

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Municipal Affairs, Sir, seems to be in a real traffic jam over the Avalon Regional Board. The minister let go broadsides at the city council this morning. Would the minister tell the House if he has explored the options that are open to him rather than force this thing down the throats now of the people who live in the communities outside of St. John's? Has the minister looked at the alternatives and if so would the minister tell the House what these alternatives are?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the regional government bill, it has been discussed with every municipality in the region. All the concerned citizens groups that wanted to meet, all the members for the region that requested meetings, as a matter of fact all the members from the region on this side met twice a month every month since last June and discussed the regional government bill. We think we have a great piece of legislation here and any concerned citizens groups, any municipality that wants to meet with me would but have to call my office and the door is always open to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman asks a supplementary I would like to welcome to the galleries on behalf of hon. members forty Grade VII students from the L.R. Ash Elementary School in Lethbridge accompanied by three of their teachers, Mr. Frank Winsor, Mr. Louis Williams and Mrs. Ann Penny. I know hon. member join

MR. SPEAKER:

me in welcoming these students and their teachers to the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs just indicated, Sir, that there seems to be unanimity within the boundaries of the area that will be affected by regional government and in actual fact, Sir, I do not know if that is true or not. But would the minister indicate because of the growing opposition to the bill and the way the board would be established if the minister would consider instead of ramming the bill through this session circulating a White Paper to give those people who are affected by it an opportunity to air their grievances, why they object to it. Instead of the bill have a White Paper this session.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, a study was started in the St. John's urban region in 1972. That study was commissioned by the provincial government. Proctor and Redfern and several other consulting firms had input to it. They had input from all the people in the area and they came up with regional services that were required within the St. John's or Northeast Avalon Urban region. Then we set up a commission known as the Henley Commission and they went out and discussed with all of the councils, all of the current concerned citizens groups and got their input from those people and made recommendations which we received in January of last year.

MR. DINN:

We then, Mr. Speaker, brought bill 101 into the House last year and we saw in the bill at that time there were some discrepancies. So we did not push the bill last year. We have had from last June all the way up until this June for the councils or anybody else to come in and discuss and make recommendations with respect to the Northeast Avalone Urban region. I met with the council four times or different councillors two times and the full council twice and they came in and made their recommendations and we acceded to their wishes in some areas.

One of the things that the council talked about was the expansion of the City of St. John's which has nothing to do at all with regional government per se. What we are talking about here is the unincorporated areas plus regional services which the regional council will address itself to. So the other objection that the city had was one with respect to appointments on the board and they said we were going back 200 years because now the government was appointing a board to look after the region. What we have now is a metroboard that is totally an appointed body. And what we felt in the interests of progressing, in the interest of having the citizens have some input to elected representatives that we would have two-thirds of the board elected. This was recommended by Mr. Henley in his report. We need to get on with providing regional services to the Northeast Avalon Urban region and we have no intention at this time to go with a White Paper. We think that since 1972 up to 1978 it is time now for action and we intend to provide the appropriate legislation to form this regional council and get on with the regional services

June 1, 1978

Tape 3794

IB-4

MR. DINN:

that are so badly needed in the St. John's or the
Northeast Avalon Urban region.

MR. NEARY: I have a couple of supplementaries, just
two quick supplementaries.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for
LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I will ask one first. In view of the
opposition that seems to be mounting over this bill and
this move by the government would the minister indicate
if

MR. S. NEABY:

he feels that it would be more democratic to hold a referendum in the areas that are affected and let the people decide for themselves whether they want to go the route that the Minister has outlined in the Bill or if they want to take some other route after doing an educational program preceding a referendum would the Minister not agree that a referendum would be sensible and more democratic, the best way to decide this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. J. DINN: If we waited in order to get things done in Newfoundland by going to referendums all the time I do not think we would get anything done. The fact of the matter is, in 1976 this region was in a very bad state with respect to, for example, water. We had an emergency situation in the St. John's urban region and the Northeast Avalon urban region with respect to drinking water. There was no planning done nor were the City capable of planning for the region. We had to do that down in the Department of Municipal Affairs with the assistance of the Engineer from the City, engineers from Mount Pearl and other areas, Conception Bay South. We had to provide that planning expertise. We think it is time now that we get a board together, a regional council together, to provide this kind of planning. We do not think it is the responsibility of the Provincial Government to do all. We think that the regional council should be formed, we think they should do the planning, and we do not think that we should have another emergency situation as we had in 1976 with respect to this region and a shortage of water, and other items that we see down the road with respect to, for example, sewerage disposal. If we depended upon the City of St. John's to provide the planning for sewerage disposal for this region we would have a disaster on our hands right now. We have the plans done for that, we are implementing most

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3795

PT-2

MR. J. DINN: of these plans, we have some \$50,000,000 that has been expended over the past three or four years in the region to provide these services, and we think that it is time now for a regional council to be formed to provide the planning, to plan for services so that we do not have the situation we had in 1976 with respect to shortage of water, not enough sewerage disposal facilities. And we intend to get on to other things like solid waste disposal because we think, for example, that Robin Hood Bay in this day and age when we have 130,000 people dumping in that area, we think it is time for that to change, we think it is time for somebody to be put in place to start planning these regional services, get on with the job, and get away from the disgraces that we have right now in the Northeast Avalon urban region with respect to water and sewer and major services. We do not think it is time for a White Paper, we think the day for White Papers is gone with respect to this -

MR. S. NEARY: A referendum is what I suggested.

MR. J. DINN: - and referendums is only delaying the day, delaying the planning, and delaying the things that we need in the Northeast Avalon urban region. I, for one, think that this regional government thing is a forward piece of legislation and a thing that we think, and all of the MHA's from the region think -

DR. H. KITCHEN: (inaudible)

MR. J. DINN: - and I have not had the opportunity to speak to the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), he has not asked me for a meeting, and if he had asked me for a meeting he could walk into my office on any day and go through from Section 1 to Section 149 discuss anything with respect to regional government, but he had no input at all nor did he want to provide input nor does it appear that he wants to see the Northeast Avalon region progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3795

PT-3

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

I believe the hon. gentleman for St. John's West also has a supplementary.

DR. H. KITCHEN: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously, Sir, nothing that we say or do is going to persuade the hon. gentleman to change his mind. The hon. gentleman appears to want to ram this regional government down the throats of the people in the area. But, Sir, opposition is mounting and I would suspect that it is going to be more savage than the spruce budworm controversy when it starts to get going. Now that the bill has been tabled in the House and made public does the Minister not think now rather than ram it through the House in the next week, or ten days, or two weeks, that it would be better just to let the bill lie on the Table of the House until - the Premier has indicated that we are going to have a Fall session, I do not know if he made the statement off the cuff or whether the hon. gentleman was serious or not - and wait until we come back, if we do come back, if we ever come back, and then debate the bill and give people a chance to think it over, think about it, educational

Mr. Neary: programme and lay the bill on the Table of the House in the meantime, would that not be the sensible thing to do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Good! Good!

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

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it may be sensible to the hon. gentleman. But, I think, from 1972 to 1978 to let it go for another six months is prolonging the inevitable. The fact of the matter is that the people in this region are crying for services. They want the services. There is not a voice, I have not heard one voice from outside of the city say for a Mr. Fahey who is not an elected member anywhere, and the only voice that I have heard, I have not heard one voice outside of the City of St. John's that does not want regional government. And the fact of the matter is, is that the people in St. John's should not be given the responsibility for providing services to Conception Bay South. We think that a regional government should do that. And the hon. the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) should be standing on his feet right now, Mr. Speaker, and -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. DINN: - supporting the regional government concept, because

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - Conception Bay South is one of the areas that, we think, needs services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And that is one of the areas that will get services, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.? The hon. the member for Conception Bay South a supplementary.

June 1, 1978

Tape 3796

PK - 4

Mr. W. Rowe: the power, Sir, to do a great number of other things to people living in this whole region, why does

MR. W. ROWE:

the government feel that one-third of this council or this group should be appointed by the government rather than being elected by the people who they are supposed to represent.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question coming from the hon. member. Obviously he was around when Metroboard was around and he was around when Metroboard was started. Why was Metroboard put in there and totally appointed by the government of the Province? He should answer that question. What I am saying is that two-thirds of the regional council will be elected and they will be representative of all of the people in the region.

And there is another question, the question of why do we not put people from city council on the regional council. Well I polled members of the city council before the November election last year and I can name names but I will not because it may be embarrassing, I polled representatives of council and they said if it was just metroboard and they just had responsibility for the unincorporated areas yes we would serve but what you are getting into in the unincorporated areas is providing services, the responsibility for the regional water system, the responsibility for regional sewage disposal, possibly the responsibility for solid waste disposal and all of these things. And we think, and this is from the city councillors themselves at that time, we think that it would be too awesome a responsibility that we are not full time people, that we have other business interests to perform.

So I said, okay, how do I get around this. How do I get representation from the city.

MR. DINN:

The way to get representation is to allow elections under the City of St. John's Act which allows the mayor of the city of St. John's to run for the regional council and any other councillor who wants to or feels that they can serve the city as well as serve the regional council, any other councillor or the mayor to run and get elected if the people so desire to have them on the regional council.

So this was the way that I found to be the best way to provide for representation not only within the city but outside the city and we reserve the right as is recommended by the Henley Report who by the way looked into this and sought the advise of all of the councils and all of the committees in the area, sought their advise and came up with the recommendation which said, that the chairman and four of us should be appointed because there is such a great need in the Northeast Avalon Urban region for service, for provisioning of this service that we need some control, operation, maintenance and management of these major systems and also some control and planning for the unincorporated areas.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. W. ROWE: The hon. minister, Sir, will not answer the question. Why does he not allow all the councillors to be elected? Sir, it is not this bill so much although there are very serious items in it which I disagree savagely with. It is the minister's attitude, Mr. Speaker, stiff-necked and arrogantly over there talking about what he is going to do, Sir, and he with the power and the government with the power on his advise to nominate or place in position one-third of this council

MR. W. ROWE:

with these massive powers, Sir. That is the worrisome part of this whole effort going on here today and the thing that worries the city council obviously and other councils as well.

