the people were notified.

Mr. Speaker, I have never had one complaint, not a single, solitary complaint from a single clergyman in this Province, I have never had a complaint from anybody who have gone to a marriage licence issuer to obtain a licence before they were married. Now, Mr. Speaker, that tells me that the whole system is working pretty well, and I think that the people who have put in place these marriage licence issuers, certainly the selection was wise, and we have nothing to be ashamed of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A motion to adjourn is now deemed to be before the House. Those in favour of the motion say "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBER: "Aye".

MR. SPEAKER: Those contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Nayes" have it.

I do now leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1977

The House resumed at 8:00.

Mr. Speaker, in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Revert to petitions.

ooo

MR. HICKMAN: Order 2.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The Committee is considering the Resolution brought in by the Minister of Finance.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The first thing I want to do, Sir, is dispose of this letter that I received the other day, special delivery, from Mr. Andy Davidson. I would like to table this letter, Sir, and so doing again reiterate the necessity for a public inquiry into this whole Scrivener affair. This is just further evidence, Sir, of the need for an inquiry and, Mr. Chairman, as the Premier rose to the occasion the other day on this silly matter of coloured televisions rather quickly, I would hope that the hon. the Premier, for the sake of the hon. Premier's own reputation and the reputation of the administration and the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland, that the hon. the Premier, would move swiftly, as he did in the case of the silly television affair, to get this whole matter of the Scrivener situation straightened out.

The Minister of Public Works, Mr. Chairman, has told us, Public Works and Services, told us a couple of weeks ago that he will table all the documents in connection with the construction of the Health Sciences Complex and Carbonear hospital. Well, Sir, to help the minister make his presentation complete I have already tabled the receipt on Progressive Conservative stationery, dated July 14, 1973, signed by Mr. Richard Greene, acknowledging on behalf of Scrivener Projects (Newfoundland) Limited the sum of

MR. NEARY: \$52,600 representing contributions to the PC Party for the year 1972. Nothing illegal about that, Sir, it is perfectly straightforward and above board. Mr. Chairman I have good reason to believe that up to the end of the year 1972, Scrivener Products had contributed much more than \$52,600 to the Conservative Party, Therefore Sir, rather than the minister merely outlining the history of these two projects and tabling contracts and documents that were eventually signed by the Scrivener people - that are already public information anyway - perhaps the minister would enlighten the House on the period between 1971 and 1972 general elections in Newfoundland, when Scrivener Project manager was requested by the PC Party moneybag to approach sub-contractors and professionals involved in the Health Sciences Project to solicit campaign contributions to the Conservative Party, and even after the 1972 election, Mr. Chairman, Scrivener Projects Limited made further political contributions to the Conservative Party by transmitting company monies and cheques to the party bagman at the request of Mr. Greene.

And during the entire period, Mr. Chairman, indeed we are told until 1973, Scrivener Projects continued its work on the Health Sciences Complex without any final fee arrangement. In fact, the profits to be made by Scrivener on this project depended upon the will of the government. It is interesting to note also, Mr. Speaker, that on April 18, 1972 Scrivener submitted the Carbonear Hospital proposal and a proposal for building the hospital at Twillingate. At the same time these negotiations were going on, Sir, another cheque, if I can find it, another cheque was drawn upon the - Yes, here it is, Sir, exhibit three - another cheque was drawn, or prepared,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the money was ever drawn down, April 25,1972, payable to the United Trust - that is the Conservative Party trust fund—in the amount of \$50,000. I would like to lay this on the table of the House, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, this House has spent a great deal of time over a relatively small matter, the purchase of the colour television sets and ended up by authorizing a judicial enquiry into



MR. NEARY: the spending of a few hundred dollars. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to this House that it would be much more in the interest, in the cause of good government and the people of this Province if we were to take immediate action and at least appoint a judicial enquiry into all matters concerned with the mysterious financial transactions connected with the prolonged construction of the medical Health Sciences Complex and the doubling of the cost of the Carbonear Hospital.

The people of this Province, Mr. Chairman, will never be content while there is a single question in their minds concerning this matter and it is up to us, Sir, to put their minds at ease as quickly as possible. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is enough about that particular situation at the moment.

Sir, the Minister of Finance now came in the other day and asked this House to approve Interim Supply in the amount OF \$160 million and the minister, Sir, just merely gave us a brief, simple explanation of why the minister was asking for such a large amount of money to tie the government over for the next couple of months until they bring the budget down.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the Minister of Finance is obligated, it is incumbent upon the minister to give us at least some indication during this debate on Interim Supply on what immediate action, Sir, the government is contemplating to deal with matters that fall within provincial jurisdiction, to come to grips with the problems of inflation, massive unemployment and low productivity in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, back in the depression years a very cynical politician, who at that time belonged to the CCF, stated that the people in the midst of the depression were so desperate that they did not expect their politicians to do anything for them. They merely expected them to promise to do things without any real

MR. NEARY: hope that anything would be done. Well, Sir, to allay such fears now in the minds of our people, the unemployed, the construction workers, the construction industry that is in such a state of uncertainty and so that we will not drive the gloom any deeper into the hearts of our people who are struggling to try and cope with the cost of living, and who are looking for jobs, especially our young people, in these dark and troublesome times, Mr. Chairman, let the government show the people of this Province that they do have plans, that they can cope and that they have every intention of producing a plan to fulfill all the promises and the implications of things that they told us that were going to be done by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, we hear the Premier, and hon. members of the administration echoing the Premier's sentiments, preaching about rising expectations, and why our people should not look forward to too much. They have to make sacrifices. The people, and Mr. Speaker, these very people who are preaching about rising expectations are those who do not need any more anyway.

PREMIER MOORES: Their expectations and Trudeau's differ.

MR. NEARY: Not, Trudeau, no Sir, that -

PREMIER MOORES: Trudeau said it first.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Trudeau did not say it first. I can tell the hon. gentleman who said it.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time, as it was indicated in the House this afternoon, we have 65,000 Newfoundlanders who are registered with Canada Manpower looking for employment. And we are told by the administration, by the Minister of Social Services, that he has removed 5,000 welfare recipients from his rolls by securing employment for them, by arranging jobs for them.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether this is not some sort of a day dream cooked up by well intentioned individuals

MR. NEARY: in the Department of Social Services who wish to cheer their minister and the members of the Cabinet. And why do I suspect that, Sir? Well, Mr. Chairman, a check with Statistics Canada shows that in 1972 the total dollar value of unemployment insurance claims in this Province came to \$70.5 million. In 1975, only three years later, the dollar benefits amounted to \$159 million, over \$159 million, more than double the amount, Sir, in less than three years. And what happened to the numbers, Mr. Speaker? In 1972, Sir, 74,000 claims for unemployment insurance benefits were made. And in 1975 this had gone up to 90,175 claims, more than 15,000 additional claims, and yet over the same period the Department of Social Services pretends to have found 5,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious where the 5,000 people went who were taken off welfare. They were simply transferred to the unemployment insurance rolls.

MR. ROBERTS: That was the whole make-work programme.

MR. NEAPY: That is right, Sir, that is the make-work programme they have down in the Department of Social Services. So, Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning the other day when I commenced my few remarks that I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, that we should not waste too much more time on Interim Supply. Let the bill go through. We have asked the minister, we have invited the minister to give us a statement of policy, a statement of the government's intentions to try and assure our people that the worst is over and that the worst is not yet to come. But I am afraid, Sir, that the worst is yet to come as far as the cost of living, inflation and unemployment is concerned. Let the minister make a statement tonight in this hon. House before we pass this Interim Supply Bill and then we can go on and wait for a detailed examination of the estimates when the budget is brought down.

Even if we do pass Interim Supply, Sir, after we get a satisfactory statement of policy from either the Premier, the head of the administration, or the Minister of Finance, as soon as we get that then let the minister bring down the budget posthaste, not delay it any longer, Sir. The excuse that we have, the minister has to wait for the report of the Advisory Board on the Linerboard Mill, is not satisfactory, Mr. Chairman. The minister has high-priced people in his department, brought in there by John Crosbie from the university, and if they cannot, Sir, tell the minister how to bring down a budget and adjust the figures later on or drop them altogether, if the administration is going to close the Linerboard Mill or if they are going to reduce the subsidies, adjust the figures, or if they are going to sell the Linerboard Mill they can adjust the figures, if these academics that were brought into the department cannot advise the minister and tell the minister how to bring down a budget, then I would suggest they be sent back where they came from, back to a little further down the Parkway here.

MR. ROBERTS: Well they would still live on the public chest.

MR. NEARY: Well they would still be, as my hon. friend says, Sir, they

MR. NEAPY:

would still be feeding at the public trough. But, Sir, let the minister now, Sir, get up and give us some indication of what plans the government have at this moment to cope with the three major problems that we have in this Province at the present time: Number one, inflation; Number two, record unemployment; and number three, low productivity.

MR. J. CARTER: Number four, you.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Chairman, the unsavoury gentleman is back in his seat again tonight. So, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the strategy of going over the estimates with a fine-toothed comb when the main budget is brought down. But I am not satisfied, Sir, and I do not believe any member on this side or on that side of the House are satisfied with the minister's explanation for this \$160 million. So let us hear it. Let us hear what plans the government have to deal with the problems that we have in this Province at the present time. That is about all I have to say at this point, Sir, and I will just wait and see what the spokesman for the administration has to say.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member would be happy to say more.

MR. NEAPY: I could, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, I am still somewhat aghast, as I always am, at the tremendous oratorical and histrionic displays of my very close friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). His invitation for me to explain to the House how to cure the unemployment and inflationary problems of the country I have to admit is beyond me. I do not have it within my power. The inflation and unemployment problems of the country are governed and controlled by the fiscal weapons that are in the hands of the Government of Canada. And hopefully tonight, Sir -

MR. NEAPY: We are talking about matters that -

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, with great restraint I contained myself while the animated larynx continued into his great oratorical flights and I would ask him to please -

MR. NEARY: Do your work now.

MR. DOODY: I will try that but you are provoking me, you see.

MR. ROBERTS: What did the minister bring the Government of Canada into this for?

MR. DOODY: So I would hope, Mr. Chairman, tonight when Mr. MacDonald brings down his budget and takes this \$1 billion that he has collected from the Provinces through his new fiscal arrangements policy, he will use that \$1 billion, or at least a substantial part of it, to stimulate the economy and the disadvantaged parts of the country. And there is no more disadvantaged part of Canada than

Mr. Doody:

the Province of Newfoundland. And I would sincerely hope that tonight we hear that several hundreds of millions of dollars have been made available to provide permanent jobs here in this Province because this policy of the Canadian Government, whatever its political stripe, of having one broad brush policy fiscally and economically from British Columbia to Newfoundland is obviously unworkable, unmanageable, ineffectual, and it just is complete nonsense.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. DOODY: Certainly, anytime.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, my question grows out of the minister's statement, and by the way I do not disagree with this broad brush policy. I mean, Procrustes' bed was a very uncomfortable one in which to sleep, and the problems of Ontario are not the problems of this Province. I only wish that we had the problems of Ontario to try to cope with.

But what I am wondering; the minister alluded to the \$1 billion that has been, I think, he used the word "saved" or perhaps he used another word. That is presumably the difference between what Ottawa would have to pay under the old shared-cost programmes in respect of Medicare, hospital insurance and post-secondary education. I think these were the three that were involved.

My question, Sir, is this; How much are we going to be getting this coming year - I do not think I am probing for any budget secrets, it will be in tonight's budget doubtless in Ottawa - but how much are we getting or will we be getting and what is the estimate this coming year under the new formula which as I understand gives us a number of equalized tax points? How much will we be getting under that formula compared to what would we have got under the old - well, they varied - but the three formulas, the one in respect of Medicare, there was a different one in respect to hospital insurance, and there was still a third one in respect to the cost of post-secondary education. The minister is looking through his file, I hope he has it. It is a question that I have been trying to get answered, I may add, for some

Mr. Roberts:

time, and it is a very valuable one.

MR. DOODY: Yes, we got the same problem in the department.

MR. ROBERTS: Are we - I mean, when the minister was in Ottawa, this was mid-December, I think, when the First Ministers' Conference met and settled the matter, the minister made some press statements, as I recall it to the effect that we might be \$10 million or \$12 million or \$14 million short in this Province in the fiscal year which begins tomorrow because of Ottawa's insistence, and it was Ottawa's insistence to replace the shared-cost with equalized tax points. Could he give us any new information on it, because I think it is an important matter, one which obviously grows out of the present bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I agree with the member from the Straits (Mr. Roberts), it is probably one of the most important -

MR. NEARY: He is not the member from the Straits, but the member for the Straits.

MR. DOODY: Yes, at long last we have something in common.

The \$14 million or \$10 million, \$12 million or \$14 million figure that I had mentioned and kept talking about at that time was the amount of money that we would have lost under the tax revenue guarantee, which was eventually split down the middle, we got a couple of tax points and a cash equivalent -

AN HON. MEMBER: How does the tax point work?

MR. DOODY: An equalized tax point in Newfoundland will work out to about \$3. some, almost \$4 million, and so we have got a tax point and a cash guarantee of a tax point - the tax point will vary of course up and down as the economy does, the cash equivalent will remain constant. The Province of Newfoundland, of course, has always been more interested in cash transfers than in tax points.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, yes (Inaudible)

MR. DOODY: That is right. The more wealthy provinces of Canada are very concerned about having all tax points and no cash



Mr. Doody:

because they have their plant in place, as it were, they have got their hospitals built, their universities built. We have been trying to do in twenty-five or twenty-seven years what the other provinces of Canada, most of them, have had 100 years to do, and the hospital plant and the teaching plant, the educational facilities, the infrastructure, if I may use that word, has all been put in place at a great deal less cost to them in terms of real dollars as opposed to inflated dollars, then it will cost us to try to keep up with them; so this is the dilemma with which we are faced.

And so on that end of it we eventually reached a saw-off and we will probably lose, under the old system - and we are not quite sure; it was an ultimatum eventually which was resolved by a saw off - and we will probably stand to lose several millions of dollars on that end of it. It is quite possible that we may pick up a few million dollars more or less on the new equalization formula that is being evolved, and

MR. DOODY: that is changed now, and I quite honestly am not in a position to explain to the House the new formula because I did not really quite understand the old formula. It is about the most complex piece of mechanism that the bureaucrats have ever managed to put together.

