

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, JULY 4, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 172 students of Memorial University, which brings to approximately 4,000 the numbers attached to similar petitions within recent days and weeks here in this House, and again emphasizes the desperate need for all those in positions of authority to get up now and state their position now before it is too late regarding the loans that are available to the students at Memorial University, bearing in mind that if the present policies that are now in existence continues it is a sure and certain fact that there are students who are qualified, who are intelligent, who have all of the merits necessary to enter the university, who will be barred from doing so on purely and simply economic grounds. It is as simple as that. So we can look to the day this Fall when there will be many, many students throughout this Province who under normal circumstances could enter the Memorial University but will be denied from doing so strictly because of the economic policies as outlined by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech.

It goes on in this petition to say that the changes introduced in the 1978 Provincial Budget, as so eloquently and dramatically presently to this House and on television, as though he were Grand Banks' answer to Richard Burton, by the Minister of Finance. Anyway, it says cutting back in post secondary education spending will have a serious effect on the ability of rural students to attend Memorial University. Is this an exaggeration? Of course not. There are going to be literally hundreds and hundreds of students who, as this petition points out, will be denied the opportunity of attending the university this year and thus far no good, sound, and sensible reason has been advocated for such a situation. Some of the figures that have been quoted on the basis of the increase and so on to the university

MR. NOLAN: state that this is similar to other universities in Canada and other Provinces in the Atlantic area. But the true facts- and I may say that those at the university, including the students, have done their homework and they have come up with fairly solid information, if one takes the trouble to read, as I hope they will opposite, and members on all sides the facts as outlined in this petition which is attached, will prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that here we have a situation where those in public life have for years been attempting to encourage students, boys and girls, men, and women from all over Newfoundland, to take the maximum advantage of the university opportunities, educational opportunities are available because of the economic policies of the administration. There is no question about it that you are going to have some real trouble and very real anguish on your hands come this Fall.

Now then, because of the university administration, and because of the lead time that students and the university must have for students to take advantage and to enroll and so on, there must be action now within the next few weeks in order for the necessary economic and administrative machinery to go into place and also so that the students and their parents can make preparation. Because what they are faced with now is this, one, absolutely barred them from the university. There is no way in God's world that they can go in there under the present scheme of things. Secondly, they are faced with an even greater problem in some respects and that is there is little or no employment for them. Now there it is. That is what you have on the plate of many young men and women in this Province today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that everyone in this House will pay close attention not only to the names that are signed, 172, but remember that this indicates over 4,000 names that we have tabled in this House within recent days, over 4,000. And if anyone

July 4, 1978

Tape No. 3036

NM - 3

MR. NOLAN: thinks that with the long hot Summer this is going to die, well I have news, Mr. Speaker, for all those in this House of Assembly. Because we on this side will continue to keep these petitions alive as much as we can and focus on them in every way possible throughout the Summer and Fall months. It is not something that may

MR. NOLAN: die here with the closing of this House of Assembly and if anyone thinks this is so they are making the mistake of their life. So, Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Minister of Education I have given up on the Minister of Finance I plead that someone pay some real attention to the situation that these students are faced with. There are a number of them who have been carrying on the point, if you like, and coming to the House each day and so on but they are not alone, they are merely the representatives, not only of the students at university but all those that will be coming in the next couple of years and their parents, their parents who have to try to find out a way, one, for them to enter the university, to cover their tuition costs, to cover their residence while they are in there and a little bit of pocket money that they can get. In addition to that this Summer with construction at the lowest ebb possible there are fewer and fewer jobs for the many students who need money, who must have some money to go to the university and so it is they have a terrible economic cross to bear and it is our business as legislators to see that we are aware of their problems and to make every effort that we can, which has not been in evidence thus far, to see to it that they get a chance to enter the university this year.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure- although I am sorry to do so; I wish I did not have to do so; I wish I did not have this problem and they did not have this problem-but I certainly support the prayer of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Thank you, Sir. I rise again, Sir, I suppose for the seventh or eighth time during this session of the House, to support this petition so admirably presented by my hon. friend and colleague the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). On this subject, Mr. Speaker, there have of course been a dozen other petitions on the general subject of cutbacks in education. I have had the honour and the pleasure of presenting two or three of these petitions as exemplified by my hon. friend's presentation today; this type of petition I have presented two or three myself and was delighted and honoured to do so.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, not only is the need which has been outlined in the petition an important one, Sir, but I believe that some of the best debate of this session of the House, some of the best, not certainly the best necessary, but some of the best debate, some of the best points made during this session of the House have been made on the presentation of these petitions on the subject of this government's cutback in the education system of our Province.

AN HON. MEMBER : Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, if these petitions serve no other useful purpose but his one, Sir, it has certainly been worthwhile having the petitions brought before this House and argued about and, - although we are not suppose to debate when petitions are presented, Sir, have what amounts to a debate on some of these very important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that within the next few days, if he has not received it already, the Minister of Education will be receiving the Task Force Report on education. Could the minister indicate whether he has received it or not yet, the Minister of Education.

MR. F. ROWE: Today is the deadline.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He has received it today.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not had a chance to read it yet.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I do not know if he has had an opportunity to look at it, Sir.

MR. NEARY: That will only take fifty seconds.

MR. W. ROWE: The Task Force that was set up by the minister was, certainly I do not think, was adequate and covered enough ground or covered enough of the interest groups which are vitally concerned with education in the Province, but, Sir, I suppose it is better than nothing at all, although when we see what the substance of the Task Force Report as we will be able to make a better judgement on that. I call upon the minister today, Sir, to give us some indication if he has read the report as to what has been recommended by this Task Force, or at least indicate to us when we can have our own copies so that we can study it and see what these two gentlemen, at least, these two gentlemen concerned with very narrow disciplines within the field of education have had to say about education generally in the

MR. W. ROWE:

Province and particularly since we are on this particular subject of cutbacks in university education standards, cutbacks in the expenditure on university, perhaps we can hear what these two gentlemen, although they have very narrow disciplines and would not cover the whole gamut, at least we can hear what these two gentlemen have had to say.

Mr. Speaker, let me make two points which have already been made but which bear repeating. One, Sir, is that no government which claims to represent the people, the rank and file of the people of this Province can tolerate a situation where even one individual who has the talent, the qualifications and the ability to do so is deprived of a university or a trade school

MR. W.N. ROWE: or any education, Sir, any further training in university or some other institute of higher learning, Sir, if any individual is deprived because of financial reasons then any government which tolerates that stands condemned and should stand condemned in the eyes of the ordinary people of this Province.

And secondly, Sir, this point has already been made by my hon. friend, most forcefully by my hon. friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), but again it bears repeating. The situation that the students are complaining about and have done so articulately in a couple of briefs and in their petitions to this House and in their demonstration out here and on the public airways, Sir, the situation they are complaining about is made even worse by the fact that as a result of the poor, adverse, inadequate financial and economic policies of this government, Sir, there are very few if any Summer jobs available to students in this Province this year. And so, Sir, ordinarily it would be bad enough for students to have to dip into their own meager resources or non-existent resources or their parents' meager resources or to go hopelessly head-over-heels in debt, that would be bad enough, Mr. Speaker, but usually at least in past years in, say, before the last six or seven years, many students could count on getting Summer employment to help bear part of this financial burden. Now, Sir, they cannot even depend on that, and this poor economic management and financial planning is going to also contribute to the fact that hundreds of qualified, worthy individuals, young men and women in this Province, this Summer and this Fall are not going to be able to pursue a higher education, the higher education which they should be able to pursue, Mr. Speaker. And who is going to be the loser there, Mr. Speaker? Not only the individuals concerned, Sir, but future generations of Newfoundlanders generally will be the losers as a result of this poor, retrograde, retrogressive unprogressive policy of the present administration regarding higher education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. I. STRACHAN:

Mr. Speaker in rising to support

the prayer of this petition I note that the 172 names of the 4,000 names that we presented so far, these 172 are names of students from rural and, I would imagine, fairly isolated areas of this Province and last time when I was on my feet on the same topic it was to that point that I addressed myself and I again have pleasure in doing so and will continue to do so, because I think that the students who are going to be hit the most by this are going to be the students from these rural and isolated areas and especially, as I put forward my point before, especially those students from Labrador and isolated parts of Labrador who are faced with tremendous burdens already without having placed on them an additional economic burden. It is difficult enough for students living in St. John's, whose families live in St. John's, to attend university and to financially scrape through the situation through university, but for students who come from isolated and rural areas the borrowing is twice-fold or three times that much and I think the emphasis should be on student assistance and I suggest last time the policy of bursaries or bursary system for students from these areas so that students with a high academic record from small communities and small schools, small areas would have an opportunity of winning such bursaries to assist them in meeting the already high cost they are faced with.

I also asked the Minister of Education to indicate to us exactly how much would be saved in the Public Treasury by the system of inflicting higher costs on the students. To me it seems to be socking it to the students whereas when we look around we see some extravagances, a considerable amount, and in Labrador we have seen a considerable amount there of money that has been wasted, money spent for very little returns and yet here we are socking it to the students, asking the students to pay more and more when in essence they should be assisted more and more - the reverse, the very reverse of the position.

I think this subject needs to be aired many, many times and hopefully the minister will take a position on which he will outline to us exactly how much money will be saved by the treasury

July 4, 1978

Tape 5038

DW - 3

MR. I. STRACHAN: in his system of cutbacks in schools, and the teachers in schools as well as the situation with the increase to students at university. I think there must be many other ways in which the administration, if they wanted to, could cut back.

Mr. Strachan: I am sure the cost of two Canso water bombers with \$400,000 out on a sale, surely if that was examined carefully one could find that many students could be financed with a university education through a correction of errors and extravagances, mistakes, rather than to sock it to the student, sock it to especially the rural student who has got to come in here, pay for his residence which is a very high cost, high cost of loans, and also the possibility that when he is finished he may have to leave the Province in order to find a job in order to repay these high loans.

I think there is no question about it. There is no more ignorant way, I think, of attacking a problem of solving the economic situation of the Province than to sock it to the students. And this is exactly what this administration has done. There must be many other ways it could have been done, many other ways it could have been saved, many other ways the fat could be trimmed off, that extravagant mistakes would not be made, that pure follies would not be made so that the student would be given every opportunity and every encouragement to carry on his education and become a better person for it.

I support the prayer of the petition and hopefully the Minister of Education can tell us exactly how much money will be saved to the Public Treasury by this system of cutbacks both in schoolroom education and to the students. How much will be saved by that? I hope that this time he will spell it out in hard dollars and cents so that we can then see whether what he is saying is appropriate. I do not believe it is, but I would like to see him hopefully on his feet this time to spell it out to us exactly how much was saved. I support the prayer of the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile followed by the hon. gentleman for St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the hon. the Minister of Education, Sir, would table a copy of the Task Force report that the Premier has in front of him there reading it, not that it will do any good Sir, because the terms of reference were so narrow that I doubt very much if it will do anything to help the University students, the students who

Mr. Neary: want to go into University in September. But I call upon the government, Sir, to table -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - this report at an early date as possible, table it today. After all, the taxpayers paid for it, why should it not be tabled? Lay it on the Table of the House this very day so that we can all have a peep at it instead of the Premier over there just scimming through it. Why do we not all have an opportunity to read it, Sir?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, presented by my hon. colleague, and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that one of the members on the government benches the other day mentioned to me that you fellows are over there, he said, presenting petitions, asking the government to spend all kinds of money, and where do you think the money is coming from? You are making foolish of yourselves, one of the members said, asking the government - here we are talking about austerity and cutbacks and you are asking the government to spend more money. Well, we are not asking the government to spend more money, Sir, we are asking the government to rearrange its priorities and not put the boots -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: Right.

MR. NEARY: - to students every time that they want to cutback.

DR. KITCHEN : That is right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague mentioned the two water bombers could probably go a long way in paying-the ripoff that was made by Field Aviation, I think he referred to, in paying some of this student aid. Well, what about Mr. Bob Cole's contract?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman that although to a certain extent Standing Orders on petitions do not have the precision that one might hope for, they do preclude debate and that at times can be difficult to define. But I do believe the hon. gentleman will probably agree with me that he is now straying into

Mr. Speaker: an area which is somewhat off the subject and is certainly approaching debate.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

Well, Sir, the point that I am making is that if you went over the Budget, the estimates, Mr. Speaker, item by item, I am sure that you could find all kinds of examples of extravagance and waste, where, if you eliminated this there would be countervailing savings and there would be no problem at all, without the government spending one additional cent, without the taxpayers of this Province being asked to cough up one additional cent, you could find all kinds of examples of extravagances and waste where you could get, if eliminated, you would get countervailing savings that could more than offset the cost of the student aid.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance and the Premier have a tendency to compare the student aid programme in this Province with the student aid programme in the other Atlantic Provinces, in the Maritime Provinces. And it is like comparing apples and oranges, Sir. And the hon. gentleman does not mention that over in Nova Scotia, for instance, Nova Scotia they have thirteen degree granting institutions and here in Newfoundland we only have one, and everyone has to gravitate towards St. John's.

MR. NEARY: In Nova Scotia you can pick the university of your choice and you can commute back and forth daily, and there is a big difference. And this petition that is being presented now is on behalf of students who live in the rural part of this Province. In the Maritimes they live closer to the university so they do not need to pay board and lodgings. All they need is to be able to -

DR. KITCHEN: They can live home and walk to work.

MR. NEARY: They can live home, that is right. They can walk to the university practically.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Cape Breton (inaudible) Dalhousie.

MR. NEARY: And not only that, Sir, but here in this Province the maximum that a student can borrow is \$750. In the other Maritime Provinces they can get their \$1,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, they cannot.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes they can, Sir. Only in Newfoundland, the maximum they can get is \$750. So, Sir, as one of the briefs that I have in front of me indicated, the provincial government caught the university community by surprise when it announced sweeping changes in the funding for its 1978 - 1979 Budget. The government has raised the minimum loan requirement for student aid to \$700 from \$450 despite recommendations to the contrary. And I do hope, Sir, the Minister of Education will now participate in the support of this petition as he has already done with previous petitions and give us an inkling what is in that report or table it. The taxpayers paid for it so why should it not be tabled? Is it a secret document? Let us have a look at it and see what is in it, see if it will do any good for our faltering educational system in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition which has been so ably presented by my colleague. And I wonder why the petitions are still coming in. It seems to me that the matter has been brought before the House now on I think four separate occasions and still the students say, 'We have a problem.' Normally you would expect a problem to be cured after so much support from both sides of the House, particularly when there is not really a problem, it is only a matter of a couple of million dollars that could be scraped up here or there. What amazes me is that we are now getting petitions from those who are presently at Memorial University, or last year at Memorial University, and the real problem is worse than that, because the real problem occurs amongst those who have not yet gone or cannot afford to go at all who would not be available to sign such a petition. So the problem, Mr. Speaker, is much, much worse than would be indicated from reading the petition and studying the names because of the people who are not on there who probably would very much like to be on there except that they might have dropped out some years ago from school because they knew they could not afford to go to university.

I was expecting, Mr. Speaker, some announcement over the weekend about this matter, that the Minister of Education would have solved the problem and met the needs of these students. I was hoping, for example, that he would have taken our suggestion last week, made twice, that the minister would set up a committee perhaps of former Ministers of Education including the present Minister of Education and we would look at the money required and see where we might pare the Education budget, or where a few more bucks might be found. And I thought that was an

DR. KITCHEN: eminently practical suggestion and one that he might announce over the weekend. I would like very much for the Minister of Education to speak now today to tell us if he has had an opportunity to consider this serious suggestion that was made to alleviate this problem. We cannot always be debating against the government. Sometimes we have to give them a few ideas as to what to do and we have given them a number of ideas in the past four or five days of supporting these petitions, all kinds of positive, strong suggestions to help the government out, because I know that the minister is under great pressure and the Premier must be under great pressure. I thought we would have an announcement from the Premier over the weekend, not in support of this petition, Mr. Speaker, but of his own resignation. But he did not for some reason or other resign. But I would hope that he would get up now and support this petition and set up a committee and get on with the job.

MR. W.N. ROWE: And then resign.

DR. KITCHEN: And then resign, right.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support this petition on behalf of 172 students representing the rural students at Memorial University. The university

MR. HODDER: is not for everyone, it is a place of higher learning and only those students who are equipped to attend university can do so.

Now, I was a high school principal for five years and I saw students who left high school and made up their minds what sort of a career they wanted. Then some decided to go to university, the others decided that they wanted to go into different trades courses and some decided that they would go to work immediately. Very often those decision are made, Mr. Speaker, with finances in mind, both from the point of view of the parent and from the point of view of the student. Very often in areas such as the Government House Leader comes from, perhaps where there is high unemployment and where students can get employment immediately, and areas such as where there are CNR dockyards and things like that, where students can come out of school and go to work, whether it be on a longliner, whether it be on a large schooner, or whether it be working at any type of job, the feeling is there, or the urge is there to go out and get that quick money first.

So many, many students when they leave school they make their decision as to what they are going to do for very many reasons and one of them is financial.

Now, when you look at the various options that students have open to them it is the type of student who is equipped to go to university who has to take the hardest blow, who has to make the worst decision, who has to make the hardest decision, whose parents must realize that they have some money put away - I know there are members of this House, perhaps right now, who may have young children, who are starting right away - and a lot of people do this - to save money.

MR. HODDER: It is a sort of college student plan where you start to save money when your child is born, so much a month, to put your child through university.

But only so many people can afford to do that. The people in the rural areas of this Province, the people who are on social services, the people whose parents are out of work, the people who are in the more depressed areas of the Province, these people cannot afford to take that money and put it aside for ten years for the students who want to go to university.

So that is happening is that the group of people who will be really leading this Province tomorrow are looking to other things. I have seen students who applied to the university and were accepted, applied to vocation schools and were not. The reason why they were not accepted at the vocational schools was because they were overcrowded, because an awful lot of students realized that there are a lot of Canada Manpower seats in the vocational institutions and if they stay out for a year they can get on a Manpower programme and go into the trade schools.

There is a provincial programme where the Province pays so much for students who go in on the provincial plan. There are students who drop out of school and who can go back and be upgraded at a certain salary, so that when a student and a parent makes the decision whether or not to go to university, there is a lot going against them. I think that this means that an awful lot of students in this Province are not getting to university who can. Those who are able and have the ability to attend university are not doing so and I predict, as I pointed out here when I supported another petition the other day, that it has already been shown in this Summer semester and in the semester before this, that the enrollments

MR. HODDER: are dropping off - when the government tried this before in 1973 the enrollemnts dropped off to such an extent that they had to change their minds on it -and I predict that enrollments will drop off again. I also predict that not only will enrollments drop off, but I think when you have this sort of thing happening that you find a lot of people losing the desire to go to university, it does not become the in thing.

 Basically what is happening is that the Province is losing the people whom we need. We are siphoning off into other jobs and other professions people we would prefer to be in univeristy taking advantage of a university training.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition presented by the member for Conception Bay South on behalf of 172 students from Memorial University.

Sir, I would like to approach it in a different way to try and emphasize in supporting this petition the fact that the students of Memorial University are not always there with their hands out looking for something in the way of bursaries or scholarships or increased student aid. They are doing this in this particular case out of complete necessity. But I would like in supporting this petition, Sir, to point out the contribution that students and other youth of this Province are making through our society in this Province today.

Sir, over the weekend I had the honour and the pleasure to attend a meeting of the Newfoundland and Labrador Coalition of Community Youth Councils. There are about fourteen of these councils throughout the Province, Sir, and there is a centre at Memorial University here in St. John's and one at the Basilica in St. John's, and I believe there is a centre in Gander, one in Hampton, one at Main Point, I think one in one or two other places. But, Sir, I was tremendously impressed, Sir, with the enthusiasm of these students outside and within the university, who, Sir, are committed to improving the quality of life in their own community by trying to get involved with adults in the decision making process in their own communities, Sir, terribly, terribly impressed. They were full of enthusiasm and they were working, Sir, very hard not just to get money to carry out their plans and build their centres but to improve the quality of life in their particular centres.

Sir, one of the things that most impressed me, there were a couple of things, one was the fact that they have a tremendous concern over the unemployment problem in this Province and I related, Sir, there that we have eighty per cent of our population approximately under thirty-four years of age, and approximately fifty-seven per cent

MR. F. ROWE: are under twenty-four years of age, and Sir, of the working force of that group, over fifty per cent are unemployed. So, Sir, the people of the university and these youth are tuned in to the problems of this Province and are trying to do something about it, trying to do something about it. And, Sir, when you look at the fact that there are thirty-one per cent of our population, thirty-one per cent of our population is less than fourteen years of age, these students have foreseen the tremendous unemployment problem that we are likely to have within the very near future. If we have over fifty per cent unemployment of the youth work force group, what is going to happen when these thirty-four per cent below the age of fourteen start hitting the marketplace or the work force? It is going to be an unemployment monster, Sir. And this Newfoundland and Labrador Coalition of Youth Councils, Community Youth Councils, working side by side with the university students, are tackling these kinds of problems, Sir. They have a sincere and basic understanding of many of the problems facing not only this Province but of the Nation as a whole. And, Sir, one of their major concerns is the very future of Canada as a nation and the unity of Canada. And a representative of the Secretary of State's Office announced at that particular meeting on Saturday night that this coalition has received \$5,000 for the purpose of holding a conference on Canadian unity, which I understand is going to be hosted by the Conception Bay South Community Youth Council, but of course there will be representatives from all over Newfoundland and hopefully from Labrador.

So, Sir, this is the kind of thing that students at the university are involved with, not just the sort of thing we hear here today where they are coming in passing petitions to members of the House of Assembly, probably giving the appearance that they are just looking for handouts. That is not the case, Sir. These students are desperately in need of additional finances and help to get through university, because they are going broke and heavily in debt.

MR. F. ROWE:

But I thought, Sir, I would avail of this opportunity to point out that the students at the university are not just concerned for their own individual or collective wellbeing in a financial way. They are willing and able and capable of making a very significant and positive contribution to the various communities throughout Newfoundland, Sir, and these students at the university represent practically every community, certainly every geographical location in this Province, and I think these deserve, Sir, not a break, just fair treatment in this whole business of what has been brought in with respect to the petitions over the last few days and I hope the minister, since he received the Task Force Report today will see fit to table it so that we, on both sides of the House, and as citizens, will have an opportunity since

Mr. F. Rowe:

it is the taxpayers' money to pay for it. And I hope, Sir, that by Friday the Premier will make his promised announcements. Sir, I give this petition my whole-hearted support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Well done! Well put!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would too want to add my support to that given by the members who have spoken so far, all from this side of the House, I believe, so far, and I would hope now that the Premier having read the Task Force report should rise in his place or will rise and give his support. It is a sad day, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: Any pictures in the Task Force report?

MR. SIMMONS: - a series of sad days, indeed, with these petitions coming in so deserving of the support of every member of the House that the only people who are supporting are those on this side and the Minister on occasion has supported rather selectively certain aspects of the petition, or at least he says he has.

Now the Premier has had an opportunity to read the Task Force report, I suppose, he has been vetting it the last few minutes to make sure there is nothing in it like a call for the minister's resignation. We are soon going to need a form letter for resignations, Mr. Speaker, there are so many ministers over there about to resign, the Premier will soon need a form for that alone. I wonder does the Task Force call for the minister's resignation? If so that would be a sad call because he cannot take all of the blame for this mess; he can take a fair amount of it, but not certainly all of it.

Mr. Speaker, the real reason the Task Force report has become a fairly closely guarded secret today is the information that I have about the report, namely, that it recommends that there be a freeze.

MR. SIMMONS: It recommends that the government go back to where it was before the last Budget, restore the tuition provisions, the student loan provisions, restore them as they were, restore the teacher allocations as they were; this you will find, Mr. Speaker, is what the interim report will say and why the minister is sitting on it, why he is so glib about the whole issue. They cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to release this report now because it will cut the legs under the government. It will show that the government was wrong in its budgetary moves effecting education in the first place.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Finance (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: It will show that what we have recommended, Mr. Speaker, to the minister and to the government is exactly what the Task Force is saying, as limited -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: - in its scope and its background as it is, nevertheless it has come to the only conclusion that anybody can come to who looks sensibly at this problem; the sensible thing to do is what we have been advocating, and what I understand now the Task Force is advocating the government in its interim report, that they put a freeze, a pre-Budget freeze mind you, a pre-Budget freeze on this whole business of tuition provision, student loan provision, teacher allocation provision, and the other items that were affected by the vicious budgetary cutbacks, by the Minister of Finance who has proven so often, Mr. Speaker, that he is much better as a Government House Leader than he is as a Minister of Finance. And how we needed him the other night!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: How we needed him on Thursday night!

MR. W. ROWE: Only there is not much to compare him with.

MR. SIMMONS: That is why, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. W. ROWE: Peckford.

MR. SIMMONS: That is why, Mr. Speaker, the Task Force report is being sat on today by the Premier, being vetted so closely by the Premier:

MR. SIMMONS: It recommends, Mr. Speaker, it recommends that we not go toying around with the education of secondary students or elementary students or post-secondary students until we know what we are doing. I support the petition from the 170 or so students, Mr. Speaker, as we have supported the petition from the 4,000 and more students, and as I believe the Task Force, in the spirit of its interim report, has supported them today.

Now let the minister get up and tell us what is in that Task Force, or let them give us the Task Force report. The taxpayers paid for it, the least we can do is have a look at it now, Mr. Speaker, The Minister of Health is in a nice mood today.

MR. W. ROWE: Watch it now, he may come over.

MR. NEARY: They got the chicken pox out in his district, out in Gander, from the spruce budworm spray.

MR. SIMMONS: Well I will sit down, Mr. Speaker, because I think the Minister of Health wants to get up and make a few sober comments on the subject of the petition, as I am sure we would like to hear from him. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the Minister of Health will do likewise in his usual dignified manner, and the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker, I would not mind if he supported the petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this in order?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, this is very much in order, Mr. Speaker, very much in order that we drum up all the support we can from the more sober members of the House, all the support we can, Mr. Speaker, for this important petition. I support it, and I hope members from the government side will do likewise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, if there is any member on the opposite side of the House who wants to support this petition I will gladly yield to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CANNING: I was hoping that the Minister of Finance would get up and make a plea on behalf of the youth of the Burin Peninsula.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: One time he was prepared to - it was after the plans were made for the paving of the Burin Peninsula; of course, he knew it was coming. He told the people of the Burin Peninsula that he was prepared to crawl up the road if they would give him any pavement, so I would like to see him standing now and supporting the youth of that area and the youth of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, we can put up with the lack of paving, we can put up for another while with the lack of water and sewer, we can put up with hundreds and thousands of promises made year after year to people, but when it comes to education of the youth, anybody, any Newfoundlander who would not stand up and defend it, well, I do not understand him, because this is something that you cannot wait for. If we have 4,000 or 5,000 or 6,000 of our young people today who want to go to the University in September, next September may be too late.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. CANNING: It is a year gone. The profession that they aimed at, their choice in their path of life can be stopped this year in September, because what is going to happen to them is that they are going to be out among the unemployed of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are that now.

MR. CANNING: And they are going to want to eat and they are going to want to have clothing, so chances are

MR. CANNING: they will have to go off in other fields and, discouraged as they will be, they probably will not return after another year or so when this government is finished and a Liberal Government takes over to pursue our policy the way we pursued it for the last twenty-three years.

Today with I think 4,000 names now on this particular issue - there must have been 12,000 or 15,000 people who cried out over the teacher-pupil ratio - very few, if any, got up on the government side to support it. I do not believe anybody got up to support those students so far. So now it may be the last petition for this session, but we will see again if the minister is going to get up, or the Finance Minister or some of the ministers. And, like I said the other day, I would like to see some of the members over there who took advantage of the day when they did not need so much to have a loan approved, those who took it. Now, Mr. Speaker, knowing what difficulty I had to get through school, and knowing how wrong we were without the opportunity we only had after Confederation after the Liberal Government took over, I for one support this petition and beg the government to consider it.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear! Well spoken.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well done.

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

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition, one of many, I may say, involving at least 4,000 students. I think it is a very sad day in the life of this Province when we see day after day university students pleading with this government to change their policy on Education in order that they may have the opportunity to go to university and get an education whereby they can go out in the world and take their place as they should and as they ought. What surprised me, Mr. Speaker, is that only members

CAPT. WINSOR: on this side of the House have spoken on this petition. Now as I look around I cannot see any member on this side of the House with sons or daughters attending the University. They must be all very young or all very old, because I do not know if there is a member on this side of the House at present -

AN HON. MEMBER: 'Graham Flight'.

CAPT. WINSOR: Yes, but unfortunately he is not here to speak. If he were here I am sure he would.

CAPTAIN E. WINSOR: However, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are members on that side of the House who have sons or daughters attending the university. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have been associated with a government who saw the need of an increased and a developed brain and increasing the educational opportunities in this Province. We all, those of us who had the opportunity to have served in the former administration, saw what that administration did to attract the students to the university so much so that at one point the government paid their tuition fee. And what have we seen since this administration has taken over? We have seen those opportunities diminishing every day. It is a sad, sad day, Mr. Speaker, when we see university students -

MR. S. NEARY: Hard, hard times.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: That is right! It is like the old saying, "Tory times are hard times" but there are a great many in this Province today who prayed and prayed without ceasing that those times would not return. But, Mr. Speaker, they are returning.

AN HON. MEMBER: Temporarily.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: And, well we hope it is only temporarily. But, Mr. Speaker, I can recall the days when, of course, you had to be the son of a very well-to-do person in your community, or the son of a doctor or a merchant to be able to afford to attend university. That changed with the coming of Confederation and after Confederation, of course. And we in the administration at that time struggled very hard to make sure that every individual who wanted to promote their education would have the opportunity to do so, and they did. But, Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the Throne Speech I said then one of two things had to happen in that university with the government's present policy, and that one was that the tuition fee would be increased where students would not be able to afford to attend and the other would be the enrollment would be decreased; whichever way it occurred it would affect the students. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is not a disgrace, but it will be a disgrace held up by the students today who have attended this House of Assembly and visited the gallery with the backing of

MR. HICKMAN: Now that I have the unanimous consent, the enthusiastic consent of hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution, "Whereas it appears desirable that an independent inquiry be made into the salaries and expense allowances of members of the House of Assembly in their capacity as members and ministers, be it therefore resolved that this hon. House of Assembly request the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to appoint a commission under the Public Enquiries Act consisting of three persons resident in the Province of Newfoundland to inquire into the following matters (a) the

MR. HICKMAN: of the present levels of salary and expense allowances for members of the House of Assembly in their capacities as members and ministers; (b) the development of levels of salary and expense allowances consistent with the changing role of members of the House of Assembly, and (c) whether an automatic formula ought to be instituted for the salary and, if so, the nature of such formula and that the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council be requested to include in the terms of reference of the commission a requirement that the commission make an interim report together with recommendations on the matters referred to it on or before the 31st day of October, A.D. 1978."

MR. MURPHY: Ninteen-seventy - what?

MR. HICKMAN: October.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, I have a question for the hon. the Premier and it has to do with the legislation regarding Regional Government in the Province, Mr. Speaker. As usual with this administration, the people of the Province are confused as to the government's stand on what they propose to do with Regional Government legislation. We have heard the minister himself say that is it, over his dead body no further legislation, he is going to resign, he is not going to seek any further legislation on Regional Government come in; yet we see the Premier giving the distinct impression if not saying directly that come the end of November the present bill is going to be debated again or new legislature is going to be introduced or some kind of legislation regarding Regional Government is going to be brought into the House. Would the Premier, Sir, kindly inform the House as to what is the government's policy and position on legislation regarding Regional Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning it was this government's intention to bring in Regional Government for the Northeast Avalon area and, for that matter, hopefully in other areas of the Province as well where the people want it and where it can be of benefit to them.

PREMIER MOORES: It is something that I discussed very recently with the mayor of Corner Brook, for instance, who has some thoughts in this direction as have other areas of the Province. Regarding the Northeast Avalon and Bill 50, that is as it was stated by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It was the intention of the government even after a second reading of that bill to consult with districts in this area during the Summer months and towards the Fall towards improving legislation because no legislation is perfect even when this House approves it unanimously as we have found out on many occasions many years past and recently. The fact is, Sir, that we do believe in Regional Government as long as it benefits the region and as that is the case we would intend to bring that legislation about as areas are ready for it.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: - Mr. Speaker, that answer. Let me ask the Premier this then. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated in this House during a couple of speeches he made, and outside the House as well, that his political career would stand or fall on Bill 50. Since that time he has said he is not going to have anything else to do with Bill 50. It would be reintroduced or would be discussed in this House over his dead body, which may be welcome news to some people, yet the Premier says it is going to go ahead, we are going to continue with discussion on Bill 50. Will the Premier indicate whether he has received a resignation from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs ?

MR. NEARY: Or a threat from him.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker, the situation is, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knew from past experience, that ministers and the first minister get together on various appointments from time to time - as if the Leader of the Opposition was the minister of the day and I am sure the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) would be his Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. But that of course would upset the member

PREMIER MOORES: from St. John' West (Dr.Kitchen). But, Sir, those are the problems that people have when they are not in government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Industrial Development whose jurisdiction this matter comes under, I believe. My question has to do with Newfoundland Hardwoods. Would the Premier indicate if there have been negotiations or are there negotiations going on for the sale of Newfoundland Hardwoods to private enterprise?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, yes. I understand there have been with several outfits actually, not just any one. I think the situation is where two or three people are making bids for it. The government has not made a final decision as yet on whether to accept them or not.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier indicate, Sir, whether the negotiations that are going on include the asphalt setup that they have down at Clarenville? Does it include the Newfoundland Hardwoods here at Donovan's overpass and also the operation in Clarenville?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of the exact detail but I do know that two of the applications for the operation do include the asphalt plant in Clarendville. I think there is one or possibly two others that are just the hardwood plants alone.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier indicate if these proposals were invited or did they come voluntary from the two or three sources that the hon. gentleman is referring to?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I think, Mr. Speaker, that there may have been offers. I am not sure on that particular question. I really am not. Sir, I would give the hon. gentleman the information. I am not sure whether they were invited or whether they came from varying groups, But I will find out.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House whether or not the government would welcome proposals from other parties other than the one or two that have already bid on the asphalt operation at Clarendville and the Newfoundland Hardwoods down here at Donovan's Overpass.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker. Anyone who wants to become involved in developing business in the Province, particularly in Crown corporations such as Hardwoods, which has not had a happy past, I am afraid to say, anyone who is interested in that sort of development and expanding or keeping going that business on a profit basis would certainly be very welcome by the government.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier indicate, Mr. Speaker, what will happen if the asphalt operation down at Clarendville is sold to one particular company? My understanding of the operation is now that the government provides more or less a service for all the contractors in the Province. What will happen to the operation that especially the small contractors will not have access to this plant, to this operation in Clarendville and they have been placed at the mercy of somebody who is their competitor? How is this going to work out? Will it not cause chaos in the asphalt market in this Province? Will not it create a monopoly situation where one company will have a strangle hold, a monopoly on the asphalt distribution in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that will obviously be taken into consideration before any arrangement is made with anybody. The thing is that there is a monopoly situation on it right now, the monopoly being held by the government.

MR. NEARY: The government has it.

PREMIER MOORES: That is very convenient for government as far as protection, I suppose, of many small industries is concerned, but where it is very, very bad is that there is, not unlike I suppose, the Liquor Corporation, there is an inbuilt profit there. It is not necessarily efficiency that is being striven for. It is not necessarily being used for the best advantage to protect the small contractors and people who avail of that facility, yes, Sir, I think that is something that should be protected, but equally I think that it should be put on a -

MR. NEARY: How will it be protected?

PREMIER MOORES: - footing whereby it is made as efficient as possible and I am not sure by government operation that is the case.

MR. NEARY: The government made \$1.25 million (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South and Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and St. John's West.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Premier. I understand that the Premier is planning an announcement concerning sort of a reshuffle of senior civil servants in the next couple of days. Perhaps he could enlighten the House. I understand that there has already been appointed an Acting Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, What other changes if any does the Premier have in mind?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: It is all news to me, Mr. Speaker. If the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) would care to elaborate maybe I could find out more information as to what he is talking about. I have no idea what he is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: All right. Would the Premier then be good enough to inform us; one, has he announced officially - I believe the minister has on the new chairman for the Housing Corporation. Will he deny then that there is a new acting deputy who has been appointed and that there has been a circular circulated to that effect to every department? Is the Premier denying that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member said a major shuffle of senior civil servants.

MR. NOLAN: That is correct.

PREMIER MOORES: There is one person who is obviously acting deputy minister after the deputy minister is gone to another job. Hopefully that will be confirmed in a permanent capacity shortly but that is the only example that I know of that the hon. member refers to as a major shake up of senior civil servants.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: I am wondering if the Premier then in answer to a question we asked on two occasions and which the Premier has given his assurance that it would be done on at least two occasions in this House publicly, if he is now prepared to table the contract of Mr. Bob Cole in this House, which he has promised the hon. member on two separate occasions?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did and I do apologize for not having it here. I have it down on my desk, the pertinent points about it, and I will bring it up and make it available to the hon. gentleman as soon as I go down and get it.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: Would the Premier also be good enough to table the contract of Mr. Bob Lewis in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I have no idea what the contract is with Mr. Lewis, Mr. Speaker, whatever department he works with.