Let me ask the minister this since he will not answer the question as to why all the councillors cannot be elected in the normal democratic fashion. Did all the councils that are going to be within the region or are within the region, did all the councils have sent out to them the proposed draft bill over the last number of months? What was it? Just the city council here or did - in other words how widely disseminated was the draft bill or the proposed bill in setting up this regional council?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there has been much said about the proposed draft. The proposed draft was an input that was provided -

MR. NEARY: Bill 101.

MR. DINN: - by all the councils in the region, recommendations that they made plus all the members in the St. John's Urban region -

MR. NEARY: False! False!

MR. DINN: You never let me finish. Mr. Speaker, do I have to put up with interruptions when I am speaking in the House.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes if you are not telling the truth

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

The point I was going to make is that the matter will progress, I think, with more clarity if hon. members do not interrupt.

MR. DINN: All of the members of the St. John's Urban region that wanted to provide input -

June 1, 1978

Tape 3797

IB-4

MR. NEARY: False!

MR. DINN: - were given the opportunity to provide
input. All they had to do was send it to me and -

MR. NEARY: You are lying.

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

I must call upon the hon.

gentleman to withdraw that statement.

MR. NEARY: May I have a word of explanation or shall I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I would ask hon. gentlemen not to intervene. We are in a situation when at times hon. members say things in the heat of debate or in a reaction which under meditation I feel quite sure they would not say. There may have been incidents where that type of allegation was made and some discussion on that held thereon. In my opinion it is the type of allegation which if the quorum of the House is to be maintained and the integrity of all hon. members maintained should be withdrawn without any intermediary explanations or statements, that it should withdrawn full stop.

The hon. member.

MR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that and may I raise now a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. gentleman on a point of privilege.

MR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, at no time have I ever been approached by the hon. minister or by any of his colleagues with respect to this bill nor has any copy been sent to me nor has any proposed bill been sent to me and for that reason, Sir, I raise a point of privilege with respect to this question. I would like the hon. minister to withdraw these remarks by saying that all members have been approached and passed copies.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. minister concerned speaking in reply.

MR. J. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to that point of privilege obviously I did not go to every person in the region. The Bill 101 was presented to this House of Assembly last year and anyone who wanted, who was interested and wanted to provide input to me was received in my office. There was never a time that the hon. member approached me that I would not see him, there was never a telephone call that I did not get back to him; Mr. Speaker, that is the context in which I said that hon. people, hon. members or anybody who

MR. DINN: wanted to have input to this bill was provided the opportunity to have input. Mr. Speaker, along with that the Newfoundland Federation of Municipalities last year held four public meetings in St. John's and all hon. members here on this side of the House and I believe - Did the hon. member - He went to one meeting I believe. The hon. member for Conception Bay South attended one of the meeting and by the way the hon. member for Conception Bay South also provided input verbally to me several times with respect to this piece of legislation. The hon. member for St. John's West had the opportunity and if he did not avail of it that is no fault of mine.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! On this particular matter I draw the attention of hon. members to May 343. I will read very briefly there from and I think that will show hon. members the approach which the Chair takes in this matter. "In regard to the explanation of personal matters the House is usually indulgent and will permit a statement of that character to be made without any question being before the House and later on no debate should ensue thereon but if another member is involved in the personal statement he is generally allowed to give his own view of the matter and to say whether he accepts it or not." I think that is the incident we are now in. The hon. member for St. John's West has on a personal matter made his submission. The hon. gentleman to my left who to a certain extent is involved has made his comments thereon and it is an instance in which an hon. gentleman makes a personal explanation under point of privilege but it is not in the technical sense a point of privilege upon which the Chair is required to make any decision as to prima facie or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I believe the hon. minister was answering the question when this matter came up.

MR. DINN: Yes that is right and I was rudely interrupted. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the answer to the question why do we need people on the board that are appointed? Well, we

MR. DINN: think it is a step forward to have two thirds of the board elected from the first point of view, the second point of view is that one third of the board being appointed -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible)

MR. DINN: And I am being harassed again by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) who seems to not want to abide by the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, and maintain silence when another hon. member is speaking. But with respect to four people plus the chairman being appointed to this board we have to this point in time involved ourselves in planning, in provisioning of service to the region. We spent as I indicated before just on water and sewer with the assistance of the federal government - and I do not want to minimize their assistance, with the assistance of the federal government some \$50 million in water and sewer. We think that we need to have some input, it was recommended by Henley, the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are involved, some of the funds are their funds and we think that they should have some input and the input that we think they should have are people on the board who will be appointed and that is one third. We at least have one third in the share of the facilities that are being provided and the services that are being provided so we think we should have people on there that we can talk to and say, this is what the government is prepared to do, these are your plans, we will take them in and you can advise us, and so on. So we think it is perfectly reasonable.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary from the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South. Then I will recognize the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. NOLAN: If I may, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The bill was tabled just yesterday I believe here in the House or the day before and what I would like to ask the minister is, did he give a copy of the proposed bill or the bill to the city of St. John's, any municipality or anyone else including members of the House prior to the tabling in the House? Secondly was it not true or is it not true that Holyrood was also to be included in this and why was it removed and was it at the instigation of his hon. friend to his right?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3799

AH-2

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question - did I give a copy of this piece of legislation to the city of St. John's or anyone else prior to it coming here to the House of Assembly and the answer to that is no. What we did give to the city of St. John's was a proposed draft which we gave to them in confidence, it was my idea, it was -

MR. NOLAN: Why not a proposed draft to the member of the House of Assembly?

MR. DINN: They asked for a copy of what we were proposing, Mr. Speaker, and in our discussions in writing down some of the recommendations, in some of the recommendations made by my colleagues on this side of the House we had something like 126 items in a proposed draft, a piece of legislation which the city of St. John's said "Can we have a look at it and make recommendations and make comments ourselves?" and I said, "Look my responsibility is to the House of Assembly and they are to receive legislation first but since this is only a proposed draft I will let you have it on a confidential basis because it is not the final bill." and lo and behold-that was a Thursday afternoon I believe at a meeting, lo and behold Monday morning it appeared in the Daily News and in other areas there were comments on what we had written down with respect to what we thought were some of the ideas we had on regional government. So, yes, we did give it to the city of St. John's, it was not the bill that we have before the House right now, it was the proposed draft which has been revised up to the time it came into the House of Assembly. We gave it to them on a confidential basis and somebody broke that confidence.

MR. NOLAN: Part two.

MR. DINN: Part two, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Holyrood. Holyrood right now is part of the Northeast Avalon Urban Region but we feel that regional government is not only for the city of St. John's, we think that there are going to be regional governments set up in Newfoundland, one for example we think may be the Burin Peninsula. The joint town and community councils of the Burin Peninsula have sent

June 1, 1976

Tape No. 3799

AH-3

MR. DINN: in many requests with respect to regional government on the Burin Peninsula . We are going to have a look at that in the next year or so and hopefully if we can meet some agreement as to what they can provide on a regional service basis or what they can do with respect to regional government we are going to sit down with them, talk to them over the next year and hopefully they will be next. We think that Holyrood for example, if we do have a regional government in that area will be one of the prime areas with respect to

MR. J. DINN: the other section for another regional government. We think it is more a part of that region that it is, for example, part of the Northeast Avalon or St. John's urban region. And yes, my hon. colleague from Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doody) did have some input there, the Holyrood Council had some input there, and anyone else who wants to have input on anything else had input with respect to that regional council bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I did state that I would recognize the hon. member for St. John's West next. Hon. member.

DR. H. KITCHEN: My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and it is on a different matter, a very serious matter possibly. It involves what appears to be an unusual practice, perhaps a scandal in the subsidized housing industry which hopefully he can clear up.

I understand that normally when the Government wishes to construct subsidized housing units they call for public tenders and various people bid on these units and then someone is chosen to construct them. The Minister might indicate in his reply that that is the normal pattern however it has been brought to my attention that in one or two instances at least, one possibly in Conception Bay and one possibly in Central Newfoundland, that developers have constructed homes under the AHOP programme which now are in the process of being purchased by this Government or one of its agencies as subsidized housing without tenders having been called. Can the Minister tell me if this is so and if it is so, why it is so, and is this another way of getting around the public tendering system?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to subsidized housing units there are several ways that subsidized housing units are built. One is by public tender and generally, by the way, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this, is done through CMHC and the Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. J. DINI: Housing Corporation if that is what the hon. member is talking about, public tenders, sometimes proposals because of specific designs, and in this respect what they do with the received proposals based on the design that they put forward and the designers, by the way, generally are CMHC. When they received these proposals in they either accept or reject and they go through a process, by the way, with respect to subsidized housing and public housing units with number (1) proposals on areas sometimes so that they can see if the local councils approve of the area first so they get proposals on areas and they get that approved or disapproved. Then they get proposals on units, say, forty units here or forty units there, thirty units here or twenty units there, and the type of unit and what will be required in that unit. That is another proposal call. Then they decide where they are going ahead with them and either agree jointly or disagree that it goes or it does not go and it is done through Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and CMHC and we have to have total agreement by both before it can go ahead.

With respect to two areas we have identified, we have not gone to public tender - we have identified areas. one is Bishops Falls, that we need public housing units and a private developer has built private units in Bishops Falls that meet the requirements of CMHC and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation with respect to what is in the unit and what the size is and what it can accommodate and whether there is a demand in the area for that kind of unit. At this point in time CMHC and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing are looking into the possibility of purchasing some of these units and, Mr. Speaker, if they do decide then they decide and we do not see any reason why when we have thirty or more units built when we have a demand for thirty or more units that we should go out and build them and not buy them from a private developer that has perfectly good units there. We do not have a demand for

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3800

BT-3

MR. J. DINN: eighty units, we do not see why the Government should go into competition with the private entrepreneur and put him out of business if he meets the conditions and if he meets the price then CMHC and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing will get together and if the conditions are perfect and right and the price is right then they will buy. But until those conditions are met then nothing will happen.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time has expired.