MR. NEARY: Worse than the Income Tax Act.

MR. DOODY: That is right, it is even more complex than the Income Tax or the Anti-inflation Board Regulations.

Anyway, they have put several new components into the equalization formula and our people and people from other provinces have been in constant communication with their counterparts in Ottawa trying to find out exactly what it is going to amount to in dollars. But there seems to be no question among the consensus of the total amount. Ottawa feels that they will be net beneficiaries of something in the nature of \$800 million. I said \$1 billion a little while ago, it sounds much more impressive. I get carried away.

MR. ROBERTS: Probably his estimates show them ahead by \$400 million.

MR. DOODY: Yes, that is their figures. Those are the bureaucrats figures.

MR. ROBERTS: And they show us getting an extra \$42 million under the general rubric of equalization.

MR. DOODY: That is right. And if we had the honour and privilege of getting the financial people from Ontario and from our own in here and listen to that debate, and listen to them explain to each other why these numbers are nonsense - and we will not really know until the end of this year exactly whether they are right. We feel that these numbers are wrong and that our numbers are right and this was demonstrated pretty conclusively

MR. DOODY: by the fact that when the tax revenue guarantee was put into place, Mr. Chairman, four years ago or five years ago, it was put in when they changed the tax laws in Ottawa. The provinces at that time, both Ontario and I think it was Manitoba, ran the numbers through their computers - and they have a much more sophisticated system than we have - and they demonstrated the fact that the provinces were going to lose money, a great deal of money. Ottawa said, Of course you will not lose money, our numbers are correct, but if you have any problems with it we will guarantee you that we will make up any revenue that you will lose.

Well, Your Honour, as it happened these provinces were right. Their numbers were right and Ottawa's were wrong and so they have been paying us money under this tax revenue guarantee thing ever since. But now they have suddenly cut that off. They said the five year period is finished and we are out of it.

MR. ROBERTS: They are still budgeting \$275 million this year.

MR. DOODY: They are budgeting it in there and we are in a constant dilemma. We are not quite sure exactly what our numbers are going to be. We are not even quite sure about the new equalization formula and our fiscal policy people are quite concerned about it and are working on it. Even up to last year when it was pretty well established what the formula was it would vary from month to month and year to year, and that is one of the disadvantages. There are many, many advantages of the Canadian joint federal - provincial fiscal arrangements and I am certainly not condemning them by any means - but the one of the disadvantages is that there are so many variables in there that if one province changes its taxation system,

MR. DOODY: if one province falls down on the job, if the economy slumps in a particular area, if the tax base in a particular province, in one of the twenty-seven components of the formula which makes up the -

MR. ROBERTS: Thirty-seven. Were there not thirty-seven in equalization?

MR. DOODY: No, there were twenty-five and twenty-seven and they have upped it to thirty-two, I think.

MR. ROBERTS: I thought there were thirty-seven in equalization.

MR. DOODY: I do not think there were that many. I have a paper on it, a document which I had intended delivering to the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister like a definition of tax transfer recoveries? I have one here and I will read it if it would interest you.

MR. DOODY: I have read it.

MR. ROBERTS: Could you explain it?

MR. DOODY: No, I cannot explain it. I have read it and I have deliberately left it in the office because I would much rather say that I do not have it with me than try to explain it.

MR. ROBERTS: It is going to cost us \$6 million in tax transfer recovery because of 1/8 of of 13.5 equalized PIT and one equalized CIT points etc.

MR. DOODY: Yes, well the PIT's are personal income tax points, Your Honour, and the CIT's are corporate income tax points. At one point up there in the discussions I was so frustrated that I asked them if they could put them both together and call them Newfoundland income tax points and then we would have a bunch of nits being transferred to the Province. Then, of course, the

MR. DOODY: thing deteriorated from there and the chariman asked me to please try to keep it under some sort of reasonable control.

But in any event, although the jargon and the bureaucrats - the honest answer is that we are not quite sure what the total number is that we are going to get from Ottawa. The figures that we have to work with are the figures that -

MR. ROBERTS: The published figures.

MR. DOODY: Right, the published figures that -

MR. ROBERTS: The published figures in the estimates are \$269 millions.

MR. DOODY: - the hon. the Leader has there. But we and the other provinces feel that these are very suspect numbers and they do not stand up under the scrutiny. There are certain assumptions in economic growth in various provinces and so on in these numbers

MR. DOODY: which are also quite frightening. But in any event the Fiscal Arrangements Act is one that is unique in the world and it is one that Canada has worked out very well and the Province of Newfoundland is fortunate to be part of it. The unfortunate part about it is that during the past several years the discussions that used to take place are no longer discussions, they are really summonses to Ottawa to hear the new edicts and the new laws that have been proclaimed.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the way it used to be when I started fifteen years ago. Ottawa would sort of announce what they were going to do and you could quarrel about it for a day and then they would announce -

MR. DOODY: I see. I thought this was a new departure.

MR. ROBERTS: Only in the Pearson days it really changed.

MR. DOODY: But by and large the Province of Newfoundland would be in a sad state indeed if it were not for the fiscal transfers-or the transfer payments.

Unfortunately the printing press is in Ottawa. The inflationary process and the unemployment problem in the disadvantaged areas in Canada can only be managed in a meaningful long-term way by the infusion of funds or the transfer of funds, or the manipulation of the interest rates by the Bank of Canada in consultation presumably with the federal government. Our options down in this Province, as indeed in all other provinces, are very limited. You can talk as much as you like and with a great deal of justice as hon. members did today about the Province's limited job creating efforts on a short-term basis.

With our limited resources, \$2 million does not sound like a great deal of money for a make-work programme and it has been said that people have been moved from welfare rolls to unemployment insurance rolls. That is the system that has been working in Cape Breton for years and they have not really come to grips with their problem to date as yet either. We have

MR. DOODY: to borrow in this Province, we have to borrow far more money than we should borrow in order to get the capital works going that we had going in this Province some years ago, we would have to borrow more money. The interest rates are such today, the servicing of the debt is such today, that a decision, a choice, a cut-off has got to be made between the amount of money that you borrow and the burden that you are placing on the future Newfoundlanders who have to pay that debt. And that is a problem that we have to deal with and that is a problem that we will deal with and explain when the main estimates come down and the budget is presented.

So, Sir, as much as I would like to answer all the questions and meet all the challenges that were put to me by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am afraid that that is not within my capabilities this evening. I would hope, as I said, for some relief from Mr. MacDonald's budget tonight. If not then we shall have to grapple with it in our own limited way down here in the Province of Newfoundland. But in any event, Sir, the fact remains that we do need this pretty close to \$160 million in Interim Supply to carry us through the next two months. The excuse that the Labrador Linerboard mill is being the reason for the delay of the budget is not an excuse, Your Honour, it is a reason.

The decision on the Labrador Linerboard Limited's future is a huge one in terms of the budgetary problems of the Province, and its impact on current and capital account and the distribution of the two and on the amount of money that has to be allocated and what can be done with it, and I think that for the sake of the next couple of weeks, or the next three weeks, it is far better for us to wait until we get some really sound and logical, reasonable advice before we come in to the House with the main estimates, because as I said earlier the Labrador Linerboard Limited mill is

MR. DOODY: a matter of major importance to the Province, not only to the people of the Bay St. George area but to the whole Province and indeed to the reputation of the Province, and I would hate to be precipitous in making any decisions without the proper advice and so, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Committee to grant us the Interim Supply that we ask in the amount of \$159,650,000. If the Committee wants to go through the various subheads and so on of course I am quite willing, but I do not think that that would be all that constructive. I would, like the hon. members opposite, prefer to wait for the main estimates and get into each of the departments subhead by subhead.

MR. ROBERTS: Is this a new programme?



MR. DOODY: No, that is one of the questions that the hon.- I am sorry, right, right. To the best of my knowledge there are no major new programmes in here. This is strictly housekeeping money, I checked with the various resource departments and so on and I have been told that there are no major new programmes in here which the House is bamboozled into.

MR. ROBERTS: Are there any capital expenditures put in here?

MR. DOODY: No, there are no capital expenditures in here. There are some housekeeping capital works, improvements in public works and so on.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no I do not mind that, Sir.

MR. DOODY: No, there are no, no -

MR. ROBERTS: Nothing on highroads.

MR. DOODY: Nothing on highroads. Highroads - if the hon member would just give me a minute to find Transportation and Communication in here, which is -

MR. ROBERTS: It will always be called highways.

MR. DOODY: \$13 million. Sub 17.

MR. ROBERTS: Personal tax rate, forty-four points down. Forty-four per cent here. Our taxes, forty-three

MR. DOODY: Forty-three.

MR. ROBERTS: Forty-three

MR. DOODY: Forty-three. Rather this new system when they move it back will - although the amount that the public will pay will not be any more it will be fifty-six per cent of the -

MR. ROBERTS: I thought it was forty-four. It went from forty to forty-four did it not?

MR. DOODY: No, I think New Brunswicks' is forty-four, I

MR. DOODY: think ours is forty-three. It is not very far away, it is in this. I can use the other hand to check with this.

MR. CARTER: It was forty-one for last year.

MR. DOODY: It was forty-one was it?

MR. ROBERTS: It was not forty-one.

MR. CARTER: Well that is what they are asking on the tax form.

MR. ROBERTS: I know it if forty-four. It went from forty to forty-four.

MR. CARTER: That is this years.

MR. DOODY: Highways, general administration, motor vehicle registration.

MR. ROBERTS: I know, but as a matter of fact, where is it in here?

MR. DOODY: The hon. minister is at a communications conference somewhere in Edmonton, I think. Somewhere in Western Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: Forty-two per cent effective July 1, 1976.

MR. DOODY: No, there is just ordinary maintenance and ongoing maintenance in the highways bit. There is no new capital projects. So, Sir, with that-and as I say, I am at the disposal of the House to go through them if it is so desired. But I agree that it would be far better if we got into the seventy-five hours later on.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not quarrel with what the Minister of Finance. I think the right and proper place is to - you know, we only have seventy-five hours left. Whatever time we have used in the last day or so on this Interim Supply procedure, and I am not going to debate it because I think whatever time we have ought to be put

MR. DOODY:

to the detailed estimates and every dollar, every penny being voted by the committee now will be recovered, if you wish, or covered again by the main estimates. The other supply bills.

But I just have one question, The minister tells us that there is no money in the bill now before the committee for Transportation and Communications other than their normal ongoing maintenance, snow clearing, road repairs, what have you. And that is fine, I am glad to know that. The paper the last three or four days -

MR. DOODY: They have been calling tenders but they will not be making any payments.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, well that is what I want to know. They have been calling tenders. In other words they will be awarding the tenders, is that it?

MR. DOODY: They will be awarding tenders but they will not be making payments.

MR. ROBERTS: And hope that the House will eventually ratify the -

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Does that extend as well to the DREE agreements?

MR. DOODY: The DREE agreements are the ones that are being called first.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I -

MR. DOODY: Is that not so? That was my impression.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean, I have a particular interest in the DREE agreements because it is, by one of those unusual coincidents, it is about the only money being spent on the Northern Peninsula is DREE money. But I notice there have been DREE contracts called, yes, of course, but I notice also within the past

MR. ROBERTS:

week or so the Minister of Transportation has put in the paper requests for bids on some projects are not DREE projects. I did not note them all down, Sir, I think one was down in Lewisporte district, the road from Boyd's Cove going out towards the Road to the Isles. And there was some in Green Bay district if I am not mistaken. Was there some road work in Green Bay district? There have been four or five tender calls in the paper the last -

MR. DOODY: I got it here in front of me now.

MR. ROBERTS: Alright. And I am just wondering where they are going to get the money to pay for these. Or are they going to -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: They do not pay for the tenders called.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from Grand Falls, Mr. Chairman, should have got his comeuppance this afternoon. I am trying to engage, and the Minister of Finance is in fact engaging in a very serious point with me. And when we are on serious business I would suggest to the gentleman from Grand Falls he stay out of it.

Mr. Roberts:

the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) that he stay out of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point that I am making, the minister will respond to it, is that tenders have been called -

MR. DOODY: There is a total of \$13 million -

MR. ROBERTS: Go ahead, sure.

MR. DOODY: Excuse me, there is a total of \$13 million in the Transportation and Communications Interim Supply vote, and under Highway Construction 1705-07-01, Transportation Development DREE capital there is \$1 million, so presumably that is that share of -

MR. ROBERTS: DREE money.

MR. DOODY: Yes, and 1705-07-02 Improvement and Reconstruction Capital \$400,000; 07-02-03 New Construction Capital zero, and then there is a \$15,000 amount in there for surveys, and 05 is new machinery \$150,000; 06 Guardrail Capital \$20,000, and 07 Replacement of Old Bridges Capital \$200,000.

MR. ROBERTS: So there is really nothing in there to pay -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Tender calls.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have already dealt with the gentleman from Grand Falls.

MR. DOODY: There is 900 -

MR. ROBERTS: There is really nothing -

MR. SIMMONS: He does not know the difference 'Ed'.

MR. DOODY: You will have to excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I have got the copies and the administrators have got the originals, so some of the copies are not - most of the - there is \$5,400,000 in there for highways, in salaries, so that accounts for the major, not the major part of it, but a substantial part of the vote, then there are the expenses, office and so on. The next big one I see here is Summer Maintenance 03-01, \$900,000; Local Roads and Grants to Municipalities \$1.2 million; Winter Maintenance \$850,000; something or other of equipment, I guess it is repairs of equipment or replacement, \$474,700,

Mr. Doody:

and there is a Winter maintenance of equipment, oh yes the other one is a Summer maintenance of equipment, Winter maintenance of equipment \$800,000; and then all of the other subheads are all blank until we get to those.

MR. ROBERTS: But there is nothing of any significance on the capital account.

MR. DOODY: That is right. That is right all the other amounts that are in here are \$8,000 - yes there \$70,000 -

MR. ROBERTS: Although the tenders may be awarded -

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: - there will be no money for -

MR. DOODY: If the House votes against supply some of these contractors are going to be in very difficult -

MR. ROBERTS: Even in worse shape than they are in now.