PREMIER MOORES: I am sure it is, but equally, Sir, I think it is all very well for the hon. Opposition to say that they want contracts with every individual who has ever been associated with a political party. If that had been the case in the past, Sir, I would suggest that the paper work alone in the last twenty-three years, or the twenty-three years before we were elected would do nothing else but fill up the time of this House.

MR. SIMMONS: Give us the contract, boy.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Sir, if there is a major job involved, and if there is a major function by the individual, of course, it is in the public interest to make sure that the people know exactly what the remuneration is for exceptional people and for exceptional jobs.

I so not say that every person who is appointed or under contractual arrangement with the government, this sort of information should come up at this sort of time. I think it is the sort of thing that should come up in the estimates; if the estimates had been debated properly this year it, undoubtedly would have.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. NOLAN: A final supplementary, just to make it clear. Is the Premier refusing to table Mr. Lewis' contract with the government or any agency of this government since he is paid, I assume, out of public funds is the Premier refusing to do this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker, hesitant.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde, a supplementary.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has been apologizing now for some three or four weeks on not being

MR. F.B. ROWE: able to table the Chairman of the Special Action Committee's contract. Could the Premier, in case it slips his mind again, Sir, get his parliamentary assistant or somebody else to run down and get the contract and have the contract tabled sometime this afternoon or tonight, Sir?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh, there he goes!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Do I have an answer, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. F.B. ROWE: He could be going off getting an ice cream for the Premier, Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: It is not ice cream the Premier needs, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It has been a long time since the Premier ate an ice cream.

PREMIER MOORES: That makes two of us, I would say.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, when the licking comes he will not be doing it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not a sucky baby.

MR. SIMMONS: I had some questions for the Minister of Manpower and the Minister of Industrial Development, both of whom are absent today. I think this is the third day the Minister of Manpower has been absent although he is the immediate environs of the House, or at least he was.

MR. NEARY: He was here a half hour ago.

MR. SIMMONS: He was just before the House opened, Mr. Speaker.

The first question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of these two, have these

MR. SIMMONS: two ministers been instructed by their Premier not to attend the House during Question Period?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to the Perry Mason of the House of Assembly I would like to reply that the answer is no. But also for the hon. member's benefit, Sir, I would like to advise him that Judge Mahoney was appointed to conduct the enquiry and not himself.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier thinks out loud, Mr. Speaker, finally. He would hope that he could have sloughed it off on Mr. Justice Mahoney. The fact is there are answers which the House deserves to know and the House is not getting those answers. But we shall keep probing, not only me but other members of this Opposition will keep asking the questions until the answers come out. The Premier might not want to realize it, Mr. Speaker, but he is answerable to this House of Assembly when he is here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough there was another Minister of Public Works, I believe, who happens to be here at the moment and perhaps that minister, Mr. Speaker, could tell us. The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, would he indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, if when he was in the Public Works portfolio he used a preferred list of contractors in giving out untendered work to various contractors?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I was minister of the department, I think, for a total period of two months altogether and no, I did not use any preferred lists of people for giving out contracts for Public Works.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: An interesting answer, a very interesting answer to have into the record, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He was there two months.

MR. SIMMONS: They were two very eventful months you will find out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to the same minister a supplementary. Would he indicate for the record whether during his two months in Public Works or at any other time as a minister he was ever offered any payment for delivery on promises to get untendered government work for contractors?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. MAYNARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister indicates - for the record, Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate whether at any time he received - I say to the Premier the answers may be revealing, even to him. I have a couple for him as well, after. But to the minister concerned, Mr. Speaker, did he at any time receive any gifts? Did he accept,

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, any gifts from any of the contractors who got untendered work from the government - and I can give him some names if he would like to react to these - the Walsh firm, the Noel firm, these two in particular, did he receive any gifts at any time from these contractors who were representatives of these firms or principals of these firms?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I think this line of questioning is totally out of order, Your Honour.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The member is asking has the minister received any gifts, has a member of this Legislature received any gifts. Mr. Speaker, a member can get up here and carry on that line of questioning and impugn motives, affect the character of an individual, reflect on the character of a member of this Legislature on a daily basis just by questions: the question leaves an impression that there has been some form of activity on the part of an individual member of the House which is not ethical or not even legal, and I feel, Mr. Speaker, if a member has any evidence at all that there has been any kind of activity on the part of a member which is unbecoming or which is of a criminal nature that he should lay his evidence on the table. And he might very well have evidence on the part of any one of the fifty-one members in the House, and if he does, of course, he has an immediate responsibility, not a responsibility two months from now or three months or five months, an immediate responsibility to give up this form of intimidation and lay his charge and lay his cards on the table. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to the line of questioning. For Your Honour's information, I have checked with quite a number of people

MR. LUNDRIGAN: the last few days in the parliamentary setting who have been involved in this kind of setting for quite some years and they feel it is unbecoming of a member of the Legislature to get up and impugn motives to suggest behaviour of a questionable nature without laying a charge or without being willing to move a question of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: To that silly point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. gentleman toward whom the point was made.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, of course, the record will show that I have questioned no motives. I have asked some questions and I have asked them for a couple of good reasons; one, because the matter of the acceptance of gifts by that minister, at least testimony to that effect, is a matter of public record, and I am giving the minister an opportunity, a clear opportunity to tell his side of the story, to say whether it is indeed true or not, and I believe he ought to welcome that opportunity. I say also to the member for Grand Falls that his advice, like most of the advice he gives, has been taken beforehand and that I have already told the police exactly what I know about this matter and other matters about which I will ask questions. And he, Mr. Speaker, will not intimidate me by alluding to unnamed sources.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Tell us your sources.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the hon. gentleman has made his submission on the particular point of order. Hon. members might recall that on a point of order brought up a few days ago I referred to Beauchesne, page 147, and among other citations there the statement that 'a question oral or written must not: and then 'i) contain imputations.' Now at that time there is a

MR. SPEAKER: distinction, as my memory tells me, between when that point was brought up at that time and now. When I gave that ruling with respect to imputations on Friday, I believe it was, it was my statement at the time that in my opinion this stricture applied to an imputation against a member, an imputation of some wrongdoing against a member, and that it would be wrong for a question to have an imputation of wrongdoing against a member. With that particular question at that time, I stated my opinion that that question contained an imputation of wrongdoing or whatever with respect to somebody who was not a member of the House of Assembly. The question was something to the effect of whether somebody had offered something to a person who was a member of the House and I said, ' If there is an imputation there, the imputation is with respect to the offeror, a person not in the House.' However, a question where there is an imputation toward, let us say, an offeree who is a member of the House, I think would come under that stricture. So having said that, I do not think it is necessary to say any more. The hon. gentleman may wish on a supplementary to rephrase the question, because I think there is a distinction in those two questions where the imputation in this case is toward the offeree who is a member of the House whereas in the other one toward an offeror who was not a member of the House. And the point is not the offeror or offeree, it is whether the person is a member of the House or not a member of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

SIMMONS: A supplementary and perhaps to rephrase the question to the minister concerned: Has the minister ever been offered any gifts by representatives of contracting firms doing untendered work for the Department of Public Works or by the principals of any of these firms? And the brunt of the question clearly is, has he ever been offered such gifts by these persons or companies?

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

MR. MAYNARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not been offered any gifts.

I have no idea what the hon. member is leading up to and what he mentions regarding being the matter of public record in a previous statement he made. But I would certainly like to see the public record that he is talking about. But there have been no gifts offered to me to award work at any time to any particular contractor.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: During the period the minister was Minister of Public Works did he at any time receive any instructions from the Premier that untendered work be given to any particular contracting firms?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is good to have in the record as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's West. I had indicated I will recognize next.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier and it concerns a question which we asked in the House some time ago and that the Premier was going to follow up on, and let us know. He indicated today that the House would in all probability meet this Fall to discuss, amongst other things, regional government. And I am

Dr. Kitchen: wondering if he has had an opportunity to look into the matter of having the Fall session of the House held in Labrador, and if so, what progress has been made in these deliberations with respect to having the House meet in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Not a great deal, Mr. Speaker, when I was in Corner Brook last week the people there having heard this were interested in also having a session there. The logistics and the set up for such a meeting is something that we will take a look at. I would suggest it is going to be very difficult for any prolonged period of time. It is certainly not something we are opposed to, but it is something that is not going to be easy, Sir.

DR. KITCHEN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

DR. KITCHEN: I wonder if the Premier would make a distinction between having it in Corner Brook and having it in Labrador, where the political climate is so much more different, where the separatist tendencies within Labrador are much greater than they are within Corner Brook, even though I know that Corner Brook does not particularly care for the city either. But I am just wondering if he would put Labrador in a different category from having it in another place on the Island?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I certainly think Labrador would be the first priority, Sir. I would like to hear from the hon. member which part of Labrador he particularly would like to see it in.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the same question of arranging visits to parts of the Province, could the Premier tell me whether there was any arrangement at any time, or if not, why not, for the Queen during her visit here to only visit St. John's and Corner Brook, why the Queen was not asked at that time to also visit Labrador or to pay a visit and drop Corner Brook, for instance, possibly?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, this has actually very little to do with the Provincial Government, but the question is a good one because we asked the same question. It was certainly my wish that the Queen visit Labrador in this particular trip. The fact was she had two days in the Province in total of which one she wanted to come to where her representative was, and to the Capital City, St. John's, and one being left for wherever. Now in Labrador to have one day with the time to travel and with the obvious number of stops - it just could not be one stop - I only wish there was a longer period of time, and I only wish that it would have been possible for her to visit there. I would have thought, Sir, that that was absolutely something that we wanted but because of time restraints we could not arrange.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier. In light of the fact that the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture when he was in Stephenville two or three weeks ago said that there would be an announcement on Labrador Linerboard Limited by the end of June or early July, and also the fact that several Cabinet ministers have been making optimistic statements, would the Premier now tell us how the negotiations are going, with whom they are negotiating and generally whether we are making any progress or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say negotiations are going well. I certainly am not prepared to say who they are ongoing with. I think that would be very wrong at this point in time. I think it is too early to say when there will be a definitive announcement one way or the other, but negotiations have been going on, they have been proceeding well with several companies.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Would the Premier be able to assure the people of Bay St. George that there is a future there. I say this... because already some councillors have made statements, you know, have asked the government publicly to either announce that the mill is going to re-open or not, because in my checking around the district of Port-au Port and Stephenville some thirty to forty people are moving out at the present time and the place is full of rumours as to what is happening. Would the Premier give us some assurance that the mill be opening and that people should stay on there?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I wish I could, Mr. Speaker; I cannot and I do not believe in making announcements unless they can be confirmed. I think it would be very wrong at this point in time.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Straits of Belle Isle are dynamite!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, is there any way to control that man at all? I do not think so. But the fact is, Sir, I do not think that announcements of that stature where people's lives are at stake should be made until they can be confirmed. As I say, we are optimistic that they will be satisfactory to the area and to the prosperity of the area, but to make a definitive statement and encourage people one way or the other I think having said what we have said they have to make up their own minds and hopefully within a few months the air will be cleared.

MR. J. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. J. HODDER: Just one comment to the Premier-if as he says he does not want to encourage people why are the members of his Cabinet making optimistic statements everytime they go in Bay St. George?

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, on that comment there is a lot to be optimistic about.

MR. S. NEARY:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: I want to get back to this Newfoundland Hardwoods and the asphalt plant down at Clarendville again for a moment. Would the hon. the Premier tell the House if a deal has yet been struck for the sale of the asphalt plant and Newfoundland Hardwoods?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Definitively, Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate what companies the government are negotiating with for the sale of this asphalt plant which will give somebody a monopoly on asphalt and certain kinds of board and wood in this Province? What companies are the government dealing with?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Well first of all, Mr. Speaker, I do not know the name of all the companies; I know there are several. I do know that if I did know the names I would not, when negotiations are going on, have them up for political debate in this House because that would crucify anyone with any good intent. But as I said to the hon. member before what we will only be too glad to do, Sir, is to

PREMIER MOORES: welcome anybody with an interest in developing any enterprise that the government is presently operating. We would also welcome people to assistance for government to operate any other enterprise of a similar nature that could be to the benefit of the Province. And that I have made very clear, that we would welcome any or all participants in that sort field.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate that the government is just dealing with one company or more than one company? The Premier indicated that there was several companies involved. I would like for the Premier to confirm whether the negotiations are going on with one specific company or if they are going on with several companies and how these companies managed to get involved in the first place? Were they asked to give submissions or how did the word get out that the asphalt operation now at Clarendville was up for grabs?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all I do know there are several companies involved and a couple made proposals to the government. Primarily it was the Hardwoods plant, and it does not take much foresight or investigative knowledge to realize that the Hardwoods plant has not done well for quite some years. They had one or two years where they came close to breaking even or made a small profit, but in fact they have not had a good track record. We were very anxious, and I think anyone who was that close to the scene or knew the scene was aware that we were anxious, to get someone to take that particular operation over. Other people on separate occasions have shown an interest in the asphalt plant for the asphalt plant itself concept.

MR. S. NEARY: Why was it a secret up until now?

PREMIER MOORES: Now we have had a couple of instances where people are also interested in the Hardwoods plant and the Asphalt plant but, Sir, it is a combination of two there is no great mystery to any of this.

MR. NEARY:

Why was it kept so secret?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker a question for the Premier

we heard today on the news that the Public Utilities Board has apparently approved a nearly 9 per cent average increase in the rates of electricity for the consumers of the Province as a result of an application by Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited. Would the Premier indicate what his administration intends to do-if anything,if nothing tell us,if anything tell us that as well-what they intend to do if anything about this yet another increase in the electrical rates to the hard pressed consumers of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the reason that the Public Utilities Board have the mandate, if you like, to hear the power increase proposals from Hydro or Newfoundland Light and Power or whoever the case may be, is a very simple reason that they do not have any axe to grind, that they do look at it objectively, that they do have a balance of what are proper charges and what are not. Now as far as the government itself is concerned, to have an independent body like that, whilst power increases are unfortunate and whilst they are pretty tough on people who are involved in them, have to pay them, obviously it is also in the world we live in a fact of life that there will be power increases. Now as far as the government is concerned, Sir, there are very few things we can do. The only thing we can do are of the sort like removing the sales tax from electric heat, like recalling Hinds Lake to save this Province \$4.5 million. This is the sort of thing we can do, Sir, and are doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Nothing in other words.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. HICKMAN: Committee of Ways and Means.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 1, Bill No. 38.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wants to speak on it, I think we pretty well, unless my hon. friends want to speak on it, we pretty well clued up the debate on this bill the last session. There is only one thing that I want to say about it, that the Provincial Government put up the sales tax, the Federal Government reduced it by three cents and so the people of this Province now are paying an eight per cent sales tax thanks to the generosity of the Government of Canada, of the Liberal Government up in Ottawa. But for the generosity

MR. NEARY: of the Government of Canada, Mr. Chairman, but for the generosity of Mr. Trudeau and his colleagues up in Ottawa, the people of this Province would now be paying eleven per cent sales tax, in actual fact. They are now paying eight per cent until October and then the agreement runs out and this is a companion bill for the one that we already put through, Mr. Chairman, on the income tax, where we amended the Income Tax Act so that the Provincial Government could get back the losses on the reduction in the sales tax.

And so, Sir, in view of the fact that the Government of Canada, Mr. Trudeau was not able to call a general election in the Spring -

MR. MURPHY: He is taking the money out of his own pocket, is he?

MR. NEARY: I believe, Sir, the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. A. Murphy) should say a novena or two for Mr. Trudeau -

MR. MURPHY: Right.

MR. NEARY: - to hope that he will be successful whenever he goes to the polls, whenever he goes to the polls again, Sir. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could say a novena that the Prime Minister of Canada -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, for all us ordinary Protestants, what is a novena?

MR. NEARY: I will ask the monk over there to tell. It would take me too long to explain it to the hon. gentleman but the gentleman, the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) is very familiar with that. I do not know if he has got the robes yet or not. He certainly has the collection plate.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: \$1 a card.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. gentleman will have a bingo game, if Mr. Trudeau -

MR. MURPHY: I am going into building supplies (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, that would be a good idea you know. It would be an excellent idea. It would be an excellent idea. Then you would get in all kinds of trouble and then the Minister of Justice would haul you into court and then you would be fined, the same as all the other people who break the law, except of course the privileged few, except the likes of Affiliated Marine Metals. They do not commit fraud, Sir - no fraud, no cheating on their part! - It is a mistake. We were withholding money because they might have made mistakes in submitting their invoices.

MR. NEARY:

In certain other quarters it is called fraud but when it is Affiliated Marine Metals, the administration's buddy, it is not fraud, it is just mistakes.

MR. SIMMONS:

They do not have to cheat, the minister does it for them.

MR. NEARY:

Who is the hon. gentleman trying to con?

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, getting back to the Retail Sales Bill Mr. Trudeau did not pull off the election when he planned it, in the Spring, and so the three cents reduction in the Sales Tax, I presume was meant to solicit - let us call a spade a spade, Sir - to solicit a few votes I suppose with the people across Canada. And I would think that with a Fall election coming up, or maybe next Spring, that there is a strong possibility that this three cent agreement, three cent reduction on the part of the government of Canada, this generous gesture on the part of the government of Canada maybe extended for another six months. I am hoping that it will and perhaps the hon. gentleman can indicate whether negotiations have yet begun. Pretty soon you will see the Minister of Finance in Ottawa, he will get aboard the DOT jet and he will start his cross Canada tour, this is only July, he still has July, August, September, he still has three months, practically all July, August and September, they have three months now to make up their minds whether they are going to extend this privilege to all Canadians, of the government of Canada having to step into provincial jurisdictions - the first time ever it happened, I suppose, in the history of Canada - where the government of Canada stepped in the provincial jurisdiction because the provinces were socking it to the ordinary people, to the consumers, were socking it to the taxpayers, especially in this Province where we have the highest Sales Tax in the whole of Canada. Uncle Ottawa, which the hon. Minister of Fisheries so strongly condemns those inside and outside of this House, every time the hon. gentleman opens his mouth he has nothing but strong condemnation for the government of Canada. It is a wonder, Sir, that they would put up with us at all, and yet here they turn around after this government increasing the Sales Tax by one percentage point, the government of Canada takes off three cents here in Newfoundland. Sir, it

MR. NEARY: was a wonderful thing, it was a godsend, a godsend to the hard pressed consumer and the hard pressed taxpayer in this Province. I would like to see the Sales Tax wiped out altogether myself but obviously, Sir, that is not going to happen for some time. But at least Mr. Trudeau and the government of Canada had the courage to reduce the Sales Tax in this Province by three cents and that is part of what we are doing in this bill now, Bill No. 38; the provincial government is upping the Sales Tax, the federal government is reducing the Sales Tax.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: The thing does not balance itself out because it would be much more revenue, it would be much more coming back to the people. And so, Sir, I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this little benefit, unexpected windfall for the consumer, I hope, Sir, that it will continue after the first of October. I have every hope that because we have not had an election, we have not had a federal general election that you will see an extension of this three cent reduction in the Sales Tax go on for about another six months and God only knows, Sir, the consumers in this Province could use that money.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words on this bill if I could get a copy of it. Mr. Chairman, there are two parts to this bill, one affecting the Retail Sales Tax and the other of tangible personal property. I do not know how many bills would have to go through the House of Assembly now affecting

MR. LUSH: the cutback that we got from Ottawa. I think this is the second one, a bill that without the generosity of Ottawa we would not have, either that or a bill in another form, a bill imposing 11 per cent sales tax, but because of the generosity of the federal government, because of the kindness of Ottawa, because of the sensitivity of that government to the needs of the people of Canada, we here in Newfoundland see a reduction from what would have been 11 per cent now to 8 per cent. And, Mr. Chairman, that is certainly a great blessing to our people, because I do not know how our people can continue to make it as taxes are continually imposed. Right now we are the highest taxed people in Canada, but this little break from Ottawa is certainly a ray of light to our Newfoundland people. And along with the hon. the member for LaPoile, I certainly hope that this thing can stay with us much longer than the six months, because our people certainly need -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) have an election every year.

MR. LUSH: That is right. And this kind of tax, the sales tax, is a tax that hits the ordinary people of this Province. It is the kind of tax that hurts everybody, but it hurts the ordinary people of this Province more so than other groups of people. And I certainly hope that this tax can stay at its present level for a long, long time.

But, Mr. Speaker, within this bill there is an item that particularly affects my own district and it has to do with boats. I think there is a regulation which says that a boat has to be over a 300 ton capacity to be exempted from taxes, and in my district there are a lot of boats, ferries - the ferry from Burnside to St. Brendan's is not a 300 ton boat and thus is not exempt from the sales tax. And, Mr. Chairman, that boat certainly

MR. LUSH: needs to be replaced now, but for the private operators to buy a 300 ton boat is a costly venture and since they do not fall because they are under 300 tons, the kind of boat necessary for that run, it is a tremendous burden on the owners to buy a new ferry. And I would hope that the provincial government would see it necessary to cut back the tonnage whereby people are exempt from the sales tax., As I have said before, the ferry in St. Brendan's, and I expect the one in Bonavista North, certainly, which is smaller than the one on the St. Brendan's run, to replace these ferries it is a heavy investment on the part of the owners.

And I would hope that the government would see fit to cut back on that tonnage so that boats of this kind, the interprovincial ferries throughout the Province would be exempt from this sales tax. And I would expect that almost all of the ferries throughout the Province fall under 300 tons, and therefore, they are not exempt from the sales tax. I would venture to say that all the ferries in the Province excepting the Bell Island one, that is probably the only one that can be exempted under this regulation. So I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the government would change this so that other ferry operators throughout the Province and other boat operators would be able to be exempt from this tax, because as I have said before, most of the boats throughout the Province, the smaller type boats, the smaller type freighters, fall under 300 tons and thus are discriminated against in a way. They fall from under the exemption that is offered in this bill, because the boat has to be over 300 tons. And as I have said, this strikes my district particularly hard because there are four boats in the Terra Nova National Park and now with the Kipawo not operating there there are other private investors

MR. LUSH: who would like to put on a tour boat there. As a matter of fact, I talked to two or three over the weekend and they talked about the tremendous tax that they have to pay when they buy a small boat for that purpose, to offer people tours around the Terra Nova National Park.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the minister listening to this today would make this change that would make the tonnage less because there are not too many operators around Newfoundland who operate boats over 300 tons, that is a big boat. Most of the freighters and most of the tour boats and the ferries that operate in the Province are under that limit of 300 tons and thus have to pay this tax, they are hit by that tax and again that is an example of the kind of business that this government promotes, the kind of business that they encourage.

Mr. Chairman, a boat over 300 tons is a large boat. It is a large boat and I would hope that the government would see fit to change this particular clause and make it a little less tonnage, more in line with the majority of boats, freighters and tourist boats and ferries that operate throughout the Province so that the small business people, the small investors, the small operators of boats would certainly get the benefit of this particular clause which as it exists now will not give them the benefit.

So I think if the government were concerned about the small operators, the operators of small boats, boats under 300 tons, that they would want to give them a break and thus provide us with greater services. Because I am sure that if a private operator were faced with the venture today of replacing a ferry on a certain run, be it the St. Brendan's one or the Bonavista North one, that the tax that the person would have to pay on getting such a boat would be a detriment to that person going to buy a boat. When he realizes the large amount of tax that he is going to

MR. LUSH: have to pay certainly he would think twice before he purchased a boat to put on a particular run.

So this particular bill as it exists is certainly discouraging private operators of ferries and tourist boats and this sort of thing, in the ferry business, discouraging them from getting new ferries boats that would be more adequate to do the job, boats more up to date. This excessive tax that they are now faced with is discouraging them. With tour boats throughout the Province, certainly goodness these people have so many regulations imposed upon them now, people who would want to go into that venture of putting on tour boats that there are all sorts of restrictions as it is and when they realize that they have to pay this excessive sales tax Mr. Chairman, it is certainly discouraging people. I would hope that the government in the interest of doing something for these ferry operators and for tour boats and other small freighters throughout the Province, that they would certainly reduce this tonnage so that most of the operators, so that most of the people attempting to get into that kind of trade, get into the ferry service, get into the touring boat business or whatever, and the small freighters around the Province, that we would remove this clause and reduce the tonnage so that these people could certainly get a break from the sales tax.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is about all I want to say on the bill. Because as I say, it does affect my own district with a ferry service there and also with tourist boats in the area. This is a problem that many private investors, people who would put on tour boats have brought to my attention; the excessive tax that they have to pay, the excessive SSA in purchasing a boat. As I have said before, the only way they can qualify to be exempted under the act is to buy a boat that is over 300

MR. LUSH:

tons and that is a large boat,
Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the government in the
interest of promoting the economy of this Province, that
particular aspect of it, ferry services and tour boats
and small freighters and the like, that the government
certainly would look at this and realize that there is
something wrong with the act and in the interest of
similar areas that are served by ferries, that the government
would look into this clause and hopefully change it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN:

If I may have but a quick word to respond to the hon. gentleman, and it will only take a minute, the hon. gentleman for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) this question has been raised with me by another hon. gentleman opposite who represents an area served by a ferry. Number one, the question of whether or not all boats should be exempt is not a matter for the Act, it can be done by regulation. I have asked officials and others to assess for me so that I in turn can advise government with respect to the question of whether the regulation should be amended, what the cost will be to the Province, because we are more generous in this Province now than any of the other nine Canadian provinces as it relates to boats of various sizes or as generous. For instance, even in the Maritime Provinces where they should have a history similar to ours of activities on the sea, they will only grant an exemption if the boat is operating extra-territorial not as between New Brunswick, say, and Grande Manan Island, but it would have to be between New Brunswick and the port of Portland, Maine, you know, beyond the twelve mile limit. The same applies to Nova Scotia.

In Newfoundland, as the hon. gentleman said, vessels of more than 300 tons gross are exempt as well as any other vessels that are in any way involved as commercial fishing vessels. I am sure the hon. gentleman would not want pleasure craft exempt from retail sales tax. But it is a fact that we are more, and I use the words, 'more liberal' with our exemptions than the other Canadian provinces with respect to the retail sales tax on boats. Some provinces give no exemption at all. And others, for instance in British Columbia, vessels are more than 500 tons, and in the Maritimes they have to be operating extra-territorial. But it is a matter that is now, I want to assure this Committee, being studied. It does not require any amendment to the Act that is before the House, the bill that is before the House, it can be done by regulation. But it is a very valid point, and one that whilst I cannot commit government I would think there is some sympathy for because - as it relates to ferries, but again is how do you find a non-discriminatory formula that would bring in ferries - or

Mr. Hickman: exempt ferries rather and make sure that pleasure craft and other boats they are not in that category of either fishing commercially or transportation of persons for fares would be still paying a retail sales tax. But it is well under control.

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

CAPTAIN WINSOR: I would first like to elaborate a little on what the hon. minister has said. He said Newfoundland is probably a little more generous than the Province of Nova Scotia, but Nova Scotia nor New Brunswick have as many inland water ferries as do Newfoundland.

Now what my hon. colleague is saying there is that for an example there is going to be a replacement of a ferry between Valleyfield and Greenspond, and that ferry is not going to be 300 ton, and because it is under 300 ton it is going to be subject to the sales tax. It is also going to be subject to all of the repairs made to that vessel during the refitting of the vessel. And let us take an illustration, Mr. Chairman, for instance, that ferry is performing the same type of service as the ferry, for example, running between Portugal Cove and Bell Island.

Now let me take one vessel in particular and that is The Katherine, The Katherine which operates on the ferry service between Bell Island and Portugal Cove. That vessel is exempt from all taxes because she is over 300 tons. But the unfortunate man or company who has got to replace the Valleyfield-Greenspond ferry, and that vessel could be 290 tons, is subject to all of the taxes.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: There is an injustice there, Mr. Chairman, and it is not only the Valleyfield to Greenspond ferry which I have had a lot of inquiries about, but St. Brendan's, as my colleague mentioned. Then you have the Change Island ferry and the Little Bay Islands ferry. They are all subject to this excess tax. And I think there is an inequality there and an injustice and a very grave disadvantage to the people who have to operate those ferries. And, Sir, surely when a vessel of that type is operating and carrying out the same services as the one which, for instance, operates between Fogo and Clarenville, but because one is probably five or ten gross tons over and above the one that is operating between Change Islands and the mainland, one is subject to the sales tax and the other is not. There is nothing fair about that, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I would urge the government to take a good hard look at that clause and do it by an amendment, amend the clause and reduce the tonnage. It is easy to come up with a formula, because no one expects all speed boats and yachts, etc., pleasure boats to be exempt, but certainly, the ferryboats and boats that are engaged in the coastal trade, there is another area. For instance, a firm or an individual would buy a trader, a freighter - and I am sure the hon. the Minister of Finance is familiar enough with small coastal vessels - one is 295 tons and is subject to the sales tax, the other one is 350 tons, you know, more carrying capacity, more revenue earning, but yet because there is a few tons in the difference one is eligible for the tax and the other is not. It is very unfair and it leaves a very great disadvantage to promotion of the local trade, and God knows we need it, it is coming back slowly now.

And then there is the other matter which the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush)

CAPT. E. WINSOR: mentioned, the tourist boat. Today we hear that the Kipawo is no longer operating out of Terra Nova Park. It is too expensive, and to replace the Kipawo, I do not think you are going to find anyone with the interest to do it. But smaller tour boats, yes, you will find many people who are interested in operating the tour boat. So, Mr. Speaker, I would sincerely hope that the minister would take a hard look at that, and he can take the tonnage down, but you cannot use the other provinces as an example because there is no comparison. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, I rise very briefly, and I mean very briefly, to speak to this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, may I have the protection of the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member is being harassed by his own colleagues, I understand.

MR. NOLAN: No, no! I did not say that, Mr. Chairman, do not jump the gun.

The difficulty I have with this particular bill, of course, on the retail sales tax, as my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned, is the fact that we have had sort of a financial reprieve, thanks to the Ottawa federal government. Now we are looking for some kind of equal compassion, economic responsibility, from the Minister of Finance. I mean, there is no way I could stand up and support, because by merely supporting this in total I would perhaps be interpreted as supporting the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance, and I mean, that is political and economic suicide, because there is no way in God's world that anybody could support that sort

MR. J. NOLAN: of backward oration. But, Mr. Speaker, why, I mean, are we to, by approving this, attempt to approve the mismanagement of our friends. opposite? Because the monies raised from sales tax go into the general revenue of the Province. The money from the general revenue of the Province goes into that expensive abortion known as Newfoundland Hydro and a number of other things. I mean, is this what the Minister of Finance expects us to approve, to indicate? And the danger is by your silence you may possibly be guilty of, or be interpreted as being guilty of approving this sort of thing. Surely no one in his right mind would do this. If the Minister of Finance is as successful in that portfolio as he has been as Minister of Justice then there are not too many failures in history that can equal that.

MR. HOLLAN:

Mr. Speaker, we are in a situation now where we have listened to the administration opposite since 1971, and every time that a pipe breaks or anything in this Province it is always the Federal Government. And now we have a situation where we have a little tax relief in sales tax from the Federal Government and now we are calling upon this administration to cut out some of the squandering, extravagances to take a good hard look at Memorial University and those who are living high on the hog, flying hither and yon. We are asking them to look at Newfoundland Hydro and any number of other things and pass on the resultant savings to a very repressed, depressed, economically depressed people who are looking for help, assistance and even understanding which they feel that they are not getting in this House of Assembly, particularly from the present administration who are in a position to do something about it. We have seen since 1971, we have heard, and even some Newfoundlanders, I am afraid were sucked in, if I may use the expression, of beating themselves on the chest by the purchase, say, of Churchill Falls. The result is that we are now kicking out \$25 million a year or more in interest. What is the good if the minister - what is the good of the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) and I having the Concorde supersonic planes if we cannot afford to operate it? But you have a situation here where even the Premier himself knows that the purchase of Churchill Falls was one of the greatest blunders ever committed by his administration.

But the Minister of Finance cannot simply paw this through as though he is down having drinks with the legal society. It is not good enough. We want to know now what he is prepared to do to reduce the sales tax on a very, very economically oppressed people in this Province. We would also like to hear from the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who sounds off about the financial position of the Province from time to time and echoes his soulful concern about it, as well he should. What he does not address himself to is the massive squandering and waste that he supports by his silence.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (COLLINS)

The hon. member for St. John's

West.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Chairman, a few general remarks

about this. We are asked to approve here an increase in the sales tax from 10 per cent to 11 per cent. basically--this is basically what the bill is--and then we are going to reduce it by 3 per cent because the Federal Government were kind enough to allow us to do that, to give some of their income tax in order for us add more to our income tax so that we could take it off the sales tax. This is basically the thing. We are asked to increase the sales tax by 1 per cent and thereby increase the yield by something like \$25 million or \$30 million a year; this is according to the figures that are there. And the question

as has been asked is what are we going to use this extra \$25 million for, what do we plan to use it for? We are not going to use it to buy shoes for welfare people. I have a case now we are going to go after where a person cannot even get a pair of shoes from the Department of Welfare to go and look for a job. He has to go bare-footed looking for work in this Province because the government are too hard hearted.

They are not going to use their \$25 million or even \$20 or even \$10 to buy a pair of shoes for somebody. This is a hard hearted crowd. They are not going to use some of this \$25 million or \$30 million extra tax that the people of Newfoundland are going to have to pay and Labrador are going to have to pay in order to increase student grants and to decrease their loan. No, they are too hard hearted about that, they do not care of things of that nature; Mr. Chairman, they are not going to reduce the cutbacks in education. They are going to put up the hydro though; they are going to put that up and put it up again. And when the question was asked in the House here today of the Premier was he prepared to do something about that he sort of washed his hands, Pontius Pilate like and says, "Well, what has this to do with me?"

We have the board of Public Commissioners to do our dirty work and they will do it and we can sit back and pretend that everything is fine."

MR. NEARY:

That is exactly what I forecasted
was going to happen last year. (Inaudible)

DR. KITCHEN:

Yes. This is all it is, a whipping boy,
another level, another buffer between the government and the people.
The government is not prepared to answer directly to the people and
say, "Yes, my son. We are going to put the taxes up because we want to
pay the students a bit more money". If they did that we might
accept that we have to

DR. H. KITCHEN: balance it out where they are going to take it from this person and give it to the other person and agree. But no. What are they going to use some of that \$25 million for? Well, a bit of it they are going to use for the silly telephone number that has been established, a few friendly contracts about helicopters and things of that nature. But are the people really going to benefit from this extra \$25 million? It is very questionable and we are going to have another bill here now before the House. Bill 74 was introduced here the other day and somebody is going to want another whack of money to subsidize a facility that should never have been built. This is the sort of stuff that is going on around here. We are being asked to cough up money, the poor people in this Province, the ten per cent to eleven per cent, and this affects the ordinary worker in this Province and the ordinary person in this Province on a fixed income. This is the tax that the spenders pay. The misers do not have to pay that. A person who has a pocket full of money and makes more than he spends can stick the balance in the bank and he is not taxed. There is no tax on that. It is the spender who is paying, the poor son of a gun who has to spend everything he makes, everything is taxed. A person who saves a bit of money sticks it off in stocks and bonds and things like that, fair enough, no tax, he has it knocked.

This is a very bad form of taxation, this retail sales tax. It is one of the more regressive types of taxation and it is one that any sensible government would not increase at this time. There is a very serious time facing this Province where very few people are working, where many people are on fixed incomes either from Departments of Social Security or unemployment insurance, pensions of one kind or another, things that are very difficult to increase, fixed incomes. More and more people of this Province are on fixed incomes and this is the tax that the government puts on. Had they levied an income tax, stuck on a few more points on the income tax, then the person who earns pay more and the person who earns a whole lot can be taxed a lot more, a super tax. There are all sorts of things the

DR. H. KITCHEN: government could do to raise \$25 million and instead they decide they are going to add another percentage point to the sales tax. It is easy from the point of view of collection because the calculations are from ten to eleven. It is not much more difficult although the retail sales clerks find a great difficulty in making the calculation. I am sure it causes them great grief. Ten per cent was rather a round figure but now it went to eleven and of course it is going to be reduced to eight and the calculations are more difficult.

But basically what we are being asked to approve is another one per cent increase in the sales tax and it should not be overlooked that that is what it is. It is not a decrease in the sales tax to eight per cent although that is what happened because the Federal Government threw in three per cent and the Provincial Government took away one per cent for themselves to spend on their little matacil and the other things that they like spending their money on, these anti-people programmes that they have been developing in recent years. I suppose though one advantage of increasing the tax is it will encourage people to save, but then who can save these days?

I would like to raise a particular point with respect to this bill and that is number 26, Section 26 to me should be looked at because I notice that the Federal Government very recently has amended some of its rules, has looked at the way it treats small businesses and has looked at the reporting practices that small business make to the government and have said to the small businesses, "Now look here, folks; what we are going to do for you is to reduce the bookkeeping. We are going to make it easier for a person to be in business by reducing the bookkeeping. Instead of making those returns on a monthly basis that you have been making to us we are going to allow you to make them on a quarterly or a semi-annual basis." I think that is a good idea to reduce the bookkeeping. One of the biggest problems that small shopkeepers, corner stores, little people with one employee or just the person themselves operating a small business, one of the biggest problems is trying to keep track of all the government work that has to be done with respect to selling

July 4, 1973

Tape No. 5059

JM - 3

DR. H. KITCHEN: a few candies or whatever it is. It might be a very good idea for the government to look at what it can do to help small businesses by means of reducing the amount of paper work.