PREMIER MOORES: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order has been called.

MR. S. NEARY: - speaking on a personal matter.

PREMIER MOORES: Just one thing, Sir, and I do not mean to interrupt the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Referring to Question Period itself - nor is this a reflection on the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) or my hon. colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing - when the thirty minutes is up, Sir, I am just wondering if the Orders of the Day are called exactly on the thirty minutes or if the question and the answer is allowed to continue into thirty-five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: On that particular matter.

PREMIER MOORES: It is only for clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. On that particular matter my practice has been that if when the thirty minute moment comes a person is at the conclusion of his question then I allow the answer. If the answer goes on too long then I cut it off. But if a person is into his question then I do not leave it dangling and that is what happens when the thirty minutes comes up during a question. So it can on occasion go to thirty-three or something like that in that sense. Also if the thirty minute time comes when a person is in the middle of their answer then I allow them to finish again as long as the time does not get unreasonable. So that is a practice I have been using. I think it probably breaks fifty-fifty in favour of either questioners or answerers. Sometimes thirty minutes expires just when a person is finished their question. It would seem then appropriate to hear the answer. And also if the thirty minutes comes when a person is sort of in the middle of their answer I have allowed them to go on. But I have never allowed this to go on too long and I certainly do not allow any supplementaries or anything.

MR. SPEAKER:

But when the thirty minute point comes and if we are in the middle of something then I have allowed that matter to come to a reasonably quick conclusion. That is a practice that I have adopted.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement, Sir, on a personal matter.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of privilege?

MR. NEARY: Well not privilege, Sir, clarification on a personal matter. I want to indicate to the House that I am speaking for my hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave?

MR. NEARY: No, not by leave of the House. The Speaker just told us according to Beauchesne I can make a statement, any member can make a statement on a personal matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Well this is done usually by getting the Chair's attention on a point of privilege and the hon. member then makes the personal explanation. I think it is that way apart from unanimous consent that a person gets a recognition so to speak.

MR. NEARY: Sir, if I have to do it under a point of privilege - I do not want to, Sir, but I can do it that route I suppose.

MR. SPEAKER: Or I can ask hon. members, does the hon. gentleman have consent to make a personal statement.

MR. MORGAN: What is it the member wants to do?

MR. NEARY: Well I guess what order makes a difference.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I will be very brief if hon. gentlemen -

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. NEARY: I am speaking on behalf of my -

MR. SPEAKER: On what?

MR. NEARY: I am speaking on behalf of my colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and my colleague for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). What I want to do by the way is to thank a minister for something that he did for us this morning. Is that allowed?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. W. ROWE: You must thank the right minister.

MR. NEARY: Would that be all right?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well, if they are in agreement, Sir. The day before yesterday, Mr. Speaker, my colleague and myself approached the minister to ask the minister if he would allow us to go down to hangar No. 3 to have a look at the PBY, the Canso 'plane that the government bought and has now been delivered, and the minister advised us yesterday that he would agree to do that and this morning the Director of Transportation, Mr. O'Brien, a very fine gentleman, was made available to my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and my colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and we went down to hangar No. 3, we examined the aircraft and then we had a meeting with the Director of Air Services in his office with the Director of Transportation there, a very interesting meeting for well over an hour -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: - no, it is a first - for an hour and a half. Some interesting questions were asked and some interesting questions will be asked in the future

June 1, 1978

Tape 3801

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: as a result of that meeting.
But what I want to do is to thank the Minister of
Transportation for his co-operation in this matter and
for making Mr. O'Brien available. I think this is the
kind of co-operation that we should have on both sides
of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I appreciate it very much.

MR. W. ROWE: - some interesting
information.

MR. NEARY: I appreciate it very much,
Sir. It clarified certain questions but it also brought
up other matters that we will be dealing with in due
course.

AN HON. MEMBER: - bring it over
to -

MR. NEARY: So really what I stood for,
Sir, was to thank the minister on behalf of my colleagues
for his co-operation.

MR. NOLAN: Do you want to reply to that?

MR. PECKFORD: In response to the hon. member's statement, as Acting House Leader for this House and on behalf of the Minister of Transportation and Communications I would like to say that we thank the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for the information that he has provided the House. I think I would be remiss in my duties if I did not go on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying that I hope that this in no way, shape or form sets a precedent so that in any other day any hon. member from either side of the House can get up after Orders of the Day have been called, and on a matter of personal information or information to the House, which does not come normally and technically under the rules, can rise in his place and give information concerning matters that had occurred in the House which might or might not be of interest to hon. members on that particular moment, because if it does set such a precedent then many of the normal rules that are to be followed in the House will be seriously jeopardized and it will be very difficult for us to operate.

MR. ROBERTS: It has been done before now.

MR. PECKFORD: But on behalf of the Minister of Transportation -

MR. NEARY: Are you jealous or what?

MR. PECKFORD: - and Communications, I would like to thank the hon. member for giving us the information that he does conduct meetings at various times in the course of his duties as a member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Now that the hon. member has been thanked, and thanked for being thanked, I do not think he will need any further thanks.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to have a few additional words to say on the budget. I have already had some time as members of the House and members of the House and members of the public will be aware. Indeed as the first speaker for the Opposition side I, on behalf of my colleagues, and I believe on behalf of all members of the House, am availing, I am availing of a time honoured tradition imbedded in the rules for a number of very good reasons of taking some extra time to put forth the Opposition position on the Budget.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, this is a rule which is imbedded in the House rules, in the Standing Orders, and Mr. Speaker, which was imbedded once again when the committee concerned last looked at the matter in the last two or three years. It was imbedded, Mr. Speaker, as I say for a number of good reasons. First of all because of course the principle of unlimited time is well established. That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be abused. It should not be abused by the member speaking, nor should it be abused by other members of the House. I say to the House now that it is not my particular intention to take an undue amount of time, I have already been speaking with some difficulty, some interruptions, interruptions from one day to the next and interruptions during the day, during the actual speech making itself. I first started to make this speech a week ago on Tuesday and I have had three occasions since then, four occasions altogether, and now this occasion today. And it is a little difficult, Mr. Speaker, when you start a speech on Tuesday and then nine days later you are still in the process of making it because the matter of continuity or train of thought, or continuity of thought comes into play. It is all the more difficult, Mr. Speaker, when you have some mischief making going on while you are trying to make your speech where you have people who come in with very extraneous points of privilege. A couple of members in particular

MR. SIMMONS: have taken an undue amount of the time of the House I think to get together something like three or three and a half hours of the time since I began speaking were taken by the member for Kilbride and the member for Grand Falls in making points of order and one monumental point of order you will remember, Mr. Speaker, which took an hour and fifteen minutes to settle, was whether or not there was a quorum in the House. That was raised by a member during the time which is ostensibly assigned to me and will be said to be part of the overall time I have spoken. Well of course let the record show for that hour and fifteen minutes, while we were waiting to educate the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) on the matter of whether there was a quorum, I was not speaking.

Mr. Simmons: I was sitting in my seat waiting for the matter to pass. I thought I should say that, Mr. Speaker, because it seems the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), in particular, is awfully concerned about the fact that I believe something of the order of eleven or twelve hours have elapsed since first I began speaking. And I repeat that is not to say that I have been speaking those many hours by any stretch of the imagination. But since I first began speaking since before these interruptions that I have mentioned to you.

I mention it for a couple of reasons, Mr. Speaker, first of all, that we do not abuse, Mr. Speaker, and I did not hear the member for Grand Falls today on the radio but I am told by people who did listen to the radio at lunchtime, and I was in a meeting, I am told that he was making some statements having to do with the length of my speech. And I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, I will not raise a matter of privilege on it now, but I will put it out as some food for thought for members of the House, I wonder if indeed the member for Grand Falls was not himself abusing the privileges of the House, if he has quoted from me correctly. I am wondering if he is not undermining in the public eye, Mr. Speaker, a very sacred principle embedded in the tradition and the rules of this House, namely, that there is a provision for unlimited time in our rule books, and for a couple of good reasons.

See, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, any Opposition, in any House of Parliament anywhere has only very few levers, and I think that is the term, very few levers, Mr. Speaker, to force a government to give its undivided attention, to an issue or issues which the Opposition feel are of import, which the Opposition feel at any particular moment in time are crucial and need immediate consideration. It can do that. It can bring the government's undivided attention to such an issue in one of two or three ways under the Parliamentary Rule Book, and one clear way obviously is on money bills. And last year, Mr. Speaker, we demonstrated that this lever is not only operative

Mr. Simmons: but that it works very, very well. And members of the House and people publicly will remember that last June I stood here in this place and I talked on a money bill, and then I sat down, and we were in Committee, and another colleague spoke, and then I stood up and spoke again, and so through the day from about 11:00 o'clock in the morning when I first began speaking until 5:30 in the afternoon we were really drawing attention to a matter that needed an immediate decision from the government. And I put to the House now, Mr. Speaker, a matter that would not have got an immediate decision from the government had it not been for the lever that we had on that money bill to hold that bill up until we forced the government to give its undivided attention to a very crucial and pressing issue. The issue you will recall at the time, of course, is still a very pressing and present issue, the issue of the Public Works spending practices. And as a result of using the parliamentary lever, and it is not something we have stolen, Mr. Speaker, it is not something we do with disgrace, it is something we do with honour, as members of this House who exercise not only our rights but our responsibilities, our responsibility to direct the government's attention, undivided attention to a crucial issue. And on that day, I believe, it was the 5th. or 6th. day of June last year I stood here, and I pointed out that we were not prepared to let that money bill go through until such time as the government agreed to a public enquiry into the way public money has been spent through through the Department of Public Works spending practices.