MR. DOODY: In worse shape than they are in now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping, sir, in my few remarks that I made when the House met at 8:00 o'clock that I could pry some information out of the minister, shame the administration into making a statement of policy, but obviously, Sir, they are going to all this feeling of uncertainty and insecurity in the Province to exist. We are not going to get a statement of policy from the minister at this stage, I can see that, and so therefore, Sir, I do not want to waste any more time, except to ask the minister if it is possible during the remaining time that we have out of the seventy-five hours to have every department called when the Budget is brought down?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Can the minister give us some assurance we will be able to get together and at least, even if it is only calling a department for an hour, let us decide the departments that we want to spend a lot of time on, but can we have some assurance that every department will be called when the main estimates are brought down?

MR. DOODY: You know, it would certainly be my desire, I would certainly like to see that, I would like to see all of the departments debated. How the time is allocated to each department I would hope

Mr. Doody:

that it would be something that most people can work out between themselves. There is obviously, and I would suspect and I have not been involved in the discussions, Mr. Chairman, but , you know, there is obviously some logistical or techcical problems .If ... somebody decides to spent ten hours on Education, and uses it on that particular subhead,or twenty hours on Finance you get into a difficult area. But hopefully some arrangement can be worked out whereby if too many hours are used up on a particular department then perhaps the House Leader on this side can call a new head or something .or something of that arrangement, I do not know, but my understanding is that these people, the House Leaders or

MR. DOODY: the leaders on both sides of the House, the two House Leaders, they are working toward that objective of getting all the departments called and have some debate on all of them. I would certainly welcome it.

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

MR. DAWE: I am not going to delay the House; just to make one point, I have been a member of this House as I said this afternoon for ten years, and I remember one night distinctly when I was sitting on the other side of the House we were here until five o'clock in the morning, passing bills such as this. And looking back over it, what was accomplished at that time? And sure I am not going to delay the House tonight. It is the government's responsibility to bring this bill before the House and they need this money to carry on the affairs of the Province. And any member, when the time arises when the detailed estimates are presented they will have due time in the proper manner to ask any pertinent question they wish to raise.

But I did note under their schedule there, Mr. Chairman, items eleven to nineteen in particular, just about one-third of the amount required. And I do trust - I will read them out, Mines and Energy, Forestry and Agriculture, Tourism, Fisheries, Industrial Development, Rural Development, Transportation and Communications, Public Works and Services and Municipal Affairs and Housing. That is just about one third of the amount asked. And I do trust probably some new employment or at least some new jobs that would be created in this expenditure. Or at least some of the men will be taken on the job, particularly in Transportation and Communications. I understand some of this includes for the Spring maintenance. And I am sure a lot of the local people in all our districts, particularly the Highways Department, are most anxious to get back to work and I do trust



MR. DAWE:                                   that within that \$13 million there is an item to get these men back to work as soon as possible. I do not know of any money in Municipal Affairs and Housing for housing construction which could be started at this time that would naturally create employment. And I do trust, Sir, that, as I say, some of these items would help create some back to work programmes, if nothing else, some back to work jobs and I trust that this will be helpful in this nature and I will be supporting this bill as presented.

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1978, the initial sum of one hundred and fifty-nine million six hundred and fifty thousand dollars. (\$159,650,000).

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Eight And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service.

On motion Clauses 1 through 3, carried.

On motion, title carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report that they have adopted a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the resolution to them referred and have recommended that a bill be introduced to give effect to same.

On motion resolution read a first and second time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before you enter this, are these debatable?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

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

MR. ROBERTS: Well, we are doing the resolution three times. I thought the bill was read three times. And my question is, is anything debatable at this stage? I have the impression it is not, that we debate the matter only in Committee. If that is so, why are we reading resolutions three times? I mean, the bill will be read three times.

MR. DOODY: It says bills read a first, second and third time.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I mean, I know what is written down on this piece of paper but that, with all respect, does not make it correct. What I am wondering is that we have debated the resolution in Committee. The resolution is reported to the House, the House accepts the report. The bill is then brought in. I would have thought it is the bill that is read three times, and I am not objecting but I am just querying. I do not know why we are reading the resolution all these times. But I will quite happily accept any guidance on it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my understanding that the practice has been - and I would not be in a position to give the rationale for it - but that the practice has been that the resolution is read twice and then the bill three times. But that the bill does not go back into Committee. But that the resolution historically or by precedent is read twice.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the reason for it?

MR. SPEAKER: The reason, I could not at the present moment give.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would it be to give the minister a chance to withdraw it?

MR. ROBERTS: We can argue over it but it makes no sense at all. I mean the resolution is debated thoroughly in Committee and as the gentleman for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) says, I think it is now well-established you could not debate the bill in the full House because the bill is thoroughly debated at Committee stage and then you know the Committee reports. And that being so, you know, as a matter of interest why are we reading a resolution twice and something else three times and then we will give something else four times. I mean it just makes no sense as I understand the procedure.

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

MR. MURPHY: Is it not a fact that one money bills a resolution must come that we debate at that stage and then the formality of then a bill because a bill must form a part of your -

MR. ROBERTS: It is not common ground, is it?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Then why read the resolution twice.

MR. MURPHY: Because you have debated it. Anyway it is a matter of form you pass.

MR. ROBERTS: But why is it?

MR. SPEAKER: It certainly seems to be a very valid point. We could alter our procedures to read the resolution once only and then the bill a first, second and third time and to dispense with the formality of reading the resolution twice in future. If any hon. member is aware of reasons that this would not be a satisfactory change - and I notice the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was making -

MR. MARSHALL: We should read it twenty times or 100 times because there is very little that happens in this House that makes sense anyway, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for his considered opinion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Well, it has now been read twice and perhaps between now and the next Supply Bill we shall have an opportunity to review the procedures, see any reasons that might be behind them and see what develops therefrom.

The Resolution has now been read a second time, When shall the bill be read a first time?

MR. PECKFORD: (Acting House Leader): Now.

On motion, a bill "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Eight And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title to be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No.38).

MR. PECKFORD: Order 4, Bill No. 19.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 4, Bill No. 19. The hon. the Member for Port au Port adjourned the debate, I believe.

MR. HODDER: Just as a matter of question Mr. Speaker, if neither one of us were to speak now, the minister is not here to close the debate.

MR. PECKFORD: We have made arrangements, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development will handle the second reading of the bill.

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, they have made arrangements.

MR. ROBERTS: You are going to get him lashed with a whip.

MR. FLIGHT: That is it, give it to him.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few words to say on the Bay St. George Community College. First I would like to talk about the political aspects

MR. HODDER: and how the thing came to be. I believe my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said earlier that there would be no dancing in the streets of anywhere in Bay St. George concerning the instituting of the Bay St. George Community College and that is quite so, Mr. Speaker. Because for quite some time the people of Bay St. George have looked for something just a little bit more than a gathering together of the institutions that were there.

However, that may be as it is, There were three existing facilities in Stephenville which have been there for quite some time. I should not say Stephenville, I should say Bay St. George because the adult centre is in Stephenville, the trade school was in the District of St. George's and the heavy equipment school was also in Stephenville. What this legislation is doing is combining the three of these institutions and calling it the Bay St. George Community College.

Now Stephenville - Bay St. George went through chaotic times over the past fifteen years. They went through the closedown of the base, and after the closedown of the Ernest Harmon Air Force Base the Stephenville Adult Centre was the only real employer in that area.

MR. SIMMONS: How many people did they employ?

MR. HODDER: At that particular time I do not know. The payroll was over the \$1 million mark, there were perhaps - I taught there in 1967 or 1968, somewhere around there, and I suppose at that time we might have had 400 or 500 students all being paid Manpower grants depending on the size of their families etc.,, and this was the mainstay of the Stephenville economy throughout the period between the closedown of

March 31, 1977, Tape 1477, Page 3 -- apb

MR. HODDER:                   the Ernest Harmon Air Force  
Base and the opening of Labrador Linerboard Limited.

MR. HODDER: And since that time we have had a few other small industries, Altantic Disign Homes are there which works on a seasonal basis. And we have a brewery which was touch and go until recently when Labatts took it over. And we have had industries come, we have had hockey stick factories and we almost had a orange juice factory at one time. And we have had something called RKO Industries which did very little else but turn out some of those little lamps where the light goes through a little beams or something else, Sir. But I do not think they ever came to anything.

However in 1970 or 1969 someone announced that there would be a West Coast Regional College, and Stephenville put up a hard fight for that particular college and they felt that they had the right - and I am just giving history now - they felt that the regional college, the West Coast Regional College, they felt that it should come there because at that particular time, and still to a great extent there were large dormitories there, large what they call bachelor officer quarters . There are dinning halls, all sort of classroom facilities.

Of course this government at that particular time with their billion dollar budgets and money flowing out of its ears decided they would put a college in Corner Brook and they built a brand new building and I still believe, Mr. Speaker, that it does not matter what type of building you have, that education can go on and you do not have to have a building in order to put out a good educational programme. But I am very biassed on that particular point.

But anyhow , forget the promise of a technical institute, but we expected that something would be put in Bay St. George,

MR. HODDER: an educational facility which would mean something to the economy of Bay St. George, and I do not think that the people of Bay St. George were out of line in thinking that because you know, it has been an insecure community for so long now that the people are almost giving up hope. I have talked to people now who have said, "I was here when the base was here, I came back because Labrador Linerboard opened up. I am leaving now and I am not coming back anymore, I do not care what happens." The whole fabric has been torn apart. Now that may not have anything to do with my remarks on the Bay St. George Community College but we did look for something more.

I want to say now that as the minister outlined the programmes for the Bay St. George Community College he said that this would be a pooling together of programmes. And he said it would be programmes rather than buildings. In other words, the clear implication was that we would not get new buildings and therefore basically at the present time we have a director who is in charge of existing facilities.

There has been no money paid for these buildings, though they are very expensive to keep up, but at the same time there has been no capital outlay. And during this whole time there has also been, as I mentioned before, the adult center which was the mainstay of the economy for Stephenville and the Bay St. George area as well for such a long time, that has over the years been cut down, and cut down, until it is about half the size it was when I taught there, I do not know how many years ago.

Now to speak about the BTS programme, which is a programme which takes a student in and brings him up as fast as possible, he works at his own rate to a certain grade



MR. HODDER:

level; they take a student and they test him and they put him in a certain level and they try to bring him - some student may reach from grade seven to grade eleven in ten months. Others may take longer.

But this programme has been of great benefit to my district, where I suppose most of the calls that I get from my district at the present time are to try to get into the adult center because the standard of education is low in parts of my district and there is a tremendous demand for this. And I must say that when the Minister of Education indicated the other day that the BTS programme - BTSD programme might be cut down at the adult center even by five per cent, this is disasterous because it should be expanded by twenty-five per cent or thirty per cent to meet the needs of the people who are there now.

Now I can not blame that on the government, but I do urge the government to do everything in their power to try to get educational upgrading in this Province. And the people come from all over the Province to what we now call, I suppose, after this bill is passed the Bay St. George Community College. People come from all over Newfoundland for upgrading and I think that all members would recognize that to increase the standard of education in this Province is a tremendous thing and it is something that we should all strive for.

Mr. J. Hodder:

The minister mentioned when he introduced that certain things had gone on in the College, he mentioned a home appliance course which was a success, and it was an unqualified success. The business community found out that there was a lack of people who could sort of look after different things in the home, machinery, refrigerators, just general handymen who could be hired by a firm who sold anything from television sets to electric ranges, I suppose, and they put off a very successful course. All of these people at the present time are working.

Another sort of thing that has happened with the Bay St. George Community College is that at the adult centre when the government was hoping to go ahead with the Lower Churchill, and the transmission line, a linesman's course was initiated in what we can, I suppose, now call the Bay St. George Community College, but as it happened the thing was cancelled but the brakes did not go on at the Community College and so they are turning out linesmen now, and perhaps they will be ready by the time, if we ever do get the Lower Churchill underway.

There are such plans as librarian's courses and all that sort of thing that can be put into, you know, programmes that the Bay St. George Community College can use. Now really the Bay St. George Community College is an exciting concept. I honestly believe that it is an exciting concept. I will give a little example of what happened in my district with a LIP project. A group applied for a LIP project looking for a sheep hide tanning industry, There is a lot of sheep raising, it is probably the most agricultural thing that is done in the district of Port au Port, And so this project, they cured the hides, and I bought one of them, it cost me \$20, I think, I was perhaps gyped, but anyhow I bought it, I got the first one that ever came from there, but the only thing was that after the LIP project was over nothing happened. Now these are places that the College can go in, this is where we need the college to go in and take up where that project

Mr. Hodder:

left off because that could become a viable industry in the area, and the Bay St. George Community College this is the concept that they are hoping to work under, so that they can go into small communities and help out.

In some communities right now the College is setting up contact committees, these committees are operating throughout my district, throughout the district of St. George's and in Stephenville. These contact committees are formed in the community and they feed back to the Bay St. George Community College the needs of their community, and then the Bay St. George Community College must try to bring in programmes which will help that particular area. Now these programmes, if the Minister of Rural Development, you know, perhaps would not appreciate this, that those contact committees of the Bay St. George Community College would come forward with ideas of things that they want in the College or want the College to help them with, perhaps Rural Development as well could help in the Bay St. George Community College, because it means that they have certain expertise with which they can walk into the communities, form those committees, have those committees thinking in terms of development and then they have the trained - we hope, now this is where we get to the crunch in a little while - we hope they have the trained personnel to be able to go out and help them and to be able to get help from other areas of government.

Now at the present time the College - I suppose I can call it the college before the bill comes in - but it has 600 people in part-time programmes, and these range from welding, typing, woodworking, to fly-tying to law to a fishery course going on in one particular community where there is net mending being taught, and there is engine repair, out-board engine repair and that sort of thing. There is also a sewing course, they go at that sort of thing, it may be laughed at, but there is a sewing course going on out West in my friend from St. George's district (Mrs. MacIsaac), and there is also academic upgrading going on at night through the Bay St. George Community College.

Mr. Hodder:

Now this is new.

Now most of the things that most people would say about the College are not new, but these particular things, the College is making an effort to get out into the communities to find out what their needs are, and to respond to any needs that the communities might have. There are an awful lot of small communities in Bay St. George who need leadership.