When I look at Section 26(1) here of this bill it says this, "Every seller shall keep and preserve books of account, records and documents showing his purchases and sales of tangible personal property, all tangible personal property purchased or taken from stock for consumption or use by the seller or supplied to employees of the seller where the tangible personal property is not sold at a retail sale." How anyone can figure out what that means I do not know but I suppose eventually

DR. KITCHEN:

after you go to court a few times you will figure it out.

Non-assessable sales of tangible personal property including sales for resale, retail sales that are exempted and sales in respect of which refund of the tax is payable. Assessable retail sales of tangible personal property. Amount of tax collected. Disposal of tax and remuneration retained by the seller and such other accounts, records and documents as may be designated by the Minister. And shall make returns to the minister in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed times. Now this involves a lot of work, unnecessary work perhaps in some cases. I have heard numerous complaints from businesses, especially small businesses who cannot keep an army of bookkeepers and lawyers and so on to keep them out of trouble, as to the amount of work they do for the government particularly for the provincial government. And it might be a very good idea if this House were to follow the lead of the federal government and made it easier for small businesses to deal with the government by reducing the amount of paper work and reducing the number of returns made annually to the government with respect to sales tax.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution, carried.

On motion, clauses 1 through 32, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: In clause 33, Mr. Chairman, there is a slight amendment. I do not know if it would fall into the category of a typographical error - no, the hon. gentleman shakes his head. If my colleague the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy would move that 33(2)(b) be amended by striking out the words 'In the hands of any trustee' and then again, (3)(b) 'In the hands if any trustee'.

MR. PECKFORD: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

On motion, amendment, carried.

On motion, clause 33(2)(b) and 33(3)(b) as amended, carried.

On motion, clauses 34 through 62, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: On 63, again I hope that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy will be prepared to move an amendment to 63 (1) to insert after the word 'taken' which is the fifth word in that sentence, the words 'to the Court of Appeal'.

MR. PECKFORD: I do move, Mr. Chairman.

On motion amendment carried.

On motion clause as amended carried.

On motion Clauses 63 through 76 carried.

On motion clauses 77 through 83, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill with amendment, carried.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report it has adopted a certain resolution and a bill with amendments consequent thereto and recommend that said bill with amendments be introduced to give effect to same.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution and a bill consequent thereto, with amendment, carried.

On motion amendments read a first and second time.

On motion a bill, "An Act Respecting The Tax Imposed Upon The Retail Sale Of Tangible Personal Property," (Bill No. 38), read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 39, Bill No. 77.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law," (No. 77).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I will not bore the House by going into what is fondly known as the Attorney General's amendment bill. It is one to cure errors that are discovered each year when we review the statutes but there is some urgency of it going through first, second and third reading this afternoon, which hon. colleagues have agreed to because I have to have an amendment moved to take

MR. HICKMAN: care of the holiday situation for Her Majesty's visit. I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law," (No. 77), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now by leave.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Bill No. 77.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 77.

A bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law," (No. 77).

On motion clauses (1) through (12) by leave, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: (13), Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to (13) (4), as I am sure the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy will move by putting in clause (4), subsection (2) is deemed to have come into force on June 28th., 1977.

MR. PECKFORD: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

On motion amendment carried.

On motion clause (13) as amended, carried.

On motion, clauses 14 through 27 carried.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am sure again that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy will move that the bill be amended by adding the following paragraph. Out in the side note will be FSN 1970 chapter 158 and will be clause 28 as follows: Paragraph (d) of sub-section 4 of the Hours of Work Act is repealed and the following substituted:- (d) Any day that may be proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council as a special holiday in honour of any special public event or occasion in all areas of the Province or in such particular areas of the Province as may be proclaimed.

MR. B. PECKFORD: So moved.

MR. A. HICKMAN: So moved?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the amendment -

MR. A. HICKMAN: Well, all right, Mr. Chairman. It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy and the purpose behind that is that Her Majesty The Queen is arriving in Newfoundland on Thursday, July 26th, and that day is Regatta Day -

AN HON. MEMBER: The 27th.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Thursday, July 27th, and Regatta Day as everyone knows is a whole holiday in the Province but -

DR. H. KITCHEN: Is Harbour Grace getting a holiday?

MR. A. HICKMAN: That is Regatta - For the benefit of the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) there is a sporting activity held in the City that he represents in this House. It is the oldest contested organized sport in North America -

DR. H. KITCHEN: According to the St. John's East -

MR. A. HICKMAN: and this would be according to in particular the residents of the district of St. John's West. I have to remind the hon. gentleman from St. John's West that many years ago, it was in 1950, there was a resident of St. John's who then was an elected official, not of this House, who at the Regatta allegedly had a bit too much to drink because I believe they have something more than

MR. A. HICKMAN: orange juice at the Regatta but not having represented the district of St. John's West I am not as familiar with what goes on at the Regatta as the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) is. But in any event when the gentleman was before a magistrate, who has since retired, and a young member of the F.C.M.P. who had not been exposed to this activity before and who had arrested the gentleman because the first two years, you will recall, Quidi Vidi was outside the City of St. John's limits and was not policed by the Newfoundland Constabulary - But in any event the R.C.M.P. had done their duty but this constable made a comment quite similar about the Regatta to that just made by the hon. member for St. John's West, which was not very flattering towards the Regatta. This aroused the ire of the magistrate and the constable got a very strong and stiff lecture. I think the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) was probably reporting at the time. And far be it for anyone to make a derogatory remark about this sport known as the Regatta, But I digressed; I was harassed, Mr. Chairman, by the hon. member for St. John's West who apparently does not share the same view for the St. John's Regatta, as enthusiastic a view as I do.

The St. John's Regatta held in Quidi Vidi, sometimes pronounced as Quidi Vidi by those who do not know any different. But in any event, Mr. Chairman, the reason for this little amendment is a little bit important and is that Regatta Day will be held on the day of Her Majesty's visit, Thursday, July 27th, 1978. Whether it rains or shines the visit goes ahead that day and it will be a holiday in St. John's for the Royal visit. The concern is that if it rains we maintain the tradition of having a holiday on the next fine day to celebrate the Regatta. So this amendment is very necessary. Also, the people of the City of Corner Brook have brought to the attention of

MR. HICKMAN:

government that they are not the slightest bit interested in having the holiday in St. John's on Thursday, July 27th. The holiday on the West Coast, in their opinion, must be on Friday, July 28th when Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II by the grace of God, etc., will be visiting the West Coast of our Province, will be visiting Stephenville and will be visiting Corner Brook and Deer Lake and the people from the West Coast of our Province will be congregating in one of these three municipalities to greet affectionately Her Majesty, the Queen. But in order to accommodate all of that it is necessary that this bill be passed now and that is why this amendment is necessary, and I hope it has the enthusiastic support of all hon. gentleman and ladies in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Chairman, this small but important amendment does have, I would say, the unanimous support of all members of the House, although, Sir, if I were the Government House Leader, I would not count on the House having a holiday on that particular day because it may be that the Queen will be required to prorogue this hon. House of Assembly on the 27th day of July. As a matter of fact, if for no other reason - we are going to keep the House open in any event, Sir, because there are so many important things that have to be discussed in the House - but if for no other reason, we should keep it open until the Queen comes so that we can have the pleasure and honour and privilege of Her Majesty proroguing the hon. House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, one or two things I would like to say about this amendment, or rather things which more or less emanate or result from this amendment

MR. W. ROWE: and it concerns the Queen's visit itself. We are all delighted to see Her Majesty come and visit our Province, St. John's and Corner Brook, but I would like to have a word of criticism for the government who apparently arranged the itinerary for the Queen's visit. The Queen obviously had nothing at all to do with it; it is the Queen's ministers here who should be criticized for some of the things associated with the Queen's visit. First of all, I am talking in terms of a matter which was raised earlier by my hon. colleague, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). It would have been a magnificent occasion, Mr. Chairman, for this government to insist on the Queen visiting Labrador as part of her visit to Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, Mr. Speaker, that would have been a magnificent gesture.

MR. HICKMAN: That is what we asked for.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, yes, sure you did. Sure they did, Mr. Chairman. That is what they asked for.

MR. HICKMAN: We did.

MR. NOLAN: For a while they were blaming the federal government, now they are blaming Her Majesty.

MR. W. ROWE: Kick out at the federal government again, Sir! They cannot even arrange an itinerary for the Queen's visit, lovely, gracious lady, without kicking out at the federal government, this hon. crowd whom we have the misfortune of having for the government of our Province, Sir. It would have been a magnificent gesture if the government here had seen to it either by negotiation -

MR. NEARY: They cannot do anything right.

MR. W. ROWE: - they cannot do anything right. Sir, the hon. House Leader cannot even proclaim the holiday for the Queen right without getting into a big fuss across the House. There a little while ago he proclaimed, made

MR. W. ROWE: public an amendment to the Act here on errors and anomalies, and why a holiday for the Queen is in errors and anomalies I do not know. We should have that investigated too, another investigation - use up the one remaining magistrate if there be one left in the Province who is not conducting an inquiry.

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland Hardwoods now, that will be the next one.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, that is the next one.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two things about the Queen's visit which I feel incumbent upon me to comment on and one of them I have already mentioned. It would have been such a magnificent gesture, Sir, for this government to use - even if they had to use all the Queen's visit to have the Queen, well, touch in at St. John's, perhaps, as the capital city and her vice-regal representative is here, after all, in the capital city, but from there go on to Labrador as part of the visit to Newfoundland and Labrador and make no mistake in anyone's mind then, Mr. Speaker, as to the way this Province is perceived by the Queen herself, and by the ministers advising the Queen both federally and provincially that this is the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. So that would have been a tremendous gesture and this government let the opportunity slip through its fingers and they should be condemned for so doing, Sir.

MR. W. ROWE: They should not have allowed that to happen, allowing this opportunity to slip through their fingers, Sir. But, of course, when you are desperately clinging on for dear life and survival these little things do not occur to you so often, Sir. When you are clinging on to your desk trying to stay on for the next couple of years, trying to keep the government from going down the drain these matters do not occur to you. The only thing you are preoccupied with is your own political survival and the Minister of Municipal Affairs cannot even manage that, could not even get the one piece of legislation, the one major piece of legislation brought in by this government this session, Sir, originating with this government in this session, they could not even get it through the House. So it is no wonder, Sir, that they forget to do things which could be of tremendous symbolic value.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: That is right, they have. Tremendous symbolic value, Sir, to have the Queen visit Labrador during this visit - tremendous symbolic value - and it is too bad the government slipped up terribly on what should have been a simple matter. And, Sir, I for one, rise in the House to condemn the government for this. They could have used the Queen in a way in which she would undoubtedly want to be used in her role as the Head of the Commonwealth and the Queen of Canada, cementing this Province together, showing to all of Canada that this Province is the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: And, Sir, the government did not even have the imagination or the ability or whatever it takes, Sir, to do these things which mean a lot in the course of a Province's history.

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Sir, the other point I would like to make is one which was already made by my hon. friend, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) recently and that is that during the Queen's visit, the children of this Province are virtually ignored. He made that point, I believe, a little earlier.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I did.

MR. W. ROWE: And it bears repetition. And he is going to make it again, Sir, he informs me. The children of this Province are virtually ignored. You would not know they existed, Sir, as far as the planning for the Queen's visit is concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are not permitted at the Garden Party, are they?

MR. W. ROWE: No children at the Garden Party. There may be -

MR. NEARY: That is only for the mucky-mucks.

MR. W. ROWE: There may be one or two girl guides there and they will enjoy themselves without a doubt.

AN HON. MEMBER: Passing cookies.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right, they may be there and more power to them and I hope they are, but, Sir, the children generally, especially those outside the city - outside the two cities, I should say, are totally ignored by this government in planning the Queen's visit.

I remember I was in grade -
1956 was it, the Queen visited here last?

AN HON. MEMBER: 1939?

MR. W. ROWE: No, I cannot even remember back then. But, Sir, I remember being in grade school at the time and being involved in the Queen's visit - flags passed out, little things of chocolates passed out, little coins, commemorating coins and so on, Sir. I do not mind saying that for myself in those days, young and so on, and for my

MR. W. ROWE: colleagues and compatriots in grade school, it was the highlight, Sir, seeing the Queen going by and so on, the highlight of my young and tender life up to that point. The highlight of my life up to the present time is having the privilege of sitting next to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). That is the highlight now, Sir.

But, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness again, I would like to say to the government, if they have the ability or the right now to make some changes in the itinerary of the Queen's visit to this Province then change it in order to involve representatives - at least representatives of children from all over this Province, Labrador included, Western Labrador, Central Labrador, the Coast of Labrador, the rural areas of this Province, get them involved in their hundreds, Mr. Speaker. They are going to spend \$1 million or whatever it is on the Queen's visit - spend it usefully in a way which is going to benefit the children of the Province and make them feel involved in this very, very useful and historic tradition which we have regarding the Monarch, the Queen of England, the Queen of Canada and the Head of the Commonwealth. And, Sir, the government should be condemned again for not involving more children into the festivities and in the Queen's visit generally.

I would like to hear why the government has seen fit to keep the Queen out of Labrador. Is this government afraid to do things which may be perceived as being tainted with politics?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Is that the problem? Well if so, Sir, the government should resign immediately because opportunities like this should be seized upon by any government which is looking after the best interest of Newfoundland and Labrador to show the solidarity between the two regions of the Province and to use this visit as a symbolic gesture in that regard. Secondly, Sir, it is not too late. I ask the Government House Leader, who is the only one who seems to have a bit of a grip on what is going on in the government today, the only minister in that government, Sir, who seems to have the least bit of a grip on the government of this Province and the functioning of this House, Sir, I appeal to him, make the changes necessary in the Queen's itinerary and the Queen's schedule to allow the children of this Province to at least have representatives chosen from among them in the rural areas particularly, not just the two cities but from the rural areas, the remoter the better and certainly from Labrador, the Coast of Labrador and the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area in Western Labrador and the Straits bring them in, Sir. If the Queen will not go to them or She would love to go to them I am sure but if She is not advised by her ministers to go to them then bring them to the Queen and have them involved in these festivities. It maybe, Sir, the Queen has so many regions that She has to visit in the Commonwealth it maybe, Sir, it may in fact be the last time that the present Monarch will have an opportunity to visit Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. NEARY: Why do you say that?

MR. W.N. ROWE: It may be.

MR. NEARY: She is only a young woman yet.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well she has thousands of provinces similar to Newfoundland and Labrador which she -

MR. NEARY: She will be back again.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well I hope so.

MR. NEARY: If not we will get what's her name over - get Margaret.

I would like to see Margaret.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Get Lord Snowden over.

MR. NEARY: What do you say we get Margaret over for a bit of a do? We could have a great time, a bit of a scuff.

MR. W.N. ROWE: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do ask the government to try to make some changes that might accommodate these two matters that I have mentioned. The Labrador situation as I say if you cannot bring the Queen to Labrador then at least bring some children from Labrador to the Queen so that they can be involved in some of the - Now this has nothing to do with the Government of Canada. I do not want to hear the Minister of Finance and Justice stand up now and say, Well it is those fellows up in Ottawa again who botched this visit of the Queen. I am sure that we could see involved in the Queen's visit.

MR. NEARY: Can you imagine him saying this afternoon that she wanted to come to where the Lieutenant-Governor was, the Queen's representative? Why could he not go where she is?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, but in any event, Sir, let me say that I hope that the Provincial Government does not use the Federal Government as a whipping post in this because I am sure the Government of the Province can make arrangements to have children brought in their hundreds, Sir, from all over this Province to involve themselves, have the pleasure and the privilege and the honour of involving themselves in the festivities and celebrations surrounding the Queen's visit to the two cities in this Province, Sir. I do hope the minister will have something to say on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South followed by the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this amendment- It is an amendment, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: Concerning the Queen's visit. Now perhaps before I start I can ask the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance particularly a question - and I would like for him to get the answer for me now while I am speaking and while other people may speak on this - how much money is going to be spent on promoting the Queen's visit? What firms are doing it and the names of the individuals concerned?

MR. HICKMAN:

No, there (inaudible).

MR. NOLAN:

Oh, yes there are. We knew months ago, oh yes. So now I am asking the minister to send one of his many, many, many officials in the various departments that he heads up now to give us the names of the firms, the PR firm or firms that are doing work. I want to know who is being paid to promote the Queen's visit out of the public purse. That is what we would like to know in this House and surely I do not think that is beyond the wits of the minister opposite to get that for us. That is item one. Item two on the holiday -

MR. HICKMAN:

The total cost of the Royal visit was \$25,000.

MR. NOLAN:

I see.

MR. PECKFORD:

It is in your estimates.

MR. NOLAN:

Is that - Oh, I would like to know what you are going to spend.

MR. HICKMAN:

I do not know. I tell you I do not know.

MR. NOLAN:

I would like to know what you have spent already.

MR. HICKMAN:

To my knowledge we have not spent anything yet.

MR. NOLAN:

To your knowledge, fine. So I hope the minister now will check with the Department of Tourism and anyone who has hired PR firms for this particular occasion both for here in St. John's

MR. NOLAN:

and also on the West Coast and give us some honest to God answers on it. The Minister of Tourism knows what I am talking about. I am sure. Is Mr. Nutbeem engaged in this, for example? Would the Minister of Finance care to tell me if Mr. Nutbeem is engaged or his firm? Would the minister find out?

MR. HICKMAN: The minister responsible for the royal visit is Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. NOLAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: All these coins that were left over from the Silver Anniversary here on the Norma and Gladys, did you give all them out?

MR. HICKMAN: They were pretty popular.

MR. NEARY: They were pretty popular but they are pretty expensive, too. You never sold very many.

MR. SIMMONS: You have all kinds of them left over.

MR. NEARY: Yes, what are you going to do with all the ones left over?

MR. HICKMAN: I do not know. (Inaudible)

MR. NOLAN: You are the Minister of Finance. Sold through your own department and you do not know.

All right, item two. Apparently according to the minister we are going to declare a holiday in St. John's or in the St. John's area. What is the St. John's area?

MR. HICKMAN: There will be a whole holiday throughout Newfoundland.

MR. NOLAN: Throughout the whole Province.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. But the areas that are likely, and this is going to have to be done with some negotiations with Mayor Murphy, the Mayor of Corner Brook, and the Mayor of Stephenville, the areas that will be more accessible, etc., from the West Coast will have their holiday out there. That is what they are asking for.

MR. NOLAN: But I wonder if I could throw this at the minister. Here we have the situation where certain people who are privileged enough to have the Monarch, Her Majesty, visit with them in their areas, St. John's being one, Corner Brook or the West Coast being

MR. NOLAN:

another, I will assume that the holiday therefore proclaimed will be a paid holiday.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: Okay. So the rest of Newfoundland who do not even get an opportunity to look at the Monarch work and they do not get a paid holiday.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, no. This is going to be a provincial holiday, Province wide except that part of the Province will have it on Thursday and the remainder on Friday. That is all.

MR. NOLAN: All right. So everybody gets it. All right. We will settle on that.

Okay. Now the other thing is here is an opportunity - I remember a little further back than the Leader of the Opposition when there was a visit and my remembrance as a boy, and I am sure the hon. member will recall, it was an opportunity for Newfoundland craftsmen or craftswomen to exhibit artistic exhibitions. I can remember for example the magnificent green archs that were built and so on, just magnificent, in many areas of the Province. It gave more of the ordinary people an opportunity to participate. The minister must know -

MR. NEARY: Even when the Archbishop was coming over to Bell Island we used to put them up.

MR. NOLAN: Sure. That is right. But the minister must know that from those days they are as treasured objects in homes in Newfoundland today. Even the tins, special tins which contained biscuits or candy which had a special emblem and so on which you will find in homes in Newfoundland today. What of this nature do we have from the planners of this particular one? There should have been an opportunity for the men and women of Newfoundland who are involved in handicrafts and so on to have a display where Her Majesty could go and have an opportunity to see these things. There should have been beyond a shadow of a doubt before any of the high mucky-mucks and all the rest get an opportunity to get their spoke in for all the children or as many children as possible to have the closest possible view of Her Majesty

MR. NOLAN:

Above everyone else it should have been the children.

MR. HICKMAN: It will be.

MR. NOLAN: It will be? And there should have been, as my hon. friend has indicated -

MR. HICKMAN: At the present time (inaudible).

MR. NOLAN: If the hon. minister will -

MR. HICKMAN: - chocolate bars total contribution of the Government of Great Britain through its Satellite, the Commission of Government to the children in Newfoundland. That was the total -

MR. NEARY: They should get a lollipop now.

MR. HICKMAN: Do you remember that? My scout master, Teddy Thorburn, made a great presentation of that.

MR. NOLAN: I remember the old West End of St. John's, all of Waterford Bridge Road, Topsail Road, people throughout Conception Bay and so on, particularly when they came into Holyrood that time - do you recall? There was a time, I believe, when King George VI - I am not sure but I believe it was -

MR. HICKMAN: 1939.

MR. NOLAN: 1939. And the Queen Mother arrived in Holyrood and came in. People along the highway, I remember people up sitting in branches of trees, on fences and everything, all children. But it was always the children out front.

MR. S. NEARY: You might say that was on your knees first.

MR. J. NOLAN: That is right. And they had a magnificent opportunity to meet and see and talk to, in some instances, Her Majesty the Queen. What have we heard? What input have you had from anybody? Have you asked anybody as to how this visit should have been handled? I mean, are we ashamed to talk to the ordinary people, the parents and so on? Are we afraid to let the young children get up close to meet Her Majesty? Can you imagine what a thrill it is for them? No, no! No consultation. We are not even told the names of the people doing the publicity, how much they are being paid, the PR firm or firms. The Minister of Finance does not know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Your time has elapsed.

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. gentleman has elapsed.

MR. J. NOLAN: No wonder they would not buy your savoury in Russia, for God's sake.

MR. J. CARTER: That is because it is green. They only buy red.

MR. J. NOLAN: That is right. Yes.

So here we have the situation now where there should be more preparation than we are aware of at the moment because while he may mention some reference to the holiday we are not told anything about the visit, how it will be handled, what preparation that will be particularly indicative of Newfoundland, the Newfoundland character, the Newfoundland craftsmanship and so on. Nothing! We are told nothing by the most non-informative Government since Nero. It is scandalous.

Give the children above all else an opportunity to be up front on this particular occasion. And it is the Minister of Finance who should be mentioning this now in reference to the holiday.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Inter-governmental Affairs.

MR. J. NOLAN: Never mind passing the buck. He either passes the buck to the Federal government, to Her Majesty The Queen, or an absent colleague. Cannot the Minister take responsibility for anything?

MR. A. HICKMAN: I take it all. Too much of it. I do not have any responsibility for the royal visit.

MR. J. NOLAN: It is just shocking.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Leave me alone. Stop picking on me. I am being harassed. I am trigger happy.

MR. J. NOLAN: Tell us what you are going to do for the children. Let us know. Find out. Send a carrier pigeon but get the information. Give us the information on what is being spent, what firm is involved in the public relations for this. I have a sneaking suspicion a tidy dollar is going to be turned over in this one, a tidy dollar. And it is not going to be spent by Her Majesty, I will guarantee you

the people to know what the children in the Northeast Avalon or wherever is included will have an opportunity to meet Her Majesty The Queen. There should have been a special emblem struck of some kind, a medallion that would be a lifelong souvenir and a treasured possession for every young child in Newfoundland. But not from this non-imaginative Government. You know, it is a sad, sad thing. Above all else you would think that after a history in this session of the House of Assembly of bungling, botching, messing up, ruining and so on, here was their opportunity to shine and do something, just one thing, right, just one good step forward, you know, it might have left a good impression, And they could not carry that off! Somehow it is sad to see. If the Minister of Justice brought down the Ten Commandments from the mountain on tablets of stone, you would have to send it back for revision. You simply would because you know from his past, his history, his record, he is just not - maybe not he personally but the

July 4, 1978

Tape No. 5067

RT-3

MR. J. NOLAN: crew with which he is involved have a habit and he can try to avoid it - He is pointing to the Minister of Transportation who I understand is the official chairman for the ceremonies, but why did he not take the trouble to ask him if he knew the man was not going to be in the House so he could give us the information today. He was not too hesitant about asking us to go ahead and to put this through today which we are happy and glad to do. So we want all to know we are not happy with the arrangements because we do not know what they are, but I suspect from everything that I know that there is very little opportunity to the people who should have the first opportunity as the hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated and quite rightly so. For him, himself, as he has admitted, at least he has fond memories not only of the visit of Her Majesty but also those things that were associated with it at the time, the little souvenirs if you like. And you will find things in homes in many parts of the city today, in my hon. friend's

MR. NOLAN:

district of St. John's West and many others even the biscuit cans or chocolate cans, whatever they were, are still in the homes and people still talk about it. But all my hon. friend can come up with is an increase in sales tax and that is the tragedy and that will be his marker.

So there you go, Mr. Chairman.

We are all for the holiday, obviously, all for it and we are very glad and happy to extend, as I am sure we will, a wonderful welcome to Her Majesty the Queen. It is a very sad thing, particularly with the situation at the moment, and in view of some of the things we talked about here in the House respecting Newfoundland Labrador and Quebec, you had an opportunity beyond belief, beyond belief - and if anyone had even a casual nodding acquaintance with PR and so on they would know, bring Her Majesty, fly Her into, say, Goose Bay, as an example, and have perhaps His Honour the Lieutenant Governor meet with Her Majesty there and His Highness Prince Philip.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No autographs.

MR. NOLAN: No autographs. Well, I would hope that the Minister of Justice will be more appropriately clad than the former Premier of this Province who greeted Her Majesty in Gander, I believe, with a certain part of his anatomy exposed. But I think the Minister of Finance is better dressed and prepared for the occasion. He knows what I am talking about. Remember the former Queen, Queen Mary? In Gander! He had the seat out of his pants!

MR. HICKMAN: (inaudible) sewed the rip.

MR. NOLAN: You were there?

MR. HICKMAN: Not that time.

MR. NOLAN: No. So what you are telling us is that you cannot even sew either.

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. NOLAN: There you go, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PECKFORD: A stitch in time saves nine.

MR. NOLAN: Saves nine, right!

So there it is, Labrador botched. What an opportunity. What a glorious opportunity for Her Majesty to go in to Labrador. The children, apparently, are going to be totally ignored, or almost. What I am afraid they will do now as a result of what my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition has said, and my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and others, is they will make a last-ditch effort to cover up their blunder by trying to get a few children involved. We want more than that because we believe that this is where it should be. I do not know exactly what the plans are but there should have been something very special for the children as a grand remembrance of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and also there should have been beautiful arches, beautiful displays of handiwork.

What kind of a gift or gifts will be presented to the Queen? Will they be representative of this Province and its people? We have a right to know.

AN HON. MEMBER: How are the children going to be chosen? From every community?

MR. NOLAN: A very good point. An excellent point. If there are children, how will they be chosen? So these are the things that our hon. friend the House Leader Opposite should now address himself to. Never mind trying to pawn through the holiday we are aware of that and we are more than willing to co-operate but there is more to it than that.

The Minister of Tourism's Department may very well be involved in this. I would certainly hope so. Is the Minister of Tourism spending any money on promotion? Is he spending any money? What firm or firms does he have hired to promote the Queen's visit?

MR. NOLAN: He too should stand and give an accounting is this is so. But these are questions that have to be answered and we do not want to have to wait for the Auditor General's Report next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, being a fair student of Labrador history I think it is correct to say that never in the history of Labrador has a ruling Monarch made an official to Labrador and notice I said, 'Official visit to Labrador' and I think the government here has botched up this opportunity. I think it is an absolute disgrace, an arrogant St. John's attitude. If the Queen has to come to St. John's for protocol then let it be so, for protocol alone. But surely in this day and age of the political climate we live in the government could have made numerous arrangements, a well organized campaign in Labrador to make sure that most of the children in Labrador could have met the Queen, a very simple procedure.

The argument that it would have taken many days to travel throughout the Labrador coast and Labrador and therefore it could not be arranged equally holds for the Queen's visiting St. John's or Corner Brook. She is not going to visit Harbour Grace or Bay de Verde or Old Perlican

MR. STRACHAN: or Port au Port, or St. Anthony or Port au Choix, exactly the same as if she visited Goose Bay she is not going to visit Nain or Cartwright or Mary's Harbour, But arrangements could be made for the children, especially the children since the children remember these kind of things, and it means more to them in the future, surely arrangements could very simply be made with CN, for instance, to have the boats organized, the one that runs once a week North and once a week South, to take the children from these communities into Goose Bay and the Queen, by visiting Goose Bay could have the opportunity of meeting all these people in the centre of Labrador and also meeting the children who are brought in by boat and it will be a holiday to remember at costs which are not very high. Certainly we spend a lot more money on a lot less useful projects. Surely then the government, if they had been interested at all and had thought ahead, could have made the first official visit of a ruling monarch to that part of this Province and Labrador a memorable occasion for the children there and something to remember in the future because that is surely what is meant by royalty and the whole idea of a monarchy system, that you have something to which you hold, it is an anchor to which you hold which gives stability to political climate, political setups, political systems.

MR. W. ROWE: Continuity and stability, that is right.

MR. STRACHAN: Continuity, as the hon. Leader states.

Surely then the children of Labrador who have never had an opportunity, never mind to go to the Aquarena, or the regatta, have never had an opportunity to meet the ruling monarch as such, the Queen, surely they could have been given an opportunity and it would have been a sensible, heart-felt opportunity, one which could have been done very simply, very easily.

I wonder if the people in Labrador are going

MR. STRACHAN: to celebrate the St. John's Regatta day or the holiday for Corner Brook. I wonder if they care. I doubt it very much. Because in essence what is on is an example of neglect, total, absolute neglect in a situation in which there should be no neglect, in a situation involving the Queen, monarchy, and there should be - that is the whole purpose of monarchy, to try to overcome these things in the Commonwealth, to try to tie people together.

I think that it is a disgraceful state of affairs. I think you should hang your heads in shame, those involved and if certainly someone else is to be involved if you want to pass the buck somewhere else then surely you could have been taking it up to cudgels weeks ago and I am sure you would have found everyone on your side. Now that everything has been decided and you now have to decide whether we are going to enjoy in Labrador the St. John's holiday or the Corner Brook holiday then I wonder if now you will bring it out and bring up the question that it is the federal government or it is the Queen or whatever, whoever you want to blame.

Surely it is the Government of this Province, surely they have some input into such visits, surely it is the purpose of the Government of this Province, and the Queen's representative who travelled Labrador two years ago and who saw for the first time and who made statements, in fact quite historic statements because very seldom does a Lieutenant-Governor, the Queen's representative, make political statements, but he felt so strongly after his visit to Labrador that he made some very strong political statements which is highly unusual, maybe he is not the traditional Prince Philip or the Duke of Edinburgh, whichever you want to call him, who has become involved in recent years in more political statements but generally the idea of a monarchy is to remain above it. But he obviously experienced in his travels

MR. STRACHAN: to Labrador strong feelings and surely there could have been no simpler way or easier way of trying to show concern for that part of the Province which will be sometime in the future the economic centre of this Province in which St. John's will be looking towards - surely it would have been correct, right and the proper thing to do to make sure that if there is a visit to any part of this Province that the first official visit should have been to Labrador and other areas second or after that. The whole thing is back to front, upside down and you wonder why people in Labrador get annoyed because the St. John's member thinks it is all different and it is all bologna. You wonder why they think it but the attitude is typical. No wonder people think that way. The Lieutenant-Governor had to come to find out. He did not believe it either when he came. In fact his first trip there he indicated that to me and his attitude by the time he had finished had totally changed and swung around. Surely the government could then have done something on this. It is something which upsets me, especially for children.

I remember the Coronation year in 1953.

I remember and still have the things, the medals and so on that were given to us at that time and I know full well that for young people, as I met the Queen when I got my medal in 1956, that surely at that time you remember these

MR. STRACHAN:

things and cherish them. They are very important to you when you carry on in future life. And surely we could have done something to give the children on the Labrador coast, very simply, very easily by C.N. vessel brought in to Goose Bay, and if you wanted to you could have split the visit by going to Lab City, but I am sure to at least one part of Labrador. To me it is not very difficult to spend a morning in Goose Bay and an afternoon in Labrador City and on to Montreal from there or wherever it is, very easily. And if the Queen had to come to visit the Lieutenant-Governor's establishment here because of protocol or whatever reasons there are, then that would be in order although it would have been preferable that the Queen go elsewhere in the Province rather than St. John's. Why is it that St. John's always has - maybe it is because it is the capital city, but why do we always have to consider that? that? We should sometimes consider other areas as well. And I wonder what the hue and cry would be from St. John's, for instance, if the Queen did not come to visit St. John's? I wonder what the hue and cry would be.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly on this issue inasmuch as the children are concerned, especially the children in Labrador who feel part of nothing, feel in many ways neglected, that they belong nowhere, that nobody really cares very much for them, and I am sure that a very simple arrangement like this could have been a holiday to remember in their lives. Many of them on the coast and in my district do not have the money, do not have the finances to send their children ever on holidays. Their only holidays are on the fishing boat and out on the fishing stages and their outside places before they return in the Fall again to school and back into their Winter inside places for the Winter again. Surely the children could have been given

MR. STRACHAN: an excellent holiday. The expense would have been a legitimate expense. It would not have been to any Department of Tourism or some publicity department or some company elsewhere to make publicity out of it, it would have been a very simple and heartfelt gesture which would have made the children in Labrador who are going to be your future and whom you are going to have to reckon with ten or fifteen or twenty years down the road and reckon with in a very severe way, you could have made them feel that they were being considered, that there was going to be something done by the government of the Province to try to make them feel part not only of this Province, but part of the Commonwealth and part of the Monarchy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: I think that the whole thing is a fool up. I get annoyed about it because I think that you missed an excellent opportunity and I imagine the defence will be that it has all been arranged elsewhere. At this late date if that is a defence, I think it is far too late. It could have been stated earlier. There could have been pressure, there could have been discussions much earlier, consultation much earlier. Weeks ago there could have been consultation so that there could have been something put together which would have recognized a large geographical part of this Province, but also recognized people who have never had such visits. I know Prince Philip, the Duke of Edinburgh, passes through Goose Bay quite often. In fact, on one occasion we had to rescue him from a Bill Carson, I believe a slightly inebriated Bill Carson, an old Hudson Bay man who drank considerable Hudson Bay rum and had great stories, in fact, a fascinating man who finally pinned the Duke of Edinburgh up against the wall with his big thumb and started telling him that he knew nothing about Canada's North and virtually poked him through the wall.

MR. STRACHAN: The Prince Philip often comes into situations like that and the people in Goose Bay have enjoyed the visits tremendously, but I think on this occasion here it should have been for the children especially and those are the ones who really matter. For the children especially it could have been an excellent visit, a wonderful visit for them. It would have given them something to remember, to talk about coming and going on the boat which is regarded as a cruise. It is the only holiday they get, cruising, everybody talks about hoping to try and get a cruise. It could have been organized by parents locally in the small communities and they would have felt part of it as well by chaperoning or taking the children there, and I think the whole thing could have been an excellent gesture.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the situation is obvious neglect and I am ashamed to be part of a process in this House here where we have not taken an opportunity and grasp this as an opportunity of trying to make the Queen's visit far more meaningful both to her, to the government, to the political climate of this Province and to the children of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) The hon. the member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER: Mr. Chairman, not to speak at any great length to the amendment, but to clarify and to give a little bit of information to the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and also the Leader of the Opposition who spoke about some Labrador children not visiting the Queen or not coming to see the Queen in St. John's. Just for their information and for clarification, if you want, there are eight native girls

MR. POWER:

from the North West River area of Labrador who are coming to spend two weeks with the parents of some Guides in the Witless Bay-Bay Bulls area of our shore. I think it is just a programme where they have invited these native girls to come to their homes for two weeks. They have done that at the same time or in conjunction with the Queen's visit and they are hoping, the parents of the Guides that I am talking with every day who are trying to arrange this thing and I have got to talk to the minister concerned and also the Minister of Rural Development hopefully to give these girls a few dollars for transportation. But these eight native girls from North West River who will be spending two weeks on the Southern Shore enjoying our hospitality I hope, they are coming in to live in our area for two weeks and they are also hoping to meet the Queen or at least be at some of the functions that the Queen will be also at and hoping to at least say hallo to the Queen or to at least be seen by Her or spoken to them by Her while the Queen is on a visit here in St. John's. And we are hoping -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mere tokenism.