Well first of all we were told that it could not be done on that kind of thing, but to make a long story short, because I just want to use it as an example, the lever worked that day, the lever that we had under the rules of the House not by boycotting or by filibustering or by doing anything which is undignified, but by operating strictly and in the spirit of, strictly within, and in the spirit of the rules of this House we were able to do the public a big service, we the Opposition were able to convince the

Mr. Simmons: government to give its undivided attention to the matter of a public enquiry. And as the public knows now that enquiry is ongoing under the commission issued to Mr. Justice Mahoney, and that enquiry met for a week or so last month, and will begin meetings, I believe, again next week for an extended period of three or four more weeks as the case may be.

On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary lever which we do not use often in this Opposition,

MR. SIMONS: we used it last June, we do not use it very often. Indeed, I think the last time we used it was last June. It worked. Inside of a day, Mr. Speaker, it worked and we were able to get a public enquiry. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, we would never have gotten that public enquiry if we did not have that lever. That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the very good reasons why parliamentarians and parliamentary experts - men of experience and women of experience - over the years who have served in parliaments all over this world have seen to it that that kind of a lever is embedded in the parliamentary rule book.

We have one other such lever, Mr. Speaker, and it is the lever of unlimited time in the Budget debate, and it is given, Mr. Speaker, under the rules to the member who first speaks for the opposition or first speaks in reply to the budget debate. We know, of course, that all other members who speak in this debate will be governed by the normal times. The Leader of the Opposition and the Premier will each have ninety minutes and all other members of the House will have forty-five minutes unless somebody moves a non-confidence motion, then he has unlimited time. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the only person who has unlimited time in this particular debate is the person who leads off.

Now my colleagues in the Opposition have designated that I should be the first to lead off on this particular issue. I have spent a fair amount of the House's time, Mr. Speaker, talking about a number of issues. At no time have I seen it as a delaying tactic. I have waited until today to say in words what I felt every member of the House understood from the beginning, that we are today and have been during the past few days using our unlimited time under the rules of the House to draw attention to some very pressing issues

MR. SIMMONS: facing the people of this Newfoundland and Labrador.

We have been in this House now since the 4th of March. We should have been here since last Fall. At the very latest we should have been here since early January. The government did not call the House together until the 4th of March. The budget came down the 17th of March. The following week we should have been allowed to debate that budget. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, contrary to every precedent in any parliament in this world, the government did not call the budget debate until last Tuesday. A debate that should have been called around the 20th or 21st of March was not called until the last week in May. So for over two months, Mr. Speaker, we were given no opportunity except through Question Period to voice our concerns on matters affecting the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador, affecting the financial condition of the Province, affecting the shockingly high unemployment rate which prevails and which is causing a lot of suffering around this Province. We were given no opportunity, first, last Fall because the government would not call the House together, then during January and February because the government would not call the House together and then during March, April and May because the government would not call the budget debate and therefore would not give members of the Opposition and members of this House generally, an opportunity to address themselves to some of the pressing problems which we face.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, to the House today that we are using this unlimited time, and I say it is not our intention to use it for any indefinite period, but we are using this unlimited time, Mr. Speaker, so that we can draw attention - as I believe I have begun to do and will continue to do during the next little while - to draw attention, Mr. Speaker, to the need for programmes

MR. SIMMONS: to deal with the high unemployment rate. We have not yet, Mr. Speaker, in this session of the House been given an opportunity to give our ideas on this particular subject and I shall attempt to do so in the next few minutes because I want to address myself particularly this afternoon, to the unemployment situation.

We are using this lever of unlimited time, Mr. Speaker, as an opposition - and I happen to be the one speaking because the rules say only one can speak - but I speak for the Opposition when I say that we, collectively, are using this lever to draw attention to some pressing issues; the issue of unemployment which I have just mentioned, other issues that I mentioned a moment ago about the financial state of the Province, about the economy generally and about what measures ought to be used, ought to be brought into play to bring about certain improvements. We are using it also, Mr. Speaker, this unlimited time lever, to get the government to concentrate its energies and its undivided attention

MR. SIMMONS: on providing us as the elected representatives and on providing the people of Newfoundland and Labrador with proof, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayers' money is being properly spent. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is more and more a concern of the people of this Province. We have scarce resources. We do not have a lot of money to lash out. We cannot afford that our bit of scarce tax money be wasted or improperly spent or spent against the law or spent in violation of the law or be used to line the pockets of a few. We must insure and we must be satisfied beyond a doubt, we must have proof that the money is being spent as it ought to be spent under the law and with compassion to help the most people with the few tax dollars we have. And to that end, Mr. Speaker, to the end of insuring that we have the proof that the money is being well spent, we in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, repeat what we have asked for before and what we think is legitimate in requesting. We ask for a public inquiry - a full scale public inquiry into the whole Scrivener matter because of the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money which has been tied up there which probably could have been better spent elsewhere; certainly that part of it which may have been spent improperly could have been spent much better elsewhere. And we demand again today, Mr. Speaker, that that public inquiry be set up. It will be argued that the Mahoney inquiry to which I made reference may have some jurisdiction there, and I looked at the terms of reference again this morning and there is no doubt that the Mahoney inquiry can address itself to any of the spending practices of the Department of Public Works which took place after

MR. SIMMONS: April 1, 1974. And I suppose by implication it could be interpreted that if they find some matter which took place after 1974 which had its beginnings before 1974 they may then be allowed to delve back into the history of it. But I think, Mr. Speaker, it needs to be made more clear, more unequivocal. I believe there ought to be, Mr. Speaker, either a public inquiry into the Scrivener affair or, Mr. Speaker, since we must be running out of judges now in terms of public inquiries there is another alternative, Mr. Speaker. And I wish the Minister of Justice were here, but perhaps we will convey it to him later. There is another alternative outside of a full scale public inquiry on the Scrivener affair alone and it is this - an addendum, an amendment - an amendment to the terms of the Mahoney Commission, an amendment which would make it clear, Mr. Speaker, a further commission - I do not know what their appropriate terms is, perhaps an addendum or an amendment or a rider or an additional commission perhaps is a phrase which would connote what I am trying to say - an additional commission to the Commissioner, Mr. Mahoney, saying, Look, in addition to the matter set forth in your commission of so and so date, we hereby instruct you also to look into all matters relating to the Scrivener affair. Perhaps that would be the simple way out rather than another public inquiry, because I can see the dangers of two public inquiries ongoing at the same time which in many ways would have to be overlapping in terms of its area of investigation and inquiry.

MR. DOODY: I think that Justice Mahoney interprets his mandate -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, that may well be. I have not -

June 1, 1978

Tape 3805

EC - 3

MR. DOODY: That is the impression I have about it.

MR. SIMMONS: Has the minister talked to Mr. Mahoney?

MR. DOODY: Not directly. The Assistant Deputy Minister of Justice, I think, -

MR. SIMMONS: I see. Well, I certainly have no quarrel if that is the case.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: No. If the Minister of Transportation has a clear understanding, well certainly that is encouraging. Not that I disbelieve the minister, but I would like to hear Mr. Mahoney -

MR. DOODY: You can check it with the -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, alright, well I shall do that. I would like to hear Mr. Mahoney expound on the matter or otherwise enter it into the record, not that I mistrust any of the persons involved, but I would like to have the assurance before we let go on this, because as I point out it is a lever that we have and that is the context in which I am talking now. I say to the Minister of Transportation that if we have the assurance that the matter will be looked into - I am not concerned about the mechanics.

MR. DOODY: You will get no quarrel from us in the department.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay, the minister says we will get no quarrel from him on it. Well, we will have to wait and see on that one, Mr. Speaker, but I would hope that we would get no quarrel, because the whole

June 1, 1978

Tape 3805

EC - 4

MR. SIMMONS: Scrivener affair has to be
looked into either as a separate public inquiry or

MR. SIMMONS: as a clearly understood part of the assignment of Mr. Justice Mahoney, and either way, Mr. Speaker, would suit me just fine.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we are using this lever of the unlimited time to ensure that there is a full investigation into the government's dealings, Mr. Speaker, with Mr. Dobbin, and in the larger context, the government's dealings, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of office space. There are a lot of unanswered questions. And let us not forget what happened there a few nights ago, all we had was a government vote, a government majority imposed, and all this nonsense we heard about a free vote of course is exactly that, nonsense. But all we had here a few nights ago, or one early morning about eight o'clock, after an all night debate, was a government vote that there be no committee set up, that is all we decided, that the committee would not be set up. It decided none of the issues, none of the unanswered questions about the government's dealing with Mr. Dobbin on office space, or the government's dealings with other would be suppliers of office space, and there is need, Mr. Speaker, for either a public enquiry into that or for a select committee of the House, as we have so often asked for over here, a select committee, Mr. Speaker, to look into the whole deal involving Mr. Dobbin and involving government office space for this year generally.

There are two sides to this, Mr. Speaker, and one is the unseemly goings on in the government's efforts to make deals with men like Mr. Dobbin, but the other side of it, Mr. Speaker, is to what degree is the public service suffering because of the present hodge podge of office space all over the city. And that is a question that a select committee could address itself to. And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that at some point soon, some indication could be given to us, that the government is prepared to set up, to agree

MR. SIMONS: to the setting up of such a select committee of the House, or some kind of an enquiry into all the dealings affecting office space.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, before I move on to the substance of the other things I want to say this afternoon, that we are consciously here on the Opposition side, using the lever of unlimited time provided to us under the rules of the House, to do two or three important things, insofar as we are concerned and insofar as the public is concerned. One, to ensure that we talk about and hear about government's plans for programmes to deal with unemployment, with the economy, with the Province's financial position. Two, we are using that lever until we get the proof, the proof we need that the taxpayers' money is being properly spent, spent within the law. To get that proof we suggest that either Mr. Mahoney or another commissioner be authorized, or let us make sure he is authorized, to look into the whole Scrivener affair, to get that proof we ask again that a full scaled enquiry, it may take the form of a select committee of this House, and perhaps that is the way out, Mr. Speaker, a select committee of this House be set up to look into the whole question of government office space.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I have heard the member for Grand Falls, heard about his bellyaching, about the fact that I have unlimited time. I wish he will also be honest with the people, and I wish he will tell the people that the unlimited time that I exercise now on behalf of the Opposition is given to us under the rules of this House, and it is an insult to the Speaker, an insult to the Speaker of this House, an insult to the House itself, for a member to go out of here and somehow imply that Mr. Speaker is letting me away with something that he should not.