Another thing that the College may get into in time to come when cable T.V. comes, I understand that one of the concepts of cable T.V. is that within the community itself there can be sort of a closed circuit community cable T.V. whereby local programming can be done, And this has tremendous implications for an institution such as this because this means that the College can use this particular facility to educate people through the media, and it could become an educational channel in such an area.

MR. HODDER:

The problem - and this is the problem with the Bay St. George Community College and this is why I tend to agree with my colleague from LaPoile district (Mr. Neary) in some of his comments that he made - the problem is at the moment that what has been done by the Department of Education or the Department of Technical and Vocational Education is that all that has happened at the present time is the melting together. And those programmes which I just mentioned are programmes which are being done by the principal, are being done by teachers outside of classes, are being done as fast as you can. When the linesman's course came up the director of the college was running crazy trying to get the linesman's course. I am sorry, not the linesman, the appliance repair course. When that particular course was going on he was running to do this and that. When other members of the - and there are other members of the teaching staff who have in addition to their own teaching load, must run out and try to at night and with all kinds of dedication, and they have that, and all kinds of idealism, are running out and they are trying to do it haphazardly.

Now the college has tremendous implications. But yet we do not have the people to do it. Now I will say this to you: You got it for nothing. It was there to start with. You have decided that you are going to call it the Bay St. George Community College for political reasons. The political reasons are that the last election you did not want to go into an election without giving Stephenville something because we had fought for the regional college. Now what I am saying is please give us the manpower with the ability to develop what you promised you would give us, because you promised us a technical college. We thought for a while we were going to get a regional college and now we have a community college. You promised us that. Just before the election it was announced. Just after the election a very good man, I might say, was appointed to head it up with a lot of idealism and a lot of go and a lot of gumption. But he is being stymied.

MR. HODDER:

Now what I am asking the government to do is not to - you know, we are in a position now that that is all we have. There is no sense knocking the Bay St. George Community College because it is all we have. The only thing we can ask you since you promised it to us, you promised it to Bay St. George, you promised us something, you have built up the expectations of the people, now give us enough people, give us enough programmes, give us the facilities to be able to do what you promised us. Now that is basically what I have to say.

Now I will say something else about the Bay St. George Community College. The Bay St. George Community College can become in Newfoundland to the forest industry what the Fisheries College is to the fishing industry. At the present time - and this was not all started since the new director came in - but at the present time the college is in the woods operation. They are training student loggers. They send people out to instruct in trailers, in trailer classrooms. They can teach sawmilling. They have the capability to teach sawmilling up to a certain number of board feet - I do not know, maybe the Minister of Rural Development knows - but they have that capability at the present time. And the logging school is still going on in Bay St. George.

As a matter of fact the other thing is that they are teaching the only wood scaling course that I believe is taught in perhaps the Maritime Provinces, because we are having students come in now from Price, from Bowaters and from Labrador Linerboard Limited to learn scaling. Now I do not know what scaling is, but I do know that the paper companies recruit the students and the Bay St. George community college teaches them.

Now what I would like to see is that I would like to see this aspect of the college developed. Why cannot we become - I know other members will say, Well why not join us or give a community college to Grand Falls. And I agree with that feeling, or where it might be. But you know different central areas of the Province. But what I am saying is that we have the structure there now. We have people willing to give what they have and we are moving into the woods industry in a very large way. And let us be to the woods industry what the Fisheries

MR. HODDER:

College is to the fishing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Now some of the dreams of the people who are in charge of the Bay St. George Community College at the moment are that they are trying to develop the expertise to cater to educational conferences. You know, we still have those dining halls and those residents. They are still there and many of them are empty. The college is very aware, of course, of the hotel situation and all that sort of thing but they are trying to get themselves geared up in such a way

Mr. Hodder.

that they can bring in the type of conference, and house the people cheaply, with conferences that would not normally come to the area; educational conferences, librarians' conferences. They even gave a room to the Liberal party when we had our caucus out there. I am quite sure that they would do the same thing for the gentlemen on the other side. But, you know, they are trying to develop this capability.

MR. NEARY: Do not forget the Independent Liberals.

MR. HODDER: Oh, the Independent Liberals, yes, certainly.

There is also at the present time a need in the tourist industry for a hostess course. Has anybody ever realized that in a lot of restaurants - and I do not knock every hostess in Newfoundland - but in a lot of restaurants across the Island that there is a need for training of people who cater to the public. And the Bay St. George Community College at the moment is planning a hostess course, you know, a course to train people to serve proper food, proper wine, and that sort of thing. Now what they are doing at the present time is, again as I said - the principal of each one of the schools, the different people who have been picked for administration are forgetting this and they are forgetting that, and they are running around, and they are trying to develop this particular programme. You know, there is also a need, we are told, and I understand that the penitentiary, the correctional centre, as it is called, is coming to Stephenville. Now this is another place where the Bay St. George Community College can work very, very closely with the people who happen to be there for whatever a period of time they are there, and can have a real input into the correctional centre, because you just do not put people away for a year to punish them, you put them away to try to rehabilitate them, and this is one of the places where the Bay St. George Community College could be a great asset. I might say also that the college is geared at the present



Mr. Hodder.

moment for the handicapped. There are provisions in the buildings as there are now to use wheelchairs and all that sort of thing. And if we do ever get a school for the handicapped in Stephenville, which was promised one time, and now, I think, it has probably gone to Corner Brook. I do not know what has happened politically on that. But if that sort of thing comes to Stephenville we can also help out in that particular way. But basically - I could talk here for perhaps hours and hours about beauty culture and all the things that are there - but basically all we have right now are the three schools pooled together, with dedicated personnel who want to do things in the communities, to be able to develop the communities, to be able to help with local governments, to be able to have personnel to run courses, and they need the help. You got the buildings free; you have put it together; you have called it a name. And I call on the government, with your promises in the past, Please make this college something that we can proud of and something that can also add an economic base to Bay St. George. There are many, many things on the West Coast where this college can bring students in. We have the residence space. We do not have to worry about building new residences. We can bring people in from across the Province for whatever need, but what I would like to see are instructors, skilled instructors and personnel in that particular college that when a programme is needed in this Province, if the Province launches into a new scheme, if the Lower Churchill opens or whatever happens, that these people can be quickly - that we can put on courses quickly to be able to look after the needs of the Province. And I for one feel that this sort of skill and this sort of expertise has been confined to the Avalon Peninsula. And we have the capability on the West Coast, we have the capability in Stephenville to do and to train just as well as you have it here. And if the government leaves it as it is, if we are left with just the combining of the three, and if you think the people of Stephenville are happy with it the way it is, they are not

March 31, 1977

Tape no. 1481

Page 3 - ms

Mr. Hodder.

But I for one support the Bay St. George Community College. But in a year's time after watching what happens, if the government does not come through with the appropriate money, with the appropriate staff, I will be taking quite a different stance here in the House of Assembly if I am still around. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member is speaking on behalf of the hon. Minister of Education. That being the case, when the hon. minister speaks he will close the debate.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few brief remarks. My hon. colleague for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has outlined the community college very well. But the idea of the community college as was stated by the administrator is simply just an idea. And it said it is not an institution nor a building. Last year around election time we saw the name Bay St. George Community College going up on several buildings in the Bay St. George area. To me that proves that the college has to have some kind of a building to operate from. And the whole concept of the Bay St. George Community College is to serve the basic needs of the community. If this is the case in the Stephenville area, the Bay St. George Community College has to serve the community of Stephenville in the Bay St. George area industrially as well as in a recreational sense.

Industrially, for example, the logging operations, we are seeing a little bit of advancement in that area. And the community college can become a very viable institution to the Linerboard operation as well as to other mills in our Province. But will the community college have a budget adequate enough to extend their programmes, to have advanced training in the technical field? As it now stands I do not think so. They are setting up little courses, quick courses, in the evening. They are trying to squeeze in a full programme just to sell the idea, to get people geared up for the community college.

Now in Stephenville, the people have gone through a lot and they have been very flexible over the past years. They will accept the idea. They will themselves more than the government develop that college into a worth-while college where they themselves can be proud. But they cannot do it if the finances are not behind the college. The idea is only as good as the money that is behind it. And, Mr. Speaker, when we

MR. MCNEIL:

have to rely on a provincial budget I see very little chance of success for the college. We have already witnessed, as my hon. colleague stated, a reduction in the BTSD adult training programme. How many more reductions are we going to see after the institution becomes one year old? I think we will see further reductions.

We have seen the college give back a few of their residential buildings that they used to use for their dormitory space for their male and female students. This has gone back now to the Harmon Corporation. Again a further reduction in their buildings. Will the community college help communities, little farming communities out in my hon. colleague's district in St. George's? Will it go into farming? Can it go into farming? Again it depends on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to deal with too much time on it, but the whole concept of the Bay St. George Community College is a good concept and it has to be made a college whereby in Bay St. George it is serving the community needs. And the community needs, especially in my own district, are mostly in industrial development and recreation. Recreationally the college does not serve a function at all at the present time. For example, we have a facility, a swimming pool that was operated by the local parish church group. They had to close up operation because they did not have the finances to support it. The college could take in this facility, could operate it, could train young people in the recreational field, not only in swimming but they could use it to other activities as well.

Mr. McNeil:

But they decided not to have the college concept move around buildings, they say it is just an idea, it is the needs of the community. One of the needs of the community of Stephenville is in recreation, and the swimming pool need has to be served. And I think the college has a duty to pick up the vacuum that is now in, for example, the aquatic area.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the bill but I do it very reluctantly. I think that the college has very little chance of success mainly because it will be restricted financially because our Province does not have the money to put into the college. We have seen the Regional College develop and I think that the Regional College concept could have been put aside for the time being and we could have maybe developed the Community College concept first, and utilized the existing facilities as we have in most of the communities already.

I believe it is nothing more than a name change, the Moores P.C. Government must make a mark some place, and the existing facilities like the vocational schools across the Province will eventually be changed, I would imagine, to represent community colleges, and you will see very little change in programmes, It will just be a name change and the Moores P.C. Government will take the credit of establishing the community colleges.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and I do hope that the government will give enough leeway to the community college so it has an adequate budget to meet the basic needs of the communities so that the communities will grow along with the community college.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Naskaupi.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, in addressing a few remarks to this legislation it obviously is a specific to the Bay St. George area, but if I could for just a couple of minutes in supporting this bill speak to the idea or the concept of a community college in general, not specifically the Bay St. George, but any community college, I just

Mr. J. Goudie:

have a couple of comments to make.

First of all, I am not familiar at all with the Bay St. George area of this Province. I have driven in the proximity of that area, but I certainly have not travelled the area at all by vehicle, but I am assuming that most of the communities in that area are connected by roads, perhaps one of the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, they are.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, they are? Okay.

But just thinking in terms of Labrador for a few minutes, particularly the coastal area of Labrador, and the facility that we have right now in the Happy Valley area, the District Vocational School there which I am told by educators is comparable to any similar facility in the Province as a whole. I think the concept of a community college could be adapted to that particular facility and apparently the process would not all be that difficult or complicated to adapt to that situation. Of course, the people who operate the vocational school, the principals and the staff would obviously have to be, not necessarily select, but at least highly qualified people.

Co-ordination, I think, probably would be the main concern of adapting a district vocational school to a community college concept, at least in my opinion. And I have difficulty in trying to understand the concepts - to understand, at least in my head, the concepts of a regional college, a community college, a district vocational school, the other facilities, particularly the concept of a polytechnical institute as well. They are all a little confusing to me.

But I think in this Bay St. George Community College with the legislation in front of us now, and any others for that matter, one thing I think perhaps should be borne in mind which would apply, I would assume, to other parts of the Province other than Labrador, and that is the idea of perhaps trying to bring some of the facilities of

March 31, 1977

Tape 1483

PK - 3

Mr. Goudie:

such a college to outlying communities, and I have to use Labrador  
as an example here because the coastal

MR. GOUDIE: communities of Labrador are not connected by any means other than boat in the Summer, air travel in the Wintertime, or snowmobile, if you are so inclined to do so. But there must be courses that can be offered, that are being offered in vocational schools, community colleges and so on, which could perhaps relieve an instructor from within the facility, the facility itself for two, three weeks or perhaps a month, to get out into the communities, to offer some of the restricted programmes, perhaps even BTSD system where upgrading can take place at least to a high school level, and the instruction be of a quality which would make the high school certificates - once one qualified for them - to be competitive with any other high school certificate from a regular facility. Because I do not think in our educational facilities we should be concerned with just the single people who may be attending such facilities, or people who perhaps can afford to be there, but we should also be concerned with the married people, male or female, who because of home responsibilities and home commitments may not be able to travel from a community, like Nain for instance, to the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area to take advantage of such a facility. I think that is one concept that the Department of Education should consider and that is the possibility and the practicality of taking some of the courses, the academic courses and perhaps some of the other more technical courses to the community as opposed to setting up a system whereby always people in a community have to travel to a central locality. I just wanted to make that point in supporting the bill for the community college at Bay St. George.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



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

MR. RIDEOUT: I just have one short point to make and that is relative to clause 19 and that is the submission of the budget. I do not recall in the debate that went on a few days ago if anybody made this point so far, but I do recall that when we passed the bill relative to the Polytechnical Institution a few days ago there was an amendment saying that the budget of that institution would be submitted by the minister to the House. I believe that was a good precedent and I would hope that the same thing could happen with this particular bill. Clause 19 as it stands right now does not have that particular thing into it; it just says that the institution itself will submit an annual budget to the minister, the board of trustees of the college. I believe the precedent established a few days ago in the Polytechnical Institute was a good one and I would hope that the minister in speaking to close debate would give some indication - well I would actually hope that he would propose that an amendment be made to clause 19 so that the same rule, the same precedent that was established here a few days ago, could apply to the community college at Bay St. George area.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate. The hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, a few remarks. Just first of all I want to say to the House that the Minister of Education regrets that he is not able to be here. He is in Lewisporte attending an educational function and he wants me to pass on to all hon. members his sincere thanks for the contribution that has been made to date in the debate, and I think had he been here for the last hour or half an hour

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

since we have been on the debate he would have been even more appreciative because there have been some very constructive comments made. On clause 19, just to be specific for a moment, I believe that the minister will deal with this particular reference when we get into a committee stage. It is not a bad suggestion but I would suggest to the hon. member that really if a budget is submitted to the minister it is indirectly submitted to the House. Now he will have to tell the minister when we get into committee whether this was the same type of thing with respect to the Polytechnical Institute and whether that amendment was carried with a clause of this nature. The minister would have to deal with that and of course he will have a response I am sure. The member for Stephenville, I appreciate the fact that he made some excellent comments. I got a little bit concerned, I am not chiding him at all, I am certainly not try to belittle his input, but I always get a little bit concerned when people dig a six foot hole and go and look for a body and ask for pallbearers. And that suggests to me that there is a negativism about the comments and I am a little worried about this kind of attitude because I believe that the first step towards achieving the goals that were suggested should be achieved by the member, and the member for Port au Port who was very definitive in his remarks, is the act that we have before us, the formalization of the establishment of a community college and of course the necessary funds will have to be made available as we grow into new programmes that will be required in the particular area.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I believe that the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) if he were here tonight would have spoken, if he has not already spoken, and would have said what I am going to say, and that is the quality of education in a region is not necessarily tied directly to the number of dollars that accrue to a region, it is not necessarily tied to the size of the building, the quality of the furnishings, the provincial expenditure, the dollars that are put forward, and I had a few years in the field of education, like my colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) which was quite obvious listening to his remarks tonight. And I can say that I have seen situations in communities where tremendous contributions were made by not necessarily teachers as we understand teachers, trained and professional people, but by citizens and teachers with very limited types of technical support and back up but with a dedication and ideas and innovativeness and so on that could help them in trying to get development and get people participating.