MR. POWER: It may be mere tokenism but it is certainly at least something that is not being done by government and it is not being done for political reasons. It is being done by some very good ladies in the Witless Bay area who have an interest in those girls, an interest in the young people of our Province and there are no politics involved whatever. I just commend them and I just pass the information on to you because those ladies are doing something which I never thought about and which I think is certainly commendable on their part and I just give you that bit of information.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, the sad part as I see it about the whole visit of Her Majesty, the Queen, to this Province, the visit has been arranged diametrically opposed to the express wishes of Her Majesty herself. This past Fall, Sir, we had the honour and privilege of having the Lieutenant-Governor visit the Baie Verte Peninsula. He visited

MR. RIDEOUT:

practically every community on the Baie Verte Peninsula and everywhere he went he made it a point of telling the people that she had come around to see him, that he had been to London just before coming down to Baie Verte to discuss with Her Majesty Her upcoming visit to Newfoundland. And Her Majesty had -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. RIDEOUT: His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor. He had had discussions with Her Majesty regarding her visit to this Province. He told it publicly in dozens of communities on the Baie Verte Peninsula and that Her Majesty had expressly said to Her representative in this Province that she wanted to see the parts of Newfoundland she had never had an opportunity to see before. She wanted to see rural Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was said by Her representative in this Province as I said at dozens of public functions, on dozens of public platforms on the Baie Verte Peninsula last October or November. I am not sure which month but it was last Fall. The Queen Herself had told Her representative in this Province that during Her visit to Newfoundland this year she expressly wanted to see the rural areas of Newfoundland. She wanted to see the Newfoundland that she had never had an opportunity to see on any other previous visit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I pose the question to the government because I understand it is the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs who has arranged the itinerary for the Queen's visit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Transportation minister.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well he is also the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I understand that that is the gentleman responsible. And I pose the question to the government, what has happened to change the expressed wishes of Her Majesty herself? What has happened? Why has not the visit been arranged in the way that Her Majesty herself wanted it arranged and as told to thousands of people in this Province by Her Majesty's representative, the Lieutenant Governor? What happened to change that? I have nothing against the Queen coming to St. John's, Mr. Chairman. I am all for it. But if that is the case,

MR. RIDEOUT:

if that had to be done because of protocol then maybe an extra day or so could have been tacked onto Her Majesty's visit. She could have come maybe a day or so early so that she could have gotten out to see the parts of the Province that she expressly told her representative in this Province that she wanted to see. That is the question that I want to pose to the government and I think we deserve an answer because the Queen's representative had told us himself that that is exactly what Her Majesty wanted.

Now I am not saying that the Queen may have gotten into Baie Verte or Seal Cove or Shoe Cove or any of those small communities on the Baie Verte Peninsula but I do say that she should have had an opportunity to get in some communities along the Northeast Coast, certainly into Labrador because that is what she wanted. That is what she told Her representative in this Province she wanted to do. And some - I do not want to be too harsh - but some mad bureaucrats somewhere in the confines of this building, I suppose, have gone against, gone contrary to the express wishes of Her Majesty. And ministers do not have the courage to overrule it when they came to organizing the trip.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the minister that that is a very pertinent question, one that I think ought to be answered here in this House because whoever has organized this trip have gone against the expressed wishes of Her Majesty to her representative in this province. She is not going to see rural Newfoundland during this visit. There is no place she is going that is going to be, with all due respect to all the communities she is going to - Corner Brook, Stephenville, Deer Lake is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Are not representative of rural Newfoundland and there is no way they can be construed to be representative of rural Newfoundland.

MR. MCNEIL: She is only fifteen minutes in Stephenville.

MR. RIDEOUT: She is only fifteen minutes in Stephenville, long enough to get inside the aircraft and gone again.

MR. MCNEIL: Well, she does not go through the terminal. They go right to the aircraft and out.

MR. RIDEOUT: There you are. So she is not going to see what she wanted to see and what she told her representative in this Province she wanted to see, expressly told him and what that gentleman, honourable as he is and I know it would be certainly telling the truth in its finest form, told thousands of people in his last tour and I assume he told it other places in the province but he certainly told it on the Baie Verte Peninsula. I think we deserve an answer as to how come that is not expressly built into the itinerary that has been drawn up by her ministers in this province.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Why they went against the Queen's wishes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Why they went against the Queen's wishes, the expressed wishes of the Queen to her representative in this province. His Honour was so excited, really excited and he wanted her to see rural Newfoundland, places like communities on the Baie Verte Peninsula or the Labrador Coast.

MR. HICKMAN: Bring her back on next year's tour.

MR. RIDEOUT: Bring who back on next year's tour?

MR. HICKMAN: The Queen.

MR. RIDEOUT: You know there is a standing order which says you cannot say anything derogatory about the Royal Family.

A. HON. MEMBER: The House is on a high plane.

MR. RIDEOUT: The House was on a high plane till the minister spoke. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one point I wanted to make. The other point I want to make to the minister is this. I do not know what is happening in St. John's with regards to preparations for the Royal visit but I do know that Boy Scouts and Girl Guide troops and Sea Cadet troops and so on in the Baie Verte area have been requested to come to Western Newfoundland either Corner Brook or Deer Lake I am not sure, Corner Brook or Deer Lake during the Queen's visit and I think that is an excellent idea. It is apparently not happening here but these are some of the young people who have been requested by organizations in Corner Brook and Deer Lake to be present. I think the government has a responsibility to make some arrangements to ensure that those young people can get an opportunity to travel to Western Newfoundland from the Baie Verte Peninsula and any other part, whatever you include in the Western Newfoundland tour so that they can be present to at least view and hopefully get a chance to exchange a word of greeting with Her Majesty. They have been invited to come - Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, Sea Cadets and so on - they have been invited to come to Corner Brook but there has been no arrangement made to this point because I have already had phone calls to me saying how it was going to be paid for or who was going to look after the cost as to get a bus from Baie Verte to Corner Brook costs a couple of hundred dollars per bus and you can raise so much money locally but you cannot raise enough for eight or ten buses which is what would be necessary if all those people who have been invited are going to get out there.

So I would hope that the minister and I have no objections to him spending some money on the Royal tour. Maybe it is better to put it into that type of thing than into elaborate PR firms and so on. So these are a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman, that I think the minister ought to give us some enlightenment on. I would

MR. RIDEOUT: certainly have no objection to the amendment. I am all for it and I think all of us on this side of the House are for it but I think we have an obligation also to point out where the government has gone expressly against the wishes of Her Majesty and also how they intend to help those people in other parts of the Province who ought to be helped to get to the area where Her Majesty is so that they too will have a memory, hopefully and I know it will be a happy memory of such of memorable event.

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

DR. H. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment and in doing so I would like to have a little word to educate the House Leader on the Government side. When I asked the question as to which regetta he was referring to I was serious because in this Province there is more than one regetta. Placentia has a regetta, Lower Island Cove has a regetta, but the regetta that I really wanted to talk more than any other one about was to impress upon him that Harbour Grace has had a regetta - I do not know how long it has had the regetta but I can remember back almost fifty years when that regetta has been going on year after year after year and I am sure other people can remember back a lot further than that. This is a long

DR. H. KITCHEN: historic Regatta and when I asked the question as to which regatta, this was not a silly remark, it was an honest attempt to figure out which of the several important regattas he was referring to. But that is not what I got on my feet to speak about.

What I wanted to speak about is that it is not often that I agree with the associate editor of The Evening Telegram but for once in my life I read his column, and I do not usually read it but I read it this weekend, and when he - I was wondering what he was going to say about the events in the House, you see, but he wrote on the Queen's visit and he called it insipid. I believe that was his word, 'insipid'. And I am sure that that is about the way we can have it, unimaginative. For once I am very glad to see that occasionally you can agree even with the associate editor of The Evening Telegram. He is right. This is not the way to celebrate this gala, enthusiastic occasion by that part of the British Commonwealth which above all parts of the British Commonwealth is loyal to the monarchy. Holy mackerel, we are the Province that flies the Union Jack as our provincial flag unless you fellow have changed it lately. You are going to change it but you have not yet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want it changed?

DR. H. KITCHEN: We are not going to change it. We want this thing, this Union Jack. This is a loyalist province. We are for the monarchy. We have a Monarchist League which collected thousands and thousands and thousands, I do not know how many signatures - 50,000 or 100,000 or 200,000 - I do not remember the number a magnificent number of signatures in a bound book and here we are going to invite this monarch to come to this Province in an insipid, dreary, meet-the-brass sort of routine and get on out of here as quick as you can, and do not make too much of a splash here, we have more important things to do. This is the impression that is being left with the people of Newfoundland when it is not fair, it is not true, it is not representing the true feelings of the people of this Province.

DR. H. KITCHEN: Now that point has to be made. We have to change these arrangements. It is not too late. It is three or four weeks yet. It is not too late to change insipid arrangements and beef them up, inject some enthusiasm and excitement into this - God knows we need enthusiasm in this Province now after the performance that the crowd opposite has given us. I mean, the unemployment is bad, welfare is low in money, everybody is going through a bad time, and it is good that the Queen is coming so that we can feel good about ourselves again and something that we stand for. We must take advantage of this visit to perk up the people, to perk us up and make us feel good about being glad to be Newfoundlanders, that there is something about ourselves that we are proud of. Let us be proud of that. Let all Newfoundland and Labrador rejoice that the Queen is coming and let us have a good time while she is here. Not just wandering around down in the grounds of Government House and visiting Memorial University, and of all things - what is it? - dedicate a cornerstone, something like that. What a silly thing for Memorial University to propose if they did propose it. There must be more important things that Her Majesty can do besides do a cornerstone. Gee whiz, anyone can lay a cornerstone. Let us have her for something important as is suggested. I believe that this year is a very important year in this Province. It is probably the most important year that this Province has ever seen, for this reason: We in this House of Assembly did something this year which is more important than Bill 50, which is more important than reducing the Minister's salary to a dollar; what has been done in this House of Assembly is that both sides unanimously supported a resolution committing this House and the people of this Province to develop Labrador. We had a plan that we all supported. Every person supported the plan that we are going to develop Labrador power and we are going to develop it for the people of this Province. We are going to develop

DR. H. KITCHEN: Labrador iron ore and we are going to develop it for the benefit of the people of this Province and process it within Labrador. We are going to build a railway and we are going to put a road. We are going to develop the offshore. We are going to develop the fishery. This commitment to Labrador which is made by every single hon. member in this House, fifty-one hon. members made a commitment to the people of Labrador that we would develop it. We passed the resolution, the most important piece of business that has been transacted in the House this year and perhaps in any year in our history. This is where

DR. KITCHEN:

we are going. This Province is geared to go to Labrador and now we should tie the two together. The National Convention of the Liberal Party, the Prime Minister of this Province, has made a commitment to that resolution. He would not be against the Queen going to Labrador after giving his solemn word to the Leader of this party on this side and he would give the same thing to the Leader on that side. Then he would go for this resolution. He is going to develop Labrador with our help, with our initiative. He is going to go along with it. We are going to go together and develop this part of the Province.

So it is not the federal government that would interfere with any plans that this House might have for the Queen's visit. They would have to go along with it. They are honour bound. They have made a commitment. The Liberal Party of Canada has made a commitment in this respect. It was argued and debated. I do not want to go over the whole thing again but it has. It should be pointed out that the Liberal Party of Canada is committed to the development and the processing of Labrador, industry within Labrador and the processing of the Labrador resources within Labrador. The development of Labrador is something that the Government of Canada is committed towards and the Government of Newfoundland is committed towards in Labrador. We are committed to it here because the government, every member, every man jack, over there, voted for it and every hon. member on this side voted for it. We all voted for it. So that is that. We are all for that resolution.

It is no good to talk about it. The government of this Province are committed to go and do something about Churchill Falls this year. I heard the hon. minister of Mines and Energy making some remarks about it publicly the other day and I am sure as soon as the House closes they will be at that thing, to get on with this great resolution, to develop Labrador. They are going to work at it. And what better thing than to have Her Majesty come to Labrador now, right now, this year, when this great plan that we have passed and this

DR. KITCHEN:

will cement it, the Monarch coming to Labrador at the same time. This will convince the people of Labrador that we mean business, that we are not just playing games. This is important, the Monarch was going to go. The Monarch can look at Churchill Falls development and this must mean an awful lot to someone who was raised in Britian to see the great Churchill Falls called after the great Sir Winston Churchill, this great war time leader of Britian, the thing that binds us with Britian, the Churchill Falls, the development of the Lower Churchill.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Queen herself wanted to make it acute, personal.

DR. KITCHEN: That is right. It is a great personal thing with respect to her, to see this great Churchill Falls development, the greatest development in all the lands that she is Monarch of, for her to go and see that. It must be a great family tradition. There is a relationship to go and see this. Now this is something that shows some imagination. And it can still be done. I do not believe that it is too late to cancel those silly little ridiculous porcedures that have been put forward. Cancel the garden party. Cancel it, the Queen's representative. Cancel it, and have it up in Goose Bay. Why not have it in Goose Bay? Have it in Happy Valley. Have it in North West River. I do not care where. No need to have it in Corner Brook. Not now. We are not talking about Corner Brook this session very much. We are talking about Labrador this session. And that is where the Queen should go. She does not have to come to St. John's. She has been here two or three times already. We had great fanfare. Let us go to Labrador. Let us all go.

Now then while we are at it I believe that Legislature has to meet in Labrador too. The Premier evaded my questions today when I was wondering - he was all excited there a month or so ago when we raised the question first, and when we got at it and raised questions here and there about the Legislature meeting in Labrador. But since - it is too much trouble, you see. It is too much trouble to arrange it. Someone says we would like to go in Corner Brook. But the

DR. KITCHEN: thing is that Labrador is the other part of this Province. That great landmass of Labrador that is where the future of this Province lies; the fishery as far as the Island is concerned, and then the landmass of Labrador. That is the future for everybody in this Province, that is where our generations yet unborn are going to be living. We are going to be up there developing the resources, and then I hope we got the imagination to do so, either that or somebody else will. It is all right for us to rant and rave here about one Province, and one name called Newfoundland, and the Cabot Island and all this nonsense. That is all it is. There are two distinct parts of this Province and the people of Labrador find it very difficult to associate themselves with the Island part of the Province. And rightly

DR. KITCHEN: so, and something has to be done, something real not just some words in The Daily News or The Evening Telegram, not just letters to the Editor, something real has to be done to bind the parts of the Province together and the only way I can see to do it is for the Legislature to go up there at least once a year, probably it should meet there, only there but certainly there and here, and now this year of the resolution, this year that the federal government have been so, and every person in the provincial Legislature has been so, this is the time for the Legislature to meet in Labrador. And it is not too late yet. We could adjourn, for example, Mr. House Leader on the government side could decide that we are going to adjourn for a little while and we will open the House again in Goose Bay in three weeks time and the Queen can be there. What better thing for the Queen to be there in this House when it meets in Goose Bay? There are buildings up there and everything. We will meet and she will be there and that will prove to the people of Labrador that we mean business. We have brought the Monarch there, the Legislature has met there and we will then know, everybody will know that we will be pointing the whole Province in the direction of Labrador. The publicity surrounding the Queen's visit in Labrador and this resolution development, that will do more for the development of this Province than can be done in any other way in the next ten years if we handle this correctly. It has to be done right. What we need, what this government needs and what this House needs is imagination and the ability to carry out and make things capture the imagination of the people once we have the right idea. The right ideas have been through here. That resolution is the strongest resolution that this House has adopted and it has to be clothed, and I believe it has to take on this year the

DR. KITCHEN: trappings of the Monarchy, the trappings of the Legislature and we have to go to Labrador this year. This House has to go. And if the Queen cannot go to Labrador, if it is too late - I do not believe it is too late to change those arrangements; it does not take that long; tomorrow morning the arrangements could be made; tomorrow morning whatever committee it is that is looking after it here can meet, somebody can get on the 'phone and 'phone London - it only takes a few minutes to 'phone London and get the thing changed. I am sure the Queen does not mind. As my hon. friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) says, the Queen has expressed the wish and that wish can be interpreted as Labrador. Let us interpret that wish as Labrador. She will go along with it, I am sure she will. I am sure she would like that. And I am sure we would go along with it, everybody would go along with it, the Lieutenant-Governor would go along with it, the Prime Minister of Canada would go along with it. Who else is there to go along with it? Who else? The Regatta Committee? Well, I do not really care if the Regatta Committee - they will go too. We can invite them up and have a regatta up in Goose Bay if they want to. It does not matter. That is not very important. We will have - let us have - and let the Premier before he resigns do something worthwhile for this Province, do something really worthwhile. Perhaps if he handles it right he will get in again, who knows? Maybe he can use - heaven forbid -

MR. RIDEOUT: God forbid!

DR. KITCHEN: No, no! I would rather have this development of Labrador under a Conservative Government than not have it at all. It is important. It is very important to have this development of Labrador. And if

DR. KITCHEN: the Premier is wise and smart politically he might just be able to gain one or two votes by it - not very many, mind you, not very many, but he could gain a few votes. And it does not matter about the votes, but it is the right thing to do, and this is why I am raising it. It is the correct thing to do. We have done so much this year in discussing this Labrador development, we have done so much. Every Wednesday up until a couple of Wednesdays ago devoted to this resolution; everybody was for it, and now it is time to do something about it.

I do not know, I am not in a position where I can make promises, but just say I can - I am sure the Leader of the Opposition who will be the Premier now after the next election will go along with this; if he does not, well, we will talk about it. Suppose this, that if the government will not bring the Queen to Labrador, then perhaps the new Premier the first visit that the Queen makes, perhaps we can assure the people that she will go to Labrador. Now I do not know if that is a big undertaking or not, but it is something to think about.

MR. W. ROWE: Do not worry, we will be in when she comes back too.

DR. KITCHEN: Right.

So my plea is this, that whoever is responsible for making these arrangements on that side change the arrangements to make it possible for Her Majesty to visit Labrador and for the House of Assembly to meet in Labrador and for both things to take place simultaneously.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping my hon. friend would have ended earlier, before he got around to giving them credit for getting a few votes over there. I would not want to see that happen, Sir. But my hon. friend is right, Mr. Chairman, that this government has it in its own hands to change the itinerary for the Queen's visit. I would suspect what happened, Mr. Chairman, is this, that when the Queen decided to come to Canada that a group of people were dispatched from the nation's capital to meet with the ten provincial governments across Canada to discuss the Queen's visit, for instance, to the various provinces but especially here in Newfoundland, the one that I am talking about now. But I would not be at all surprised, Sir, but a group of bureaucrats, of mandarins up in Ottawa were dispatched down here to Newfoundland and told to go down and sort out the itinerary for the Queen's visit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Standard procedure.

MR. NEARY: I would not be a bit surprised, Sir, but in that group would be two or three maybe French Canadians.

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. I would not be at all surprised.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, at least. At least.

MR. NEARY: Maybe they were all French Canadians, I do not know. But they came down and they dictated to this government and they told this government where the Queen would go in Newfoundland and this crowd, Sir, did not raise any objection. That is true. That is true.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, that is true.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you still want an autograph?

MR. NEARY: No. I am going to talk about that now in a few minutes, about the autograph part of it. I hope the protocol officer this time will be a little more efficient than he was at that particular occasion. And, Mr. Chairman, there is precisely what happened. Down came these bureaucrats from Ottawa and dictated to the government,

MR. NEARY: to the ministers, to the Premier and the ministers in this Province, told them where the Queen was going to go during her visit to Newfoundland.

MR. NOLAN: You do not say.

MR. NEARY: No, that is true.

MR. NOLAN: They had input into it?

MR. NEARY: They had no input into it at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not think?

MR. NEARY: No. They just sat back and allowed this crowd, mainly French Canadians, to tell the government here where the Queen was going to go in Newfoundland. They should have dug in their heels. They should have sent that crowd back packing back across the Gulf, go back up to Ottawa, we will arrange the Queen's visit in this Province and we will tell you, Mr. Ottawa, where the Queen is going to go in Newfoundland and Labrador. They did not do that, Sir. The minister half an hour or so said, "Well, do you want me to get a letter where we asked for the Queen to visit Labrador? Do you want me to get a letter?" Well the hon. gentleman may be able to produce a letter where they made a little mild suggestion that the Queen visit Labrador.

If this crowd, Mr. Chairman, if this government wanted the Queen to visit Labrador the Queen would visit Labrador and that is it. Do not try to be wishy washy about it, make no excuses at all, the Queen would go in this Province where the Premier and the ministers wanted her to go.

MR. W. ROWE: Hear, hear! That is right.

MR. NEARY: And it is just as well to face it. And that is the long and the short of it, Sir.

MR. R. MOORES: The French Canadians.

MR. NEARY: The French Canadians mostly decided where the Queen was going to go in this Province. And they just sat back and took it like everything else. And my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said earlier today they were probably so busy, Sir, trying to prop themselves up, trying to cling on by their fingernails, cling onto power, that they just figure, well this is nothing, you know just the Queen is coming and this is just another bother, you know why worry about it.

MR. NOLAN: 'Alex' was going to go to the -

MR. NEARY: Little did the government know, Sir, that we were going to have one of the liveliest debates that we have had so far this session in the House this afternoon and it is not finished yet. I am sure that my hon. colleague, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), all my colleagues, Sir, are savage, rearing to go to get into this debate for the negligence and for the embarrassing situation that Her Majesty -

MR. SIMMONS: Hickman for Queen.

MR. NEARY: - has been placed in by this government not digging in its heels and deciding where Her Majesty was going to go in this Province and allowing this committee to come down from Ottawa and tell the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: A committee?

MR. NEARY: A committee, four or five bureaucrats came down from Ottawa and while this is - this was a couple of months ago, a few months ago, as a matter of fact the security by the way, the security for the Queen's visit has now been underway I would say -

MR. S. NEARY: let me see, for about almost a year the security have been out getting organized for the Queen's visit.

MR. HICKMAN: It did not start with until the Fall.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, since last Fall. That is almost a year. Give or take a couple of months, it is going on almost a year now that the R.C.M.P. have been organizing the security in this Province for the Queen's visit. My hon. friend, the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) mentioned this afternoon about the biscuit cans and all that sort of thing, well there is a little thing that is out already, Sir. Mr. Chairman, there is a little thing that is out, a little badge. It is out already. It says 'Newfoundland 1978' and a picture of Her Majesty on the button, and these are being -

MR. SIMONS: What is behind Her Majesty?

MR. W. ROWE: The Newfoundland flag.

MR. S. NEARY: What is behind it? Well, here is what it says -

AN HON. MEMBER: The British flag.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, the British flag. Yes. I thought you meant the little label on the back of it.

These, Sir, are being distributed throughout the Province to raise funds for the Vera Perlin school, the retarded children's schools throughout the Province, which is a good move. Lady Barlow had these in the -

AN HON. MEMBER: She is in the gallery.

MR. S. NEARY: Lady Barlow? No. She has left the gallery unfortunately, but Lady Barlow had these in the - Give one to my lady friend over there who is always smiling and so nice, sitting at the table.

So you can see that things are -

MR. W. ROWE: Do not let it worry you. He thought you meant 'Alex.'

MR. S. NEARY: Things are starting to get organized a little bit, Sir, in the Province and I would say that the Monarchist League are starting to get a little active and are starting to edge their

MR. S. NEARY: way in to getting the thing properly organized. If it was left up to the Government the whole thing would be a shambles. I believe now that the Government are getting a little bit interested, more than they were a few weeks ago, in trying to get as many children as possible out to see Her Majesty.

MR. W. ROWE: Only as a result of pressure.

MR. S. NEARY: Only as a result of pressure from people like Lady Barlow.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are trying to cover their tracks now.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about the autograph:--

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, Sir. I am coming to that too, the autograph. I found out the hard way that Royalty do not give autographs. No, they may give photographs but not autographs, and I found that out from the old bloke himself.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with some of the previous speakers. Well, I might say this also before I mention the garden party, that from what I can understand Her Majesty will hardly have time to powder her nose when she is in Newfoundland but it will not be out meeting the ordinary people. That is the tragic part of it. She is on a very tight schedule and she will hardly have time to go to the ladies room and she is on such a rigid, tight schedule. One of these functions, of course, is the garden party, the famous garden party. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have to tell members of this House how I feel about the garden party. I feel just as strongly about the garden party as my hon. colleague, the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) because it will be just an opportunity, it is an opportunity, that is all it is. It is connived by the elite, the big shots, to make sure that the mucky mucks, the high mucky-mucks in this City get out to shake Her Majesty's hand and show off their new hats and their new gowns. That is all it is, Sir. That is all it is.

July 4, 1978

Tape No. 5077

RT-3

AN HON. MEMBER: It is all free.

MR. S. NEARY: All free. And, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be cancelled, the garden party. Call it off. I am sure, Sir, that the Queen would feel much more comfortable going around to a senior citizens' home or going to a hospital. Take her down to The Janeway Hospital and let her go in and see the little children in the hospital. She would be much

MR. NEARY: more at home there than she would down shaking hands with a bunch of tottering old badgers who are just about worn out now, coming on quivering and shaking, millionaires coming off with their grandchildren in tow.

MR. W.N. ROWE: And members of this House.

MR. NEARY: Yes, members of the House.

MR. W.N. ROWE: She could do without that.

MR. NEARY: I tell you one thing I cannot stand in case anybody does not know how I feel about these sort of things, I cannot stand them, Mr. Chairman, although I have gone to the odd one, I have gone, but generally speaking you never see me hobnobbing around to these parties, these banquets and -

AN HON. MEMBER: Wildcat parties.

MR. NEARY: Well I tell you, I was faced with a situation today, Sir, where my second oldest daughter wanted to know if I would take her -

AN HON. MEMBER: Stephanie.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Stephanie, that is right - if I would take her in the place of my wife to meet the Queen and I said I would have to think about it. I had no intention of going but that sort of put a new angle on it,

AN HON MEMBER: How old is she?

MR. NEARY: She is twelve. Twelve years of age.

MR. W. ROWE: It should have been all children involved.

MR. NEARY: That is right. All my kids would like to meet Her Majesty but they will not have the opportunity to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe she wants to meet you instead.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know. Maybe she would, Sir. They were in London recently, two of my kids, and saw the changing of the guards at Buckingham Palace and all this sort of thing. I am sure, Sir, that there are tens and tens piled upon tens of thousands of little children in this Province who will be disappointed because they will not get the opportunity to go out and see Her Majesty as she drives by in an open car or whatever she is driving in.

MR. NOLAN: Craig's helicopter.

MR. NEARY: Well I was coming to that, by the way. Talking about travelling Newfoundland today, there is no trouble to get Her Majesty back and forth across this Province today. Well, first of all I think Her Majesty should have overnighted in Churchill Falls, that would have been the ideal place. Bring her into Labrador West, have her overnight in Churchill Falls and then come on down to the coast, get aboard of a helicopter and come down the Great Northern Peninsula, swing into Western Newfoundland, pop into Central Newfoundland in a helicopter or a plane, no problem, and the Southern Shore. I would like to see the Queen go down to my own district of LaPoile.

Mr. Chairman, here we have the fishery in this Province. Well I am sure that Her Majesty would not mind going down on a wharf or down on a fish plant, visiting a fish plant in this Province instead of going out and laying a cornerstone for some foolish nonsense that somebody thought up. I mean that is the sort of thing that Her Majesty would like to do, is it not? I am sure the Duke would like to do it. I remember the last visit that they made here, Sir, when they departed from Portugal Cove I was tied up on the - personally I was not tied up -

AN HON. MEMBER: That came later.

MR. NEARY: The Kipawo, that came up this afternoon, the Kipawo was tied up on the opposite side of the wharf to the Maneco and there was no breakwater in Portugal Cove at that time and a Northeast wind came up, the worst storm we had for the year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well I was there that day and was an eye witness to what happened and I must say I had to admire the courage of Her Majesty. But I also had to admire the seamanship of the late Mark Saunders, who was captain of the Maneco. I remember the Empress of Scotland was hove to out in Conception Bay, she was anchored out there, and they were all going around debating - my hon. friend who is sitting in the Speaker's Gallery will remember what I am talking about, the departure from Portugal

MR. NEARY: Cove; it was very, very dramatic indeed.

AN HON. MEMBER: She was Princess Elizabeth then.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. All the Royal Naval personnel were crawling around all over the place. Now the late Capt. Mark Saunders, as my hon. friend knows, was a man who never wore a uniform, never wore a captain's cap or anything like that. And he was a very mild man, very mild mannered, very quite man. You would hardly know he was around but I will tell you that he crossed that Tickle and went across to Conception Bay when nobody else would dare put the Maneco out. But anyway they were there and there were lights flashing on and off, flicking back and forth to the Empress of Scotland and they were debating whether or not they were going to allow the Queen to leave from Portugal Cove, this was the big debate, because the Maneco was going up on one wave and the Kipawo was going up on the other one when the Maneco was on the way down and everybody thought for sure they was going to be an accident. They were there, they were just about ready to call it off when somebody said

MR. NEARY: "Well, has anybody asked the bloke who is in charge of this boat whether or not he will go?" And he was standing in the background; that is one day they had stuck his captain's cap on him, put his little bit of gold braid on and he was standing back, and one of these Royal naval officers said, "Well, what do you think? Are you the captain of this ship?" He said, "Yes." "What do you think?" he said, "Do you think you can make it?" He said, "Tell her to get aboard." So they put her onboard. I can see the Duke now and the Princess standing on the skid where they used to put the cars aboard the boat. Just as they got aboard a wave came in and the Maneco went up in the air and when she came down he said, "Let her go." And away she went. But his only problem that day was getting away from the Empress of Scotland. He was not worried about getting away from the wharf in Portugal Cove, he knew he could do that. And following along right behind them, if hon. members will remember, were the fishermen from Port de Grave with the bunting on their motorboats, riding off the whitecaps, the tops of the waves. Do hon. gentlemen remember that? And then Don Jamieson came back with this very colourful description of the Princess and the Duke leaving Portugal Cove - absolutely fantastic, Sir! And I saw the letter -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) to say after it was all over.

MR. NEARY: No, I saw the letter that she wrote to the late Captain Mark Saunders. It is too bad, Mr. Chairman - and Your Honour is familiar with it, by the way, being married to a girl from Bell Island. But I saw the letter that the Duke wrote to Captain Mark Saunders. He told him that it was the most outstanding piece of seamanship that he ever saw in his life. And so it was. It was absolutely amazing! It was fantastic!

MR. NEARY: And it was a credit to Newfoundland. And this is the sort of thing now that - I do not mean that we should put her through another storm - but I am sure that Her Majesty would feel more at home, more comfortable in the rural parts of this Province visiting fish plants, going around visiting the native population in Labrador, visiting my hon. friend's constituency so the little children can come out with their flags on the side of the road and wave at Her Majesty as she goes by. That is the sort of thing, Sir, that we should be doing. It is only a two day visit. You can cram an awful lot of stuff into forty-eight hours. I am talking about things that are very worthwhile and not just garden parties and cocktail parties. I can see it now, everybody standing around when Her Majesty is here - she will waste more time and probably be bored to death and say, 'What do we have here in this Province, a crowd of alcoholics?' Everybody will be standing around with his little cocktail glass in his hand and she will be bored stiff. And I am sure the Duke will be completely bored because he likes the outdoors, he likes to move around, he likes a little bit of action. And so, Sir, I am inclined to agree with the previous speakers that the itinerary, the programme, has been very sloppily and very poorly arranged by the government. And, Mr. Chairman, make no mistake, this government have to answer for it, because this government could have had whatever they wanted as far as the Queen's visit is concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier had better buck up.

MR. NEARY: He had better buck up, that is right. They could not even do this right, as my hon. friend said.

MR. W. ROWE: They were counting on this to shore up their bad, bad image around the Province.

MR. NEARY: Is that right?

MR. W. ROWE:

And they even bungled this.

MR. NEARY:

Well, there it is, Sir. I do not think it is too late. Sir, there is still time even though Her Majesty is due here on - what is it, the 27th? - the 27th of this month. There is still time to tell that crowd up in Ottawa what they can do, that we are going to look after Her Majesty when she comes to Newfoundland and we are going to bring her to places that we want to bring her, not where they want to take her. And I think it has been a very worthwhile discussion this afternoon, Sir, a very worthwhile debate. I do not have anything else to say about it except that I agree with the previous speakers and I am sure there are going to be some other members who will want to get in on this discussion. They have very strong feelings about it. It is not too often we get a chance to play host to Her Majesty and her good husband, and so, Sir, when we do it we should do it right. But the government have bungled it again and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they will get out the programme, get out the itinerary and take a look at it and see where we can make changes so that Her Majesty will be exposed to as many Newfoundlanders as possible, especially sick people, especially veterans who are in hospital, especially people who are in senior citizens' homes who cannot get out

DR. KITCHEN: and see Her Majesty and especially to the youth and to the young people and to the children of this Province. And if they do not do that, Sir, they cannot do anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Shall the amendment carry?
The hon. member for Burgeo -
Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: A few words, Mr. Chairman.
I was hoping the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) would have had a few things to say but the last time he spoke his mind he nearly got kicked out of the Cabinet so he probably will not say much on this.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from
LaPoile has a theory that the Committee came down from Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: My theory is a little different. I believe they went back and found the schedule of the 1959 visit of Her Majesty and just decided to rerun it. Because this schedule, if you will notice, this schedule this year is the same schedule she followed in 1959. She came into St. John's, she then flew to Deer Lake and she travelled from Deer Lake to Stephenville and got aboard a plane and left the Island. That is the same -

DR. KITCHEN: Is that right?

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: She was in Stephenville?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: There may well be. There may well be.

The same schedule as 1959.
She had not been here for eighteen years or nineteen years and they are going to run here through the same schedule as she went on eighteen or nineteen years ago. I remember that one well because it was the 20th or 21st. of June 1959. She came into Deer Lake. I got aboard a chartered boat

MR. SIMMONS: with three other teachers and we came from St. Anthony where we were teaching to get into Hampton and into Deer Lake in time to see Her Majesty, on the 20th or the 21st of June 1959. That is the last time she was here and, as I say, she went to St. John's, Deer Lake, Corner Brook, Stephenville the same as she is doing this time.

There is one change this time.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Carry on with your speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Carry on with your speech.

MR. SIMMONS: The one change, Mr. Speaker, is that this time they have to open an airport for her. They have to specially open the Deer Lake Airport for one day to accommodate her travel. The airport is closed right now as most people realize because they are resurfacing the runway. How they are going to manage to interrupt that I do not know, but it is going to be at some considerable cost, I would suggest. They are going to open the airport at Deer Lake for one day to accommodate Her Majesty's schedule at considerable cost no doubt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think most of the things have been said about this. It is not often Her Majesty comes to these shores and one would think that the government would give some attention to the question. This nonsense about her having to come to St. John's for protocol is nonsense, of course, because that would mean she would also have to go to Ottawa for protocol and she is not going to Ottawa at all, she is visiting just three provinces, Newfoundland and Labrador, Saskatchewan and Alberta. There is no reason why she had to come into St. John's at all.

I do not know what is involved in terms of schedule changes. I know these things

MR. SIMMONS: they tend to want to check out many months beforehand but she is coming among a friendly crowd, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps in the time allowed, or the time left, some changes could be made. She does not need to come to St. John's at all. She does not need another foolish garden party. God knows she has enough of these, I would think. She does not need another dinner. I am sure she goes through lots of these. I think we have made out point on that, Mr. Chairman. What she needs is what she requested to have, according to my colleague for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and that is some exposure to the ordinary people of this Province.

I would like her to be in my district but there are so many districts she cannot get to every -

MR. J. CARTER: Have her meet the Liberal caucus.

MR. SIMMONS: She would be exposed to very ordinary but able people, I say to the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the sometimes member for St. John's North. Very ordinary, very down to earth but amazingly able people if she were exposed to these.

MR. RIDEOUT: She did not ask to go to the savoury farmer's district, did she?

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, will the Government House Leader take it upon himself to talk to this colleague the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and see if a few changes can be fenagled here to get Her Majesty off some of the very time consuming, boring items that she has been assigned to like fooligh old garden parties and that kind of thing? If they cannot, Mr. Chairman, can we have the understanding that we can give our garden party invitations - I am prepared to give mine - to two people who otherwise would not get to the garden party? Are they transferrable these invitations we got from Government House?

MR. SIMMONS:

We could do it that way, could we not? Give it to two youngsters or two other people who normally would not get to Government House for one of these garden parties. I got my invitation today but I am prepared to give the invitation to me and my wife to two other people who otherwise would not get in the grounds of Government House.

MR. SIMMONS: So if we cannot get rid of the garden party perhaps we can have that understanding that we will give our invitations out to people who otherwise would not get on the grounds for that particular day. But look, the real suggestion we are making over here is scrap the agenda and get her into some other parts of the Province. It is not a difficult thing to do. You have got time. You have got three weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Put your minds to it.

MR. SIMMONS: Put your minds to it.

See what is happening here, Mr. Chairman, is typical. Who else, Mr. Chairman, who else but this government could manage to bungle the Queen's visit? Who else could manage? You know, it takes some doing, Mr. Chairman. You have got to work at it to bungle the Queen's visit because you have got so much going for you, so much good will and understanding. But if you really work at it, Mr. Chairman, you can manage to bungle it. And what is this I hear about somebody making a racket out of the Queen's visit? This nonsense about all of the PR firms involved, is this what is going on again? I hear one of my colleagues talk about a PR firm or two involved in the Queen's visit. Only this government, Mr. Chairman, could bungle the Queen's visit and make a racket out of the Queen's visit. Make a racket out of it, and bungle it at the same time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what the real problem was they used the wrong map, you see, they have used the wrong map. The map they used has only got St. John's and Deer Lake and a few other places on it. They either used, according to the theory of my colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), they used the Quebec map which clearly shows Labrador to be in the Province of Quebec or - I wish my buddy were here now from Tourism - or they used his map. I was at a Parliamentary Conference with my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition the other night, at a dinner, and they get up and they present a map, a map of Newfoundland to our visitors, Sir Robin Vanderfeld from England, and some other people. And do you know what map they presented? A map of the Island of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. And we raised the problem with the deputy minister, and the deputy minister in the presence of his minister and a hundred other people or fifty other people gets up and says, well actually it is rather awkward, you know, getting Newfoundland and Labrador on the same piece of paper. That was there excuse.