Mr. Speaker is doing what I am doing in this instance. We are both abiding very much by the spirit and the letter of the law when it comes to the regulations of this House. And what

June 2, 1978

Tape No. 3806

NY - 3

MR. SIMMONS: I am doing at this moment in time is seeing to it, and what Mr. Speaker is doing at this moment in time is seeing to it, as we always do I hope, certainly as he always does, that the rules of this House are properly enforced, and for a member, like the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) to go on the airwaves and suggest, Mr. Speaker, that somehow you are not doing your job here is an insult to the House and he should be brought perhaps before the bar of the House if that is possible, or he should be taken to task and perhaps I should have raised the point of privilege in the first place, because it is a serious violation I submit, Mr. Speaker, of the rules of this House, when you have members like the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) going outside this House and undermining the very traditions we fight for, undermining

MR. SIMMONS: the very traditions that allow us to be here in the first place, undermine the very traditions and rules and privileges that have been given to us by time, by our ancestors, by people who fought hard for their freedom. To have a member go out and just for the reason of getting his voice on the air to somehow imply that we are here doing something that is despicable and without dignity. It is a shocking, shocking indignity in itself and that member should be taken to task, Mr. Speaker, for so undermining the rules of this House, for so undermining the position of this House in the public minds.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! I in no way wish to interfere with the hon. member's remarks but I would just like to bring to his and to other hon. member's attention that there is a ruling pending in this general area and hopefully later today this ruling can be made in the general area that the hon. member is discussing, that is the remarks made in regard to whether or not the House and the people in the Province were insulted by certain remarks. There is a ruling pending in that general area which hopefully we will get to later today.

MR. SIMMONS: The ruling from the other night.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand it talking about the ruling that he left in abeyance the night before last when he himself was in the Chair, a ruling relating to whether a member had used insulting language or something of that nature.

AN HON. MEMBER: A member had said that something was an insult to the House and -

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) had said that something was an insult and one of my colleagues got up and rose on a point of privilege and the ruling has not been made. I fully understand that, Mr. Speaker, and I hope Mr. Speaker, did not think that I was in anyway getting into that particular area, I was actually addressing myself to an action of the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) not in the House the other night - and that is another subject which is now pending a ruling but the action of the

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3807

AH-2

MR. SIMMONS: member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) this day on the public airwaves, this is the issue I was talking about and I think I well made my point on it. I wish he were here, he was momentarily when I began my remarks because I would rather say these things in his presence. He should tell the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, when he is bellyaching, and I think that is the proper term for it, when he is bellyaching, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that a member is using unlimited time, that one he should tell the people of Newfoundland in all honesty that that member is doing it because that is his right and the right of this chamber, the right of this House. He should also, Mr. Speaker, instead of just leaving it hanging and saying that I have been talking for so many hours, he should tell the people that he interrupted my speech for over an hour on one occasion, that his colleague from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) interrupted my speech for two hours on another occasion making some silly points of privilege or so they call them, he should tell the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, - that member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) should also tell them that I have taken considerable time in this speech, Mr. Speaker, talking about such things as the oppressive tax measures of this government, the tax increase to eleven per cent, the dental fee, the hospital ward fee and all the other increases, the other oppressive tax measures that are in this Budget if you can call it that. He should tell them that I have talked for awhile about the misleading nature of the blueprint, the so-called blueprint that the Minister of Finance brought in with his budget, that misleading document that talks about all the jobs that are going to be created, that talks about the per capita income increase and I showed how misleading those statements are. He should tell them also that I have talked about the government's approach to industrial development, about the tunnel across the Straits and the \$110 million they squandered there, about how they signed a death warrant for Stephenville, about how they played foolloose and fancyfree with Come By Chance and made contradictory announcements at a time when they had information to the effect that Come By Chance was in trouble they

MR. SIMMONS: made announcements about a second refinery at Come By Chance and a petrochemical plant. I have talked about the government's approach to industrial development, I never said I am proud of it, I have talked about it, I have said what is wrong with it, I have said what is misleading about it, I have said what is dishonourable about it. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) said nothing about that today, Mr. Speaker, because that was not convenient for him to say nor did he say, Mr. Speaker, that I have talked for an hour or so about the government's misuse of public funds. Nor did he tell them that I spoke for an hour or so about the particular needs of the elderly in this Province and how we ought to change our attitudes about the elderly before we salt them all away in institutions without even asking whether that is the course of action that is best for them or not, it is for some but it is not for all. Nor did he tell them that I expressed my concerns about the Public Accounts Committee and how it is being stalled now, how we cannot get the committee to meet now. I gave my suspicions as to why it is not meeting, it is a very important vehicle of this House, Mr. Speaker, and it is being stalled right now and I suggest it is being stalled for some ulterior motive and I said that the other night.

I have talked, Mr. Speaker, about the government's spending practices generally, I have talked about the letter writing of the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) I did not spend much time on that,

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, because it is not an important issue except to the extent that a minister of the Crown is using the public taxpayers money to buy postage to insult the public taxpayer. I think that is serious that a minister of the Crown would use the taxpayers money to insult them by writing position pen letters. I mention that. I did not spend time on that, Mr. Speaker, because it is too petty a matter in a way.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a serious matter.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, it is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker. It is a serious matter when a lady in Baie Verte whose husband goes down in a mine every day not knowing whether he will come up with or without the disease that he so dreads. It is a serious matter when she in her righteous and legitimate concern writes the minister responsible for energy matters in this Province, and pours out her soul to him in a very diplomatic way as you will see from the correspondence that was tabled in this House. It is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, when she is insulted, and it is not my words, look at the letters tabled in this House, when she is being insulted by a minister of the Crown of whom she only ask that he give some consideration, that he show a little compassion, and she gets kicked in the teeth for being concerned about the health of her family and her children. It is a petty issue in a way, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time it is a crucial issue. Because if we do not have in government, Mr. Speaker, men and women with compassion to understand -

AN HON. MEMBER: The sensitivities.

MR. SIMMONS: - the feelings, the concerns, even the sensitivities, even the whims, Mr. Speaker, of the ordinary people of this Province and what is the government all for? Government is not a business, Mr. Speaker, government is not just a matter of arrogant and efficient and proper bookkeeping. It should must be that. But they must realize that it is there, Mr. Speaker, to service people, the sensitivities of people, the feelings of people, the legitimate concerns of people.

Mr. Simmons: So I did talk, Mr. Speaker, although the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) saw it convenient not to mention it. I did talk about the poison ten letters from the Minister of Energy. I did not spend a lot of time at it, although perhaps I should have. Because it underlies the whole reason for government either you have people in government whom you can empathize, whom you can relate to, or you do not. In the case of the Minister of Energy, of course, we do not.

I talked, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes about that nefarious, skulduggeryist, Special Action Group. I did not get much action by talking about it. I did not even get the Premier to keep his promise that he had tabled the contract of Mr. Bob Cole, a \$47,000 part-time job. He went before a Rotary Group down here in St. John's a month or so ago, and described the people on the Action Group as a volunteer group and I had this elderly gentleman -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: - down in St. John's call me, and he said, did you see what the Premier said to Rotary yesterday, he said, they were volunteers. He said if you hear, he said, Simmons if you hear about another \$47,000 volunteer job let me know. He said, I will take it. He said, I am only seventy-three years of age, but I take it, he said, just as a volunteer provided there is \$47,000 in it. I guess he would.

So I did talk, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes about the Special Action Group. I talked about the government's relationship to that famous trio, Mr. Speaker, Doyle, Shaheen, and Dobbin. And how in some ways those relationships have changed. The government's relationship to Doyle, Shaheen and Dobbin. And I said, Mr. Speaker, in paraphrasing a bit of Shakespeare the other day that when the Premier talks so often and so nervously and so sensitively about Doyle, perhaps to paraphrase Brother Shakespeare very badly, "Methinks the Premier doth protest too much." I believe he goes out too much, Mr. Speaker, saying I do not know the fellow, so much does he say that you have to ask the question, what is he really concerned about? Is he

Mr. Simmons: really concerned that his real relationship with Mr. Doyle will come out, like his real relationship with Mr. Dobbin is coming out?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: I have talked about these issues, Mr. Speaker, but the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) did not see fit to talk about that, or the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) when he gave his pontifical version yesterday of what is going on in the House of Assembly. Those people, Mr. Speaker, who go on the public airways like the member for St. John's East, and the member for Grand Falls, and misrepresent what is going on in this House, Mr. Speaker, should be dealt with by the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Should be dealt with by the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: I have had enough, Mr. Speaker, of all this bellyaching about people lowering the dignity of the House. And they get on the public airways and in the same mouthful when they condemn people of lowering the dignity of the House they are doing the very thing, they are complicating it, they are doing it worse than anybody here could do it even if we set out deliberately try it every minute we are here. We could not