This kind of a concept, the community college concept, is one of the finest concepts that has been introduced to this particular Legislature. I believe that it is the first time in the Province that a formal move has been made to put into legislation something which is a concept that is more applicable to our Province and the North, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) has made reference to it, than any other part of the country. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) really reminded me of the first year I was out of school and working, about fifteen or sixteen years of age, down in Knob Lake building a bit of railway track and I had finished high school and had gone down working with an extra gang on the railway and one of the chaps out of the few members of the crew that we had was a professor from Frontier College. And I said, "What is this professor business?" I automatically assumed he had seven doctor degrees and maybe even could convene some kind of a policy conference at some given stage and so on and so forth. And I came to find out

MR. LUNDRIGAN: that he was an average, ordinary worker, a railway worker who was affiliated with Frontier College, which has as its constituency the whole of our country. And that college has found its way into remote parts of the country where people who were attached to the college really offer programmes. No facilities worthwhile, Books, ideas and this kind of thing, and this is not to say that that is what we will have in the Bay St. George area but the idea that the member for Naskaupi (Mr.Goudie) picked up is perhaps this concept with variations and modifications can very well be a very, very useful instrument for development in particularly Coastal Labrador. I am certainly for it and I know a number of my colleagues are very, very strongly behind using this kind of mechanism, this kind of instrument, if you want, for development.

As a matter of fact I do not mind saying that recently we have had a conversation among our colleagues in Cabinet about this kind of instrument again which is being formalized here in the form of a college for a particular region of the Province. I was most impressed with most of the remarks of the member for Port au Port. He is obviously very familiar with his topic. He worked in the area. He is an educator and he excited me, Mr. Speaker, by not only saying that we have a number of bodies there in the present area but he defined for the House, as far as I am concerned, what a community college is all about. And maybe the member for Naskaupi (Mr.Goudie) raised a question about the complication. We talk about the university, heavily academic oriented, almost a classical education; a regional college, the same type of orientation, is it not? Heavily academically oriented and essential, certainly essential not for every community but for various regions throughout the Province which I hope will take place in the future.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Then you get into your trade school. Again it is a very sophisticated technical education. The polytechnical institute is again an advancement of your technical education. In the community college with your adult education, a side of technical education to it, and maybe even - not maybe even, certainly an academic edge to it, is it not, with your upgrading school and the like, also has a capability of looking around your community, which might mean the whole of the West Coast of the Province, and saying that we have got a need in Doyles to have people skilled and qualified in doing something with the wool that we have there right now, with the new industry that we have built up to do something with the wool in this Province. We need some skills that we now do not have.

Let us adapt a quick programme, it does not cost necessarily a lot of money to address ourselves to that problem, get the people involved and get the college, your useful tool of development. Not to say that the higher sophisticated academic thing is not necessary and very vital but it is a

MR. LUNDPIGAN:

different type of endeavour and this is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Into the community?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Into the community. It is an educational institution but it is also very heavily edging on development, local needs, things that people can do to help their economy, to help in their homes, to help with a more meaningful living in their community, to help with maybe a richer existence in their homes which might not necessarily have an economic angle to it at all.

MR. HODDER: If the minister would allow me for a second. I mentioned the LIP project for the tanning industry. Now, you know, I honestly believe that if the Bay St. George Community College had had the technical expertise or the money to be able to bring somebody in to help those people who were stumbling around drying sheep skins over sawn off barrels, that this could be an industry on the peninsula today perhaps employing two men, perhaps three. And that to me is development and that could mean why the college could work, if the proper money and experience and expertise is put into it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for that kind of comment. I think he has got a very reasonable attitude. I believe he has got a very keen understanding. Now he has gotten on to another angle which I want to make a couple of remarks about. He is saying that if we do not get this great institution that the people have been let down because of the fact that there is either existing or anticipated economic hardship, economic disadvantage, unemployment and the like. Now I can sympathize with that. And every member of the government, I am sure every member of the legislature, feels the same concern, that in his region and in many regions of the Province there is not adequate opportunity for our people. We know that and we have had it for years. We will have it for decades into the future in parts of our Province, and perhaps in almost the entire Province.

But the hon. member certainly cannot make the comment realistically that because there is a big measure of disadvantage or

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

disparity that you must sort of just take dollars to build something bigger without recognizing the fact that you are not asking to meet an educational need, the member is asking that there be an economic need met. This is the kind of lack of realism that we are all guilty of. I am guilty of it as the member for Grand Falls. The member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) is guilty of it. The hon. Premier is guilty of it and all of us are. When we have a problem we tend to say, Now what are we going to do about it? Like I was trying to get an opportunity this afternoon in response to the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons): What are we going to do about it?

Well let us take a nice bundle of dollars, government dollars and go on and we will build a bigger road, a broader road, a wider road, a bigger institution or whatever the case might be. Now that is not going to solve the problem. That is going to be an artificial economy in place. But I believe the hon. member has to be - I think both members really are the most directly affected - have to be really satisfied that the government have made a determined bid with respect to this particular angle that the minister is on with this bill that is before the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have to wait and see.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have to wait and see. The institution will be established. The concept will be brought to birth and brought to life in the Province. Hopefully it can be a foot in the door for some of the thinking that hon. members across the way are presenting to government. And certainly if the move is made, the programmes get off the ground, they are successful, they get some good publicity, people start to perceive the advantage of them around the Province, then there is a sort of a decentralizing of the government to that particular region. And this government has been very decentralist in its attitude on matters of this nature, Mr. Speaker.

I believe the members have made an excellent input from the point of view of the government and the minister in particular.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

He will be very pleased with reading in Hansard the remarks of the hon. gentlemen across the House this evening and again on his behalf I want to express his appreciation for the contribution that has been made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion a bill, "An Act To Establish The Bay St. George Community College," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 19)

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting Timber Scalers." (Bill No. 37)



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

MR. MAYNARD: Just a few explanatory words on this bill, Mr. Speaker. It is really a consolidation bill. Under the present system of registering or licencing or giving permits to people to scale timber can be done under three acts, three existing acts; the Crown Lands Act, the Logging Camps Act, the Weight and Measures Act. And what we are doing in this bill now is to bring it all into one piece of legislation. There are very few new provisions, very minor ones, I should say. There is authority given for a Board of Examiners to issue certificates and renewal certificates now under the new legislation as opposed to no board, but being issued by the minister entirely previously. And it provides for the issuing of scaling manuals and instruction scaling techniques. The provisions for licencing of scalers will be tightened up somewhat so that we ensure that people who are licenced for scaling under the act will be more capable of doing the job well and more familiar with the job before they are issued a licence. And the act also provides for conversion to the metric units of measurement. I do not think it is necessary to say too much more on the timber scalers. I would assume that all hon. members are aware of what the act is, and why we have timber scalers' licences. I would be happy to answer any questions that hon. members may have. I move second reading.

MR. NEARY: How much are the licences?

MR. MAYNARD: The licences at the present time are \$5.00, the initial licence.

MR. NEARY: Will that be changed now, the \$5.00?

MR. MAYNARD: It is proposed to make some changes but these will come within regulations to be made under the act at a later date. It is also proposed in the new regulations that we would have a renewal fee as opposed to the system at present where there is no charge for the renewal of the certificate.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, there is not very much that can be said about this particular bill at this time. I do reserve

Mr. Flight.

the right, and I am sure my colleagues will reserve the right, to look at each clause, clause by clause during Committee. There have been a few concerns raised since the bill arrived on our desk, that we want to be sure that the rights of the existing scalers, the scalers who are presently licenced in this Province that their rights are not jeopardized. I know of scalers in this Province who have got Grade VI, Grade VII education and who have made their living scaling all their lives up to this point. And I would certainly surely oppose any set of standards that may indeed make it difficult for them to carry on their trade. I wonder also - it appears that this bill will cover all scalers in Newfoundland. Up to now I think it has been the practice to licence scalers, but it has also been the practice that the logging companies trained, hired and paid their own scalers. And I am not aware - the minister can certainly inform my colleagues whether or not a scaler for a private company, Price (Nfld.) or Bowaters, scaling Price wood, if there is a requirement that they be licenced?

MR. MAYNARD: I will answer that in Committee.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister is going to answer in Committee.

If there is not a requirement now that all people scaling wood in this Province be licenced, there is no way that I would personally support the bill if there is a possibility that people to this point in time who have been scaling, regardless of what their qualifications are, if there is any possibility that their jobs will be jeopardized in favour of someone who is coming in more qualified, more highly educated, or more technically trained. We have to protect the rights of the people who are in the business.

And, Mr. Speaker, since we are going to licence scalers and make scalers accountable to the Province, maybe we could broaden the scope a little bit. We have scalers on every project in this

Mr. Flight.

Province right now, particularly I am thinking of the paper companies,  
and there is practically no - I am not aware - of course this will  
be argumentative - I am not aware that this government has got  
any protection in the woods at all. We talked about -

Mr. Flight:

I raised an issue in this House last year, Mr. Speaker, about brows of the wood were left to rot in the woods, truck loads upon truck loads, thousands of cords of wood being left strewn around the countryside. Mr. Speaker, that is still happening. There is still on the roads being logged by paper companies in this Province today hundreds, thousands of cords of wood left to rot. There is a reason for it; it is not economic, as far as the company is concerned, they go in and take what pays the most and they leave what they want to leave.

Now the Premier in August of 1976, I think, made a statement that the logging industry in Newfoundland, the forestry products of our economy, a part of our economy, provide 2,500 jobs in this Province, and it is hoped in five years to double that to 5,000. He also indicated that we have to utilize our bark, the tops of trees, sawdust, everything. And how anyone can reconcile that statement with what is actually happening in our woods today it is beyond me. Anyone who would make that statement, or any minister of the Crown who makes that statement is obviously not in touch with what is happening in the woods operation in Newfoundland today, and that includes Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters, it may indeed include the local sawmill operators, I do not know, but I do know what Price (Nfld.) is doing and Bowaters.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Lay it on him.

MR. FLIGHT: The Premier - I will reiterate, recap for the Premier the reference.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: I may be irrelevant, Mr. Speaker -

MR. RIDEOUT: The Minister from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is irrelevant too.

MR. ROBERTS: Lots of times.

MR. FLIGHT: The Premier will remember in August of 1976 making a statement that the logging industry of this Province employs

Mr. Flight:

2,500 people, and that it is his hope and his intention and his administration's intention to double that work force in five years.

PREMIER MOORES: When did I say that?

MR. FLIGHT: You said it in - well I will produce the quote for you, It was made to the press. I have the clipping.

PREMIER MOORES: Twenty-five hundred jobs.

MR. FLIGHT: It is presently - there are roughly 2,500 jobs, and it is your hope to increase it by 2,500, and double the work force or the jobs that can be had as a result of our forestry resources.

Now what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, and assuming that I am quoting the Premier literally, what I am saying is this that it is very difficult for anybody who knows, who have seen the operations of Bowaters and Price (Nfld.) to reconcile that statement, because you went further and the hon. Premier said, Mr. Speaker, that we have to utilize the sawdust, the bark, the stumps, the tops, we have to utilize all of the forest resource.

AN HON. MEMBER: He says, he did not say that.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, he said it. The Premier said it in a statement.

Mr. Speaker, when I travel Price (Nfld.) roads and see hundreds of cords of wood left to rot on the ground that will never be picked up, when I watch thousands of cords of wood free floating in Red Indian Lake, and there is twice as much there this Spring than there was last Spring, then one can say, What is the Premier talking about?

So maybe, Mr. Speaker - I will not dwell on that any more - maybe what we should do is enlarge the responsibility of scalers who will be licenced by this Province that will in effect be representatives of this Province to report on those kind of activities. They will see it firsthand, Nobody else, in my opinion, Sir, and nobody else representing the Department of Forestry or the minister is either telling it as it is, or if they are telling it as it is nobody is listening is to them. Thousands of our cords of wood are rotting. The Linerboard over there, the biggest problem

Mr. Flight:

they have is that they cannot get wood that is cheap enough to operate a mill on, while at the same time Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters are allowed to waste hundreds, and hundreds and thousands of cords of wood, and maybe, Sir, this bill could be enlarged to give the scalers the right to report on that type of thing. The loggers themselves are doing it, but nobody is listening to them. The loggers know what is going on in the woods. They know the tremendous waste that is happening in Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters operations.

So, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is time that we had someone in there eight hours a day and who has got the authority and knows the operation, and knows when

MR. FLIGHT: wood is being wasted. The Minister of Manpower, the former Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, told me at one time last Summer that he believed what I said about the wood floating around Red Indian Lake and that he was going to verify and that he would do something about it. Well I will tell this House now that he may have verified it but he did nothing about it. There is more wood in Red Indian Lake right now than there was last Summer this time.