DR. KITCHEN: He should be fired.

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Tourism -

DR. KITCHEN: He should be fired.

MR. SIMMONS: - presented a map, a tourist map of the Province but it only has got the Island on it, Mr. Speaker, just the Island, that is all, and the excuse was it was kind of awkward to put Labrador on there. Well Quebec is not finding it awkward at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: No they can get it in.

MR. SIMMONS: Not finding it a bit awkward. I do not know if my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) just heard what I said, that we were at a dinner last week and the Minister of Tourism and his deputy presented a map of the so-called Province, and all is on it is the Island. So we point this out to him. And there is some lame apology made in the presence of all these guests from outside of the Province or from outside of Canada that it is awkward to get all of this on the same bit of paper.

MR. LUSH: It is incredible.

MR. SIMMONS: Is that not shocking? And that is the official Tourist map.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: That is the official Tourism map, Mr. Speaker -

MR. LUSH: That is incredible.

MR. SIMMONS: - the official Tourism map that they are sending out to people all over the world. Can you believe that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: So perhaps that is what happened, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps when they planned the itinerary of the Queen they used either the Quebec map, which of course showed Labrador as part of the Province of Quebec, or they used the map of the Minister of Tourism, which he presents to all of our visiting dignitaries, which has only the Island on it. Why does it

Mr. Simmons: have only the Island? Because it is too hard to put Labrador on the map. You know, it does not look pretty, it does not look good, it looks out of balance, you see, because of the vertical length of the thing. It just does not jibe somehow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker.

The opportunities this government misses, Mr. Speaker, to do something for Labrador has now even extended to the visit of the Queen, as strange as that sounds. I am appalled. I am absolutely appalled.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think so many other things could be said because I can get up pretty tight about the way this government handles Labrador, reflected again in the itinerary of Her Majesty. But that aside, let us just put a simple plea to this hon. crowd, Mr. Speaker, to have the schedule revised, the itinerary of Her Majesty revised so she sees some ordinary Newfoundlanders in their ordinary settings, not in their cocktail dresses or in their landscaped lawns, not in plastic Britain, Mr. Speaker, she can see that back home, plastic Britain she can see back home. A carbon or a poor second copy of things British - and things urban, and things contrived and sophisticated she can see back home, but

MR. SIMMONS: let her see real Newfoundland and Labrador. That is not too irrational a plea, is it? Let her see. We are glad to have her, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, she will get much more enthusiastic support and response from the real loyalists, the real monarchists in this Province, the rural people, the few who will get to see her, the handful who are dragged in from the Baie Verte Peninsula, or who will get in from other parts, she will get more enthusiastic response from these than she will from the dozen fellows she is going to run into on the Government House lawn and then at the university dining hall the same night and then earlier that day at the cornerstone. She will keep shaking, Mr. Chairman, the same thirty sweaty hands for two days or the day she is here, the same thirty people. She will be saying at the end of the night, "Did I not run into you somewhere before?" "Yes you did, three times earlier today, Your Majesty." Let us get her out, Mr. Chairman, where she can meet some ordinary people. That is all we are asking. We have learned long since, Mr. Chairman, that in this House it takes a while to make the point and so we have a strategy over here. It is only incidental that the strategy happens to drive the Government House Leader up the wall.

MR. HICKMAN: No. No.

MR. SIMMONS: But apart from that, Mr. Chairman, the strategy is say it enough times -

MR. HICKMAN: And after the first few (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: - say it enough times, Mr. Chairman, we have got the message. You know, blood pressure is a serious problem, I say to the minister. We have the message and he need not worry about. We have the message, do we not?

MR. W. ROWE: We got the message. Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: But I wonder if the government has the message and I say for the people in the gallery in particular that the method we are using today is called the bludgeon approach. It is the only approach we know that gets through to the government. You have to say it again and again and again and again and again. It is the method we have used on Education petitions, on electricity increases. We have just got to say it over and over and over and over again and eventually we finally get through to them. But what we said, Mr. Chairman, in the last two hours is very simple. It could have been said in about fifteen seconds were you dealing with anything else except this hon. crowd. And the message is simple. My colleague from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) has said it, from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), my other colleagues have all said it, scrap the present itinerary of Her Majesty, if that is at all possible, at least look into it, explore the possibilities, scrap the itinerary and let her get out and visit some ordinary people in this Province. We will be all happier for it and I am sure she will too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may have but one brief word because I would not want people to be under the impression of what is being -

MR. NEARY:

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you very much. What I would not want is for the record to, you know, to show that what has been said here this afternoon is correct because it simply is not. This is not the way royal visits are arranged. A formal request was made by the Government of Newfoundland for a royal visit about three years ago for the first time, because we had not had a royal visit

MR. HICKMAN: for something like fifteen years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Eighteen.

MR. HICKMAN: Eighteen years. And we were subsequently advised, because none of this was made to Her Majesty the Queen, it goes through the Secretary of State, not the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but the Secretary of State with a man named Butler, whose surname was Butler, I have forgotten his first name now in Ottawa, and Her Majesty's Ministers decided afterwards that - we thought the centennial year would be an excellent year - that it would be held in Ottawa only, so last year was out. At the same time we renewed the application, and I would not want to be held to this but I do know that in the beginning when I was involved in it, the hope was, and I am sure it was expressed, that the visit be through Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman behind me indicates that it was. What happened then was this, that it is Her Majesty who sets the number of days that she has available for any particular province and Her minister advised us that Her Majesty had but two days to spend in Ottawa -

PREMIER MOORES: In Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: - in Newfoundland rather and the indication that we received, despite what the hon. gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) said was that certainly Her Majesty was visiting where her minister the Secretary of State indicated.

MR. RIDEOUT: That was true from me.

MR. HICKMAN: I realize it was true from the hon. gentleman, This is not pointing the finger at Ottawa, it is simply a fact of life. There is a matter that I would like very much to have attended to whilst Her Majesty was visiting this Province, the use of the prefix 'royal'. I will not say where. I know that Her Majesty is in -

MR. NEARY: - Labrador.

MR. HICKMAN: - that Her Majesty had indicated off the record that she would very much like

MR. HICKMAN: to do it, but it has been made abundantly clear that constitutionally Her Majesty can deal only with her ministers and her ministers are not ministers in the Province. I hope the amendment commends itself to hon. gentlemen.

On motion, amendment carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed bill No. 77 with amendment, carried.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed bill 77 with amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted.

On motion, amendment read a first time, bill No, 77 ordered read a third time now, by leave.

On motion, bill No. 77 read a third time ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: It being six o'clock I leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

VOL. 3

NO. 108

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

TUESDAY, JULY 4, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: Motion 8, Bill No. 56.

A bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of A Loan By The Province." (Bill No. 56).

Shall the Resolution carry?

The hon. Minister.

MR. A. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is the Act to authorize the capital borrowings of the Province for this fiscal year. I have not got before me, because the hon. Minister of Finance is not present in his seat tonight because of other obligations he had -

MR. NEARY: How much money are we talking about?

MR. PECKFORD: We are talking about \$150 million this year, which is down somewhat from our normal capital borrowings. Our total capital borrowings for this year amount to around \$190 million, and we are talking about borrowing requirements already in the works of about \$50 million, so that we looking at a balance that is required of \$140 million. And given the business of the flexibility of the market and when to go we are asking the House for an additional \$10 million to give us some flexibility there which gives us the \$150 million asked for in the Bill.

Of course, I suppose, Mr. Chairman, we could all go into a great, long dissertation for the need for additional capital expenditures in the Province. I mean, one does not have to reflect very long to think about requirements, as I look to my left, Mr. Chairman, for the Grand Falls Hospital, from the Health Department point of view the dire need for an expansion to that facility. Or if I look to my right I can see the hon. Minister of Social Services, the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) in the Clarendville area, and the need for additional - or not additional, for some hospital construction in that

Mr. Peckford: area. And in the Port aux Basques area which my friend across the way, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) knows about, there is a great need for improvements to health facilities there. And we can go on and on, I suppose, on the health side or the educational side. There has been this past number of days a number of petitions brought into the House as it relates to - I know it is on current account, but as it relates to education which involves capital account, and additional schools that are needed around the Province, the additional facilities needed at the University, the on-going highway's programme, transportation and communications, and so on it goes. The water and sewer on the Municipal Financing Corporation which each year borrows anywhere from \$15 million to \$25 million for capital improvement, and not only capital improvements, but capital money for starts to water and sewer systems where they do not now exist.

When one think that in the Budget this year, Mr. Chairman, we have somewhere around \$11 million or \$12 million for subsidies to municipalities for existing water and sewer systems, one realizes the great burden that this business of on-going water and sewer installations much have on the current account as it relates to subsidies and on the capital account it continued to borrow at a high rate

MR. PECKFORD: rate to ensure new facilities.

The hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) no doubt, for example, in his district can mention quite a few areas that need, from a health point of view, water and sewer facilities. Embree comes to mind immediately from my previous days in Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WHITE: Campbellton and Birchy Bay.

MR. PECKFORD: And Campbellton and Birchy Bay and so on it goes. And I can in my own constituency mention several communities that have no water and sewer facilities, and so on we can go with it. So what we are trying to do this year, Mr. Chairman, is to cut to a minimum, not only as related to operational or maintenance or current account in the Province but also to keep at a reasonable level the capital account because whoever is here five or six or ten or fifteen years from now are going to have to live with the capital borrowings of other governments, whether it is the same parties or not, other governments previously, and their maintenance or their current account estimates, or the current account part of their budget is going to be going up at a tremendous rate. I guess that the rate of borrowing over the last six years, since 1972 for this administration has amounted to on the average for the Municipal Financing Corporation alone some \$20 million per year. It averaged out around \$20 million per year over the last six years, since 1972 to 1978, on capital borrowings for water and sewer systems. And that does not go very far when you are taking a look at Conception Bay South, for example; you cannot even make a dent in putting water and sewer facilities into Conception Bay South unless you spend \$2 million or \$3 million a year. You are taking a good chunk of your budget just in one particular area of the Province. So when you look at those kind of expenditures over the long term now, the current account is really going to suffer. So when you look

MR. PECKFORD: at those kinds of expenditures on education, which are high from a current point of view and must continue to be high from a capital point of view if you are going to continue to build the library at the university, for example, which we talked about this afternoon to some degree as it related to the Queen's visit and laying the cornerstone for it, if you talk about - which is going to continue to be on the education side - new schools: I suppose we all had a sort of an erroneous impression five years ago that one day we could say, "We have all the schools in central locations, we have all that done and we can go a few years before we can need to have the kind of capital expenditure on education," but I do not know if that is true any more. I think with education changing as it is, we never will. There is going to be a fairly high level of capital expenditure on education that is going to always be needed.

Hospitals; Even though we have been in Confederation since 1949, even though we have the Health Sciences Complex, even though we have fairly central hospitals around the Province and referral centres there is a need now, as petitions indicate, as the Opposition has indicated, as many members on this side have indicated, as the people of the Province indicate, we need major capital expenditures over the next five to ten years on hospital construction, hospital expansion that are going to demand higher levels of capital borrowings.

MR. NEARY: The Premier is going to shut everything down - The Health Sciences Complex, there is the medical school, everything.

MR. PECKFORD: So, Mr. Chairman, you know when one looks at \$150 million and when you see it broken down in the way -

MR. NEARY: I heard the hon. gentleman this morning saying -

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to speak and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is impeding that process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. minister wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. PECKFORD: So, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is we have capital borrowings or capital requirements in this fiscal year of \$190 million. We have already borrowed for '78-'79 a Euro-US issue of \$50 million, so that the balance required is around \$140 million. And then, if you allow flexibility for taking advantage of favourable market opportunities, we are putting in a \$10 million proviso there, giving us a loan act limit of \$150 million. We think this is needed in this fiscal year and we would like to see the hon. House pass this kind of bill now.

MR. E. PECKFORD: And as I say in way of justification - not only in justification, but one could very easily get into a fairly wide-ranging debate about reasons why the \$150 should be \$180, or reasons why the \$180 should be \$200, or reasons why the \$200 should be \$250 and there is no ceiling, Mr. Chairman, on that. None. Every hon. member can put fairly high demands, in a reasonable, sensible way, upon the capital borrowings of the Province as it relates to water and sewer, as it relates to education, as it relates to health requirements, as it relates to transportation and communication and other areas where capital borrowing are going to be needed; but these are surely the more high profile, high visible ones which relate to hon. members present and which relate to demands that rural parts of the Province as well as urban parts of the Province would want to put on our capital borrowings. Notwithstanding, given all those important areas, albeit we get from Ottawa a fair amount of money as it relates to ninety - ten programmes, seventy-five - twenty-five programmes, fifty - fifty programmes, Trans-Canada, we still have to come up with our 10 per cent or we still have to come up with our 25 per cent or we still have to come up with our 50 per cent. So when you add that in there as well that does take some of the sting out of \$150 million pretty easily and leaves very little for the other programmes that I just mentioned. So when one looks at all of that you cannot have it both ways, Mr. Chairman, I guess is what I am saying; is that on the one hand you cannot totally demand everything and at the same time ask the government to be fiscally responsible in its operations in the bond market, in its operations in the marketplace. So given those comments, Mr. Chairman, and indicating that this \$150 million is not in any way a large figure as it relates to 1978 dollars, as it relates to the ongoing demands that various constituencies, various areas of the Province put upon the Public Treasury, as it relates to capital borrowings,

MR. B. PECKFORD: We would like to see this \$150 million bill go through. We recognize, as will the Opposition rightly point out, that there are demands here, there are demands there, there are demands somewhere else; There are even, I suppose, areas where the Opposition would like to think there is some waste on the capital side but in the overall, on the \$150 million, most of the money is going reasonably into highway construction, municipal affairs construction, into education construction, and into major hospital construction. Even though this year we have reduced it a lot from what it has been in other years we have finished the Twillingate Hospital, we have finished the Carbonear Hospital, we have finished extension to the Waterford Hospital - we are in the process of completing major extensions to the Corner Brook area and their hospital, and now in the coming years we will have to look at finishing other expansions in Grand Falls, new construction in Clarenville, on the Burin Peninsula, in Bonavista Channel-Port aux Basques; in Placentia, there is major need of health improvements there. So one can easily look and say that we could have \$250 million, one can easily look and argue about how we are spending the \$150 million, but I think we can stand fairly proud on how we are spending the \$150 million this year. On all fronts we are trying to be reasonable as it relates to the Trans-Canada Highway agreement, as it relates to Provincial roads agreements, as it relates to Municipal Affairs capital projects where they are needed, where a capital works programme is really needed from a health point of view, an environment point of view, we are trying to be reasonable and to ensure that that is being done.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would sit down and on behalf of the Minister of Finance introduce Bill 56, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province."

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, for the second time in about two or three days we miss the Minister of Finance and the Government House Leader. We missed him, Sir, last week because in his absence the Acting House Leader put the House in a shamble and allowed a bill to be defeated by the

MR. W. ROWE:

Opposition. And now, Sir,

I just heard what has to be characterized as one of the weakest introductions of a money bill - and an important money bill, \$150 million worth of borrowing by this Province in this year - one of the weakest introductions, Sir, of a loan bill that I have ever heard in my life. We do not know what the money is going to be spent on; we do not know the government's philosophy or rationale or fiscal or financial management policy; we do not know how the government is going to go about raising the money, whether there have been any changes in policy about raising the money. We heard the hon. the member for St. John's East wax eloquent some weeks ago when he talked about the Euro-dollar loans - well, the German mark loans I guess they were he was worried about at that time - and the upward revaluation of the mark which has caused us to lose untold millions of dollars, as he said, based on so-called expert advice. We have heard nothing about these matters of great moment and great importance to the people of this Province and to this House of Assembly. Very weak, Sir. It is too bad the Minister of Finance was not here to introduce this bill. We know why he is not here: He is celebrating his twenty-fifth wedding anniversary, and I wanted to mention on behalf of the members on this side of the House, we would like to offer to him our great, sincere congratulations on this occasion. It is a happy occasion for him - I hope and I trust it is. It usually is, twenty-five years. And so we offer him our congratulations. But, Sir, we miss him sorely. We miss him as much as his wife would have missed him had he had to spend the twenty-fifth anniversary here in this House. But we do miss him, Sir, because I am sure we would have got more of an explanation, more fact, more data, more philosophy of this government - if indeed a philosophy exists - more idea as to the fiscal and financial

MR. W. ROWE: management policies of the government and where they are going to raise the money, what the money is going to be spent on. But, Sir, we have not had any answers on that whatsoever.

This amount of \$150 million represents basically - not entirely - but basically represents this government's capital construction programme for this year; that is, the money that this government will spend on capital construction. There will be other money spent, of course. DREE, other departments of the Government of Canada both directly and indirectly will be spending money on capital works and construction of various sorts in the Province, but this is the provincial government's contribution basically to the construction programme for this year. And, Sir, we have reached the point in the sad financial history of this Province - sad recent financial history of the past six or seven years - where you can look at a figure like \$150 million and say in the one breath, Sir, that the figure is both pathetically small and insignificant and at the same time, much too large; pathetically small, Sir, because the needs and demands of the people of this Province are so great, and this is not going to be a drop in the bucket when it comes to meeting those needs - water and sewer systems, roads, upgrading of roads, paved highways, recreation facilities of all kinds, hospital construction, public services of every description, Sir. And this is not going to be a drop in the bucket. It is a pathetically small amount of money for the provincial government to be spending on a construction programme, a capital works programme. Yet, Sir, any responsible individual in the Province also has to characterize the amount of \$150 million as too large an amount of money for this government to be borrowing and spending. And to see that this is no paradox or no contradiction, Sir, all you have to do is to look at the

MR. W. ROWE:

debt that we are saddled with in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Look at the Budget, Sir, and you see a debt, direct and indirect, of \$2½ billion - \$2,500 million that this government, this Province and every individual in the Province now owes on the financial markets of the world -

MR. W. N. ROWE: \$2,500 million. And when you realize, Sir, that it is going to be an additional \$150 million or more added to it this year, you realize that this administration has got this Province squarely on the path to what has been described for the last six or seven years, the path to bankruptcy. Twenty-five hundred million dollars owed by this Province and another \$150 million added to it this year.

MR. J. NOLAN: It went bankrupt in 1969-1970.

MR. W. N. ROWE: In 1971, Sir, when this administration came into office, we were described as being bankrupt or on the brink of bankruptcy when \$900 million was owed by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador -

MR. J. NOLAN: After twenty-three years.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - after twenty-three years in office, from 1949 to the end of 1971. This administration came in on January 18 of 1972, and there was \$900 million owed directly and indirectly after twenty-three years in office, and after this Province had made the greatest leap forward in public services in that twenty-three years, a greater leap forward, I should say, than it had made in public services than it had made in the 450 years of preceding history. Twenty-three years of government under the former administration of Mr. Smallwood, \$900 million of public debt. Too much perhaps, but there was something to show for it. And six years later, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: That is the truth.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - six years later we find that the public debt of this Province has gone up one and a half times in six short years. And you look around, and what is there to show for it, Mr. Chairman? What is there to show for \$1,500,000,000, \$1,500 million increase in the public debt over six short years?

MR. NEARY: They have a couple of holes on either side of the Straits.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right.

We can look at three projects, three brilliant projects which account for a half a million dollars or half a billion, rather, \$500,000,000 - we can look at three projects, brilliant projects, Mr. Chairman, brilliant in

Mr. W. N. Rowe: concept, brilliant in execution, what are they? First of all we have the BRINCO, the famous BRINCO takeover, which even the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) district in an unguarded moment described as being stupid. He used a different language; I will not use the language because it might be unparliamentary, but at least it was a stupid move to spend a couple of hundred million dollars or thereabouts, -

MR. PECKFORD: \$160 million.

MR. W. N. ROWE: \$160 million. How much is that now?

How much is that now with the interest capitalized at this moment in time?

MR. PECKFORD: \$160 million.

MR. W. N. ROWE: It is about \$200 million at this moment, Sir, and we are talking about this moment I trust, that every person in this Province owes collectively for this particular species of lunacy perpetrated by this government -

MR. NEARY: A shame.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - \$200 million, knock off \$40 million, call it \$160 million or \$170 million. And what have we got to show for it? No more to show for that, Mr. Chairman, than if that same amount of money had been taken by the Premier of this Province, and if he had gone out on the Norma and Gladys to the middle of the Atlantic Ocean and torn it up into shreds and thrown it overboard. As far as anyone alive today is concerned, or for the succeeding two or three generations, I would submit, nothing, Sir, except some bullheaded notion that was considered to be perhaps politically beneficial to the government at the time, some bullheaded stubborn notion, I am even prepared to lay the great portion of the blame on the former Minister of Mines and Energy, the present member for St. John's West, I would consider him to have been the main thrust in this but the government here went along with it.

July 4, 1978

Tape 5088 (Night)

PK - 3

DR. KITCHEN: The federal member for St. John's West.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The federal member for St. John's West, correct.

Although he is going to have his hands full this time.

MR. W. ROWE: He may in fact be back here pulling off some more cute little stunts; \$200 million because he thinks it is the bright and clever thing to do. "We will show Mulholland," he says, "coming down here with leases that we do not want to sign or do not want to live with. We will show him. We will show him. We will lash out \$200 million of public money." Which has meant that people, particularly in the more rural areas of this Province, have had to go without untold numbers of public services as a result of that extravaganza, expenditure of money for no good purpose whatsoever. Now if the government had used the money in some way or other to take over or regain the value to this Province of even half the value of the Upper Churchill power, if they had used the money in some way or other to perhaps help to pay off the debt still due as a result of the Upper Churchill development and got more money elsewhere and had looked after the bond holders and then had renegotiated under threat of pulling the switch, had renegotiated a return of a large portion of the value of the Upper Churchill power to this Province, that might have made some sense, Mr. Chairman. That might have made sense if we had gotten \$400 million or \$500 million a year of additional value to this Province from the Upper Churchill development. That would have made a lot of sense. But what in fact the government proceeded to do was to take over Brinco's assets in Labrador, then to institute a court case, which my grandchildren may see the end of and they may not. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the way to handle the problem. Certainly we know that \$200 million or thereabouts has been rendered useless, of borrowing power, of increase to the capital debt of this Province, \$200 million and we are suffering today - the people of Grand Falls are suffering, the people of LaPoile district are suffering, the people of Trinity North are suffering, the people of the Burin Peninsula are suffering - because they cannot have their much needed medical services, and they could have had it, Mr. Chairman, if it had not been for this brand of idiotic act on the part of this administration with regard to the Upper Churchill

MR. W. ROWE:

power-or rather,with regard to
the Brinco assets.

What else did they do, Sir? Well, Sir,
a week or so before a general election in 1975 we saw the Premier
and some of his minions on the other side set off a few fire
crackers on the Newfoundland side of the Straits of Belle Isle
and on the Labrador side of the Straits of Belle Isle. What
was that all in aid of? Well, Sir, we were going to have
a tunnel across the Straits, you will recall, and the Lower
Churchill development was going ahead and tens of thousands
of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, Sir, were deceived,
misled. I would not go so far as to say all Newfoundland,
because some Newfoundlanders and Labradorians had already
cottoned on to the wily, cute and cunning practices of this
administration. But tens of thousands of Newfoundlanders were
misled and deceived on the eve of a general election into
thinking that the Lower Churchill development was going to go
ahead. And right after the election, Sir, all semblance of work
ceased. But the only problem, Sir, you would not mind a little bit
of political trickery every now and then, you know, I suppose some
people might even get a kick out of political gamesmanship, they might
even get a good laugh out of it, oneupmanship, gamesmanship, political
trickery, chicanery of a low order, some people might get a kick
out of that kind of thing, That would have been all right,
Mr. Chairman, if it had not been for the fact that in the process
of wilfully giving the wrong impression to the people of Newfoundland
and Labrador, the government had not spent and wasted \$110 million
of public money, \$110 million, not counting the capitalization of
that interest over the next number of years.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

And we know where

Newfoundland and Labrador stands on the issue. We know that. We know that if the Lower Churchill does not go ahead by some date in 1979, I do not have the exact date in front of me here now; we know if that project, the Lower Churchill does not go ahead within a number of months from now, Mr. Chairman, then Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will have the debt of \$70 million or \$78 million-whatever it is, around that figure-forgiven. It will no longer be a liability of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, it will be a continuing liability of this government, and it will mean that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will once more have had \$100 million- with the interest added and so on, \$110 million as of now I would submit, Sir, a millstone of a further \$110 million slung about their necks, and that will prevent them, Sir, from ever having, in some cases, communities in this Province, from ever having decent public services as a result of that low form of deception of the Newfoundland people for purely political purposes, Sir, and no other purpose. And if Your Honour, or any other member opposite in this government, can persuade me or give me data or facts to convince me that there was another purpose, a purpose that was in the interest of the people or for the general good, Sir, I will be willing to listen. But I have been listening now during this whole session, this session of the House, and prior to this session outside, listening to reports by and comments by the ministry and, Sir, nobody in the administration has ever given the least inkling or clue to the public of this Province that \$110 million on the Lower Churchill political deception was ever for anything else than to win the 1975 election. Now, Sir, that is an expensive election. Talk about an Elections Act or an Election Expenses Act, Mr. Chairman. That must be the most expensive election ever won in the history of the world anywhere. The President of the United States would not spend that kind of money trying to get elected or re-elected.

So that accounts for some \$300 million of the \$1,500,000, 000 which has been spent or squandered by this administration in six short years. We also have, of course, the sad tale, the oft told

Mr. W. N. Rowe: tale but nevertheless the sad and tragic tale of Labrador Linerboard over in Stephenville, now closed down. We all remember what was said about that before the 1975 election. The government would never close it down, the government would make sure they would keep it opened. How many times did my hon. friends hear that during the 1975 election campaign? Commitments made left, right, and centre that the Linerboard mill would never close down, it would be kept open.

And then, Sir, after some \$200 million has been spent on trying to keep the Linerboard mill open, either by outright purchase or subsidy to the Linerboard mill, the mill's operation, which has subsequently been capitalized again, the government closes it down. Now, Sir, I would dispute the need for this government ever to have laid out a cent with regard to the Labrador Linerboard mill. But, of course, again we had the big thing that was going to be done right after the 1972 election. In they came full of the arrogance which, as low as they have sunk in public esteem over the past six years, Sir, they still have they still have arrogance, that is all they have. They had big ideas too back in 1972.

MR. NOLAN: They were going to redistribute the timber limits all over the Province.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right. Oh, yes they were going to redistribute the timber lands, they were going to make this a viable operation. They whipped it back from a man whose name has been bandied about a lot in this House, whipped it back from him, and decided to run it as a Crown corporation, another example

MR. W. ROWE: of a low order of moronic behaviour by any administration, a Crown corporation. And they pumped \$200 million, or \$250 million probably by this time - it is hard to get figures from the ministers involved - into that operation when I would say, Sir, that if the government at that time, in 1972, if the mill was in financial difficulties, had allowed it to go into receivership and bankruptcy - as, by the way, the predecessors of the Bowater mill in Corner Brook did on two occasions if my knowledge of the history of that mill serves me correctly, on two occasions before Bowaters took it over and turned it into a viable operation - if the government of the day, Sir, instead of having the arrogance and these big highfalutin notions about what they were going to do, instead of whipping it back and pumping \$200 million or \$250 million of public money into it, had let it go and let somebody else come in of the calibre of Bowaters - I am not saying necessarily Bowaters; the calibre of Bowaters - come into it, take it over from the Receiver in Bankruptcy and operate the mill, either operate it as a Linerboard mill or convert it into another type of paper operation altogether, that would have been a sensible thing to do, Sir. But no! This government would not do that; they were going to do the big thing. They were going to show how brilliant they are and how bold and courageous they are with another \$200 million of the money of the hard pressed taxpayers and Consumers of this Province. Okay, Sir, assuming that what they did at the beginning was wrong, let us look at the subsequent history of the Linerboard mill. After running it for a few years, the government in its usual typical timid fashion as it has become lately, timid and lacking in ideas, lacking in courage and tired and worn out and intellectually bankrupt and

MR. W. ROWE: shell shocked and spending all of its time trying to cling on to the shreds of power remaining to it, Mr. Chairman, what do they do? They cave in under the pressure of the gnomes and moneychangers of Wall Street who tell them, 'Close down the Linerboard mill. If you do not close down the Linerboard mill you risk losing a notch on your credit rating.' So in they run, all the ministers; in they run, the faithful minions of these gnomes and moneychangers of Wall Street; in they run, Sir, and put the golden padlock on it, as my hon. friend has so aptly coined the actions of this government.

MR. NEARY: The silver spade has been replaced with the golden padlock.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: Slap the golden padlock on the Linerboard mill. They cave in under that kind of pressure. And what is happening now? Well, first of all, Sir, from the information that we have - and my hon. friends the members for Stephenville district (Mr. McNeil) and Port au Port district (Mr. Hodder) and St. George's district (Mrs. McIsaac) might have a word to say on this as well - I understand that the closedown costs to date are at least as much and probably more of a cost to this government than if the mill had been kept operating. I am prepared to believe that and accept it. I do not know because I have not seen an audited balance sheet or financial statement by this government.

MR. HODDER: The member for Stephenville has had a question on the Order Paper about some costs which has not been answered.

MR. W. ROWE: Has been?

MR. HODDER: Has not.

MR. W. ROWE: Has not been. No, that is right because I -

MR. HODDER: No answer.

MR. W. ROWE: He briefs me two or three times

MR. W. ROWE: a week on what is going on with the Linerboard mill, and so far we have no hard factual data concerning the actual closedown costs of the mill. But my understanding from knowledgeable and informed sources is that the shutdown costs are more than if they had let the mill remain open. And I understand as well that the market for linerboard has increased or been a little better than it was at the time of the shutdown. As a matter of fact, the informed opinion that I have is that the shutdown took place at what was an all-time low below which you could never expect to go. Below this particular low, no informed opinion would say that the market for linerboard would ever go below that. So what they have done, Mr. Chairman, is caved in to the pressure, closed it out at the worst possible time, and the closedown costs have been at least as much and probably more than if the mill had been kept in operation.

Now, Sir, what happens? Even with the mill in mothballs

MR. W. ROWE: and closed down, there appears to be a considerable amount of interest by reputable and viable paper companies in either purchasing or making an arrangement with the government for the operation of that mill. Even in its moth balled state. And I understand, Sir, that contrary to what the Minister of Transportation, who is the Chairman of the Crown Corporation, contrary to the impression he gives, which is a very gloomy and pessimistic picture, I would much rather go along with, and I believe correctly so, the impression given by the Premier today, for example, where he talks in terms of something good happening very shortly and I am sure that that is true. Word is all over the Province, again from informed people and people who may have some fairly reputable or fairly good knowledge about what is going on, that the mill is likely to be sold or an arrangement made with a reputable company, whose name I will not use in case I am wrong on that point, but it is a well known company, that there is going to be a sale or an arrangement entered into a year or so after the closedown takes place.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what kind of a government would take that kind of a precipitate, rash, headlong action? What kind of a government would take this kind of a rash action, Mr. Chairman, when anyone with any reasonable foresight whatsoever would have thought that, within a year or so or within a couple of years, with a going concern we would probably have a good opportunity to sell the mill? But instead the government closes down the mill, puts it at its worst - that is from an attractiveness point of view to a prospective buyer - disrupts hundreds of families, hundreds of families, thousands of families disrupted, property values plummeting, businesses going down the drain left, right and centre; psychological torture of the worst order perpetrated by this government on helpless individuals in the Stephenville and general Bay St. George area as a result of this madness, and in Labrador, the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area as a result of this

MR. W. ROWE: madness on the part of this present administration.

And by the way, Mr. Chairman, somebody should institute some sort of an investigation as to how the principal of a holding company very closely related to the party which forms this administration, why, Sir, that particular holding company is over in the Stephenville area busily buying up property at bargain basement rates? Now what does that mean?

Now, Sir, you know, one becomes tired and it becomes tiresome and tedious, constantly questioning what is going on by this government and people closely associated with this government and the party represented by it, becomes tedious and tiresome. Sure you could fling \$1 million or a multi million scandal on the table tomorrow and the people of Newfoundland are so shellshocked by the brazen effrontery of this government regarding similar activities that they would not even notice it. So it is becoming tiresome and tedious, but the question has to be asked nevertheless and that is why anybody closely related to the party forming this administration, is over buying up property in the Stephenville area. It has all the appearances of jackalism. It has all the appearances. There was a company mentioned by -

MR. NEARY: Regency Holdings.
MR. W. ROWE: Regency Holdings.
AN HON. MEMBER: Who is Regency Holdings?
MR. NEARY: Your former bag man.
MR. W. ROWE: Go down and look at the share list.
MR. F. ROWE: Go down to the Registry of Deeds and have a look.
MR. NEARY: Your former bag man.
MR. W. ROWE: Go down and look at the share list.
MR. PECKFORD: You do not mind making a hint but you would not tell me who it is.
MR. W. ROWE: It has already been stated publicly a hundred times.
MR. NEARY: I will tell you. Want another hint?

July 4, 1978

Tape No. 5092

NM - 3

MR. PECKFORD: No, I do not want a hint.

MR. NEARY: He used to be very close to the Premier, Mr. Davidson's buddy.

MR. PECKFORD: Your buddy, too, in that case.

MR. NEARY: No, the Premier's buddy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: He arrived today. The Premier could not find him. He arrived today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think members on both sides are interrupting the hon. member.

MR. W. ROWE: Thank you, Sir, for your kind protection. I am glad to see the Acting House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Energy defending so well.

MR. PECKFORD: Offending.

Mr. W. N. Rowe: Defending so well and so ably and so willingly activities -

MR. NEARY: Another clue: He used to represent Bell Island one time.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - activities, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member is like a spruce budworm.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Just listen, Mr. Chairman. What is wrong? Is the hon. gentleman getting sensitive?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Is he about to bungle tonight's activities as badly as he did last Thursday's?

MR. PECKFORD: Do not judge everyone -

MR. W. N. ROWE: The first time, Mr. Chairman, in the history of this House or any other House where a government could not get through the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: - the major piece of legislation which it had staked its existence on. One minister staked his whole political future on, and he has since backtracked.

MR. NEARY: Now he does not know where to go.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A typical Tory commitment, I might add. Now he is trying to get another portfolio so he can scuttle that as well.

MR. NEARY: No future for him.

MR. W. N. ROWE: He wants to go down in history like Sir Winston Churchill who had the onerous responsibility of scuttling the French fleet so it would not fall into enemy hands; he wants to go down with the great Sir Winston Churchill as having scuttled a dozen departments. He has already scuttled one. The Minister of Mines and Energy has succeeded in scuttling the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, \$250 million of public money down the drain with regard to the Labrador Linerboard; \$200 million of public money down the drain or put away under a rock somewhere for several generations before any good it will do in the Brinco takeover;

Mr. W. N. Rowe: and \$110 million at least of public money wilfully, Sir, destroyed, taken out of public use by this administration with regard to the Lower Churchill, the abortive, premature Lower Churchill set up - or start up, rather back in 1975 a week or two before a Provincial election, and it is only now, Sir, that the government has succeeded through the good graces of Ottawa in entering into - what? a feasibility study to see whether the Lower Churchill development is in fact feasible. \$110 million, Sir, of public money down the drain at a time when there were no markets in hand for the Lower Churchill development or any power that might be produced; at a time, Sir, when no financing had been arranged from any source whatsoever or committed or even agreed to or even negotiated on, and, Sir, when no arrangement had been made with the Province of Quebec with regard to the transmission of power either to Quebec itself or outside of Quebec to markets elsewhere. No arrangements on these three vital issues, any one of which, Mr. Speaker, could have destroyed and scuttled the going ahead of the Lower Churchill development. Yet this government, with these ministers, Sir, and with that minister over there, the Minister of Mines and Energy - I do not know if he was then; he probably was not, John Crosbie, I believe, was at the time, or maybe Leo Barry, I am not sure.

MR. F. ROWE: Crosbie.

MR. W. N. ROWE: But the point is, Sir, that the money was wilfully spent by this government. And now, Sir, there are hundreds of communities that cannot have a water system or water and sewer system, roads cannot be paved, hospitals cannot be built, and this government wonders, - wonders, Sir, - why it has sunk to the lowest level of esteem that any government since 1900 has sunk in the history of this Province. You do not have to look very far.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Sir, I unfortunately have to conclude my few remarks at the moment, I hope to be able to rejoin the debate in a little while, and I hope that my colleagues here can manfully carry on. Perhaps we might hear from someone on the other side who may wish to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. W. N. ROWE: No, I have to leave the House for a few minutes, but I will come back again.

MRS. H. MCISAAC: Your time is not up yet, is it?