MR. SIMMONS: do it, Mr. Speaker, in as vicious a fashion as the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) did it yesterday and the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) did it today, and I predict there will be another member over there tomorrow, because they are getting so desperate, Mr. Speaker, that they are willing to do anything, even to submit to low tricks like we saw yesterday and today on the public airways - low tricks to undermine this House and talk about it being destroyed. It will be only destroyed, Mr. Speaker, if we do not have the guts and the intelligence and the fortitude and the good sense to conduct the House's business in the House. We try to conduct it on the airways, we try to make out little kindergarten points like the member for Grand Falls outside where he cannot be rebutted as it were. Let him come in here, Mr. Speaker. If he is concerned about the House and its dignity and its performance and its function, and whether it is going to be a vital organ in the future of this Province, whether it is going to be an instrument of good for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, come in here - be a man about it. Do not get behind a tape recorder - come in here, be a man about it. If there is something you do not like about the House let us change it here. The challenge is not all that big, Mr. Speaker, when the persons engaging in the kindergarten tactics, the members for St. John's East and Grand Falls, are people who have the majority of the House on this side. So they want change? They do not like the unlimited time? Let them change it. They have the majority over there - let them change it. I say now, Mr. Speaker, we are inventive

MR. SIMMONS: enough on this side of the House. We take our responsibilities seriously enough on this side of the House that if they cut off the unlimited time, I give them notice now that we will find another way, Mr. Speaker, to get this government to concentrate its undivided attention on the main issues of the day - on the issues of unemployment, the economy, the financial condition, the high taxes we are paying here. We will find a way. We happen to have a very good way right now called unlimited time and we intend to use it responsibly - not indefinitely, but responsibly until we make our point. And we will make our point today if we sit down today. If it takes us another week to make our point we will take another week, but we will not be intimidated, Mr. Speaker, for one milli-second by those kindergarten tricksters who have not the gall nor the gumption nor the guts to perform their job responsibly in this House but instead go outside and chip away at the very process that means so much to us. The very parliamentary process that people have fought long and hard for over the years, they go out and they chip away at it for the sake of thirty seconds commentary on the radio. Let them come in here, Mr. Speaker, and do something about it. If this mechanism is not working exactly as it should be, let them come in here and help do something to beef it up, not to tear it down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: I have talked, Mr. Speaker - although the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) did not mention it - about the government's financial position, and it is much more desperate than we know. And one of the reasons it is more desperate than we know is because the

MR. SIMMONS: books up until a year ago were not even being properly kept. In the 1975 - 1976 year there were \$200 million in entries which were either entered in the wrong places or not entered at all. How do you like that? - \$200 million entered in the wrong places in the government books or not entered at all. How do you know, Mr. Speaker, where you stand if one-fifth of your entire expenditure is entered in the wrong places or not even entered at all? How do you know you have a deposit in a bank in New York if you do not have a record of it? Well, I will tell you how you know. In this case you happen to have a trusting banker who calls you up, as he did the government, and says, 'By the way, do you know you have a deposit down here?' It is only a few million dollars, mind you. How is that for responsible fiscal accounting in government? Is it any wonder I stand here and ask again and again what is our real financial position as a province? Do we really know if we are not even keeping the books right?

AN HON. MEMBER: And you say you are wasting time when you bring these questions forward.

MR. SIMMONS: And then, Mr. Speaker, I am supposed to be wasting time if I tell the public such petty little things as, 'We had \$200 million put in the wrong places or not in it at all. We had money in a New York bank we did not even know about until the banker came back and told us.' That is wasting time, Mr. Speaker. I am wasting time, Mr. Speaker, if I point out that \$15 million to \$20 million of the taxpayers' money in 1975 - 1976 was misspent without public tender. That is supposed to be a waste of time, Mr. Speaker. It is a waste of time,

June 1, 1978

Tape 3809

EC - 4

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in one way only.

It is a waste of time for those who do not want to hear
it. It is a waste of time

MR. SIMMONS: for those who wished it could be kept covered up, it is a waste of time for those who did not want it to see the light of day. I can understand that for those people it is a waste of time. I will not spend too much time apologizing to those people though, because they are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why it took so much digging and ferking around, and digging and digging and ferking around, so much of it, and public enquiries and police investigations before we even begin to get to the truth and I say now, Mr. Speaker, again the Public Works thing, the Scrivener thing, as serious as they are, my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has done a lot of research on the Scrivener project in particular. I say to him, I say to the House, that as serious as Scrivener is, as serious as the Public Works scandal is, it is only the tip of the ice berg I say to him, just the tip of the ice berg. Everywhere you go, Mr. Speaker, those who are not frightened off from calling you for fear their telephones are being tapped, for fear if they write you a letter your files are going to get rifled as mine were, for fear they are going to be seen with you because you are being trailed half the time. Those who have not stopped being seen with you for that reason, those who have not stopped writing you for fear their letters are going to be snatched out of your file at some dark hour of night -

AN HON. MEMBER: How does your wife react to it?

MR. SIMMONS: Well let me say it this way, I managed to get home last night in time to turn off the television. I managed to get up time enough this morning to get The Daily News and I hope to get home in time this evening to get The Evening Telegram and I hope to be the only person in the household who reads it today. But, Mr. Speaker, that does bring up another issue which we will come to in time, because you see, Mr. Speaker, those people who will still write who have not been intimidated and Mr. Speaker, that is what it is, it is an intimidation process. And I do not know how the member

MR. SIMMONS: for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), I do not know, Mr. Speaker, a man with his background, his eminent background, all the good he did for the South Coast people in Newfoundland, I still keep hearing about it, and the principle, Mr. Speaker, that he has always displayed, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how he can sit there. I really do not. And perhaps some day, just as friend to friend, over the privacy of a cup of coffee, when there is nobody trailing me, I hope, Mr. Speaker, I hope he will sit down and do me the courtesy of just telling me how he rationalizes all of this because I cannot see, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see a man of such integrity, such principle, a man who has fought long and hard for what he truly believes in -

MR. CALLAN: Still fighting.

MR. SIMMONS: A man whose beliefs are admirable. I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why he is not up asking some of the same questions we are asking. I cannot understand it. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I expect when all this is over he will probably be the next speaker over there because of all over there, Mr. Speaker, of all over there -

MR. W. ROWE: Green Bay is not getting up is he? Poison pen pal.

MR. SIMMONS: Well we will need a ruling on that as to whether you can read letters in the House, read your own. You can read other letters but then you have to table them. But what happens when you read your own letters, Mr. Speaker? Is that parliamentary.

But, Mr. Speaker, seriously, those people who have not stopped writing me because they are afraid their letters are going to be snatched in the dark of night down in my office or in my home some week when I am out of town, those people who have not stopped telephoning me because some of the things they told me on the phone in strictest confidence have somehow become less confidential, those people, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SIMMONS: who still write me and who still phone me tell me enough that I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Scrivener and the Public Works scandal are just but the tip of the ice berg.

Well as I say I talked about these things. I did not spend a lot of time on the scandals. I wanted to draw attention to them. But I wanted also to talk about the financial position, the job situation, the position of the elderly, the job that the Minister of Education is doing to education in this Province. I talked about that at some length. It is very dear to me. I spent a lifetime in education and I would like to talk long and hard about it, but I am aware of my possible conflict of interest there because being so close to it I may not be able to see the forest for the trees in some respects and I say that to him honestly. And so I have not talked as much about that issue as I would like to. But from the feedback I get, Mr. Speaker, from the concerns of my friends in education and people generally and parents and youngsters, students, I know, Mr. Speaker, that what is happening in education, and the minister must take a lot of the responsibility, will be with us for a long time to come. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just by way of preliminaries, just to bring you up to date because I did want to take the past ten or fifteen minutes or so just to enforce, because it has been such a long time since I first began talking and there has been so many interruptions, one day we did not get to the speech at all because we could not get through Question Period, last Friday if you remember. So it has been over a week or so since I first began talking. I just wanted to bring you up to date about the various issues that I have talked about in the few hours that I have stood here.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other issues many of which we are not going to get the time to talk about. Mr. Speaker, I talked just a moment ago about the financial situation of this Province and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how much worse, as bad as it is, how much worse would the financial situation of this Province be if the federal government were not bailing this crowd out all the time?

The just bailed them out on the Trans-Canada Highway and the Minister for Tourism said, 'Over my dead body'. 'Over my dead body' he said to Frank. 'Over my dead body' he said, the Minister of Tourism. The Minister of Tourism said, 'That Trans-Canada Highway agreement, no way! Over my dead body' he said to the Premier. And do you know what, Mr. Speaker? They did it over his dead body. They did it over his dead body. If I have ever seen, Mr. Speaker, a politically dead specimen -

MR. MORGAN: I will be here when you are long gone.

MR. SIMMONS: Up she comes! - a politically dead specimen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Time will tell.

MR. SIMMONS: It goes to show, Mr. Speaker, the advisability of that sign, which I shall now paraphrase, in various offices. "Those who are politically dead please fall down." He does not have the courtesy, Mr. Speaker, to fall down although he is - over his dead body they were going to do it and the Premier took him on and did it over his dead body.

But, Mr. Speaker, the feds have bailed them out on the Trans-Canada Highway, the feds are bailing them out generally, on transfer payments of various kinds, the feds have bailed them out on tourism, bailed them out on the Trans-Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am only quoting the words of the Minister of Tourism. He does not like either - or has he changed his mind now? - he does like what happened in Transportation, he told the whole Province that. He had to take it back to stay in the Cabinet.

Like the other day, Mr. Speaker, he did not agree with the spruce budworm decision, but the he took it back, Mr. Speaker, to stay in the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: I do not mind the hon. gentleman for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy), Sir, having a nap but would somebody close his mouth when he is sleeping.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: I would make no wonder he fell asleep because -

MR. WHITE: He has been asleep for years.

MR. SIMMONS: I think in fairness, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's Center is well advised to keep his mouth open. Any sign of life over there will do because if his colleague behind him thinks he is dead he will bury him.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please!
I feel there is no matter that the Chair can deal with here.

The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. undertaker friend from Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) is always on the job.

MR. WHITE: He is even dressed for the occasion.

MR. SIMMONS: As they say, he is the last man to let you down. He is dressed and I say to the member for St. John's Center, the hearse is waiting outside.

AN HON. MEMBER: When is the funeral?

MR. NEARY: He is gone off disappointed now, look!

MR. W.N. ROWE: The member was not dead after all.

MR. NEARY: He wants to see if he has one to suit him.