Price (Nfld.) put on a great show for the general public of this Province. They hired sixteen or seventeen people, cleaned up Buchans Landing, cleaned up the park, cleaned up all the areas that is obvious to the general public and that is it. Finished.

MR. NEARY: You should get that guy on television. What is his name?

PREMIER MOORES: Bruno Gerussi.

MR. NEARY: Yes, what is the name of the programme?

PREMIER MOORES: The Beachcombers.

MR. NEARY: The Beachcombers, get The Beachcombers.

MR. FLIGHT: I have talked, Mr. Speaker, with officials of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture and I have found in the officials of the Department of Forestry a reluctance to agree with what I am saying. They defend the companies. They say that there is nothing we can do about it, officials of the Department of Forestry.

Then the Premier says that we have to utilize our bark. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe we should enlarge this bill, give the scalars the right to tell us what is happening in the woods. Maybe we will believe then. We believe everything that Price (Nfld.) tells us.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter signed by one of the former ministers of forestry, the present hon. Minister of Health, that an individual applied for a licence to cut white pine on

MR. FLIGHT: Price limits, and Price (Nfld.) had decided that they did not want him cutting white pine on their limits. Now they were not cutting it. They do not utilize white pine. It rots on the stump, falls down. The Buchans Task Force indicated that there is something like 10 million board feet of white pine in the Lloyds River - Red Indian Lake area and that they recommended that that resource be utilized.

As I understand it, Price (Nfld.) immediately said, "Oh well, if it is there we will utilize it. We are prepared to look at a joint venture." Suddenly when it became obvious to them that somebody else might go in on their limits they wanted to utilize the white pine that they ignored for fifty years. And in requesting from the Minister of Forestry that this gentleman get a permit to cut white pine, the Minister of Forestry wrote a letter back and he indicated to the gentleman who was prepared to go in and utilize and cut the white pine that the was sorry he could not help him get a licence because Price (Nfld.) had informed him that they needed all the white pine that grew on their limits to build bridges for their operations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when a minister of forestry in this Province is prepared to accept carte blanche that type of a thing from Price (Nfld.) or from any other logging company, then the forestry industry in this Province is in trouble. I do not know how much digging into the matter he did. I do not know how much looking into and seeing exactly what Price was saying he actually did, but I saw his letter that indicated to this gentleman that he was not prepared to have him cut white pine. Maybe if the scalers were licenced, maybe if they had some responsibility for this type of thing they would have advised the minister that Price (Nfld.) would not use one hundredth of the white pine that is rotting on their limits in building bridges and that we should utilize it. And so, Mr. Speaker, we can go on and on.

We are going to licence scalers. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in licencing scalers we would broaden their responsibilities



MR. FLIGHT: and put them in a position to tell the minister and tell his officials and tell the public of this Province what is actually going on on the timber limits of the two paper companies in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the paper companies are getting away with murder in this Province. And nobody will believe it, but they are getting away with murder and they should be stopped. We have a linerboard mill over there that if all the timber that Price (Nfld.) have allowed to rot and float free, and Bowaters were allowed to rot and float free over this last ten years, if they had that supply we would not have to worry about bringing any timber in from Labrador or closing down the mill.

I am wondering if the present minister is going to take any more of a stand on this than the past minister did. The issue was brought up in this House a year and a half ago and I have noticed no indication, no action at all on some of the requests that were made.

The minister said, Price (Nfld.) said wrote an official letter to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment

MR. FLIGHT:

and suggested that the logging— that the sacking of Red Indian Lake, the cleaning up of Red Indian Lake was going on as normal, they were carrying out their normal sacking operations. Thousands of cords of wood floating free and they had never sacked Red Indian Lake. And the indications are now they never intend to sack Red Indian Lake. And if the ministry is not prepared to put the pressure on and say, You will clean up Red Indian Lake and you will stop wasting our resources, they will never sack it and the wood will keep sinking to the bottom. And they will keep going back in and cutting free standing timber. And that, Sir, any way you look at it is a loss to the economy of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I will support and I suspect that this side will support the legislation that would set up a board and require that scalers be licensed. But I would strongly recommend to the minister that in so doing he would look into the possibility of broadening that bill to give the scalers the right to tell what is going on, and not only to tell, to report what is happening in on these timber limits. Price (Nfld.), Mr. Speaker, and Bowaters are a power onto themselves in this Province. They recognize no authority only their own, and I doubt very seriously if they have ever had any authority to contend with by way of inspection in the woods where the action is, where the things I am talking about are happening.

The minister or his assistant minister or his assistant deputy minister should go in and see first hand what is happening. And I would suspect, Sir, that he would be concerned. Mr. Speaker, even if this does not happen Price and Bowaters will go their merry way and this Province will be the loser.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I have just got a couple of quickies for the minister, Sir. The Board of Examiners, I wonder if when the minister is closing the debate if he could elaborate a little more on the makeup

MR. NEAPY:

of the Board of Examiners. The minister-or in the legislation it says, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint a board to examine scalers of timber to be known as the Timber Scalers Board consisting of three qualified persons all or any of whom may be appointed from among persons employed in the public service of the Province!" Now I would like to know if that is possible to get the qualified people within the public service.

It goes on a little further. It says, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate the chairman of the board and the secretary of the board from the members thereof and may prescribe the duties of each. A member of the board who is not employed in the public service of the Province may be paid such amount for attendance at meetings." I presume the thought behind this is to keep the expenses down because these are not full-time jobs. They are just a board that will meet occasionally, meet from time to time whenever the necessity arises. And I presume that is why the legislation gives the minister the authority to try to find the people within the public service. What I want to find out really is if that is possible.

In the next section, section five that deals with examinations, Sir, I am wondering if the - I presume that the examinations will be oral. Probably some of it will be written, and another part of it will be actual performance. I am mainly concerned about the written part. I know in the Department of Manpower, as the minister is aware, if a mechanic or a plumber or an electrician want to bring somebody with them to do the written part of the examination they are allowed to do it. Say a man may not be able to express himself in writing, and he is allowed to bring a son or a daughter or a relative or a friend who will write down the answers that the applicant gives him. I wonder if the minister could tell us if this would be permissible under this act in writing, if there is any written - I presume there is some written part to the examinations.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister should tell us now  
if the amount of the increase in the license - the minister alluded there a

MR. NEAPY:

few moments ago that under the regulations there would be an adjustment in the fee. Well, Sir, I believe we should be told now what the minister has in the back of his mind in connection with increasing the license fee.

Mr. Neary.

I believe that that is quite important, and we should not have to wait for the regulations. And one other matter, Sir, that I would like to ask the minister to clarify is that in the event of grievances, is there any recourse under this act for appeal? I know under Section 17 when disputes arise between loggers and timber scalers, there is a procedure whereby they can settle their differences. But is there any recourse for appeal, you know, in connection for instance with the examinations of somebody who is not satisfied with the way the examinations were held? And I would also like for the minister to tell the House - because I am a little bit ignorant of the situation and probably there are other members like myself - where we have schools now for loggers and scalers, where they are located and if they are operating on a year round basis, and how many instructors we have? Give us a brief outline of the training programme. These are just a few questions, Mr. Speaker, that I would like for the minister to clarify in closing the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): If the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the questions that have been posed, first of all I might point out that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), although he had some interesting comments, they were totally irrelevant to the Timber Scalers Act. And the comments that he had, and I would assume that he will probably have quite a few more which would be more appropriate at a time when the Forest Land Management Taxation Act is being discussed, and I would assume that there will be some amendments to that act this year. So there will be ample opportunity to discuss the whole forestry programme, how it is being managed, whether or not wood is being left in to rot or whatever, and what type of controls have been put on it. And I would be only too happy at that time to discuss the problems and the possible solutions with any member.

Mr. Maynard.

The question was raised as to whether or not scalers, who presently hold certificates, will have their certificates renewed? The answer is, Yes. Section 10 of the bill states quite clearly that anybody who holds a certificate now under any of the three acts will automatically get a new certificate under this present act. I am not aware of any scalers operating for private companies that are not licenced. If there are scalers operating for private companies that are not licenced, their scaling and their returns are certainly not recognized by the Department of Forestry or by government and, therefore, not recognized by any of our scaling methods.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked if there were qualified persons in the public service to serve on a board? The answer is, Yes. All of our foresters have to have a valid scaling course and be qualified, fully qualified in scaling. We do have, of course, the chief scaler for the Province in the department, and it is possible to get qualified persons in the public service to serve on such a board. That is not to say that we will have all public servants. It will depend on how we can do it with the least possible cost, because this board obviously will not meet very often. It would not be appropriate to have any full-time people, obviously.

The exams would obviously - the person who is taking an exam for a timber scaler would have to be able to do a written exam, because the ability to make written reports is a requirement after the licence is issued. The scaler is required to make periodic reports under the new act, if I might refer to it. It sets out the requirements for making reports - which I do not see here now, but it is in one of the sections - "A timber scaler shall make a monthly return on forms supplied by the department showing

Mr. Maynard.

the volume and class of timber scaled during the preceding month, the name of the employer of his services, and the permit number under which the timber was cut." Obviously any person who is in the scaling business does need some formal education.

MR. MAYNARD: That is not to say that some parts of the examination may not be oral, but certainly there would be written sections to the examination which the person would be required to complete successfully. The examination fee is presently \$5.00, our proposal is to have it at \$10.00 and a renewal fee of \$5.00 per year. There is no recourse for an appeal from an examination, and that is a pretty standard procedure that you do not have an appeal from any examination whether it is in high school, elementary school, a Manpower training course or whatever. We can and we do give training courses in various parts of the Province helped out by the Federal Manpower programmes. We have our own people from the department give these courses at various times depending on the number of people applying for a scalers license from any area, and of course once a number have applied from the Western region or Central or whatever, if it is enough to put on a course then we do it. But there is no set schedule for the courses or neither is there any set number that we have to have before we give a course.

I think that answers most of the questions. Again I would like to point

MR. NEARY: May I just ask one further question? ...

MR. MAYNARD: Sure.

MR. NEARY: In connection with - let me see where I am here. Everything now is going metric, are they measuring now in metric or are they converting now to the metric system? Is this something new or are they doing it now anyway?

MR. MAYNARD: Well both methods are really being used in some cases, Sir. But the metric conversion has started and at least as far as the government is concerned we are committed



MR. MAYNARD: to being totally into the metric system by the end of 1978.

MR. NEARY: So they all have to be re-educated now to the metric system?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, they will all have to know how to do the conversion and the easiest way to do that of course is to simply sit at a table that converts cubic feet to cubic metres or whatever. And that sort of thing will be supplied so it will not be a long training course to convert to the metric system. Merely doing it in the normal way for the most part and then using a conversion table until such time as logs and timber are cut metrically. It is going to be some time, I would suspect, before Bowaters who are using four-foot wood can convert to three and one half foot wood, which would be meter wood. Because of their wood-room and this sort of thing. It is going to take some time to convert but it is not going to be a difficult thing for the present scalers. It will possibly take some instructions but that is being co-ordinated through the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment, all the metric conversion effort, so it should not cause too much problems.

Again, on the question of timber harvesting, how timber is harvested by the companies, their controls, their regulations and that sort of thing, I want to point out that we have proposed some amendments to "The Forest Land Management And Taxation Act, 1974" which should be coming up in this session of the legislature and it will certainly give all members of the legislature ample opportunity to discuss anything regarding the forest industry that may come to their mind. And hopefully I can answer or discuss it with them on a rational basis.

I have some very strong views about the way the forests

MR.- MAYNARD:

are managed as I am sure that other members have. And I will do everything to give them the opportunity to discuss it.

I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", Contrary "Nay", Carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting Timber Scalers" read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently by leave. (Bill No. 37). Agreed.

MR. PECKFORD: Order 6, Bill No. 25.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt A Certain Agreement Entered Into Between The Government And Burgeo Fish Industries Limited And Others."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Pural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) in his place because we sort of half hung off this evening waiting for him to be here because it is of very important and vital interest to his area. Mr. Speaker, this bill gives me the opportunity to not only make a few remarks about Bill 25 but perhaps to make a couple of observations which I have been wanting to make for quite some time, and that is about the government's intentions or commitment to a particular area.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, approximately \$6.5 million of government commitment to a community on the Southwest Coast of the Province, namely Burgeo, a history of commitment that has never been made by any government to any community of this magnitude. And the hon. the Minister of Finance, who is not with us this evening, not with us at the moment, I should say, who left a minute ago for an important commitment that he has, really perhaps is the individual who should be here and presenting the bill and taking the kudos and the credit that he deserves because this piece of paper called Bill 25 to me, Mr. Speaker, is an indication of a level of government commitment on the one hand and, secondly, a level of government impartiality on another hand that is something which really has hardly been recognized in this House.

It is sad to know, Mr. Speaker, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) stood in his place and presented a petition from his riding in which he indicated the serious concern of people in the particular region regarding unemployment - and of course he very properly did that and very properly said to government that he was concerned. And the debate ensued which lasted for quite some time this afternoon, a little bit of fuss back and forth, which is always part of parliamentary procedure and parliamentary debate. I would hope this afternoon when he gets an opportunity to speak - or this evening - he will have I am sure the proper parliamentary courtesy to make reference in some detail to what has happened in his riding with respect to this particular fish plant.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is being brought into the House as a result of a commitment made by the government to have ratified an agreement which is already fait accompli with National Sea in respect to the whole Burgeo situation. Some years ago, I believe I am right in saying in 1972, approximately 1972, there was a very major fuss in the Burgeo area, perhaps one of the two most serious labour disputes that ever existed in this Province. The long and the short of it was that the government were faced with a situation where they -

AN HON. MEMBER: 1971.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: 1971, where they were expected and assumed the responsibility of purchasing the assets of a particular company called Burgeo Fish Industries. The assets of that company were left there and would have perhaps deteriorated and the community would have in itself deteriorated. A community of, I would assume, I believe, about 3,000 people would have died on the vine in the event that the government did not make the commitment to move into Burgeo and purchase the assets of that particular company.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that when the assets were purchases in -

MR. NEARY: You paid double what you should have paid.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member is saying we paid double what should have been paid. I am not familiar with the full details although I have got a considerable knowledge of the background to it, that undoubtedly the government were faced with a situation where they were, because of a social responsibility, in a situation where they might very well have paid more. I do not think there is anyone would deny that the government did not get any bargain in picking up the assets of Burgeo Fish Industries. The assets was a decrepit and a neglected fish plant which I visited in 1975 to discover personally - and it is something that I already pretty well knew from knowledge and from input from the members of Cabinet and so on - a fish plant which was in a very, very terrible condition and which by the way is a credit to the work force of Burgeo in the sense that they have continued to operate that plant and be one of the most productive

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

work forces in the Province.