MR. W. N. ROWE: No. But you can speak for an unlimited number of times in Committee, so I am not losing anything by giving up now.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like some minister on that side of the House to get up and tell us what the money is going to be spent on. Has a roads programme being tabled in this House yet? Has the Minister of Transportation given anyone the courtesy or done anyone the courtesy of tabling a roads programme as to where the money is going to be spent?

AN HON. MEMBER: No statements have been tabled yet.

MR. W. N. ROWE: No, Sir. I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs passed something around the House there one time to various members. Has there been a full list, tabled?

MR. J. NOLAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs did that Friday.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He did. He passed one around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. W.N. ROWE: But can some responsible minister on that side of the House, Sir, some responsible minister please stand up in his place and give the House the courtesy of what the \$150 million of public money is going to spent on.

MR. S. NEARY: They are going to billboards around the countryside, the Department of Tourism, stick up billboards everywhere.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The unmitigated gall, Sir, of a government to come here and ask for a blank cheque, \$150 million, and not even do the members of the House the courtesy of what the money is going to be spent on. And also, Sir, I hope the Premier is within hearing distance -

MR. NOLAN: He is down in his office, plotting.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Plotting what?

MR. S. NEARY: Self preservation.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Like Mission Impossible he will destruct. But Mr. Chairman, would the Premier kindly stand in his place at some time tonight and indicate to the House, and through the House to the public, whether -

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible) under Smallwood.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, do you mind?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Especially that hon. minister, Sir, especially that. Now, Sir, would the Premier kindly stand in his place in this hon. House and tell us whether his government is going to close down the Medical School or whether they are going to keep open the Medical School?

MR. S. NEARY: He is taking his advice from Grand Falls.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I have never in my life, Sir, heard the like of it from a leader of a government where he can go on the public airways in a wishy-washy, indecisive way, and raise doubts about the very existence of one of the most important institutions - whether it

MR. W.N. ROWE: was a mistake is another question - but one of the most important institutions in this city today, the Medical School and the hospital associated therewith. Now, Sir, does not the Premier realize how totally irresponsible it is for him to go on the airwaves and to raise doubts about whether the medical centre - the hospital, the Medical School - whether it is going to continue or not? Does he not realize how totally irresponsible it is? If he is going to close it down then let him close it down; if he is going to continue the thing in operation then let him continue it in operation, Sir, but do not raise doubts about it. How many professors and teachers and so on and so forth up at that Medical School now are at this very moment saying to themselves, "Well, God! This is not going to last very long. Better get out of here. Better move out of here.

MR. S. NEARY: End of contract!

MR. W.N. ROWE: End of contract if something comes along. If a teacher up there at the Medical School, Sir, has a choice now - he wants to stay here in St. John's, say, some local person, some young, local, native person who is teaching at the university, the hospital, the Medical School is confronted with an offer which, say, is equally attractive to the position he now has at the Medical School here, he would rather stay here, but because of the grave doubts that the Premier flips out over the airwaves he probably now says to himself, "I am going to get out of here. I am going while the going is good. I am going to seize this opportunity while it is offering and -

MR. S. NEARY: Take my pension out of this crowd.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - get out of here. "That is the kind of doubts that the Premier is raising, speculating in public about whether the Medical School is going to be closed or not. Pure speculation! Not to mention the unseemliness of a leader of a government continuing to give the impression of not being able to make up his mind from one day to the other.

MR. F. ROWE: He is taking advice from a defunct Cabinet minister.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, let the Premier stand up now during this debate, because we are talking about the expenditure of public money - for all I know maybe some of this money has to be spent on cleaning up some of the outstanding bills and so on for the Health Sciences Centre, I do not know because the government -

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, very much so.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, the government will not do us the courtesy -

MR. S. NEARY: Twenty-five to thirty million dollars.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - of giving us a detailed breakdown. But I would assume that the Health Sciences Centre will come in for a fair chunk of this and of course the Medical School is closely allied and associated with that.

MR. S. NEARY: Notwithstanding that no tenders were called, that there were extensions to contracts and all that sort of thing.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, that is right. We will get into all of that and I hope my hon. friend gets into it during this debate.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, the Premier's buddy arrived today. He will give us an inkling about what is going on.

MR. W.N. ROWE: If he goes on the stand tomorrow we should have a good clear idea as to what transpired during the dark ages of this government.

MR. S. NEARY: The man they could not find, you know.

MR. W.N. ROWE: But in any event, Sir, I will now resume my seat and hopefully take up where I left off at a later time during this debate because, Sir, we intend to try to find out what the money is being spent on, we intend to make some suggestions as to where the money should be spent, we intend

MR. W. ROWE: to make sure that the people of this Province are adequately informed as to where wastage has taken place, where outright skulduggery may have gone on, as is now coming out in the Mahoney enquiry and elsewhere -

MR. NEARY: That is part of the conventional wisdom of this bunch

MR. W. ROWE: - and that the people of this Province have a clear idea as to the financial state of this Province - \$2,500,000,000 of public funds. And I would say that if you asked any ten people on the street today, if you went outside, Sir, and asked them where \$2,500,000,000 of public money has been spent, Sir, not one of the ten, or not one of the hundred or not one of the thousand if you asked them, would be able to point to one tenth of that value and indicate where it may be. Whereas, Sir, the \$900,000,000 which was spent by the previous administration, much maligned, mind you, the \$900,000,000, Sir, if anyone asked where that \$900,000,000 had been spent or committed during that twenty-three years it would be, Sir, a matter of if you seek my monument look around you. Because there it is. It is everywhere in this Province. But, Sir, for the last six years the appearance has been one of wastage, spendthriftness, extravagance, outright skulduggery and every form, Sir, of wastage of the public money.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: What? Is he up again? You just spoke. Give someone else a chance.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, that is the most stupid, incompetent hon. member for a Leader of the Opposition ever I heard speak on a bill dealing with financial administration in the Province, ever I heard. Here is a member now who tells us, Mr. Chairman, that after he speaks, even though he does not take up his forty-five minutes, he has to go to something more important. Albeit now, Mr. Chairman, he believes that this is the most important thing to come before the

MR. PECKFORD: House for a long time, yet he can now stand, as he is right now, in the second door, out from the House, and say that he has something more important to do. Yet while he speaks here, Mr. Chairman, while he speaks here, Mr. Chairman -

MR. W. ROWE: What about the Premier?

MR. PECKFORD: I got him back in the House, Mr. Chairman! What do you know about that, Mr. Chairman. He is sensitive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Order, please! A point of order has been raised.

MR. W. ROWE: A point of order, Sir. I thought I had informed the hon. minister in case he is wondering -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Order, please! Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: The point of order, Sir, is that it so happens, Sir - you know, I would not have mentioned this earlier - but it so happens I have my son in the gallery who I now would like to get home at a reasonable hour. I brought him up here tonight to see the debate.

MR. PECKFORD: Fine. That is not a point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: To see the hon. minister in action, Sir.

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

MR. W. ROWE: To see myself in action and, Sir, he is getting a good impression of members on the opposite side. But I promise, on my point of order, Sir, I promise the hon. minister that I shall return and engage him in further debate on this matter.

MR. NEARY: And I will tell you what he said while you were gone.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: That is not a point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has on many occasions, Mr. Chairman, used the same kind of tactics as it related to the hon. the Premier when somebody in the gallery, either his family or somebody else was there, to try to use those heart string, oratorical comments, to try to persuade hon. gentlemen. It is not a point of order and it is a very stupid thing for the hon. member to bring up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I feel it is not a point of order but just a point of explanation. I will ask the gentleman to please continue.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, one time before I had went to get up to debate in this hon. House as it related to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and it had to do - I think it was in the Address in Reply or in the Budget Speech, I am not sure which, Mr. Chairman - but, Mr. Chairman, I got up at that time primarily to indicate to this hon. House that the Leader of the Opposition, in all he had to say, did not mention at that time the fishery. And while I listened tonight for the last thirty or forty minutes to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, he again did not mention the fishery, neither did he mention rural development, neither did he mention specifically transportation and communications. His only went, Mr. Chairman, for the whole time he spoke was to try to lay bare, as hon. gentlemen have done for the last couple of years, the whole question of the Brinco takeover or of the closedown of the Linerboard mill. These were the only two issues.

MR. PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the hon. gentleman, who went to Paris for a year to try to beef up on his political science and still cannot find a certain page in the Budget Speech which details the capital expenditures of the Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, I had no great desire when I introduced this bill, I had no desire when I introduced this bill to lamely try to point out to the Leader of the Opposition - I thought I would be laughed out of the House, Mr. Chairman -

MR. PECKFORD:

to point out where in the Budget Speech was detailed the capital borrowing and the capital expenditures of this government. And I find when I look at it, statement number five, Summary of Capital Account by Department, which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says the government will not provide the people of the Province with the details of how they are going to spend this \$150 million. Mr. Chairman, this is ridiculous,' says the Leader of the Opposition, 'they will not provide the details. They want the hon. House to give the government a blank cheque as to how they are going to spend this \$150 million.' And I find, Mr. Chairman, as of course I knew and all hon. gentlemen on this side knew do, contrary to the views on the opposite side, Consolidated Fund Services - what is that? - Gross Expenditure \$1,300,700 ; Related Revenue, none, \$1,300,700 the provincial government; Finance \$41,135,000, giving the net expenditure for the Province of \$37 million; Education \$24 million gross, \$1 million Related, \$22 million provincial; Justice \$3 million, no Related, all provincial; Rehabilitation and Recreation \$3.5 million, all of it just about, except for \$17,000 provincial; Health \$13.385 million, \$4 million Related Revenue from Ottawa, \$8 million left for the Province; Mines and Energy \$2.7 million, \$225,000 Related Revenue, \$2.5 million provincial; Forestry and Agriculture \$6.7 million, \$4.2 million Related, \$2.5 million provincial; Tourism \$9.6 million, \$6.7 million Related, \$2.8 million provincial; Fisheries \$16.2 million total, \$4.5 million Related, which means federal, overall \$12 million of the \$16 million, provincial; Industrial Development \$2.5 million, \$1.1 million federal, \$1.4 million provincial; Rural Development gross, \$3 million Related, \$1.4 million provincial; Transportation and Communications \$68 million, \$38 million federal, \$29 million provincial; Public Works and Services \$1.6 million, \$23,000 federal, \$1.6 million

MR. PECKFORD: provincial; Municipal Affairs and Housing \$38.4 million, \$14 million federal, \$24 million provincial; Consumer Affairs and Environment \$950,000, \$950,000 provincial. There are the details for the departments. Now, Mr. Chairman, you could say, 'Yes, but that is not good enough. That is only detail as it relates to department. That only tells me where the \$150 million is going to be spent as it relates to each department.' Now I have the break-down from Finance, Justice, Municipal Affairs, Rehabilitation and Recreation, Tourism, Mines and Energy, Rural Development, Industrial Development. Now, Mr. Chairman, how do I get at the capital account of the government as it relates to how those individual departments are going to spend the money? And, Mr. Chairman, that is part of the estimates. And what did we see in the estimates? We saw an Opposition who wanted to just make tiny Brownie political points as related to the estimates. They were not willing to get down to the sub-heads of the department to find out how the capital account or the current account was going to be spent in this fiscal year. Now if the hon. gentlemen opposite are really serious on this loan bill of \$150 million -

MR. NEARY: We are.

MR. PECKFORD: - then the hon. gentlemen are being totally inconsistent in their view as to how they should oppose the government on this side. Because if they are really serious now, they should have been serious when the estimates were going through and to question the ministers responsible for the various departments as to how the capital funds were being spent. But they did not see fit to do that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is serious in his charge that the reason why water and sewer, or water or sewer or both, or paved highways are not being done at the rate that we would

July 4, 1978

Tape 5096 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. PECKFORD: like to see them done because of
the Brinco takeover, I stake my political career, and
I am sure hon. gentlemen here on this side will do
likewise, that we did the right and proper thing in
taking over that

Mr. Peckford:

corporation when we did. Remember, Mr. Chairman, we not only took in our own hands how we will develop our resource. Remember, Mr. Chairman, up until then somebody else outside of this Province could decide how they want it developed, our resources. And I will say as one Newfoundlander that the government and this Legislature must always have in its power the right to decide how it wants to develop its resources. It must have the jurisdiction. Now I agree whole-heartedly that private enterprise is the best vehicle to develop. I do not question that. But I do question that some corporation has the jurisdiction and the power over a resource. That is totally and absolutely alien to my way of thinking about developing a region in this Province or a region of a country or a country. And that is what we were up to when we initiated the Brinco takeover that we now have in our hands.

Remember, Mr. Chairman,

we took back water rights that were in the hands of some private corporation.

DR. KITCHEN: The Reids.

MR. PECKFORD: To who?

DR. KITCHEN: Reid Newfoundland Limited.

MR. PECKFORD: Reid Newfoundland Limited. The hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) should read his history book again, and determine who gave the Reids all of the power that they have in this Province. It was a Liberal, capital "L", government that did that, and it was a P.C. Government that is now trying to tax, for example, that same group of people to ensure that any mineral potential that exists on their lands get developed.

So when the Opposition tries to use as their tack for not approving or opposing in some terms the whole question of the \$150 million for this year, they better be very careful how they approach it. They are talking about \$150 million essentially for things outside of the Brinco takeover. They are opposing additional paving on the Baie Verte Peninsula, they are opposing water and sewer systems all around the Province, they are opposing improved health facilities around the

Mr. Peckford: Province. I mean, let us face it, they are opposing DREE agreements that have been signed on which the Province has to come up with their share of the capital funds on additional mineral development in the Province, additional rural development in the Province, additional tourist development within the Province, which the Opposition has failed to question the government about as it related to the whole budgetary procedure in the estimates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: They were intent on doing then what they should be doing now which was the general debate, the general Opposition as it related to overall general policies that the government has enunciated. Now is their time to do what they did in the estimates. In the estimate procedure they should have gone subhead by subhead and it is all detailed in every department, in every department the capital account budget for residential construction in the Province. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition are against paying widows their subsidy for rents in subsidized rental units throughout the Province, and poor people who want to live in decency in subsidized rental units which we continue as a government to support and to push CMHC to give us additional agreements on? There are more subsidized rentals again this year.

DR. KITCHEN: Buying homes from your buddies.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, the amount of roads that this administration has paved in six years will far outclass the number of roads that the former Liberal administration paved in twelve. That the number of schools that we have built and the capital expenditures that we have spent in six years far outlasts or outclasses anything the Liberal Administration did in twelve. Almost any capital expenditure, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition wants to mention, we have doubled it. Yet at the same time as they say we are being fiscally irresponsible, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, as they say that that we are being fiscally irresponsible -

DR. KITCHEN: So you are.

MR. PECKFORD: - then they say \$150 million is not enough, and then they try to point to a number of areas which amount to \$100,000 or \$200,000 or \$300,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend as

MR. PECKFORD: one hon. member to let the Opposition go unscathed as it relates to that. They can attack the administration all they like but when it comes to the substantial ninety-five to ninety-eight per cent of the funds that are used on capital expenditure, this government has been responsible and has paved more roads, built more hospitals, built more schools -

MR. NEARY: Go away.

MR. PECKFORD: - built more water and sewer systems -

DR. KITCHEN: That is what the enquiries are about.

MR. PECKFORD: - in six years than the great, so-called great Liberal Administration did in twelve; that we have been progressive, that we have tried to put in the hands of individuals, we have increased the housing budgets over the last six years, ten times as much as the former administration did. We have gone into subsidized rental in a substantial way. Not in St. John's, not in Corner Brook, but in all the major regional centres in the Province. I think last year -

MR. NEARY: Thanks to CMHC.

MR. PECKFORD: And thanks to the proposals we put to CMHC.

MR. NEARY: CMHC.

MR. PECKFORD: I think even in Botwood and Bishop's Falls area, for example, we have gone into subsidized rental. We have gone into it down in fishing communities, down on the Southern Shore and Fermeuse area, in Marystown we have gone into subsidized rental areas. And this is capital expenditure that we have been using to do that so that we have been heavily involved.

MR. NEARY: Thanks to the Government of Canada.

MR. PECKFORD: And thanks because we happen to be a part of Canada for some strange reason that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) does not understand.

MR. NEARY: I understand. I know where the money comes from.

MR. PECKFORD: We fully acknowledge what we get from

MR. PECKFORD: Ottawa. But for the Leader of the Opposition to try to pretend that he can suddenly excuse away or put away all the \$150 million which he would like to do on the Brinco takeover, or on the Linerboard shutdown, Mr. Chairman, the Linerboard shutdown, albeit the hon. Leader of the Opposition can get up and make statements on which he does not use facts to substantiate that now we understand now - hindsight! What a beautiful thing; it is twenty-twenty every time. You can say now that Linerboard prices are - everybody should have known back a year and a half or two years ago and they are not that high now, Mr. Chairman. They are not that high now. They might be somewhat higher than they were when we closed the Linerboard mill down. They would have to increase a lot, Mr. Chairman, in order to justify. And the Leader of the Opposition is a strange bird, Mr. Chairman, a real strange bird. He is the man - this is what I do not understand basically and fundamentally about the Leader of the Opposition - this is the man who advocated regionalization and centralization because primarily from an economic point of view the people that the Leader of the Opposition had working for him when he was a minister in the former administration were pushing very hard this whole question of centralization, not from a social or psychological point of view, sociological point of view, but primarily from an economic point of view, how can - I saw the former Premier when the Leader of the Opposition was minister - how can this tiny little Province out in the Atlantic ever be able to afford to put water and sewer and pavement and all the services that everybody not only wants but should have this year; how can they have it all in those areas? Now here is the same hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, here is the same hon. gentleman who advocated that policy which was based partly, I would say seventy-five per cent on economics, now trying to knock, here is my point, Mr. Chairman, now trying to knock an industry which was heavily subsidized

MR. PECKFORD: by government, heavily subsidized by government, when that government says, "We want to see that industry, we want to see that thing work on its own, stand on its own two feet. We have put hundreds of millions of dollars into it. We tried to bail out a bad situation that was created not by us but by somebody else when they decided to put the Linerboard mill in Stephenville in the beginning. And we tried, number one, Mr. Chairman, we tried and number two we said we failed. We tried, but government is no vehicle or agency to develop, maintain an industry like Labrador Linerboard or a paper mill or a mine or anything else. We are not capable of doing it. We just cannot do it and we have to use public funds to do it and we subsidized it \$30 million and \$40 million and \$50 million a year until we were told, Mr. Chairman it was not a silly, foolish

Mr. Peckford:

decision as is implied by the Leader of the Opposition. It was not a foolish decision based on some whim, some political whim of mine or somebody else on this side who was in the Cabinet to decide at the time. It was based on experts in the field of marketing linerboard in operating pulp and paper mills from around the world.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Do not be foolish.

DR. KITCHEN: Competitors are the ones who told you to close her down.

MR. PECKFORD: That is who advised the government at the time and it was on the basis of their advice that we did a very, very hard thing to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: And, Mr. Chairman, who over on this side? Nobody nobody in Newfoundland in their right mind, from a political point of view, will want to close down a major industry like Labrador Linerboard mill.

DR. KITCHEN: That is the whole point.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is the point we are trying to make -

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. W. N. ROWE: - psychologically you are all off your heads.

MR. PECKFORD: And there it is, Mr. Chairman, there it is. There it is. That tells us the whole story. The Leader of the Opposition just told the whole story. That is the whole point, Mr. Chairman, "they are all off their heads," and that is where the great disease, malignancy has its core, Mr. Chairman, over there where these hon. gentlemen will when on their debate like I am now making will try to make cheap, sloppy, silly little political points across the House to try to undermine a fairly valid point that an hon. gentleman is trying to make. That is the whole problem.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to read the Budget Speech that was presented, a copy of which was delivered to him just after the Speech was given, if he wants to read it and then make

Mr. Peckford: his criticisms, and if the Leader of the Opposition directs his forces, which he does not have that much control over, I agree because there are three or four leaders over there; -

MR. NEARY: What about last Thursday night?

MR. PECKFORD: But if he did have some control over them why does not the hon. Leader of the Opposition, why does he not instruct some of his lieutenants to go through the estimates that are here in the Department of Health, and tell them to question in estimates, where you have plenty of time, what the government is doing with its capital expenditures and what it is not doing with its capital expenditures.

There is a section here, Mr. Chairman, a page in the Budget Speech besides the one I have read out, which deals with fisheries in particular because it is such an important part of the economic life of this Province, which delineates in clear terms the amount of money that is being spent on fisheries and where it is being spent.

MR. F. ROWE: \$800 million from Ottawa.

MR. PECKFORD: A fantastic amount of money that is being spent on fisheries on capital account this year to do the kinds of things that hopefully the Opposition are fully in favour of.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much provincial money in the fisheries?

MR. PECKFORD: There is a lot of provincial money in fisheries.

The hon. - look transportation development expenditures. In 1977-1978 Trans-Canada Highway \$100,000; 1978-1979 \$14 million; the Northern Peninsula Highway \$11 million last year; this year \$13.2 million; last year St. John's Harbour arterial road \$8 million, this year \$12.5 million; Bonavista Loop Road \$5 million last year, \$6.4 million this year, and on it goes, Mr. Chairman, on it goes the kind of expenditures that we are spending, fisheries development that the Leader of the Opposition failed to mention in his great criticism of capital expenditures of \$150 million, he would not even get down, he could not lower himself, Mr. Chairman, to get down to talk about fisheries matters because he is a princeling, a corner boy, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He is a corner boy born and bred, he does not understand rural Newfoundland. He tried to resettle it all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: General development, multipurpose vessel construction, fisheries loan fund, fishing gear supplements, marine facilities, fish handling facilities, cold storage facilities, central port development, research and development, inshore fishery enhancement, product and market development, fish processing incentives, \$25.1 million capital expenditures in this year. Between transportation and communications I have just handled \$80 million to \$90 million of the \$150 million that the hon. House hopefully will approve for this government to spend on projects this year in two major areas of development, transportation, which is a great enhancement to economic development, and fishery development, which in itself directly helps economic development. Not to mention the Rural Development

MR. PECKFORD:

agreements to be signed, the Tourism agreements to be signed, the additional Fisheries Developments to be signed, and on it can go, the various DREE agreements that we had, the Forestry and Agriculture ones, the access roads we are building, the additional forest management programmes that we are trying to bring onstream, And yet the Leader of the Opposition can get up and try to deceive everybody to believe that all that \$150 million of capital expenditures is going for the Brinco takeover and all that \$150 million is going for the Linerboard mill. Trash, Mr. Chairman! Garbage! And the Leader of the Opposition as a former member of this House, as a former minister, and now as the alternative Premier, so-called, in this Province can get up and try to deceive this hon. House into believing that we are not spending anything on Fisheries, Mr. Chairman.

MR. W. ROWE: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not mind the minister more or less losing his temper.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, do not get up.

MR. W. ROWE: But for the sake of decorum and for the precedents of the House it is unparliamentary for any member to say that any other member is deceiving or trying to deceive this hon. House, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. I rephrase that, Mr. Chairman. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not trying to deceive. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has through his comments indicated to this House that he believes that a large portion of the expenditures on capital accounts this year are going for the Brinco takeover and the Labrador Linerboard closedown. This is what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition based most of his remarks on and by those comments I stand. If that satisfies everybody, Mr. Chairman, I can continue.

MR. NEARY: Take it back, boy. Apologize.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) I feel it is not a point of order. The hon. minister has explained it and I will ask him to continue.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you very much.

MR. W. ROWE: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman, let me understand the ruling. You are ruling, Sir, that an hon. member of this House can say that another hon. member is deceiving or trying to deceive the House, is that correct? Because if it is correct we should know what the ruling is so that we can all use the same kind of language, you see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was under the impression that the hon. minister rephrased his comments and more or less withdrew them.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, I mean, I asked him to withdraw the unparliamentary words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it you have made your ruling on the point and I can continue. Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! If the hon. member is not satisfied with my ruling, there is always a way to challenge it.

MR. W. ROWE: I am quite satisfied with it; we will all use unparliamentary language.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the Leader of the Opposition would not be so sensitive and would just behave himself over there I can continue.

The Leader of the Opposition also got into a great tirade as it related to the Brinco takeover and the Lower Churchill Development Corporation and the fact

MR. PECKFORD: that now after all these years all the government have managed to do is to ask for another feasibility study. You know, Mr. Chairman, that is not a fact. That is not the position of the government. That is not what happened. The Government of Newfoundland have a very comprehensive feasibility study as it relates to the Lower Churchill development, as it relates to the Gull Island development. All the Lower Churchill development -

DR. KITCHEN: It has not been made public.

MR. PECKFORD: No, it has not. It has been public. The hon. the member for St. John's West closets himself in a little corner -

DR. KITCHEN: (Inaudible) hiding it away under the carpet. I do not even get a copy of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Order, please!

DR. KITCHEN: Table it. I wrote you and asked for a copy and you would not give me one.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, there has been a very detailed feasibility study done on the whole Lower Churchill development which by statements in this House over the last two or three or four years all the information has been given notwithstanding what the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) says. And here is the Leader of the Opposition, in his total and absolute ignorance to what is going on in Labrador or what the Labrador Power Development is all about, trying to say now that the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, a federal/provincial corporation which is about to be formed, is going to be charged in the first instance with doing a feasibility study. Now that is not true. The Lower Churchill Development Corporation will be updating the figures that were put into the feasibility study, that were a part of the feasibility study, and will be trying to get the Gull Island or Lower Churchill development going. It will be charged with the sole

July 4, 1978

Tape 5100 (Night)

EC - 4

MR. PECKFORD: responsibility of doing that.

Now that is a different situation than saying that we have to start from square one, from day one and start developing a feasibility study. All the basic data as it relates to the Lower Churchill development, as it relates to

MR. B. PECKFORD: getting that project underway is available, has been done and many, many precious dollars have been spent to do it. And all this new corporation will have to do, which the federal government is all in favour of establishing, is to refine the figures to see whether it is \$1.9 billion or \$2 billion or \$2 billion or \$2.1 billion; that is what the whole Lower Churchill Development Corporation is all about. Besides which, of course, its main mandate is to get the Lower Churchill development underway to be able to negotiate with Quebec and with Ottawa and the federal punch in there gives us a better opportunity to do it. Mr. Chairman, I mean you know when it comes to the Lower Churchill thing, the greatest thing that could be done on the Lower Churchill Development is for the Federal Government, if they so desire, to say we are going to put a corridor through Quebec. Let us not kid ourselves, Mr. Chairman, there is an easy way to get Lower Churchill going.

DR. KITCHEN: Never mind resolutions passed in this House.

MR. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, there is an easy way to get Lower Churchill going: Let us not have the Federal Liberal Party in convention decide on a resolution, which means nothing, to say that they are in favour of Labrador development. Let us have the Federal Government that is now in office say that it will and it wants and it demands a corridor through Quebec for Labrador power. In one fell swoop they could have Labrador development going and Gull Island going, Lower Churchill going. The power is not here in this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, it is in Ottawa and if Ottawa wants to move and put on its holsters against Quebec, if it wants to draw its guns against Quebec it can do it and it can do it in a very dramatic fashion to indicate not only that it is willing to take Quebec on but more importantly it is willing to recognize the aspirations and hopes of a Province or of a region which has lots of resources but lacks the means to develop them. They only people, the only jurisdiction that has the power to bring Lower Churchill onstream is not here. I wish it was here, Mr. Chairman, for I could make a decision on it pretty

MR. B. PECKFORD: fast, I could give my vote in Cabinet pretty fast. The decision lies in Ottawa, not because I want to blame Ottawa but because, by the same token that we receive many monies from Ottawa because we are part of Canada, we can also say in true justification that Ottawa being the National Government, the senior government in the Northern part of the North American continent must and has the opportunity now to exercise how sympathetic it looks upon Atlantic Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador. It can do it in one fell swoop, no problem! Let us not kid ourselves on that, Mr. Chairman, Let us not hear this talk about BRINCO is takeover as being a sell-out to the people of Newfoundland when we were getting back control over our own resources in the same way as everybody agrees on the offshore oil and gas that we must have control and we must dictate to the oil companies because it is our resources if there is any there. What is going to happen? We must set the guidelines. They will develop on our terms. We do not develop it. We set the guidelines and the climate and the environment for them to develop it. but on our terms. We are the masters of our own house, not BRINCO; no corporation is to be master of that. That is the difference. That is why we spent the money, Mr. Chairman, and now we have a sixty-six and two-thirds share of CFLCo. Now where is the headquarters of CFLCo? Where is the headquarters now of Upper Churchill? Is it in Montreal, Quebec? No, Mr. Chairman! It is in St. John's, Terre Neuve. That is where it is.

MR. S. NEARY: Where is Lower Churchill though?

MR. PECKFORD: And Lower Churchill Power Corporation will be in St. John's, Newfoundland or in the capital of this Province when it is set up and we will have control over the development of that resource as well with federal participation because they recognize, as we do and we have for some time, that energy projects, like Lloydminster in Alberta, Saskatchewan and like Gull Island are high profile, high employment, high construction opportunities in a sector which demands additional development not only because we need the energy but because we do not want to be dependent upon foreigners for it.

July 4, 1978

Tape 5101 (Night Session)

DW - 3

MR. PECKFORD:

But, Mr. Chairman, we will continue
and the Opposition can continue as long as they like for the
rest of this

MR. PECKFORD: Summer and into the Fall. They can continue to try to attack this administration for paving roads down in the hon. member's district -

MR. NEARY: You have not started yet.

MR. PECKFORD: No, but they are in the process. Do not worry, we have got a commitment there. The hon. member does not have to worry about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: He does not have to worry about that. We have made a commitment to improve systems, social services on the Baie Verte Peninsula. And we are going to continue to expand health facilities, we are going to continue to build water and sewer systems. And if the Opposition are against \$150 million to do those basic things, which any government worth its salt will do, let them attack us, Mr. Chairman. Let them attack us on those grounds. Let them not attack us on the grounds of Brinco over which we now have control and administer from St. John's. Let them not attack us on that. Let them not attack us on the Labrador Linerboard where we are trying to give to this Province an industry which will stand on its own two feet. The only reason why we have, Mr. Chairman, seventeen or sixteen per cent unemployment instead of fifty per cent unemployment is because Price and Bowaters are making a profit.

Oh, it is a dirty word, Mr. Chairman, a profit. Subsidize it! Get in there with both feet, governments! The long-term interests economically of this Province lie in having whatever additional forest resources, if the budworm does not kill them, in this Province that are not needed by Price, which are not needed by Bowaters and which is sufficient to sustain an additional third mill, put on an economic basis. Then let the companies so dicker with the unions and let the companies open it on that basis and that basis only. Because once you get a subsidy built in, Mr. Chairman - man is a very fickle character in this whole universe, he is a very fickle character - and if the companies for one minute think that we are in there subsidizing, like we were in Labrador Linerboard, then automatically there is a subsidy

MR. PECKFORD: of \$5 million or \$10 million that is needed to keep it going, whether it is or whether it is not. That is natural. And I suppose if I were part of some great corporate entity that would be my first inclination too. The greater the profits the more sympathetic the directors. And therefore if I could extract out of any government anywhere in the world a fair amount of subsidy, a fair high level of subsidy for an industry of which I was a participant, so much the better, so much the better. That is not where the action is, Mr. Chairman. It is not in the Brinco takeover of a number of years ago or the Linerboard close down of a couple of years ago. The action is Mr. Chairman, where \$150 million is going to be spent, in fishery development, which is jobs; in transportation and communications, which is also jobs, directly and indirectly, because an improved transportation system, secondary and primary, will help develop economic opportunities in this Province. And then with our rural development agreements, and our tourist agreements, and our ongoing housing agreements and our education things that we have to do, and our Manpower things that we have to do and all the other things which are built into it, because we are hammering at Ottawa every day to sign another agreement, or extend the highways agreement, or give us more money for Nordco or more money for planning agreements. We have at this moment, this very moment, geologists looking over rocks in Labrador to try to find some future, some potential for a mine. So the two per cent argument is not going to go down with ninety-eight per cent of the people. The two per cent argument that two per cent of the money is being wasted or so on, or not being spent right - which happens in all governments. There is no government that has all of its capital expenditures totally in line with what the majority or everybody thinks they want. But, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you right now, ninety to ninety-eight per cent of what this government is spending on capital expenditures this year is done with a great deal of planning and a great deal of reason, with politics thrown asunder.

Mr. Peckford: If somebody wants to argue with the other 2 per cent let them argue with the other 2 per cent, and I will continue to contend that when it comes down to \$150 million, \$145 million to \$149 million of that is being spent to bring better services to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: And nobody can deny it almost on any field as I have already mentioned, nobody can deny it. It is a fact. It is a fact that we are spending more in the last six years on all the kinds of social services than was even dreamed of in 1965 or 1968 or even 1970. But it is still not enough. Nowhere near enough.

I hear from just as many widows or people on long-term assistance as the hon. members opposite.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, and you write the nasty letters.

MR. PECKFORD: And I would like to respond to them and say that there is another \$100 a month coming to them.

MR. W. N. ROWE: But you sent poison pen letters.

MR. PECKFORD: But when one has to balance it all up one has to paint with the broad brush and it is a tiny bit different. And you can isolate any particular segment of society from a human point of view, from a population point of view or from an economic point of view and come up with the same answer, because life is never that easy. But, Mr. Chairman, for the Leader of the Opposition to get up and to try to cloak it all over with the Brinco takeover and the Linerboard closedown, shows his shallowness, shows why he is on the other side of the House, Mr. Chairman, because he thinks -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Not for long, though.

MR. PECKFORD: Oh yes, oh yes. Not for long, Mr. Chairman.

DR. KITCHEN: It will not be long now.

MR. PECKFORD: The greatest dream the Leader of the Opposition has is not to improve the lot of the fishermen, it is not to improve the lot of the widows -

DR. KITCHEN: Money for the poor people.

MR. PECKFORD: The greatest ambition and dream the hon. Leader of the Opposition has is to be over in the seat now occupied by the hon. the Premier. His concern is not primarily for whether Newfoundland rises or falls, it is for whether he rises over here, and the hon. the member for Humber West (Premier Moores) falls over there. That is a sad commentary, Mr. Chairman, on the politics of our day, and why so often I find as I go throughout this Province that there is a lot of disenchantment with all politicians, federally and provincially, and the one comment I hear heard over and over again is the one I just made, "where is the alternative?" There is no alternative.

The hon. leaders so-called opposite have shown their shallowness -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Ask your buddy to put it to the test.

MR. PECKFORD: - Have shown their shallowness. Mr. Chairman, we have put it to the test twice and when we are ready we will put it to the test again and we will see whether the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. N. Rowe) is still the Leader of the Opposition or whether he is no longer here. Whether he sees it -

MR. W. N. ROWE: No, I will not be Leader of the Opposition, I will guarantee you that

MR. PECKFORD: - or whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who has quite a few people around him ready to stab him as soon as he falters, whether the Leader of the Opposition goes not to France this time, but even goes farther East -

AN HON. MEMBER: What are you talking about?

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows what I am talking about, he knows it only too well. The hon. Leader knows it only too well what I am talking about.

MR. F. ROWE: What about your own leader?

MR. PECKFORD: I have heard from members opposite, we all have. Oh, oh we know. We know. We know all about now the members opposite and where there positions are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: I know I have hit a sensitive chord, Mr. Chairman. I would like to get on to matters more substantive, but if the Leader of

Mr. Peckford: the Opposition wants me to continue to be shallow I am part of that argument too. I can come down a few rungs to where he wants me to be, if that is his wont. But, Mr. Chairman, let the Leader of the Opposition fully recognize that whilst he thinks he is riding on a crest that has some future in it, let him also look to his right and to his left and to his back, because the Leader of the Opposition, once he falters, will find himself in a mire not of his making, not of his making.

You know, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) can grin so nicely now when he hid away for a few days after the Leader of the Opposition announced his - after he became leader, after he announced his shadow Cabinet and the people who were going to be his whip, and who was going to be on the frontbenches, and the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir did not get a look in, and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: - all of a sudden -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on his right hand.

MR. PECKFORD: Ah, yes, yes. I give the Leader of the Opposition credit; he did whip the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir into shape. How long? The question is not whether he whipped him into shape, Mr. Chairman, the question is, how long he can keep him there? That is the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Or then, of course, also what shape he whipped him in, which perhaps is

MR. PECKFORD: a more interesting question. But in any case, Mr. Chairman, for me to sum up -

MR. W. ROWE: You keep your eye on Grand Falls.

MR. PECKFORD: For me to sum up, Mr. Chairman, if the Leader of the Opposition thinks that he is going to try to defeat this loan bill of \$150 million, which is to bring lower rents to widows and poor people in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: If he thinks that he is going to try to defeat or oppose this bill because he is not going to allow pavement to go ahead in this Province, or new roads, if he is going to try to oppose, to stop water and sewer projects from going ahead in this Province, the Leader of the Opposition has got another thing coming to him, because this government is committed to ensuring that these capital funds are approved so that we can get on with the job of bringing those social services to the people. He can oppose it all he likes, but we are going to give to the poor people of this province more money, if the Leader of the Opposition would only stop opposing and be positive for a change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, one of the very basic rules of public speaking, particularly preaching, is that if you have a very weak argument, shout all the more louder. I leave all of us to judge just how strong the member's arguments were by the way he shouted his way through that forty-five minute piece.