MR. SIMMONS: He wants to make sure the flowers are still fresh, I guess.

MR. NEARY: e is gone out to see if he has a five foot box to fit him.

MR. WHITE: A hat box will do.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the gentleman who is not asleep. He may be politically dead but now asleep, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism. He dug his heels in -

MR. WHITE: For a good cause too.

MR. SIMMONS: - on a good cause, the Trans-Canada Highway issue. If he had done what the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) had done, he would have gotten the accolades of everybody on this side - and that is not important, I say to him. Do not ever be overly impressed by the nice things we say over here about you, when we say them we have a reason for saying them - but more importantly he would have had the accolades of every person who drives over that Trans-Canada Highway.

He dug his heels in on a very important issue, but then, Mr. Speaker, just when you are beginning to say, now there is a man of principle, he backs off because the practical issue is more important to him than the principle. Hanging on in Cabinet, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SIMMONS: so they should - concern, Mr. Speaker, that is being fuelled because of the lack of any real, definitive information on this whole issue. So, Mr. Speaker, in that context, the other night we were on this heart rending debate. And we all over here did not agree - I hope the government noticed that. We all over here did not particularly agree on the solution to the problem. There was no vote involved as such - no substantive vote. And we gave our position freely. I tried to get up in the debate but did not get an opportunity, and knowing I had this opportunity I did not want to crowd out some other people who also wanted to speak. But we had a heart rending debate the other night. It was the spruce budworm thing. And it is one that we do not have the easy answers to. You see, Mr. Speaker, if I may use a crude analogy, when you do not have the answers, when you do not have the definitive answer on an issue be it the spruce budworm or anything else there is only one course of action, Mr. Speaker, and I use a crude analogy to make it. If the fellow is condemned to be hanged but there is some doubt, you do not say well, we will hang him and we will find out eventually if we did the right thing, because it is hard to get life back into him after you have hanged him, you see. And that is the principle which must be operative here if there is a reasonable doubt. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, all the 800 who went to the meeting in Gander last night are not crackpots. There may be a few people there with axes to grind - a few people out to get the minister from Gander or the minister from Green Bay or the Minister of Forestry - there may be that. There may be people there out to get me or the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight)

June 1, 1978

Tape 3812

EC - 3

MR. SIMMONS: or the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), but that aside, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that of the 800 the overwhelming majority of people went there for one reason and one reason only. They went there because they had a concern over the spruce budworm issue. And as in my crude example about the man about to be hanged, if there is a reasonable doubt, there is only one possibility -

AN HON. MEMBER: When in doubt leave it out.

MR. SIMMONS: - delay it until we can find out what it is we are doing here, what we are meddling with here - whether we are meddling with the health of youngsters next year or five years down the road.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: That is the issue. I do not care what the economic consideration is, I do not care what the dollars involved are. Who is going to put a price on a human life? Who is going to put a price on the health of some youngster? If there is any doubt at all - and that is where we admired the Minister of Tourism the other night. The man had the guts to get up and say something that he knew was going to get him into some trouble politically, but he had the guts to do it. Nobody had the guts to do it first of all.

MR. ROBERTS: The spirit was willing but the flesh is weak.

MR. SIMMONS: You see, he has almost enough, Mr. Speaker, the Trans-Canada Highway issue and the spruce budworm issue illustrates that that minister has got almost enough courage -

MR. W. ROWE: To open the barricade.

MR. SIMMONS: They sing in the evangelical

June 1, 1978

Tape 3812

EC - 4

MR. SIMMONS: churches a song and one
verse is 'Almost persuaded', and the last line is
'almost, but lost'.

AN HON. MEMBER: - 'Jim', you will
never get saved.

MR. SIMMONS: 'Almost' - that near, but
lost.

June 1, 1978

Tape 3813

EC - 1

AN HON. MEMBER: Alleluia! Alleluia!

AN HON. MEMBER: Praise the Lord!

MR. SIMMONS: And the minister illustrates the other aspect of what I want to say to him. Not enough to mouth the words, not enough, Mr. Speaker, to say the alleluias - you have to identify with the cause, you have to do something about it. He started to do something about it the other night, Mr. Speaker, and he almost got there, but then somebody said, 'Jim, Cabinet. You will have to give up Cabinet.' The old devil speaks in his ear, 'Cabinet'.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twelve grand.

MR. SIMMONS: 'Cabinet. Do not forget Cabinet, Jim. Are you sure you want to give up Cabinet and all its perks? - sitting around the table of important men two or three times a week solving the great problems. Cabinet, Jim - 'Tourism, conferences in Quebec City, Vancouver. The Premier might even invite you to South America when he goes on his job hunting tour next year. Simmons over there recommended South America - the Premier will probably take him up - go to South America. He might even not take the Kilbride member next year, he might take you, Jim - Cabinet, trips abroad, helicopters, Jim - all you are going to have to give up.' And of course, he gives in. Almost, but lost. Twice he has done it, Mr. Speaker - once on the 'highway' issue, now on the spruce budworm issue. If I were preaching, as he suggested, I would call to mind a verse of scripture which in paraphrased version only, Mr. Speaker - I assure you I cannot quote it exactly - in paraphrased version it says something to the effect, 'How much longer shall my spirit strive with man?' How many more chances will he be

June 1, 1978

Tape 3813

EC - 2

MR. SIMMONS: given, Mr. Speaker? How many more?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: You are going to burn, boy!
You are going to burn!

AN HON. MEMBER: Like the rest of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is going to go the way of the budworm!

MR. WHITE: It is a nice day. We should adjourn and go out on the lawn.

MR. SIMMONS: No, there is a chance there, you see. There is a chance for him before he is eternally lost. There is a chance before he is completely, irrevocably, eternally lost. There is a chance. There is going to be another issue. This week we will give him another issue. This week we have in the cards. This week we have another chance for the Minister of Tourism, and perhaps this time, having heard the warnings he will heed them. Perhaps this time he will have the courage to say, 'Yes, Cabinet with all its perks, helicopters, trips all over the place, the chance of going to South America next year with the Premier - all these, yes, I know, but I have my principles to worry about. I believe that the government should not have caved in over the Trans-Canada Highway deal,' he will say. 'I believe the government should not be callous about this spruce budworm decision. I believe they are a bit premature. I believe,' on the new issue we are going to put before them this week - 'I believe the course the government is taking is the wrong course. And for that reason I will take the only honourable way. It hurts me to do it, but it would hurt me an awful lot more if I did not do it. I believe it is the only way, because I have to look

June 1, 1978

Tape 3813

EC - 3

MR. SIMMONS: in the mirror tomorrow morning.'

AN HON. MEMBER: We use the same kind of hair spray over here -

MR. SIMMONS: Now while we are talking, Mr. Speaker - because I am sure there has been no doubt during the past few minutes about the finances of the Province - I want to get into another issue.

When I got off on the Minister of Tourism - I admit, a favourite subject for me, I have a certain admiration for him, Mr. Speaker, I cannot put it into words but it is there - but, Mr. Speaker, when I got on that subject I was talking about the federal government and the way it was bailing this government out on tourism and on transportation, two issues that the minister knows an awful lot about.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism a few minutes ago said, "Ah, negative. All you do is criticize." Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a positive suggestion now, Mr. Speaker, a positive suggestion, you see, Mr. Speaker, I have been having a look, Mr. Speaker, at this Term 29 about which we had such a fuss, and let us set the record straight on Term 29, Mr. Speaker. Let us set the record straight because when it was raised by a government member sometime ago he did not bother to mention again, he did not bother to mention who it was that just about run us into the ground on Term 29 in the first place. He did not bother to mention that it was his great buddy, the Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, who tried to run us into the ground on Term 29. He did not say that it was he who felt we should get even less than we are getting, not more as has been suggested but less according to Mr. Diefenbaker in that day. He did not say that it was Mr. Diefenbaker who split the P.C. Party asunder back in 1957 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Started the United Newfoundland Party.

MR. SIMMONS: Not 1957 but well just after that and started the United Newfoundland Party. He did not mention those things.

But, Mr. Speaker, to the substance of the matter. This Term 29, Mr. Speaker, the financial term of our agreement where two nations - now let us be understood about this too, we did not go begging or screaming into the arms of Canada. We went screaming somewhat because only fifty point something or 51 per cent of us wanted to be part of Canada at the time. But it was not a one sided deal, Mr. Speaker. There were as many on the Canadian side as I will show you from some documentation who wanted Newfoundland to be a part of Canada as there were in Newfoundland who wanted to be a part of Canada. There were a lot of people in the then Canadian nation who had good reason to want Newfoundland to be part of the bargain, to be part of a new nation. So two nations came together, Mr. Speaker, and one of the terms, the financial term, the now famous Term 29, the McNair Commission set up by the federal government found in somewhere around 1958 or 1959 having analyzed our ability here to provide public services,

MR. SIMMONS:

water and sewer and the other services we need here, having analyzed our ability to provide them and having analyzed our ability to pay for those, and this is the whole spirit of Term 29 you remember, having analyzed these two abilities, the ability to pay on the one hand, the reasonable taxation that we could levy here on the one hand and on the other hand the requirement for services, having analyzed these two the McNair Commission, and this is not a Newfoundland commission, this is a federal commission, came to the conclusion that there was a revenue deficiency, that there was a shortage of funds, there was a short fall. In other words we needed more services than we could pay for even if we lashed it out in terms of taxes to our people. There was a deficiency.