A supermarket, an administration building, and a number of houses and a few odds and ends constituted the assets of Burgeo Fish Industries. Mr. Speaker, subsequently the government made a commitment to the people of Burgeo to try and get some competent people to operate and run the fish plant in Burgeo. Obviously neither department of government, neither minister of the government or department would be capable of running a fish plant in the sense of the operations and the marketing of that particular plant.

Mr. Lundrigan:

The government were able to secure the involvement of National Sea which is one of the most respectable fish companies in the country, to operate the plant for a particular fee, \$75,000 a year, is the management fee with 5 per cent -

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the plus?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The plus is 5 per cent of the results of the sales of the produce from Burgeo Fish Industry as determined by the sales of the product on the Boston market from the blue sheets, which I believe is the official day to day fish prices paid by the people who purchase our produce, And that was the arrangement which was made with the National Sea Company to manage, to operate and to sell our fish. And they have since that particular time and until today and until the completion of the new plant they will have the responsibility for that particular thing which I have just described.

I indicated as well, Mr. Speaker, that the government were faced then with the responsibility, What are we going to do with a fish plant that really does not have the kinds of capability to carry on a prolonged and long term fishery in that community? And in 1975, after tough, hard negotiations to the point where we have to almost say to companies involved and National Sea that we are not certain about which way we should go, the government sat down and had to make a decision to participate in the construction of a new plant which we expect will cost the government of this Province, with the contribution from DREE, from Ottawa, anywhere between \$9 millions and \$10 millions, and that was one of the most fundamental decisions that was ever made by the government of this Province. It meant, Mr. Speaker, that the government recognized that without the new fish plant in Burgeo that the community was written off. It was just as well to re-enforce the resettlement programme.

Mr. Speaker, the decision was made, even though with some regret that the negotiations had dragged on for about two

Mr. Lundrigan:

years before we could finally consummate and put together the entire deal which meant an escalation in the cost of the plant. The last estimates, and the estimates on which the plant determination was made, was \$9.1 millions in order to build the new plant with a contribution of \$3.5 million from DREE and the rest of the contribution directly from the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador with some assets being put in by National Sea.

Now I will try to just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, indicate to members the scenario on how the thing happened. In essence, Mr. Speaker, when we purchased as a government Burgeo Fish Industries National Sea were left in Burgeo with the assets of the old Burgeo Leasing. Now Burgeo Leasing was a company that was owned and is owned exclusively by National Sea. It was an operating company to operate the Nat Lake plant, and the Nat Lake Plant was built by the Spencer Lake team and the National Sea with an 80 per cent - 20 per cent ownership from National to the Lake team of companies. National bought out the Lake group, of course, and they exclusively owned Nat Lake and exclusively owned Burgeo Leasing up until approximately one year ago.

The agreement which is before us today, and I am giving a little bit of detail on this deliberately, Mr. Speaker, so that members can participate meaningfully, it is a little bit complicated but I will try to outline it the best I can. The government decided that the best route, and the legal advisors have decided that the best route to pursue would be to use Burgeo Leasing Limited as the mechanism, the mechanism in order to construct a new plant. In order to do that it was necessary for the government to buy into equal ownership with Burgeo Leasing. Burgeo Leasing had assets of \$2.4 million and the \$2.4 million was basically the depreciated Nat Lake plant, if you want. Also, Mr. Speaker, the company, National Sea, that owned it really made a contribution of approximately \$1 million, \$950,000 in the way of a loan to Burgeo Leasing, the operating company, \$950,000, and this is spelled out in detail in the particular document.

Mr. Lundrigan:

The government purchased through common shares, 5,000 common shares, and through 420,000 preference shares an equivalent ownership position, and if one wants to be technical about it, we purchased 175 of the 350 shares worth ten cents each which was a little package of voting preference shares that Spencer Lake and them owned, I do not know the reason, we do not know -



MR. LUNDRIGAN: preference shares that Spencer Lake and them owned. I do not know the reason, we do not know the reason, but we did purchase right down the line, even to the point of \$17.50 worth of ten cent preference shares, if I am not mistaken. So we purchased equal ownership of the particular Burgeo Leasing and what we have done since then, Mr. Speaker, with the contribution of \$2.4 million from National through the depreciated value of their plant and \$950,000 of loan, what we have now done since then is own equal positions with respect to Burgeo Leasing, and as a result of that we were able to start building the plant with Burgeo Leasing being the parent company, if one wants to put it that way. So really in essence we have today, and will have when the plant is completed, a company called Burgeo Leasing owning a new plant in Burgeo and that new plant will be fifty per cent owned by Burgeo Leasing and National in the sense that we are equal owners in the company.

MR. NEARY: Even though National did not put one red cent into it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: National have put in \$2.4 million worth of depreciated assets and \$950,000 as a loan to the particular company called Burgeo Leasing. As a result of that they receive a partial involvement in the first mortgage that we will have on the plant. The Government of the Province are then called upon by agreement to place in position, either through a guarantee or monies that can be raised by Burgeo Leasing, \$3.5 million as the first phase of the construction of that plant. And the \$3.5 million is secured by a first mortgage, the \$950,000 from National is part of that same first mortgage, and the first mortgage is to be paid off over the period of eighteen years, Mr. Speaker, with the monies being paid equally in proportion, I should say, to the National Sea for their \$950,000 involve in our \$3.5 million involvement.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: There is then the requirement by government, Mr. Speaker, to put forward whatever remaining monies there are required in order for the government to finish constructing the plant, and that means in essence that we will be putting up anywhere from it could be as high as \$3.5 million or \$4 million more. Hopefully with the kinds of good bidding we have had in the last year, and with the efficient management of the construction at Burgeo, we will get away cheaper than it could have been in a different kind of a construction period. And that is a very positive thing from the point of view of the government.

The DREE monies of course of \$3.5 million will be forthcoming on the completion of the plant. We are to finance that amount of the monies during the interim period. DREE have agreed to allow us to capitalize the interest on the monies we borrow for that period and include it as a part of the capital costs of the plant, and all of these things itemized and indicated right here in the document, Bill No. 25.

We would then, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the construction period, which we anticipate to be September of 1978, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and National Sea, through their company, have the immediate requirement to purchase the old trawlers from Burgeo Fish. Burgeo Fish will continue to operate up until and could operate up until five years following the completion of the plant.

So essentially what we will have next September, September of 1978, we will have two companies, we will have the new plant owned by Burgeo Leasing and we will have Burgeo Fish. Burgeo Fish will basically be a real estate company. It will not have any involvement directly in the fish business, it will own a supermarket and it will own an office building and it will own a number of residences.

Burgeo Leasing will have purchased from the Burgeo Fish

1  
MR. LUNDRIGAN: their inventory, and their receivables, and their trawlers at fixed agreed rates which are outlined right here. As a matter of fact I believe exactaly \$500,000 is the agreed price for the trawlers to be sold to Burgeo Leasing from Burgeo Fish.

As well, Mr. Speaker, there is an agreement where the existing odds and ends, I will call them, from National Sea in Burgeo, which is less than \$100,000 in value, will be purchased by Burgeo Leasing so National will have no presence other than their ownership in the company.

There are two managment agreements.

MR. NEARY: Plus the fact that they will own the trawlers.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: There are two managerent agreements. Burgeo Leasing, Mr. Speaker, will own the trawlers. Burgeo-Leasing which is fifty per cent owned by the government and fifty per cent owned by National.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other things I should in a preliminary way mention to the House and that is there are two management and operating agreements, outlined in this particular document in appendices

Mr. Lundrigan.

(b) and (c). No. (c) to simplify, it is an agreement where we enter into an agreement with the Burgeo Fish Industries to operate what effectively will be that real estate company after 1978 of September. We as well enter into an agreement with the new fish plant. National will, through Burgeo Leasing, enter into an agreement with the new fish plant for a period to operate and sell the fish and manage that particular plant for an agreed period. Mr. Speaker, at the end of an eight year period, during which there is a binding agreement between National and Burgeo Leasing, at the end of an eight year period National will have the right - the option, I should say, to purchase the assets of Burgeo Leasing, which means they will have a one year option to purchase by redeeming the preference shares and to buy the common shares, which is the ownership of the company, for the book value of the company to be determined at that period. Obviously the only way they would want to buy the company - if it is a profitable company - if it is a profitable company - the formula which has been established in the document and is before the House means that they would pay excessively for the assets of Burgeo Leasing. At the end of that one year period the government in the ninth year - or I might say the tenth year, will have the option to do exactly the same thing.

The government, of course, would not purchase the shares, the assets of Burgeo Leasing unless again it were a profitable arrangement. The company will be tied into the agreement for an eighteen year period during which period, of course, the first mortgage will be repaid. So that is the general situation on it. There is a lot of technical knowledge in here. It is a formality in some ways that we are bringing this before the House for debate so that the House will be properly informed, so that it is a public document and so that everybody will be quite familiar with it.

Mr. Lundrigan.

Now the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)

is making some comments across the way about National and their involvement. I would like to make a point here about the management agreement. The real management agreement where we agree for an eight year period when the new plant comes on stream to pay a management fee of \$75,000 a year minimum fee to Burgeo Leasing. Under the old agreement, Mr. Speaker, we were entitled to pay them \$75,000 a year. There was no ceiling on what we could pay them. But the way we would pay them is based on the profitability of the company. And to date - I can give the figures in a minute - to date the company has not been paid in excess of the \$75,000 management fee except in one year and I will give the reason for that in a moment. We have now in the new agreement put a ceiling on the plant, the management fee, in the event that things turn around in a magnificent, in the event that we find new species, in the event we find new product lines. We got better markets. We got a more efficient plant. We got a good trawler fleet and the like. It could very well be that we will have a positive cash flow, a very positive situation with respect to Burgeo Leasing. And consequently we have a ceiling of \$225,000 put on a management fee which is the maximum that the company can draw down during any period while this agreement is in effect.

MR. NEARY: Is the plant paying its way now or not?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will give you the figures on that in a minute.

The other comment is that we do pay, and we will pay in the agreement the same as we have since 1972, a five per cent sales fee. And that five per cent fee I would indicate we feel if we were doing it as a government, Mr. Speaker, would be approximately what it would cost the government to sell our fish assuming we had - and with no marketing and no nothing. It would take us we feel administratively about five per cent to sell the fish. National are certainly

Mr. Lundrigan.

not getting any big deal as far as the five per cent for the marketing effort is concerned. And we know that it would cost us just about the same amount as they are receiving. They have a more efficient operation naturally in marketing than we could have. We use their labels. We use their outlets. We use their people who are offshore in the U.S. market and so on, and they certainly are not making any big deal off us in this Province at this moment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the big deal business. I am, like the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I have got no great big heavy gut feeling for big heavy companies. I do not get the feeling that anybody is doing us a favour, but I will suggest that this is one of the finest pieces of work that has been done by a government department

MR. LUNDRIGAN: in trying to put together a deal, the best in a bad situation that could be gotten for government. It is possibly more complicated. It is possibly more - There has been more quid pro quo and give and take and cut and thrust and hard-nosed bargaining in this document than on the Come by Chance Oil Refinery. I am very proud of it and the departmental people and the Minister of Finance and others should certainly be very pleased with the work that has gone into putting together a really copper-fastened deal, the best we can get for this province under the circumstances.

Now the member for LaPoile raised a question about the profitability of the company since we have taken it over. The company has been losing money. The company has not been losing money as a result of the lack of productivity of the work force. I say that with obviously no political motivation. It is no political benefit to me to be complimentary to the work force in Burgeo. So my comments can be discounted on that basis. I have visited the plant. I am aware of the statistics in a plant which is unbelievable. If members could see for themselves the kinds of odds and ends and ins and outs and corridors and ways and means of getting around and the conditions of the plant the work force in that plant are to be commended. They are without a doubt one of the finest work forces in any plant in North America and that is the reason we have not lost more money in the community of Burgeo and Burgeo Fish Industries.

The operating losses, Mr. Speaker, in 1972 were \$469,000. That is a fair little commitment to one community in terms of an industry which the brunt of the burden being borne by the Province. In 1973 we picked up \$94,000 in losses again. In 1974 and I believe that was the banner year for the fisheries in the province in terms of market conditions and the like, we made \$209,000. That is a good credit to management as well.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Young Gerry Malone who is down there and who has done a tremendous job, a fine outstanding young fellow, and he has a tremendous rapport with the work force. The kinds of problems, traditional problems that existed with the work forces is almost nonexistent today in that particular area. In 1975 we lost ourselves \$1 million in operating losses in the community of Burgeo. In 1976 we lost \$373,000 and these figures of course are figures that are not surprising to government. We knew that we were going to have that kind of loss when we got involved back in 1971-1972.

Mr. Speaker, we have accumulated, I cannot add that up quickly but I am looking at approximately \$1.5 million in round figures that have been operating losses in that period of time. We have had the employment in the plant though, I mean, it is something that we have to look at; we have had a range of from just over 200 to 250 people in that plant during that period of time and that is something that ought to be noted. We have had from fifty-two to seventy-eight the range of people working in trawlers. So we are talking over 300 people directly affected as a result of the plant. Now the wages are interesting as well to observe. In 1972 we had \$447,000 and \$132,000 respectively paid the plant wages and the trawler share - \$447,000 and \$132,000 respectively. In 1973 -

MR. NEARY: I thought the losses were \$400,000 that year.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, actually our losses were almost as great as our wages. In 1973 -

PREMIER MOORES: The wages were about \$600,000 there totally.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Was it? About \$600,000 in wages and about \$469,000 in losses. In 1973 we had plant and trawlers again respectively \$642,000 and \$257,000. So we are looking at \$900,000 and we had losses of \$94,000. In 1974 we had \$900,000 and \$500,000, that



MR. LUNDRIGAN: was \$1.4 million in wages to the plant and the trawlers. We had profits that year of \$200,000. So that certainly is a commendable change around. We had unfortunately last year -

PREMIER MOORES: We should have quit while we were ahead.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Premier suggests we should have quit while we were ahead. If we were playing a poker game, which I am not unfamiliar with, that is maybe what one would do but even in that kind of a game one tends to continue. In the area of 1975 -

AN HON. MEMBER: To one's sorrow.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: To one's sorrow. In 1975 we had, looking at the wages again, were \$742,000 and \$481,000. The wages were down, the put-through was down as well and we had \$1 million in operating losses that year so that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! There has been a quorum call as a matter of fact.