He is right, you know, Mr. Chairman - on a personal note, before I get into the essence of what I want to say - he is right. The Leader of the Opposition certainly did whip me into shape. Boy, I must say I will give him credit for that. He really whipped me into shape. Would that I had that kind of skill and ability when I hired the member not once but twice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: I hired him first as a teacher and then as a painter.

MR. W. ROWE: And both times -

MR. SIMMONS: And I do not mean as a Michaelangelo painter, Mr. Chairman, I mean as the painter of an exterior of a building. I had a look at the building the other day and I have to get part of it repainted, the part he painted. So would I had the skill, would I had the knowledge -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - would I had the knowledge -

MR. W. ROWE: He does not only bungle in the House.

MR. SIMMONS: - would I had the knowledge in dealing with people that the Leader of the Opposition has.

Mr. Chairman, I listened -

MR. PECKFORD: I have lots of fine stories.

I am going to have to start telling them,

I suppose.

MR. MORGAN: I could tell a few stories as well.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, go ahead. I will let the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) tell his story.

MR. PECKFORD: If the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir was going to be correct when he starts to extract episodes out of a whole series of things, one can extract an awful lot of episodes which are not at all complimentary to the hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: And one can do it in fun, or one can get vindictive like as one writes letters.

MR. PECKFORD: Exactly. Which I do not want to.

I do not want to. But which I can do. And the hon. member knows from whence I speak.

MR. SIMMONS: If the member has some story to tell about me I would invite him now to tell it before I continue.

MR. PECKFORD: No. I am just telling the hon. member that if he wants to just -

MR. W. ROWE: More threats.

MR. PECKFORD: - poke you know at a certain area, it is a very sensitive area which I could get involved in if I wanted.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I obviously hit a very sensitive nerve and -

MR. PECKFORD: No, you did not at all. Because I am very proud that I could paint buildings and cut trees, you know. I find nothing wrong with that.

MR. SIMMONS: It is all right.

MR. PECKFORD: If the hon. member finds something wrong with that kind of a thing -

MR. W. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. W. ROWE: I want to hear my hon. colleague here. I do not want to listen for forty-five minutes to the mad ravings of that hon. minister over there.

MR. PECKFORD: Oh my!

MR. W. ROWE: Let us hear some sanity now for the next forty-five minutes or so, Sir. Would you kindly ask the hon. minister to keep quiet for a few minutes.

MR. MORGAN: We can all tell a few stories.

MR. PECKFORD: We can all tell a few stories about the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: We can all tell a few stories and I hope there are all as harmless -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Is the member ready to sit?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! Hon. members of the Committee will realize that interjections really are out of order and whereas on occasion they are made, if they do interfere with an hon. member's ability to speak, clearly the Chair has to intervene.

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I invite all the story tellers among us to tell stories. I hope they are just as harmless and full of fun as the two I have just told. If you want some other more serious stories I have some of these too. But now that we are over our story telling time perhaps we can get on to the subject at hand. I believe the theme of what the Minister of Mines and Energy had to say for the last forty-five minutes and it is significant that in two and a quarter hours in this House, two and a quarter hours on this particular bill, or less than that really, about two hours, he found it necessary to make two of the three speeches to defend this indefensible bill. This, understand it, this is a bill to borrow another \$150 million. That is what we are talking about, a bill to borrow another \$150 million. And at one point

Mr. Simmons: I heard him go into his 98 per cent, 2 per cent argument about if 98 per cent was spent well, well then what about the other 2 per cent? And I believe if you might sum that up in a few words you really hear the minister say, what is in a million? What is a million? What is the difference if we waste a million here and there?

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: But I submit, Mr. Speaker, in a land of scarce financial resources such as ours a million is an awful lot of money.

DR. KITCHEN: You can get a lot of shoes for a million.

MR. SIMMONS: A million is a lot of shoes for people, a lot of school fees, a lot of school taxes; a million is a lot of money, however you put a yardstick on it. And it is callous of the minister to get here tonight and suggest that any government in this Province can afford to waste \$1 million or \$2 million and what difference does it make.

I only wish the minister were in his seat. He was most anxious to have my colleague stay and hear him out, and my colleague did with one brief interlude when he had to take his son home. Unfortunately he did not have the same good grace to stay in his seat which he required of my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. But let the record judge on that one. I say nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Mines and Energy at the very least has misled the House tonight on a couple of matters.

MR. J. CARTER: Deliberately?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, that is for the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) to say; if he feels that it was deliberate let him say so.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Let him say so.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The answer to that question is yes.

MR. SIMMONS: He did mislead the House at the very least, Mr. Chairman, on a couple of matters. First of all, he did not bother to tell the House or those who may be in the gallery and otherwise listening to the

Mr. Simmons: transactions here tonight, he did not bother to tell the House it was not the Opposition that has broke with long standing tradition-in the British Parliament, in the Canadian Parliament, in the Parliament of every Province of Canada, the Parliament of Australia, and New Zealand, and other countries in the British Commonwealth - it was not the Opposition that has broke with long-standing tradition of having your Budget Debate first and then your estimates, so that you could have your broad general debate under the Budget Debate first, and then have estimates whereby you could ask questions about particular subheads and get the kinds of answers he talked about tonight, about how the government is spending this \$1,000 here and \$1 million here. It was not the Opposition who broke the tradition there. It was the government that did the unprecedented thing, I suppose never done elsewhere in the British Commonwealth, never elsewhere in the British Commonwealth was it done, where they came in and brought in the estimates first and forced us in the Opposition to have our general debate on estimates when we should have been debating under the Budget Debate. That was the government that did that. And if we did not ask as many questions on estimates as we should have, Mr. Chairman, only the government can take the blame for that. Of course, that is the kind of detail that he very conveniently just slips over from time to time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the time for asking questions is by no means past. It is only the 4th. of July yet, Mr. Chairman, and what better place to be on the 4th. of July, being celebrated tonight in another country just to the South of us, what better place to be than in a House of Parliament -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - trying to get the people's business done and done properly over almost insurmountable obstacles, almost insurmountable obstacles, trying to get the business of the country, the business of the people attended to.

He misleads the House on another account, Mr. Chairman. He actually suggested at one point that this Loan Bill here of \$150 million, he said at one point that \$80 million to \$90 million of it will go for

Mr. Simmons: transportation and fisheries. Now, Mr. Chairman, that just is not true. That is not true. It is an untruth to say that \$80 million to \$90 million of it would go for transportation and fisheries. I understand what he said in another mouthful that \$80 million to \$90 million will be spent on those two disciplines, on those two departments of government, but to suggest that is the amount that will be taken right out of the loan amount is nonsense, absolute nonsense, and another way in which the member so often misleads this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, he can stand there all he likes and he can rave on and make great comparisons about Liberal years and Tory years. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we have had a Tory Government now for six years plus. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that no amount of academic comparison by the minister of the Liberal and Tory years will put bread on the table of the welfare recipients.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: No amount of such comparison of the Liberal and Tory years will pay the shockingly high electricity bills that the people around this Province have to face, thanks to that minister and the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: No amount of comparison of the Liberal years and the Tory years, Mr. Chairman, will provide jobs for the tens of thousands of Newfoundlanders who are out of work tonight thanks to the present Premier, thanks to his failure to keep his promise about full employment six or seven years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, at any time I will engage in a little academic exercise comparing the Liberal and Tory years, if he wants to go back in the history, Mr. Chairman, and tell us what some Liberal Government did in 1900 or in 1905 or 1910 in giving Sir Robert Bond a lot of land. It is a long way to go back to finally get something on the Liberals. I have only got to

MR. SIMMONS: go back two or three years.
I have only to go back to the 1974 - 1975 fiscal year, I say to the Minister of Manpower, or the 1975 - 1976 fiscal year, I say to the Minister of Forestry, or the 1976 - 1977 fiscal year, I say to the Minister of Industrial Development if he were here, to find things on this crowd. I do not have to go back to 1910 or 1905 to find a government that gave a bit of land away.

MR. WHITE: They all put names on the list.

MR. SIMMONS: If you want to talk Liberal governments, Mr. Chairman, and go back in history seventy years to do it, well, let us remind the Minister of Mines and Energy that we do not have to go back that far to find a Tory government that actually wanted to sell Labrador for \$50 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: They wanted to sell it altogether, one Tory government, for \$50 million. If you want an academic exercise, Mr. Chairman, if you want to start comparing Liberal governments to Tory governments, I will compare them any day of the week with you and the Liberal governments will come out on top. But what do you prove, Mr. Chairman? What did I have to do with a Liberal government in 1910? How could I take the credit or blame for that? How could anybody on the other side take the credit or blame for a Tory government that wanted to sell Labrador in 1932? What utter nonsense, Mr. Chairman! How bereft of argument are they? How bereft of common sense are they when they have to dig back sixty or seventy years to find something sensible and convinceable to say to an audience? How stunned, Mr. Chairman, can you be and still stand in a vertical position?

MR. WHITE: Back in those days they did not know about anything else.

MR. SIMMONS: May I have some water, please?
Make sure it is water now. You are bringing it to this side of the House this time so make sure it is water.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: That is right, make sure you are dipping into the right barrel.

MR. NEARY: We are going to get a breathalizer installed.

MR. SIMMONS: I think, Mr. Chairman, you should have a breathalizer now. Before you come into the House, reflecting on the rowdy goings on of the last few days, you should have a breathalizer. All members of the House should be subjected to a breathalizer before you come into the House. Would that not be a brilliant idea? Because I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of our problems in this House have anything to do with hostilities or tempers or the hot hazy weather.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Health would have flunked it here the other night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: The member for Bonavista North?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Alright, I will have to say it again to make it sensible for the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) and for the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor). I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and I am saying very candidly that I am not sure a lot of our problems in this House have to do with the fact that we are a partisan crowd or that the hostilities are pretty sharp or that it is late in the year. I think if we all managed to come in here sober, Mr. Chairman, we would get a lot more work done. We would not have so much punching around and physical assault as we have if everybody just came in here sober, that is all I am saying. If you want me to say it - the member for Bonavista North,

MR. SIMMONS: he wants to know the source of his problems the other night. Nothing to do with numbers. The sooner we start calling a spade a spade around here the better it will be for all concerned. That is what I mean by a breathalizer. Perhaps we all should take the breathalizer before we come in here. Perhaps we would straighten out a lot of the problems - fewer fights and get more work done. How is that? Is that sensible enough for the member for Bonavista North? Or would he rather I avoid that subject as the Premier did the other day in the paper when he said nobody was at fault for the fourteen who showed up the other night. They showed up, I must say that for them - brought, dragged, sent into the Chamber, but they were here.

MR. NEARY: He is gone. You frightened him out of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: I mentioned the breathalizer and they all left. I mentioned the breathalizer and they all scattered to the four winds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say to the more sober among us, let us look at this particular bill, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Smallwood.

MR. SIMMONS: Want me to talk about Smallwood? At the right time, Mr. Chairman, we will talk about Smallwood.

Now let us talk about this bill, this \$150 million dollar bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: I know they all are distracted on their breathalizer. We will come back to that.

MR. C. POWER: What do you mean, 'they all'?

MR. SIMMONS: The member for Ferryland?

MR. SIMMONS:

We all? I know we

all are concerned about this possibility.

MR. POWER:

There are certain non-drinkers on both sides of the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, that argument

is about as sensible as saying that all people who drive within the speed limit at all times should somehow be exempt to a speed limit because they drive within it anyway. Mr. Chairman, as the police will tell you, the only way that you catch the culprits is to apply the same law to everybody, and I say to the member for Ferryland, if he is a teetotaler he should be the first to take the breathalyzer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins)

Order, please! I feel we

may be wandering a little afar from the matter under consideration and in committee, as hon. members realize, we have to keep to the point.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I quite agree.

The word the Chairman is looking for is 'staggering' - staggering a little from the point, but we will stagger back to the point now, Mr. Chairman, because I want

MR. SIMMONS: very much to talk about the bill, the \$150 million. Now the Minister of Mines and Energy talks about -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: I am being harrassed by my own crowd now, Mr. Chairman. I got the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) all exercised ever since I mentioned the breathalizer. He has been hanging on for dear life to that glass of water he has there, trying to dilute it as best he can.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, all I have said - if the member for Humber Valley (Mr. House) does not like it he does not have to like it. All right? It reflects on me and it reflects on every member of this House when it goes across the country that we are in here behaving like a bunch of drunken sailors, that we are in here going after each other physically, that we are in here name calling each other, and I say it is time that we called spades spades and stop saying it had to do with tempers or it had to do with fellows not liking each other, or it had to do with little partisan fights because I am a Liberal and you are a Tory. I say it has nothing to do with that at all.

MR. HOUSE: What has it got to do with?

MR. SIMMONS: It has to do with us all coming here in a mood and in an attitude and in a frame of mind to do the country's business and if we cannot do it, if we cannot do it, buddy, I am not taking the blame for somebody else's mistakes. That is all I am saying to the member for Humber Valley (Mr. House).

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: That is all I am saying. And I will submit that is the message and I will submit to the breathalizer at any minute.

MR. HOUSE: So will I.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay.

MR. MORGAN: And so will I.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay. And I daresay so will most of the members in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: You could also put in a lie detector.

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

I think that the discussions may lead to some disruption -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! The discussion that is going on may lead to disruption of the Committee and I feel that this should not proceed further.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I was just pursuing a very sensible suggestion to expedite the work of the committee. We will get back to it at some point, Mr. Chairman. The \$150 million the government wants to borrow: Now we are told by the only government speaker we have had so far and he has spoken twice, and perhaps he will speak again because if he speaks often enough he might tell us what this bill is all about. Now he made much ado, Mr. Chairman of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition did not talk about fisheries, and did not talk about rural development, well, Mr. Chairman, I never heard this member mention a thing about health in two speeches. I never heard him mention a thing about education in two speeches. You know, must you talk about everything everytime you speak for forty-five minutes? Is that the new gospel, Mr. Chairman, that you must talk about everything everytime you speak?

This bill, Mr. Chairman, this \$150 million, I cannot tell you what every cent of it will be paid out for, but I will tell you this, that fully a third of it, \$50 million, will be spent to pay the interest on two monumental government blunders. So do not tell me that is for roads or water works or sewer or education or paying

MR. SIMMONS: the widows' allowance. Let us not have that tear jerking argument introduced by the Minister of Mines and Energy. Because at least \$50 million of this, Mr. Chairman, and you can do the arithmetic on it if you want to; at least \$50 million will be spent to continue to pay for two monumental government blunders; the Upper Churchill, the Churchill Falls blunder, the CLFCo. blunder and the Labrador Linerboard blunder. And these two together this year are costing us between \$50 million and \$60 million in interest alone. Now do not tell me, Mr. Chairman, that that interest somehow gets into the pockets of the widows and the welfare people and the poor generally and the unemployed because I do not believe it and it is not true; and it is less than candid, less than honest for the Minister of Mines to stand here tonight and suggest it is true.

\$50 million, Mr. Chairman, is going to pay off a couple of government blunders, the government blunder of CFLCo. has now cost us over \$300 million. The government blunder of Labrador Linerboard has cost us another \$200 million and just to pay the interest

MR. SIMMONS: on these two blunders alone, Mr. Chairman this year will take one third of that amount right there. Now, Mr. Chairman, nobody, I suppose, in Parliament would ever suggest, Mr. Chairman, that borrowing is wrong. We all do it in our own private family budgets. We do it in our business budgets, those in this House who may be involved in business. It is part of a fairly sensible or certainly accepted way of doing business, of borrowing against tomorrow, of spreading your capital cost over a longer period than just today or this year. It is an accepted way of financing, and if we do it in terms of home financing and car financing and appliance financing, if we do it in terms of business financing, why should we not do it in terms of government financing? Of course, Mr. Chairman, nobody will argue with that. But, Mr. Chairman, the same restraint that applies to personal financing or family financing, or business financing must apply to government financing. And that is two restraints; one, what is it for, what do you need it for, can you justify the borrowing in terms of the need; and two, can you pay it back? Two, can you pay it back? Do you have the ability to repay? And, Mr. Chairman, in this year when I realize that \$163 million of our budget, \$163.7 million, almost \$164 million will be spent this year - more than we are borrowing in this bill, Mr. Chairman - will be spent just to pay interest on our debt, just to look after debt charges in this fiscal year '78-'79, \$163.7 million this year, in this fiscal year will be spent to look after debt charges, just to pay there interest on what we borrow.

We are now going to borrow \$150 million which in effect is now even as much as we are going to pay out in debt charges this year. So we are now borrowing to pay back the borrowing. Is that the sign of a government that is able to meet its commitments when it has to borrow just to pay back the borrowing?

MR. SIMMONS: What kind of a mess would we be in tonight as individuals, Mr. Chairman, if on our car, and I daresay everybody around this room has a loan on his or her car, what kind of a mess would you be in, Mr. Chairman, if you had to go out tonight and borrow again, get some more money to pay off the loan on the existing car- to pay off the interest, I should say, to meet the payments on the existing car, not even to pay off the loan, just to pay the interest on the existing car loan. Where would it end?

That is what is happening here, Mr. Chairman, and this year we are spending \$164 million just on debt charges alone. That compares, Mr. Chairman, when this government took office six or seven years ago, it inherited debt charges of \$44.5 million. In six years the annual debt charge commitment has gone from \$44.5 million to \$163.7 million-in six years! This is the same crowd, Mr. Chairman, in 1971 who were ranting and roaring because the former Liberal government had us so far in debt, where we were about \$1 billion in debt at the time. As of the end of March this year we are \$2.4 million in debt.

MR. NEARY: Billion.

MR. SIMMONS: \$2.4 billion in debt compared to \$1 billion six years ago.

MR. NEARY: Two and a half times.

MR. SIMMONS: Two and a half times the debt now, Mr. Chairman, what it was just six years ago and our debt charge requirement up almost fourfold from \$44 million to \$164 million. It has now become, Mr. Speaker, the third largest expenditure of government after education and health; debt retirement has become the third largest expenditure of government. Of a \$1 billion business we pay out almost twenty per cent of it or about sixteen per cent of it, \$163 million, we pay out sixteen per cent of it just to pay the interest on our debt. It is not wrong to borrow, Mr. Chairman, but

Mr. Simmons: it is wrong to borrow for the wrong thing, wrong to borrow for the wrong thing, wrong to borrow just to cover up your past mistakes, your Churchill Falls mistakes, your Lab Linerboard mistakes. That is what is wrong about it.

Now the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) tells us, and I have his words, he says, "This government has been responsible." Has been responsible! I will tell you what they are responsible for: They are responsible for the \$15 million to \$20 million that was spent in the Department of Public Works with no tenders. They are responsible for that, \$15 million to \$20 million, with no tenders, lashed out to their buddies.

MR. S. NEARY: Sixty-five million over in the Health Sciences.

MR. SIMMONS: They are responsible for the new deal that was cooked on the Health Sciences Complex.

MR. NEARY: The Carbonear Hospital.

MR. SIMMONS: They are responsible for the new deal on the Carbonear Hospital that has cost the taxpayers some extra millions of dollars.

MR. NEARY: Now they are going -

MR. SIMMONS: They are responsible for this -

MR. NEARY: Now, they are going to give away now the only place that is paying, the asphalt plant.

MR. SIMMONS: That is another one. They are responsible for this Special Action Group and all the money slashing out into Montreal. They are responsible for the \$110 million that went down the drain on the Lower Churchill. Oh, they are responsible alright! The problem is when will they own up to their responsibilities. When will they own up to this bag of tricks, Mr. Chairman? Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: They made \$1.25 million last year on that asphalt thing down in Clareville, now they are going to give it away to one of their buddies.

MR. SIMMONS: Who? Can you tell me?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: So all this that the Premier told us today about negotiating with several companies on the asphalt plant is just utter nonsense, the same old smoke screen?

MR. NEARY: Balderdash!

MR. SIMMONS: You are suppose to believe that, Mr. Chairman, just like you believed he did not have a deal with brother Dobbin, although he had it signed, sealed and almost delivered.

MR. NEARY: Well, he almost got this one delivered now.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. Now the asphalt plant is going the same way as Linerboard, the same way as the Dobbin deal, the same way as Scrivener, the same way as Carbonear Hospital.

The Labrador Linerboard, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding what the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) says, about how they were constrained to take it over because somebody had to make it work, the Labrador Linerboard was vindictive, deliberately vindictive from beginning to end. It had nothing to do with business. It had to do with the plans of a former Cabinet minister, Mr. Crosbie, that was sold hook, line and sinker to an unthinking government, a government that is now left holding the bag after Mr. Crosbie has gone. The Premier is quoted fairly widely as saying that that former minister cost the Province \$200 million. That is what he tells now in his cocktail circuits. I was not there, but somebody told me the other night that the Premier very recently said to a group of people that in his estimation the former minister, Mr. Crosbie, cost the Provincial Treasury by his policies \$200 million.

MR. NEARY: You know what Crosbie -

MR. SIMMONS: I say to the Premier he is low, he is being too kind. He cost us \$200 million on Linerboard alone.

MR. NEARY: You know what Crosbie is saying about him now, do you not? If they had an ounce of decency they would all resign.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Crosbie has got a few words at his cocktail parties about the Premier, too.

MR. NEARY: Right. About them all there.

MR. SIMMONS: And perhaps they should take some of Crosbie's advice on the subject. Among the most sensible is that the government should resign altogether. The Labrador Linerboard was a vindictive move dreamed up by a minister who had a very serious conflict of interest and then sold to an unthinking government. That is how Labrador Linerboard

Mr. Simmons: . got off the tracks.

MR. J. CARTER: Whose fault was it in the first place? Joe Smallwoods!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the question and answer routine we are hearing now is from the same hon. member, the only one in the history of this Province, the only individual in the history of this Province who denied Mr. Smallwood the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, the day that the House received a resignation of Mr. Smallwood he denied him the opportunity of having it on film, so I would not take it as exactly an unbiased comment from the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). He has got this obsession about Mr. Smallwood. And because he says it is not necessarily true.

MR. J. CARTER: Wrong! Wrong! Wrong!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Labrador Linerboard was the victim and the people of Bay St. George were the victims of a very vindictive skuldiggerist move by a person in Cabinet who had a conflict of interest, a very serious one, a shameful conflict of interest between his Cabinet portfolio and his business interests, and then everybody in Cabinet became party to the crime by swallowing the think unthinkingly and now it is on the backs of every taxpayer to the tune of a couple of hundred million dollars.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Do not tell me, Mr. Chairman, that this \$150 million is going to look after the widows. This \$150 million is going to cover the past mistakes of this administration—the money they blew in public works, the money they blew on Labrador Linerboard, the \$110 million they blew on the Lower Churchill, the \$300 million they blew on the Upper Churchill. That is where this is going. Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, all this session we have had to come back to one single word, scandal? Everywhere you look, Mr. Chairman, in our money bill, in our Question Period, in any debate in this House at all it all comes back to a very recognizable pattern, the pattern of a group of men who got too greedy -

MR. S. NEARY: Joey's crowd looked like Archangels.

MR. R. SIMMONS: The pattern of a group of men who got far too greedy. What complicates it, Mr. Chairman, is that only a few of them over there, Mr. Chairman, are in on the secret and the rest are being the unwitting pawns. So you get the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) who stands up, and he believes this, Mr. Chairman, when he goes on about widows and how this bill will do great things for the downtrodden, he believes that. I know his philosophy—he believes that. But what is so sad about it, Mr. Chairman, is that he is being sold a bag of goods by his own crowd over there, by the clique—and he is not a member of the clique, Mr. Chairman, he is being sold a bag of goods by the clique. One of those days when it all comes out in the wash what a bunch of red-faced egg-all-over-your-face crowd they are going to be over there. They get up, Mr. Chairman, and they wax on. They can do it because in some respects, I suppose in all respects, they do not really what is going on. Philosophically they are on the right track, some of them over there. They are philosophically on the right track but what they will not admit to is that their own crowd right around them is pulling the rug from under them every second trying to protect their own hides. We cannot even get them in the House now during Question Period, cannot even get them in the House. They go back and pace the floor in the Government Common Room during Question Period.

MR. R. SIMMONS: They will not even come in now. One time they had the attitude, "We will brazen it through. We will give answers, we will give words with a serious look on our faces." Now they have got beyond that. They go back in the back room now and pace it up and down and their buddies come over tell me where they are. "You know where So - and - So is? He is over there pacing up and down now." That is what tell us.

MR. S. NEARY: Are they (inaudible).

MR. R. SIMMONS: That is the word from the Government members Common Room Room. Any wonder I asked the Premier the question about whether he had told them not to come here? I just want to make it clear who we could blame for this, whether the Premier or the individuals themselves. Well, we have the Premier's word, whatever that is worth, that it was not he who told them to stay out of Question Period. But they stayed out, Mr. Chairman; they have even stopped answering the questions now because they realize, Mr. Chairman, that even an answer on the record now, the wrong answer, can be extremely damaging.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are told to believe that this \$150 million has to do with providing good government. This \$150 million, Mr. Chairman, has to do with covering one's tracks, making up for past mistakes, having the taxpayer cover your tracks for you; that is what that \$150 million is all about. I would not mind voting \$150 million or \$200 million to a government that had exercised some prudent management over the past few years, but a government that has behaved with the public chest like they were a bunch of drunken sailors, Mr. Chairman, I cannot get all enthusiastic about handing over another \$150 million of a slush fund to them. I cannot get excited about that, I really cannot. If we had some evidence of prudent management, there would be a few honest errors, as the member for Green Bay says. Of course there would. Perhaps there will be a 2 per cent error range, perhaps they would have 2 per cent of error. But when you get into a contrived error of about 95 per cent, a planned error of 95 per cent in the way you spend the money, I cannot be as sympathetic, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid. I cannot excited about saying to the boys, here is another \$150 million. Go squander that, too." When

MR. R. SIMMONS: I look at this bill and look at the record of this government, and then look at the plight of my own people in Bay d' Espoir, where 80 per cent of them are unemployed, or in Grey River, where they have been let down again and again by the government, or in MacCullum, where the Premier promised them a water supply, or in Francois, where the Premier and his crowd botched up what would have been a good water supply by going in and buying them off during an election -

MR. R. MOORES: Victoria, where he promised them a fire truck.

MR. SIMMONS: There are so many other places in my colleague's district from Carbonear and all over this Province, when I see the plight of those people, people, Mr. Chairman, whose hopes had been raised by this administration that promised full employment in 1971, that promised they were going to improve the services around this Province. When I see that on the one hand, Mr. Chairman, and I see the abysmal, disastrous waste of public funds on the other hand, when I see it being lashed out to McConnell in Montreal, when I see the private deals for the asphalt plant down in Clarenville we hear about today - every day there is something else, something new! You are almost afraid to wake up in the morning because you know that you are going to hear some more skulduggery today. It has almost got to that point, Mr. Chairman. It has become a game, Mr. Chairman, a game of salting away your buddies.-

MR. J. CARTER: That is just the hate speaking -

MR. SIMMONS: No hate, Mr. Chairman, only pity. Only pity for the taxpayer, the taxpayer who finances this drunken spree.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) if I could muster some hate I could find a rationale.

MR. J. CARTER: The baloon just went across the -

MR. SIMMONS: We should both go. We should both go.

MR. CALLAN: The hot air -

MR. SIMMONS: I could just hold on to the member's legs and there would be enough hot air in them to keep us both up until we got across the Atlantic. We would not need a baloon at all. The court jester from St. John's North! Did somebody pay him extra tonight just to be an intrusionist here? He is moving all over.

MR. SIMMONS: It is like a Midsummer-Night's Dream. I forget the name of the jester now but he keeps popping up under one tree and then another tree. He has been in about six seats so far tonight, just like the court jester. He moves and he says a few lines and then he will come back here and say a few more and he will be down in the corner to say a few more, just like that jester, I forget the name, in a Midsummer-Night's Dream.

MR. PECKFORD: Bottom.

MR. WHITE: What is that word again?

MR. PECKFORD: Bottom.

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon? Bottom! How apt the name. Parliamentary too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: Who are you referring to, by the way?

MR. SIMMONS: I am talking about the court jester, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). He keeps popping around and saying little sweet nothings here and there.

MR. W. ROWE: A cute little fellow.

MR. SIMMONS: Putting in his little bit of poison. He does verbally what the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) does so well in writing. They are a team.

MR. NEARY: They should get together.

MR. W. ROWE: Poison.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the central issue in this particular bill here, this \$150 million, is how is this money going to be spent? Well, you have the word of the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) who says it is going to be spent on the widows, on the welfare people, on the unemployed. You know, Mr. Chairman, we could put that one to the test. If the Premier would stand in his place tonight, and we will give him until tomorrow or Thursday for that matter, and could come in with a programme showing how this \$150 million is going to be spent creating jobs, or on extra allowances for welfare recipients, then we will vote for

MR. SIMMONS: the bill.

MR. J. WINSOR: Not a copper.

MR. SIMMONS: We will vote for the bill if the Premier can give us a schedule demonstrating how this \$150 million is going to be spent as the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) says it is going to be spent.

MR. HODDER: He is not even going to speak in the debate, the Premier is not.

MR. SIMMONS: In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, you can take my word if you want to, and I take it from the Budget, that at least \$50 million of this \$150 million, at least \$50 million of it is going to be spent bailing out the government again on an interim basis for two monumental blunders: Churchill Falls, and Labrador Linerboard are costing the taxpayers this year in interest alone between \$50 million and \$60 million. That is one third of it, Mr. Chairman, if you want to know what we are borrowing our money for, that is what we are borrowing it for. That is what we are borrowing it for, that and the millions wasted in Public Works, the millions wasted on Scrivener, the many other millions that are all coming to light.

MR. NEARY: His buddy arrived today.

MR. SIMMONS: It must be a frantic night. The Premier's buddy arrived today. He is going to talk tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: His former buddy.

MR. W. ROWE: He is going to sing like a canary.

MR. SIMMONS: He is probably going to sing. Yes.

MR. NEARY: I thought you could not find him to get a summons delivered?

MR. W. ROWE: Try to intimidate him.

MR. SIMMONS: I hope the Premier thinks tomorrow night the song is as funny as he does tonight, that is all. He will sing.

MR. NEARY: Twenty-one years, boys, is a mighty long time.

PREMIER MOORES: I hope he does sing. A few other people are going to sing, too.

July 4, 1978

Tape No. 5111

NM - 4

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I believe the hon.
member is drifting away from Bill 56, I would ask him to continue.

MR. NEARY: Take her back to the point.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I was just providing
a little interlude for

MR. SIMMONS:

I was just preparing a little interlude for my colleague to sing a little song to the Premier who is in need of all of the humour he can get tonight. It is like being on the eve of your demise with your best buddy of yesteryear about to do some talking tomorrow in a very public way, it must be very much full of pressure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I suppose I was drifting from the bill. Mr. Chairman, if you buy the member for Green Bay's (Mr. Peckford) version, this is all going to be spent on widows and the unemployed.

AN HON. MEMBER: New houses and everything.

MR. SIMMONS: On the other hand, Mr. Chairman -

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, that is what bothers the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I thought it was something far more serious that bothered the member for St. John's North.

AN HON. MEMBER: Short and two-faced.

MR. SIMMONS: I gave an either/or proposition a few minutes ago. I said if the Premier can demonstrate how this \$150 million will be spent on the widows and the unemployed, the welfare people, I will vote for it. If it is going to be spent paying for the government's mistakes on Scrivener, on Labrador Linerboard, on Churchill, on the Carbonear Hospital, I am going to vote against it. At the moment I am leaning to the latter because the evidence is monumental, and the evidence is mounting, that this is going to be spent to get the government out of another financial jam on an interim basis. That is my feeling, and it is shared very widely around the country. If you can prove me wrong on that I will vote for the bill and very gladly. I will vote for the bill if you can prove that this is going to be spent where it needs to be spent, for the unemployed, to create some jobs, to create

MR. SIMMONS: to create some of the thousands of jobs that the Premier promised he would create before he came into the Premiership six or seven years ago.

Mr. Chairman, there will be other opportunities to speak on this bill. We see it, Mr. Chairman, this borrowing bill, we see it as being -

That is a new one, eh? There are all kinds of them over there today?

MR. W. N. ROWE: What does that one say?

MR. SIMMONS: This says, "You are doing extremely well. A brilliant speech."

MR. W. ROWE: Keep it up.

MR. SIMMONS: A brilliant speech. You have unlimited time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who signed it?

MR. SIMMONS: I signed it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: But I only have five minutes remaining, the Table reminds me, so I shall just clue up for the time being.

We have other opportunities. We see this bill, Mr. Chairman, the Opposition, let it be clear, the Opposition sees this bill of all the money bills, it views this one with a very particular significance, and for that reason we intend to debate this bill very thoroughly until we understand what the money is being spent for. We will be lectured and harangued and told, "You should know it is the annual Loan Bill" and that kind of stuff. That is true to an extent. But what is it this year that requires the extra \$150 million? And we want to know in some detail. And we are prepared to debate it at length. And who knows, Mr. Chairman? Her Majesty may not have the honour of proroguing the House, although we would be willing to do that and start a new session the next morning, but if she does not have the honour of proroguing the House she can at least come and sit in and spend a few

Mr. Simmons: brief minutes with us -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - because we might not be able to get down to the cocktail party, we might be so busy here debating Bill 56 at that particular time, July 27 after all is only three weeks away, and we have been here, I think, ninety days today since we came back after Easter--well, ninety elapsed days but not those many days in the House--but three months today since we came back after Easter, so any three weeks spent in a good cause, Mr. Chairman, debating a bill as important as this one, I believe is well worth it, and we may well have to do it. So, as I say, we might not be able to prorogue for Her Majesty, but we would be certainly glad to have her here to talk about an issue this important. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (MR. YOUNG): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal I could say on this bill, but for the present I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred and made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred, and made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received presently.

On motion the Committee to sit again presently.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House not adjourn at 11:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the House not adjourn at 11:00 P.M.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Those in favour of the motion please say "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contary-minded "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

MR. PECKFORD: Bill No. 56.

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Chairman, we have experienced a number of tricks in this House so far, but for the Premier to cut me off on the pretext of making a speech on this surely must be the most contemptible thing that has happened in this House to date this year. To abuse his authority and his ability to get recognition from the Chair, to make a move like this has got to be regarded as a very low blow, particularly since he does not have the slightest intention nor does he have the guts to speak on this bill before the House right now.

I marvelled, Mr. Chairman, when the member for Green Bay, the Leonidas of the North, who stood at Thermopylae with the fourteen great people and got slaughtered last Thursday, had the gall to come back and challenge us again. He will find out. And then the Premier, the silent menace of the Tory Party, the silent menace who does not have the guts to speak in the Throne Speech. He cannot even defend his own programme before the House and he is the Premier. What a man! What a bundle of nerve! What a great philosophy, psychology—you can call it what you like! I think the Premier should go and do what he normally does and leave the House to the people who are grown up and can speak for the people. He did not speak in the Budget Debate. He cannot defend his Budget. Who is the Premier over there? It is not the man who occupies the Premier's chair and does

DR. KITCHEN: not get up except to make motions to stay all night. What an interesting person! A man who cannot get up and speak and defend his programme! He has to get number two and number three and number seventeen up - number fourteen! I cannot go over fourteen because they only have fourteen that they can depend on, Mr. Chairman. Very interesting! Someday we will have to make a little scroll putting the names of the valiant fourteen up there and we will circulate it around: 'They stood by the ship.' The Premier was gone, they were all gone pretty well. Even the Minister of Tourism was not there that day. They were all gone. If he had been there I would have felt that there was something there, but he was gone. A few poor souls there - they are going to have their names in scroll. The Premier did not even speak on Nordsee. I can well imagine why he did not speak on Nordsee, the man who had a fish plant over there and ran off to Ottawa and sold out and left it, went off to Ottawa to do a job for the people. He was going to do a great job for the people of Bonavista - Trinity-Conception and he conned us all into supporting him. How many of us here supported him, when he ran for Bonavista - Trinity-Conception, and worked hard because we thought he was going to do a job? He has not yet. He appeared in the House of Commons how many times? How many times was he in the House of Commons? How many days did he sit? - Fourteen? Fifteen? Sixteen?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Collins) Order, please!

DR. KITCHEN: He did not sit at all because he ran away.

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

I do have to remind the hon. member that in Committee debate has to be pointedly relevant and we are on the resolution.

The hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

You do not have the latitude -

DR. KITCHEN:

Never mind the latitude! I am interested in the longitude of this guy, the dimensions.

I am talking about Nordsee, Sir, because this is related to what we are talking about. We are talking about loans and we are talking about the ability of this government to spend money, and I am saying that the record of the head of this government is such that the people cannot believe him. Do a job in Ottawa! Is he going to do a job with \$150 million now that he is going to borrow? Do a job?

DR. KITCHEN: Some job! We know all about the Premier's record in politics, one sad betrayal after the other, and now he has not got the nerve, has not got the nerve to say a few words on what his programme is going to be or why he wants the money. I think he should resign. Every Newfoundlander, except the fourteen, the valiant fourteen, would like to see him resign. I would bet if there was a secret vote held over there, if they ever do hold a secret vote, he would not get one. He would not even get his own. \$2.5 billion, Mr. Chairman, \$2.5 billion - just think, \$5,000 for every man, woman and child in this Province - that is what we owe, that is what we owe, \$5,000. I hope we strike oil. We will need to strike oil to get out of the hole. Some hole! \$2.5 billion worth. Looking back over the years we can point to a few schools from the previous administration. We have heard the litiny time after time after time the number of things that were spent, but what has been spent on this one, by this group. It has been mentioned about the hon. group - sometimes I wonder about some of the words we use and the meanings we attach to them, Mr. Chairman, the Premier had an explosion up in the Straits of Bella Isle, a \$75 million bang.

MR. MORGAN: Even your colleagues are not listening to you.

DR. KITCHEN: Boy, when the Premier has a bang in Labrador he really does it in style. \$75 million down the drain.

MR. MORGAN: Listen to the real leader over there.

DR. KITCHEN: And now he is asking us for another \$150 million. Give that crowd, Mr. Chairman, give that crowd \$150 million, authority to borrow \$150 million? Not fifty cents, Sir! Not fifty cents will I go for. I would not let them borrow fifty cents because they have not shown that they can handle fifty cents, or ten cents or one cent, not a copper, not a copper should they be entrusted with because they cannot be trusted with money. They cannot be trusted with money. It is an administration riddled with scandal -

DR. KITCHEN: enquiry after enquiry after enquiry before the courts - and then they want another \$150 million from the people of Newfoundland through the House of Assembly to go and spend some more to build other buildings and things. Not a cent, Mr. Chairman, not a cent will we ever give them, not a cent! We dare not give them a cent because we do not know what is going to happen to it, not a copper, not a red cent, not to this crowd. Now if the Premier wants to call an election and get the confidence of the people, and if he gets in again and has the confidence of the people, and then if some of us get elected we will probably have the duty. But he has to go to the people this time before he gets a cent from this side of the House - not a red cent, not any colour cent, not a cent. Their record speaks for itself. Their dedication to the job speaks for itself. I mentioned the fourteen. There are people on the other side of the House who do a bit of work from time to time. I know they do. But I am speaking about the Leader of the Government and his chief lieutenants. They do not work. "They toil not neither do they spin." They do not do a darn thing except play around; one day a week into the House of Assembly, into this Confederation Building. I clocked the Premier. I clocked him. From the time I was elected in June right on up until late this Fall, one day a week. And he was here two days this week, he was not there at all the next week. How can you do a job, how can you run a government when you are not there in the seat of power? Occasionally you can do a few things away from the Confederation Building, I realize that. But you cannot do the job unless you are prepared to do it and if you are not prepared to do the job you should not be over there. It is time to give it up and get some people there who do care for this Province, who do care for the people, who do know what to do.

Dr. Kitchen: you have got to be in the House. You have got to speak, Mr. Chairman, you have got to speak and defend your programme and tell us what. It is no good sending up the Leonidas of Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) or some number third string, You have to have the first string up, the first person, and he has to tell us the programme: Why do you want the money? What are you going to use it for? Why should we trust you with \$150 million? The people of Harbour Grace could not trust you. The people of Bonavista-Trinity-Conception could not trust you. The Conservative Party could not trust you as President, the National President; you ran away. John Diefenbaker would give you a chapter and verse on the Premier. Talk to John Diefenbaker about him. I have talked to John Diefenbaker; he gives him a great reference. Some reference.

PREMIER MOORES: What about your references?

DR. KITCHEN: I listen to people when they are sitting in their House. I would listen to the Premier if he would get up on his feet and make a speech like a man, instead of running off. Getting up and moving that the Committee rise. Well, well! And getting the attention of the Chair in order to do that cowardly thing when we all thought he was going to get up and speak. "Yes," he said, "I am going to speak next." Do you want to speak, Mr. Premier?" I said to him. "Oh, yes, I am going to speak next." He spoke next all right. Some speech. I hope that speech is reported as his defence of why he wants \$150 million. I hope the press reports every single word he said. Every word that he said, every word that he uttered in defense of why he wanted to borrow \$150 million this year. And if that defense, these words, can convince the people of Newfoundland, then let him have the \$150 million. But there were no words, just a little trick. A typical trick that we all know about, and it has got to stop. The people of Newfoundland will not be tricked into lending this crowd any more money. We are not going to lend them any more money. We cannot lend them any more money. We dare not lend them any more money.

Look at the record of construction. Some of this money is going to be spent for construction, all sorts of construction; I looked through the estimates while the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford)

Dr. Kitchen: was speaking and before, looking down through the various extensions to the Buchans Hospital, for the Grenfell Association, Western Memorial Hospital, community clinics, General Hospital, the Janeway Health Centre, others, over \$6 million for hospital construction this year. I suppose some of this is going out on tender. But can you trust them to put out tenders any more? Can we do it? I ask you, can we do it in the light of the scandal? And I say we cannot do it. We dare not give them the money. We dare not.

Now we have to be realistic, and we have to be fair, and we have to guard the interest of the people. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we dare not, we dare not, with all the will in the world, with all the will in the world we dare not give them a red cent, not one cent can they get.

We speak about the psychology. The previous speaker, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) spoke about the psychology of the Budget. The psychology. It was resettlement psychology, whatever that is. He speaks about the psychology. He speaks about philosophy. This Budget, this bill, this borrowing policy that we are asked to approve, there is no philosophy to that. There is no psychology to it. There might be a bit of mythology to it. I can see what they do. I believe what they do in the finance group, whoever they might be - it is not the Premier, because obviously he knows nothing about it, they must get a sheep or something or other and chop up the sheep and study the entrails, because that is about the extent of the philosophy that underlies this government. They do not know what they are doing. Maybe they consult Dr. Chase's Almanac or their horoscope to see how they spend money or who they should give a contract to. I do not know how they do it. Nobody knows how they do it. But it is certainly not done well.

And let us look at those financial advisors, the wonderful financial advisors. The government pays people to advise them. They hire certain firms to float their bonds and so on. And these great financial advisors last year told them to close down Linerboard, close down Labrador Linerboard mill - at least they say that is who told them. And I cornered one at a public enquiry down in the Public Utilities

Dr. Kitchen: Board the other day, and I asked him, "Did you advise the government to close down Labrador Linerboard mill?" "No," he said, "I was not party to that. But if I had been I would have told them to close it down. " And this is a person who draws money from the Public Chest. And now a year later they are trying to sell it off. I would like to really know what happened in Labrador Linerboard mill. I would like to know who is going to buy that mill. I would like to know that someone who is related to someone who is on the Advisory Committee, who advised them to shut it down, is looking for a cheap mill. I wonder if that is what is going to happen? Is one of those companies who were on the Advisory Committee to buy up that Labrador Linerboard mill? And are they going to get it cheap? Are they going to get a cheap mill? Because if that happens, Sir, there will

DR. KITCHEN:

be a revolution in this country. There will be something very strange happening in this country if anything like that happens because we have had enough skulduggery in government and we have had enough betrayed people and we are not having anymore of that. We cannot, we dare not have anymore of that. We have to have straightforward government, we have to have a Premier who is prepared to put it on the line in the House of Assembly, the people's House, and speak to the people, speak to the members, and not just get in front of the television set with a paid hack interviewing him as he smiles to the camera and everything goes well. What a dishonest way! I do not use the word dishonest in a - what a deceitful way of getting to the people. You have to put your programme in the House of Assembly you have to get up man-fashion and defend it and not hide away, not hide away in the Common Room when your turn is to speak, not go away on a little trip, not run off. One day a week in the House, in the Confederation Building and let the government go on, not when your elected to run the affairs of the Province. Shame! Mr. Chairman, the Premier, if he has any decency, would resign. Resign! Call a general election and let the people decide who they want for Premier, let the people decide. Let us have a new House of Assembly, let us all have a new House of Assembly and come back because what has happened in the past few months here is that the government does not have the troops. Fourteen is what you have; the rest you cannot depend on. You cannot run a government. The ministers are run ragged, the ministers that I know, the few over there who are conscientious are run ragged trying to do their job in the House of Assembly and to try to do their work as ministers. They cannot do it properly. It is very hard because there is twenty here and there is twenty-nine over there and it is very hard for twenty-nine to handle twenty. Very difficult. You need more people, you need more muscle on the other side in order to handle what you are doing and in order to convince me vote for a \$150 million loan, you are going to have to have a stronger crowd over there, someone who can administer \$150 million.

I have just, by way of diversion, picked up a magazine called Wine Rack, and to carry on from the remarks that my

DR. KITCHEN: from the remarks that my hon. colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was making - not really though - this is a magazine that is put out by the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation and it has everybody's picture in it. This is a Province that is in financial shape that is bad, and they publish pictures of all the staff - I do not know where they distribute it - advertise various amounts of liquor, this one retiring and that one retiring. This is the sort of stuff that you get from a large corporation making a boodle of money. How does it help this Province to publish that magazine? It does not help us one iota, it does not help us a bit but it does cost us money and this is what I mean by trusting that crowd with money. How can you trust them when they waste money publishing everybody's picture up in the Board of Liquor Control when they should not be doing it. There is need of that; civil servants are paid, they do not have to get their picture in the paper every second day or every second month. There is no need of this magazine, there is no need of it! It does not talk about government policy, it does not talk about anything, it is just pictures. It is all unnecessary. And when I look through this and I see the seventeen varieties of Screech, or whatever it is, and how it is changing its form - big deal! Is this what this government is famous for, for changing Screech, for new varieties of liquor? Is this the alcoholic government, the government that is going to make even better alcohol, going to seduce ever more Newfoundlanders into being alcoholics? Is that what it is for? Is this what this magazine is for, to sell more booze to more Newfoundlanders? If that is what it is for then we should stop and think about what we are doing; think about what we are doing, because all we are doing is making it possible, making it necessary for the Department of Health, the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation to come out and pick up the tab. On the one hand we are encouraging people, we are encouraging people to drink, and we should not be doing that. It is all right perhaps to tax people who do but we should certainly not be encouraging people to drink and certainly we should not be wasting money putting people's pictures in the paper and at public expense

DR. KITCHEN: the profit from the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation should be going directly into revenue and no part of that should be taken over for fancy in-house publications with people's pictures in the interior of the stores and bottle shapes and which wines are good, which wines are bad and all this old stuff. This is a pure waste of government funds and whoever is in charge of the liquor store - I suppose he is out celebrating his anniversary tonight. Maybe the Wine Rack might be a good thing, but this should certainly not be something that we publish. I would like for the government to look at all their publications and see how many of these can be cut out. It is a small matter but I thought that at the first opportunity I should get up and bring it to the attention of the House. There are many others too, I might add, not containing facts but containing exhortations to drink and things of that nature, It is not the way the thing should be; it is far from being what should be.

Now coming to these financial advisors, coming back to them again because it is very serious this question of who should advise the government: Who should advise the government on its financial procedures? There is no doubt that we need some financial advisors who are skilled in the money market, but if a financial advisor has been proven to be wrong - as was the case in the Labrador Linerboard mill; wrong, dead wrong - then he should be fired. Get rid of him and get somebody else. You cannot slip in a field like that. They made an error, a gross error, a serious error, so serious - well, you could only know how serious it was if you had been over on the West Coast to see what was a great town suddenly collapse. I have seen a great many towns collapse in my time. I have seen Harbour Grace collapse - that was the Premier's first mistake. I cannot blame it all on him, that is true. I cannot blame it all on him but part of it we can. When he left and they sold out to the Lever Brothers firm, they came in and they chickened out and they left and this great expansion from fifteen - what was it? Harbour Grace had about three or four or five thousand people, depending on how much the harbour you take in; the plan was to make it fifteen thousand people, these great elaborate plans, and then she folded in, she folded inwards then and it collapsed when they took off

DR. KITCHEN: because the price of fish went down in the United States as a result of something or other. And now he is expecting us to get on with something else, but I believe that when a major plant folds as a result of bad financial advice that was given to this government then the government should look at its financial advisors and hold them accountable. How come you gave us this bad advice? wherever the advice came from. How come? Give them a chance and then if they cannot live up to it pitch them out. We do not need advice like that and certainly we should not be paying for it and paying through the nose for it, too. Financial advisors do not come very cheaply either. It is a hard, hard thing when you cannot get financial advisors to do their job as they should do it.

I want to say a word now about Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, the fat calf, the fatted calf, the prodigal son. We got rid of one, One is going, the chief man; he could not stand the heat either, He could not bear for his name to be mentioned in public so he took off. Good riddance, I say, good riddance. Any person who is head of a government or who is head of a corporation and cannot defend the policies of that government or corporation should not be head of that corporation or that government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who are you speaking about?

DR. KITCHEN:

I am speaking about the person who was head of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, who was the president, chief executive officer, chairman of the board - you name it! - the person who was getting all sorts of emoluments, the most highly paid person on the public payroll in the Province, I think. I am not sure about that because there may be people tucked away that I do not know about, but the people that were open, that was the most highly paid person. I would like to find out, for example, what the contract of the new person might be, too. Is it more or is it less or is it the same? These things should be tabulated, they should be part of public policy. It is the right of members in the House of Assembly to get the full story on the financial position of the Province. What is the point of hiding it away? What are we protecting by hiding these things away so that they cannot come out? The

Dr. Kitchen: Minister of Mines and Energy talked about a contract or a proposal that he made to Ottawa. I asked him in the House for a copy. "Write me." I wrote him. He told me one had been tabled two years before and that the other one was confidential. And he keeps talking about this proposal that he has made to Ottawa. Why does he not table it? What is so funny about it? What is so secretive about it? Why do these things have to be kept secret? Why do they not be shown and let the people know what the proposal is so we can all go to bat for it. Gee Whiz! It is no good telling me that it is the federal government who is the obstacle. How do I know unless I see what he is fighting for. If that is a good proposal that you sent to Ottawa, and we see copies of it, and we agree with it, then we will help you fight it. Ottawa is not for us. Our loyalty and your loyalty is to this Province. And if Ottawa is in your way, preventing you from getting a good contract or a good deal on the development of the Lower Churchill then tell us what you propose, and if we agree with your proposal then we might very well fight for your proposal, publicly and privately.

MR. PECKFORD: Who is this 'we'?

DR. KITCHEN: This 'we' is this side of the House of Assembly. We will do that. Why would we not? We will do these things. But if you hide it away, squirrel it away, we do not even know if you are telling the truth. We do not know if you are telling the truth that you have got a proposal. I do not know if you got a proposal. Every time we ask for it we cannot see it or get a copy of it, so I presume you have not got one. Prove it! Show us!

It is like the Minister of Fisheries and his telegrams to Mr. LeBlanc. They have to be tabled. We have to know them. Normally you would trust a person when they say they did it. You would say, yes. But Gee Whiz! The record of this government is such that you have to have documentation, and even then the documentation is not very

Dr. Kitchen: good. We heard about a contract that we had with Mr. Dobbin. We even had a copy of it. The Leader of the Opposition tabled a copy. The Premier's signature was on it; Frank D. Moore's was written on it. I saw it and it looks very much like his signature. And I saw Mr. Dobbin's signature on it. I saw it. I cannot be sure it was his signature because I have never seen his signature, but no one denied that it was his signature.

PREMIER MOORES: Can you control all that support you have around you?

DR. KITCHEN: But what happened was that the signature meant nothing. We have got a crowd, Mr. Chairman, a crowd whose signatures on a piece of paper have no meaning, and this is the crowd that expect us to give them \$150 million to go and borrow and pay 10 per cent and 11 per cent in the markets of the world, 10 per cent and 11 per cent so that our children and our grandchildren and our great grandchildren forever are going to be paying off this debt so that we can trust you to spend some more money. Not one red cent will we get some proof that you need it, and that we can trust you. We dare not, we dare not advance any money, we dare not vote for any money. This House, every member here who cares for this Province I believe that the Minister of Health has a deep feeling for this Province - how can you trust that Premier with \$150 million? That is something you are going to have to square with your conscience if you vote for this bill. Never mind what side of the House you are on. That has nothing to do with this question. It should not. This is your grandchildren and your great grandchildren, this \$150 million loan that we are going to be asked to vote for here and you are going to have to answer to your grandchildren on it. And so are we all. Every single person is going to have to answer for this.

DR. KITCHEN: We are not going through a little ritual here, where this one says, yes, and this one says, no. Every man has to answer to the people around him, to his electorate, to himself, to his family. This is what honour means, when you can look them in the eye and say, "I did it, and this is why I did it." Not like the Premier, the Premier cannot look at us, he cannot get up and defend why he wants \$150 million. He does not know why he wants \$150 million.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The reasons were in the estimates. You are joking.

DR. KITCHEN: He cannot tell us why he wants \$150 million. We can read the estimates, but that does not tell us half enough. It tells us very little. I have got it all written down here. What does it tell us? Health Sciences Complex \$4, 789,000. What do they want to do with that? Who is going to get that? Another few bucks for Scrivener to come back to the government.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You are only now asking, that?

DR. KITCHEN: Is that what you want? Never mind, I am asking now.

I am telling you, Sir, we cannot trust you with a cent, and we will not trust you with a cent.

MR. PECKFORD: You had 75 hours in the estimates. You are abusing the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: This is what the House is for, to make the points to the

DR. KITCHEN: people. The Premier, if he had a nerve, if he had a gut, if he had a word, a tongue in his cheek, if he had anything he would not ask the Chairman to get up on his feet and bump me off because he has got seniority. I was up on my feet first. He got up, he bumped me off. He said, "I am going to speak." So I sort of laughed at him, he told me he wanted to speak, he told me previously he wanted to speak. So he wanted to speak, What did he want? He wanted to adjourn the debate. He wanted to get back into the House so that then he could have a little thing that would go on all night and all night and all night. This is the problem that we have, you see, this is the whole question: When you have a government that cannot be trusted with a cent, how can you trust him with five bucks or \$10, or \$100, or \$1,000. My gosh, I suppose we would not mind a few dollars, would we? But they are not asking for \$1,000 or \$100,000 or \$1 million or \$100 million but \$150 million. \$150 million is what they want to borrow. That is only small stuff because they are also going to tax us for another \$850 million that we are going to have to pay in taxes and then there is another few hundred million dollars that they are going to get from Ottawa. This crowd spend money? You cannot trust this crowd to spend money. You cannot trust them to do anything.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Are you going to hold on or keep her going?

DR. KITCHEN: Keep her going. There is no rush. We are here all tomorrow and the next day and the day after and the day after that. It is a wonderful bill we are on. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that we can do now what the government would not allow us to do in the estimates: We can go over each item, item by item, and I am not going to speak for the Leader or the House Leader, but my recommendation to them might very well be this, that we do what we could not do, we were not permitted to do - because there was no debate on the estimates; we had to use the estimates to debate the budget which had not been called. We did that, now we can do the estimates in number 56, and that is what I believe

DR. KITCHEN: we should do, and then we will go down through.

Now just to start her off maybe we will get a few questions going. I would like to know who is going to get the contracts on those hospitals that are put forward here. We have got \$6,150,100; Buchans - \$125,000 on the Buchans Hospital, who is going to get the contracts for that? Are they going to be tendered?

MR. HOUSE: The tender is not overlooked.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh yes they do the tendering, the pretext of tendering.

DR. KITCHEN: Who are going to get the tenders?

Who are going to get the tenders? What about the Western Memorial Hospital, \$1,800,000? Are you going to put the Minister of Public Works, the present minister in on that, a man who is, unfortunatly, under a cloud? Is that what we are going to do? I think we should tidy up the act a bit before we can allow you fellows to borrow money and to be trusted with public money. You cannot do that. The people who administer the money have got to be above reproach while they are doing it. We are not judging guilt. We are just saying that there are certain proper procedures that anyone in a civilized society would go through and a person who is under a cloud stays clear until it is cleared up and then we go on through with the procedure.

Community clinics - \$400,000. Are they going to be tendered or is it going to be in \$10,000 lots or \$5,000 lots like other buildings? Is that what we are going to do, Give them out in \$10,000 lots until it makes up \$400,000? Is that what we are going to do? Rental purchases - \$1,299,100; General Hospital Rehab - \$500,000; Janeway Child Health Centre - \$1 million; Other, that is a good one, Other - \$500,000. I presume

DR. KITCHEN: the other is little bits, little fuses, little pieces of electrical equipment and panels and things. Maybe. I do not know what it is.

MR. C. POWER You sound like Roger Simmons.

DR. KITCHEN: It does not matter who we sound like, the truth is there. The truth is there that the credibility of this government is gone. There is no credibility. You have proven that you cannot manage money, you cannot manage money. You cannot handle it. You cannot handle it. The people do not trust you with money and certainly we will not trust you with money. If we could trust you with money, Sir, you would have it, provided we agreed with your programme. But the main point that we are trying to make here is that we cannot trust you fellows - not all of you, The Premier I am talking about and his close associates. He is the person who puts the Cabinet in place. I am not talking about all the members on the other side but I am saying this, that you are there. It is your responsibility and you are going to have to answer to whatever you answer to. Some people answer now, some people

DR. KITCHEN: answer years later; they believe in a different answering service. You answer to whoever you answer to, to your children, to your God, to whoever you answer to. But, by God, in this House you answer to us and you have not given any indications, and particularly am I upset with the Premier who will not get on his feet and tell us why he wants \$150 million and to justify this and to flick out those members of his Cabinet who are inefficient and who are under a cloud. For the time being flick them out. You have got to do that. That is the way it is done, that is the way it should be done. The people are more important than the party. It is more important to have \$150 million properly administered. We have no money in this Province to waste. I have a constituent, I keep mentioning this constituent, who has not got a pair of shoes to go and look for work. The fellow is going around looking for work with his shoes out, an old pair of shoes with the taps out walking all over the ground with his bare feet. And he goes down to the Minister of Social Services and he says, "Well, the regulations are such and such you cannot do it." You go to the top civil servants - the same thing. Another lady I know the plaster is falling down in her house. She cannot afford to put the plaster up and she is frightened to death, afraid it will fall down in her bed and kill her, this plaster fourteen foot ceilings in the old part of St. John's. The plaster is falling down. She cannot fix the old ceiling; she has not got any money, she is on welfare. Go to the welfare, "Well, the way it is," says the bureaucracy and the minister, "We cannot pay for internal repairs. That is our policy. We do not pay for internal repairs." You do not pay for internal repairs?" "No, we pay for external." "Well, this is external. How can it be external if it is internal?" "It is external because the rain which came from the roof that you did not fix two years ago has loused up the plaster and the plaster is now in a very dangerous position in several bedrooms. Now will you fix it because it is caused by neglect on the outside?" Now that is

DR. KITCHEN:

the kind of rigmarole you to

do with the Department of Welfare. Now this is very important. Now the reason I mentioned these and we can give dozens and dozens and dozens of cases of people-we talked about students here for four or five days, an hour or so each day - the human plight of people who cannot afford to do what they want to do and the misery! - Now for everybody. There are three types of people in this Province right now: there are the people who have never had it so good like some of the people opposite, never had it so good, never had so much money in their lives, do not know how to spend it, take off, long trips, go, great. When the Summer comes they jump and go back and forth. Great. I am just as bad perhaps. But then you have another crowd who cannot go anywhere. They can hardly get enough to eat. I know families, not 50 per cent of the people but a substantial number, not just one or two cases, who have no furniture in their houses - a chair or two. It is unbelievable that in this day in age there can be people living - decent people, nothing wrong with them; decent honourable people, straightforward people with children - and they have no place for the youngsters to sit down. If one sits down the other six have to stand up or sit on the floor.

This is what is happening. And you want \$150 million, uncontrolled, where buddies get it, kickbacks, this sort of stuff, and you wonder why we have some difficulty in allowing you to clue it all up in a few minutes and take off, have a bit of sport for the Summer. I would not be doing my duty by the people who elected me, and I would not never get elected again if I did not mention these points in this House.

I know people whom this rate increase - you talk about Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro - that is your organization! and Newfoundland Light and Power too because that is the same as a public company because we are paying every cent that they make comes from the people of Newfoundland. I would like to know about their car policy, both of them. They told down in the inquiry - they did not tell me the truth down in the inquiry down there in the Public Utilities

July 4, 1978

Tape 5120 (Night)

DW - 3

DR. KITCHEN:

Board. I asked them this question are those cars: there is a certain number of cars down there that the vice-presidents have - each one of them has a personal car which they drive, they can take their children out, it is part of the deal they can drive out around, they can come to work in it or they can leave it home and come in a company car, it does not matter. But they drive this car that is

12329

DR. KITCHEN: their own personal car. That is in lieu of wages. They do not get paid enough so they give them this car. But I am not talking about that crowd. That is bad, that is really, really bad but the point has been made time and time again, I do not want to prolong that one, but I ask the question; what about the other guys who drive around in company cars? You know, the fellow who takes it home because he is on call, if he is called in in the night obviously he has got to have a car that works, and a company car; it makes sense when they explain. My question to them was this, "But listen, can he go and drive around his family during the day on his holidays in that car?" "No." "Is it ever done?" "No." Oh, no! Ask some of my colleagues that question about Newfoundland Light and Power. It is the same thing. If they do it, because every dollar that they spend in company gas is probably a cent or a fraction of a cent that is added on the bills of the people in St. John's West or whatever district you are from, and that is what is happening. I believe that the Minister of Mines and Energy has got to look at these power companies. Never mind sloughing it off on the Public Utilities Board. They are just a bunch of overworked accountants, largely. They do not examine what is going on. They only administer the policies that the government sets. I am not knocking them. They are doing the best they can but we cannot in this House of Assembly, the Premier nor his ministers cannot slough it off on a third party, an intermediary, and say we have no responsibility. We cannot play this Pontius Pilate game. For years, and it is still going on, it has been going on in education, "Blame it on the DEC's," and I do not want to get into the education bit now, but it is the same kind of a buffer that they have been using in education. And I know you fellows did not create that, it was created by somebody else, but it is there. It was there and I am not saying we should do it, but we can do away with it in this Light and Power thing. There is no need of it. There is no constitutional provision here. I believe the minister should look

DR. KITCHEN: at this, the way cars are used and the way these things operate, every bit about it. There should be no wasted money by these public corporations because every cent, every dollar, every hundred dollars wasted, up goes the light bill in the district, a little bit, just a little bit, and every time the light bill goes up some widow, here is the one that the minister was talking about, some widow is finding that there is that much less she can buy to eat this week. And with the price of meat - talking about the price of meat, let us talk about the Department of Consumer Affairs. I have not made a study of what the Department of Consumer Affairs does, so some of the things I will say may not be too appropriate, but what I want to say is this, that if the Department of Consumer Affairs is not doing what I think they should be doing then they should get power from this legislature to do these things. And on the question of prices, how much price gouging is going on in this town? I believe there is a lot of price gouging going on in the supermarkets in this town. I believe there is. And I do not know if it is the provincial responsibility or the federal responsibility, I do not care whose it is, I know the job is not done to the point where someone who gouges should darn well pay for it. And when I look at some of the profits - I looked at it in the Financial Post. I do not know if I should say this, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, but the Opposition Office gets the Financial Post, right?

MR. W. ROWE: Right.

DR. KITCHEN: It comes to us and we can read it. Otherwise I would not be able to afford to read it, but we read it. And we look at the 300 companies listed this week, 300 companies, and I looked at the profit margin for Dominion Stores, one of the most profitable companies on a share earnings basis in Canada. Can you imagine that? It is a good company, I am not knocking Dominion Stores because prices

DR. KITCHEN: there are lower than they are somewhere else, but the fact is that they are making unusual profits and I do not believe that they should be making unusual profits in this Province. When I pay \$3.09 for a pound of cod tongues I know darn well there is something wrong in the supermarket.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should be out jigging, boy.

DR. KITCHEN: \$3.09. I have not got time. Our job is here. Our job is not out jigging or playing golf or that sort of thing, out fooling around. That is not our job. Our job is in this House watching the people's money and we have \$150 million to protect and we are going to protect \$150 million. We have to protect it until you can prove to us that you can be trusted with money. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the record of this government on public trust and administering money is pretty bad, is pretty bad. It can be a lot better. And I for one am certainly not going to vote for this bill. There is no way that I can vote for this bill. I would like to have a government which has a philosophy, that knows where it is going, that knows what it wants to do and why it wants to do it. The Minister of Fisheries

Dr. Kitchen: talks about all of the capital investment he is going in the fishery, but when I look at it I see \$12 million. What in the world can you do with \$12 million in the fishery? Nothing! If he were to get up here I would like to hear the Minister of Fisheries give - this is an area perhaps where we could. The Minister of Fisheries, as far as I know there is nothing surrounding him, maybe he can make a very good case for an expanded programme. I would be prepared to lend perhaps the Minister of Fisheries a few dollars. I think I would, providing that the boats were not out on tender administered by Public Works; that is one thing I would not want. But that may be something. If you can get up and defend your programme and tell us why you want to borrow the money, your capital expenditures, put it on the line, tell us why, and we look at you, the minister who is proposing it, we size you up to see if we can trust you - we cannot trust the Premier because he is in charge of the who shebang; he cannot even get up and defend his policies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! You have about half a minute.

DR. KITCHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will conclude my remarks because I understand that it is possible for one to have another few words at a later time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: After listening to the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), Mr. Chairman, it is no question whatsoever as to the reason why so much time is being wasted in this House. If there was ever an illustration of why more hospitals, and better medical care is needed, I do not think I need go any further than to have some one listen to what we just heard. The quality of education certainly needs to be studied. The fact is that the hon. member for St. John's West made a great many comments, obviously he cannot read the Budget, he cannot use the estimates. The fact is that this sort of resolution has never been debated to any degree in any House before. The Budget and the estimates are used for that purpose, but the Opposition in their use

Premier Moores: of the time in the House, for whatever purpose they see it for, obviously saw fit not to use the proper time to find out the fiscal information regarding the Province.

Well, Sir, regarding the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), I get the feeling that he does not really like me very much. But then again, Sir, if we review the history and the past, I suppose that is understandable. I remember, Sir, very well the first nominating convention of Bonavista-Trinity-Conception when he ran against me as the P.C. candidate for the federal riding. I remember in the Leadership Convention for the P.C. Party when he ran against me for that. It was at that stage, Sir, he began to be known as "10 per cent Herb." The fact is, Sir, in elected office the man never got 50 per cent in his life. He had to have a three way vote in order to get in. And when he talked about my term as National President of the party of Canada, which I resigned from to come home to Newfoundland because that is what I wanted to do, that is a distinct difference than his career in a political party as president when he was kicked out of that party both as president and as a member of the party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, the money is needed this year, the reason is spelled out in the Budget, and it is there for all to see. The Opposition it is all very well for them to say that we want more roads paved in our district, we want more water and sewerage in our district, and 90 per cent of the members opposite have to come to me at one time or another and said I would particularly like this road done in the district or this other thing done in the district, but then they say, "do not borrow money to do it; wave a wand," and they have got to make up their minds. They talk about the debt that this government has run up, and the fact is it was \$900 million when we took office, and if we never borrowed a nickel it would be \$1,800,000 today just in accumulated interest.

MR. PECKFORD: One billion, eight hundred thousand.

PREMIER MOORES: One billion, eight hundred thousand.

MR. PECKFORD: \$800 million.

PREMIER MOORES: \$800 million rather.

The fact is that that debt would have doubled on its own, but for political reasons it is so easy to say, "You should not have bought back Brinco." Should we have bought back Brinco? The Opposition say it was the greatest failure that this government ever had. I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, why it was not. We bought back the rights on the water resources of Labrador so that in the future they could be developed for the people of this Province and not be developed by any private enterprise for monetary gain in any deals with other provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that

PREMIER MOORES: this was one of the probably greatest moves by this government or any other government that will ever be in office because, Sir, we were buying back our heritage, buying back the water rights of our Province so that they could never, never again be given away against the wishes of the people which any government will represent. The fact is, Sir, that never in the future will there be any giveaways unless the government directly does it. They will not be victims of Brinco or anybody else - And Brinco is a good company, but when they have dividends to pay, when they have profits to earn, the taxpayer of Newfoundland is not their first responsibility. The fact is, Sir, today whether it be the Lower Churchill, whether it be Lobstick, whether it be any other hydro development in Labrador, not one of them will go ahead unless it is for the benefit of this people.

And the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) is getting worked up again. And here he was - not \$100, not \$1000, \$1 million, \$100 million! You were in the Cabinet too long; it got to you.

DR. KITCHEN: Not a copper! Not a copper!

PREMIER MOORES: It is nice to see Mr. Smallwood's prodigy, Mr. Speaker, but with a great deal of less success, there is no question about it.

DR. KITCHEN: I got you up on your feet.

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member did not get me up on my feet. The hon. member for so many times was on the floor he does not know the difference when one stands naturally and when one finally makes it. The fact is, Sir, regarding Brinco and regarding the Lower Churchill, the fact is, Sir, that these rivers, this hydro development and this resource in the future is now controlled by the people of this Province and that is the way it should be. The fact is in Labrador Linerboard mill, the history of its conception and how it was developed is the saddest story of financial spending in the history of this Province. I suppose even in the two months that the hon. member lasted in the Cabinet - the unelected member of the Cabinet, about the only way he would ever get in

PREMIER MOORES: the Cabinet, Mr. Chairman, but the fact is that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: He smiles! He smiles! Even if the Opposition formed the government, Mr. Chairman, I doubt even then if the hon. member would be in the Cabinet. However, having said that, Sir, the fact is that Labrador Linerboard mill, the wood costs and the method for it were ill-conceived, the product hit a market at a time when it was very depressed; the fact is that the product was too expensive at the time when the markets were very low. The future for the mill has got a good chance. I do not think that there is any question that put in the proper management hands, put in the proper perspective by people who do want to make a profit, and I do not think that is a bad word, given the access to the wood to make sure that the supply is there, I do not think there is any question but the mill at Stephenville will get back on its feet.

Now, Sir, when we talk about why is the \$150 million necessary, as I said a few moments ago members of the Opposition, the members on this side all want things done in this Province. The government's role really is not to operate industry, it is not to operate business, it is to provide service where private capital can flourish within an environment. Roads have to be paid for, schools have to be paid for, water and sewerage, health facilities, fisheries facilities, forestry facilities and all the other capital projects that have to be done. That takes money, and to say that the Opposition is not going to vote for money and at the same time say that they want certain things done, Mr. Chairman, they just cannot do both nor will they. The hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) said, "We will not give you authority to do." I know, Mr. Chairman, that he believes in anarchy. The only problem is that he believes in anarchy only if he is leading it. I have said that before and it happens to be true. I think there are members on the other side who will agree with me. The fact is, Sir, that in the past there was mass misdirection in this Province, both industrially

PREMIER MOORES: where we saw more harebrained schemes, and I think everyone admits them today, but we tried to build up an economy based on things that we did not have in this Province. And in those days the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) was raving from the roof tops -

DR. KITCHEN: What happened in Labrador? What about the \$2 million (inaudible).

PREMIER MOORES: - raving from the roof tops that he had to go, Smallwood had to go, and then bowed as best he could and whipped into the Cabinet, the opportunist to the last. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) does have his problems in his particular position.

DR. KITCHEN: There he is with all his faults.

PREMIER MOORES: However, Mr. Chairman, is it possible to ask the gentleman to be quite even for bubbling moment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) The Premier requests to be heard in silence. Let us observe that rule.

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that -

MR. NEARY: Are you like this in caucus meetings?

PREMIER MOORES: Some days. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we have seen in this House of Assembly - and I could go about

PREMIER MOORES: the need for the money: it is in the Budget, it is in the Estimates and it has been talked about many times. What we have seen in this House of Assembly for a couple of months now is the abuse of the House, in my opinion for political reasons, the abuse of the system for political reasons and I suggest, Sir, that whilst it can go on for a while it has to come to an end and come to an end quickly. Everyone should have a fair chance and, Sir, there is a lot to be done, but the Opposition's behavior has been obvious and someday I am sure when memoirs are written it will be admitted even by them.

Sir, as far as this government is concerned the people have to come first, not people who are power hungry for the sake of power. That is not enough, that is not enough, Sir. The fact is power at any cost will not do. The hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) and members of the Opposition talk about when the next election comes, and I can assure the hon. member there was never an election won on a poll yet and when the time comes we will see who will lose. Because when the time comes, Mr. Chairman, when the crunch comes do not think that the election is going to be won by comments in this House, by statements against other individuals or whatever the case may be. When the time comes we will be there, we will be there in spades. And the day we were underwritten in the beginning by Mr. Smallwood was the day that he found out that was a mistake. I suggest that, unlike some of the Opposition think, you are not appointed, you are elected and there are two years or a year and a half before even that happens. But, Mr. Chairman, we have seen an abuse of the House for the last couple of months. We have seen every trick in the book played and for that reason right now, Sir, the hon. Leader from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) - 'Leader'. Good God! - the president from St. John's West when the time comes to make his statement it will be nice to see them have to make them without immunity as establishment. For that reason, Sir, I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. NEARY: What a coward! What a coward!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the Committee have considered the matters to them referred, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, the sixteenth of November, 1978 at 2:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that the House adjourn until 2:00 P.M., November sixteenth, 1978.

Those in favour 'Aye', contrary 'Nay';

in my opinion the 'Ayes' have it.

MR. NEARY: What a crowd of cowards!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The House stands adjourned until Thursday, November 16, 1978 at 2:00 P.M.