There is a quorum.

The hon. Minister of Rural and Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In 1976, I am quoting from statistics that were prepared by my department right here, and this one I have to admit I have not looked at this one, and I hope it is correct, I am sure it is correct, but I am told and it certainly does not seem to add up to the feeling that I would have had myself. But last year my facts or information tells me we had \$1.3 million and \$1.3 million respectively from both operations which is over \$2 million \$2.5 million wage pay out in that community. The operating loss last year was \$373,000. The put-through in fish Mr. Speaker, we had going from 1972 to 1976 going from 2.6 million pounds produced, that is finished product, 4.3 million pounds, 5.5 million pounds, 4.1 million pounds in 1975 and 7 million pounds in 1976. That is based on a range of from 8 million to 22 in raw product. That is just a fantastic success story. It is the kind of a success story that perhaps we do not hardly hear enough about and certainly if we got to wait for the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir to bring it to our attention I think we would be waiting until Doomsday.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this particular commitment is something which ought to be put in perspective. In 1975 the hon. members will remember the government launched into a very very heavy austerity programme. On this side of the House there are 30 members approximately, the other side of the House there are 21 members approximately. This government took a situation and looked at a community of 3,000 people. The government could have said, we have no interest in Burgeo. The government could have said, we cannot afford Burgeo. We cannot afford a hospital in Grand Falls, we cannot afford a hospital in Burin, we cannot afford a hospital in the community of Clarendville, we cannot afford to do anything in Argenteia, unemployment rate of 28 per cent. We cannot afford to do anything in another dozen ridings in the Province

MR. LUNDRIGAN: of Newfoundland and Labrador that are communities which are occupied by members of the government side of the House. We have situations in every riding, in the government members ridings which are of a critical urgent nature. Now, I listen, I make this point, I make this point and the hon. member for down in the Marystown area, I am going to get around to him later on because I have a few little things to get off my chest when I get around to him, but I am going to be a little bit polite until he gets back in good top form. He gets back in good top form because even out in Grand Falls he was saying, "You must be going to run in Marystown, that is all we hear from you, Marystown and Burgeo! You must be going to run in Marystown because every time we turn on the radio you are pushing, negotiating, flogging away for Marystown." I will get around to the member because it is not relevant on the particular debate here before us right at the moment.

But, Mr. Speaker, the government sat down and said, 'Where does our responsibility lie?' Now I raise the question because members across the House and I saw the member, unfortunately he is not here, from Lewisporte one day get up and talk about the partisanism, the parochialism, the smallmindedness, the political inclination of the government. This government made a decision that has cost the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, not including the operating losses that have added up since 1972, not including the millions of dollars that were spent, perhaps we never got a good deal because we were caught with the social responsibility in 1971. It was then, on top of all of that, responsible for making a decision which will cost the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador \$6 to \$7 million directly. We are not only not backing away from it, we are bragging about it because we recognize, we recognize Mr. Speaker, that this was the best way to go. The option was resettlement. We said, "We are going to scrap resettlement."

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We do not want to see our communities disappear! It is going to cost us \$6 million to \$7 million. Now, are our responsibilities finished when we spend these \$6 millions to \$7 millions of dollars? Mr. Speaker, we do not even know even with the big plant, with our plans for research into some of the potential for shrimp that is South of Burgeo, with the regeneration of species, pelagic and other species as a result of the conservation measures, with the new product lines that we are hoping to be able to introduce, we do not still know if we are going to break even. We certainly do not expect to make money. We are also faced with the problem of having to make a decision as a company - Government-National in Burgeo Leasing - to make a decision about what to do with landing. What are we going to do with trying to improve the landings into Burgeo?

Right now we have five old side trawlers. It is a compliment to the fishing crews out of Burgeo that they get involved in the particular side trawlers. And we know that. We are faced with the responsibility of having to make a decision in conjunction with industry at some point for catch capability in this particular area and in other areas as well in this Province.

Hopefully industry, National, with their great fleet which they should be expanding can provide the total catch capability that can empty into Burgeo and have the maximum put-through which could be 30 million pounds a year. Ten or twelve million pounds of finished product a year, a bigger work force, that is what the people of Burgeo want, a bigger work force. These are the kinds of commitments we have made when we

MR. LUNDRIGAN: talk about a particular area.

What kind of a decision? The hon. member says one. I would like for the hon. member to have been present - and I have been present even though I do not represent Burgeo - and make that kind of a comment to some of the people from that community that are as tough as nails. That is the reason they have survived. "One" he says, as if it is insignificant and incidental. "One", the hon. member for Marystown says, as if it is incidental and insignificant. \$6 million, "One" looking down the road at trawler fleets and the like.

These kinds of decision - we are not here debating 850 communities. If we were, Mr. Speaker, I could take about 700 hours. Because in every community there have been commitments and efforts made by government. Not easy decision. This Province is not blessed with the financial capability of being able to take \$25 million or \$35 million and throw it at the economy and hope that it takes root like the Feds have been able to do with LIP this year. If we had the financial resources in this Province, if we were as wealthy today as the Province of Alberta it would not be any more money that we would need to be able to provide the stimulus required to bring our economy quickly into a position where it is healthy.

And hon. members across the way ought to be aware of this. We cannot have our cake and eat it too. The member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) stands up in his place and says, You cannot afford that kind of stuff. He did not say that specifically about Burgeo, but he says you cannot afford the level of expenditure that you are involving yourselves with. Reasonable people say, "How can you go any further with expenditures? In order to do it you have to grab more taxes." Our

MR. LUNDRIGAN: people are overtaxed. Is there anybody in this House who would deny, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province are overtaxed? The government are aware of it. The responsibility of what type of decision do you make? Where do you draw the line? Where do you make the choices? I have learned the hard way, maybe, that is why I get a little bit aggravated when I see young crackerjack upstarts like the member over across the way from Windsor, my contiguous political neighbour out in the community of Windsor and my crackerjack Irishman from up in White Bay - Baie Verte. A good parliamentarian, an Englishman with an Irish attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I sort of enjoy their cut and thrust but when you get to the point - Leaders of the Opposition, financial spokesmen for the Opposition, get down to the crunch they have to bear in mind that this government have been making wise choices, choices that are not the best political decisions. If we were making the best political decisions. If we were making the best political decisions for us, Mr. Speaker, we would have closed down Burgeo. I have in my hand right now an amount of money which is greater than any budget I have had in Rural Development since I have been here in one community. Is that committment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What did you pay Lake for the fish plant?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I can go on and talk about Spencer Lake. I can go on and talk about what we paid Spencer Lake.

MR. SIMMONS: Ten times as much as the plant is worth.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the choice that we had, the choice -

MR. NEARY: Was to win an election.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Was to win an election? The  
hon. member has a preoccupation

Mr. Lundrigan.

winning elections. John Diefenbaker was not as expertise in winning elections as the hon. member, and he ran eight times and got defeated and got elected a dozen times. Winning elections! Winning elections! We made the decision, Mr. Speaker, in Burgeo -

MR. SIMMONS: Spent millions of dollars for a plant that was worth nothing.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, we made the decision in Burgeo - that member for an enlightened educator I am a little bit surprised - we made the decision on Burgeo to spend \$9.1 million in the Fall of 1975. I did not detect that there was any great -

MR. SIMMONS: We are talking about 1972 now.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh, you are talking about 1972.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, let us go back and talk about it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: 1975 is not important.

That is when we made our big decision on Burgeo was in 1975.

AN HON. MEMBER: - people of Burgeo, you know, just before -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen across the way, you know, they disappoint me a little bit because they feel, they have this feeling that there is no such a thing as political integrity; there is no such a thing as statesmanship; there is no such a thing as -

MR. SIMMONS: We do not feel that at all. It is just that you do not see much.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the hackling across the way. The member for Burgeo is there now, and he is going to get up and have his few remarks. "We do not see it!" What kind of a small minded little man would you have to be not to see the leadership the government has shown with respect to a bill spending \$9 million in one community of 3,000. He is not of the principle and the stature to stand up in his place and give a bit of credit to a government that has gone out on a \$9 million limb.



MR. SIMMONS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is having difficulty containing himself. I can understand that. He will not, Mr. Speaker, stand there and through you, Mr. Speaker, lecture me about how little integrity I have. I will not stand for it. My rights in this House preclude that kind of an attack. I am not going to stand for it. Now, Mr. Speaker, either that man retracts what he has just said about my lack of integrity or we will pursue this one further. I am here trying as best I can to listen to what I was told by the minister at the beginning of his remarks would be an enlightening address of information on the Burgeo bill. And I am listening with interest, but all we are getting over here, all of us, is a lot of abuse for some reason that I cannot understand. I do not know what we have done, Mr. Speaker, tonight. We do not have to agree with him, do we? Do we have to clap every sentence he says? All we have done, Mr. Speaker, is taken exception. We do so for a very good reason. But these tirades about partisanship and about how small minded we are? Mr. Speaker, the answer to the minister's question, in completing my point of order, about how small minded you have to be to make a charge, in the words he said, "Not to appreciate this," I appreciate it, but the answer to his question how small do you have to be, Mr. Speaker, about one-tenth as small as the minister is appearing to be right now.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is no point of order. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has not established a point of order. He has not referred to the Standing Orders or to any reference to indicate it. He has not quoted any statements made by the hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development to indicate that. It is specious; it is foolish, and he has not established a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, which overrides a point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is not the first one ruled on first?

MR. SIMMONS: Point of privilege. No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A point of privilege.

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

I distinctly heard, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development make reference to some lack of integrity on my part. Mr. Speaker, I do not have access to the tapes at this moment, because the words were said in the last five minutes. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is an important enough issue, that we recess the House and we get the tapes to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that what I am saying is correct, that the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development has very directly stated that I have a lack of integrity, and he is not within his rights at all as a member of this House to say that kind of thing, and it is not required of me that I sit here and take it. I would strongly appeal to

Mr. Speaker to recess the House, to get the tapes and at which time I will make the appropriate motion as required to under a matter of privilege.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On that particular question of privilege, Your Honour, in view of the fact that I obviously in my response in trying to get through the weavings and the wranglings of the legislative procedure I have offended the sensitivities of the hon. member, and he is obviously very deeply hurt and concerned. If I have done anything of that nature in reflecting on his integrity I certainly would like to withdraw it and continue with my remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think words on both sides have been said with some heat this evening, possibly related to the lateness of the hour. I think that the hon. minister has made a retraction which seems to the Chair to cover the situation. So I would therefore rule that the hon. minister should continue his remarks.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am certainly not being my normal self at this moment today, because I am basically a very nice fellow, very easy to get along with and certainly a statesman in every sense of the word as hon. members will recognize and agree.

MR. HODDER: Will the hon. minister permit a question.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Certainly.

MR. HODDER: I was just wondering, you know, back in 1972, what was the price that was paid to Spence Lake for the fish plant when it was bought at that particular time?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite remember what the particular price was. I believe it was - was it \$2.7 million? I cannot remember, whatever it was. Hon. members when they get into debate -

AN HON. MEMBER: \$2.6 million.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: \$2.6 million. Whatever it was it will be brought in. I cannot quite remember. It is not really, I suppose, relevant to the bill in one sense. But it is an important question, because I think the member is correct when he suggests that we did not get any bargain in Burgeo. There is no doubt about that in the world. I do not know. I would like to sort of almost suggest some of my feelings on that myself. But I do not think it would be constructive in view of the fact that the company that we are talking about is no longer there. And we have got to do the best with what we have and what we have is very significant. I am not going to pursue the comments to any great extent more. I would like to comment on the fact that yesterday afternoon the Minister of Fisheries and myself, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and a delegation from Burgeo were in town and we were treated to the pleasure of having their input on their perception of down the road in Burgeo. And they are concerned that they have got those stern trawlers there and we are concerned as well. Hopefully within the next little while we will be doing some negotiating in trying to find ways and means to encourage industry - National being the industry - to ship more fish into Burgeo. The name of the game is to get the maximum put-through so we will have the plant operating at capacity. Of course, the long term prospects in that regard are excellent. My own personal feeling, the Minister of Fisheries' feeling which I am sharing sort of from him, because he is expert in this area, is that Burgeo does face a very, very prosperous and bright future, as indeed I feel the whole fishing industry does.

These people came in yesterday. They made a very good case. I believe the member took them and talked to National Sea and had some discussion with National Sea regarding the need to ship fish into Burgeo this year. They made a presentation to me to see if there was a way to get the landing equipment which is the big

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

problem for landing the stern trawlers in there, temporarily established in the old plant so that they can maybe receive some fish from National's existing fleet this present year. We are looking at that. I have got a couple of my fellows who are particularly expert in this area - not in town now - and they will be looking at it when they get back. But we have taken a real personal interest in the Burgeo situation. We have taken an interest which I believe - and the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Industrial Development and Finance in this area have taken it almost as a pet project. And perhaps that is the reason why I find it a bit aggravating. And I will sort of, Mr. Speaker, continue along this line tomorrow morning to explain this thing further. I find it a bit aggravating when members sort of do not - maybe I am a little bit hard on the member for Burgeo Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) because I believe he deserves it, when he does not express kind of positiveness about this kind of set of circumstances that deserve to be presented.

In any event I have some more information and I will put this on the record tomorrow morning. I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow morning, April 1 at ten o'clock and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved that the House adjourn until tomorrow Friday at 10:00 a.m. Those in favour "aye", contrary "nay", carried. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Friday at 10:00 a.m.