In that day in 1957, Mr. Speaker, in the 1957-1958 year the McNair Commission found that there was a revenue deficiency of just over \$8 million, \$8,102,000. Now to put it in other terms, Mr. Speaker, what the commission finding was saying is this, that even if Newfoundland has to provide services, not equal to Canada or Ontario or B.C. but equal to the Maritime Provinces which we know have always been in terms of services, I think the minister will agree, in Atlantic Canada still behind say Ontario or B.C. Right? And it was in this context that the McNair Commission was talking. To provide services equal to the Maritime Provinces we could not find the tax dollars even if we taxed as high as the highest province in Canada, the highest tax in Canada. We would still be \$8 million short in 1957.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us be clear what that means. Did it say \$8 million forever? No, Mr. Speaker. It took the expenditures for 1957-1958 and subtracted one from the other and said right now they need another \$8 million. Now what happens, Mr. Speaker, if the value of the dollar changes? What happens then? If \$8 million in 1957 dollars is \$8 million but in 1960 it is only \$7 million or in 1970 it is only \$2 million or \$3 million, did the McNair Commission, were they so stunned as to think that somehow everything would take care of itself and that if you had \$8 million in 1957 but only \$3 million

MR. SIMMONS:

or \$4 million in 1970 that that would be enough. How could \$3 million effectively in 1970 do what \$8 million was supposed to do in 1957?

Well we all know the answer to that. It cannot.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have got to look, and I was disappointed because I put this question to the Premier about

MR. SIMMONS: a couple of weeks ago here in this House. We have to look again at term 29 and we have to say, What was the spirit of it? What was the spirit of the commission finding? What was the spirit of the McNair Commission finding? And the spirit was clearly this - it can be nothing else - the spirit was this, Mr. Speaker, in simple blunt terms, 'We have as a nation to continue to help Newfoundland to meet the difference between what they can afford to raise in taxes on the one hand and the cost of providing services equal to those in the Maritime Provinces on the other. That was the spirit of it, Mr. Speaker.

At that time that spirit translated into \$8 million. The spirit of the McNair report was to see to it that the difference was paid by the nation in a transfer payment, if you like. That was the spirit. Now here we are, Mr. Speaker, in 1978 and of course we all know - if you remember, those listening to my voice, if you will just remember your salary in 1958 or 1959. I remember mine. I was teaching in St. Anthony. I was a principal, no less. A great, big two-room school. Principal of a two-room school. Not only was I getting a teacher's salary, I was also getting what they called a principal's bonus, fifty dollars a year for each classroom under your jurisdiction. You were allowed to count your own for that.

AN HON. MEMBER: On hundred dollars?

MR. SIMMONS: A hundred dollars a year for being principal that was, plus the title of course. And it worked out, Mr. Speaker, to \$187 per month before taxes - \$187 per month is what I was getting in 1959. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what I could buy it is probably worth \$600 today, \$500 or \$600 today in twenty years since just about.

MR. SIMMONS: This \$8 million, Mr. Speaker, if it required \$8 million in 1959, of course, it requires a lot more today. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, I am told that the 1957 or 1958 dollar - get this, Mr. Speaker, the 1957 or 1958 dollar worth a dollar in 1957 is worth twenty-three cents today. Twenty-three cents today, not a quarter of what it was worth in 1957 or 1958, not a quarter. So the \$8 million of 1957 or 1958 or 1959 with McNair's Commission report, is worth perhaps \$2 million or so today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Three.

MR. SIMMONS: No, what I meant is that if you had that - no, I see what the minister is saying, but I am just going in the other direction. All right? Put it this way - the minister is one step ahead of me on translating it in the other direction, but what I am saying to him is that the \$8 million could only buy what two or three would have bought in 19 - I am sorry - the \$8 million, 1957 dollars, would only buy \$2 million or \$3 million worth today. That is what I am really saying. Okay? And to buy \$8 million worth today you would need something of the order of \$35 million, just over four time as much. That is the point I am making. The \$8 million of 1957 if you had it today could only buy really, \$2 million or \$3 million worth. If you extrapolate that, or if you translate it means that the if the commission meant in 1957 to give us \$8 million I am saying, and the minister is helping me say it, I am saying that today that should translate into something around \$35 million.

How do we argue that, Mr. Speaker? We argue it simply - and I am not going to go through the entire argument, but just to state the spirit of it - we argue it, Mr. Speaker, by saying clearly and simply that the spirit of the McNair Commission findings

MR. SIMMONS: was to allow us to keep pace, to allow us to keep pace with services in the Maritime Provinces in two ways: As much as possible by our tax rate, which is the highest in Canada, and then to do the rest by a makeup payment from Ottawa. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is the government would only begin negotiating this one with Ottawa in serious terms - and I was disappointed when I asked the Premier about a month ago about this subject that nothing is really in the works on it, or that was the impression I got from him.

The revenue deficiency now is so serious, Mr. Speaker, that Ottawa would have to jack up the payment by something over four times the amount.

Mr. Speaker, I have here

MR. SIMMONS: a letter written back in 1959 by a Mr. Kerstead who was a professor of political economy at the University of Toronto. He said, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: May have been. He was a professor. I will get his initials now. B.S. are his initials. B.S. Kerstead written in 1959, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of Term 29 and to my knowledge he is not a Newfoundlander. I do not know that he is or is not but he is at the University of Toronto at this time and he is writing about Term 29. I think it is important to establish that he is probably not a Newfoundlander because he is not just peddling our narrow viewpoint on this. He is putting forth what I believe is to be a sound economic argument and he is talking about Term 29, Mr. Speaker. I think perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it might be helpful when I am through reading this or part of it as I am required under rules to table it because it is something that all members should have a second look at.

It is a letter from a Professor B.S. Kerstead which I will table in a few minutes and it was written back in 1959. It says in part, "Term 29 of the Terms of Union between Newfoundland and Canada is part of a contract into which both contracting parties entered in 1949. At that time the Canadian Government was gravely disturbed over the economic and political instability of Newfoundland and about the possibility of Newfoundland becoming the possession of the United States. Union was earnestly desired by Canada but was rather unpopular in Newfoundland. Only the leadership of Mr. Smallwood was able to prevail upon the opposition of the business interest of St. John's. When the Newfoundland negotiators came to Ottawa both they and their Canadian counterparts had no knowledge of what it would cost to set up public service in Newfoundland comparable to the tolerable minimum of such services elsewhere in North America. Because of its strange history of neglect Newfoundland at the time of union possessed very few public services and those of a primitive sort. Thus Newfoundland

MR. SIMMONS: refused to enter into union with Canada unless provision was made after an experimental or a transitional period for a considered revision of the financial terms of union. Hence Term 29 was included in the act of union at the insistence of the Newfoundland delegation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quoted that first of all because I think it puts in perspective a comment I was making earlier that the impression that is abroad lately that somehow we were a bunch of beggars taken in by an unwilling Canada. It is not exactly the scenario that was in place at the time at all. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of people who saw good argument, good strategic arguments at the time, good political argument to have Newfoundland as a part of the Canadian nation. And so in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, they were willing to agree to Term 29 which provided for that so-called make up money, that money which would provide the difference between what we could afford and what was required to give us services at least up to what was then or is not operative in the Atlantic Provinces.

I table the letter, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest hon. members have a good look at it. I would like to have a copy myself I say to the page when he gets around to it. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government will want some positive suggestions about financial matters. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Term 29 of the Terms of Union between two nations, Canada and Newfoundland, indeed that term contains a great opportunity for us if we will explore it properly, if we made it the subject of some meaningful and serious and ongoing negotiation, if we couple with it the finding of the McNair Commission Report, a commission set up by I believe then Prime Minister St. Laurent and later acted on or procrastinated on by Mr. Diefenbaker. But a McNair Commission Report if we coupled that with the Term of Union we would find, Mr. Speaker, that we have a very strong case for requiring the money to be paid in today's dollars and today's value and today's prices if you like rather than at 1957 or 1958 prices.

I think it is a crucial issue,

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, and I cannot stress it too much. It alone would give us the extra \$25 million or \$28 million and that alone could make some difference in the - it would make a fair dent in our position to meet our commitments to pay our bills. Mr. Speaker, these are some of my concerns about the financial position.

I want to talk for a few minutes about another subject that is I believe is crucial to our development and that is the fishery. The fishery of this Province, Mr. Speaker, much has been said about it it is difficult to avoid getting caught up in the rhetoric and to be too rosy in your descriptions in your pontifications about it. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I happen to believe that the fishery holds more promise than any of the other resource possibilities potential we have. Holds more possibility for a number of reasons and I am not advocating that we abandon the others they have their place and in time I or other speakers here will come to them. But Mr. Speaker, the fisheries resource especially because of the 200 mile limit and it did two things it did the obvious thing of giving us access to more fish but it also did something psychologically - I think the Minister of Fisheries agree with it as it did the advent of the 200 mile limit was a great boom psychologically for us it changed attitudes and I re-said it to the House before about my teaching days when you talk to students and you talk to teachers and the attitude came through clearly that there was something despicable something second class about being in the fishing business. Well that is changing, changing very dramatically, psychologically it is very different now the whole business of the fishery is very different and people look to careers in the fishing industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a couple of central facts that we need to underline about the fishery. Number

MR. SIMONS: one; fish you see, Mr. Speaker, fish is the only source of protein - we are talking about the needs of a hungry world, we are talking about scarce food resources expensive food resources. Fish, Mr. Speaker, is the only source of protein you do not have to feed. The only source of protein you do not have to feed, it is there all you have to do is catch it conserve it of course. Do not sacrifice it. Do not plunder the fishery. Given a proper conservation, management approach all you have to do is catch. It is the only source of protein that you do not have to feed. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that Britian for example is short of white fish stocks codfish for example. There is a great opportunity there for exports from Newfoundland. I am told though that Britian is not waiting for Newfoundland to act or for Canada to act I am told that the tremendous shortage of white fish stocks is being made up in part and let us be clear the shortage came about largely because of the implications for Britian and Germany for example of the 200 mile limit. And that shortage which they now have that short fall is being made up in part by a new supply from Argentina supply of hake from Argentina and because of the codfish shortage and because they cannot get the codfish they want from us. Because we have not developed our markets over there.

I have come quickly to the subject of marketing, Mr. Speaker, because I have a feeling that most of the other factors involved in the success of fishery are going to in time take care of themselves. That is not to say we should not give attention to them or do things to hasten their development but I believe the crucial aspect of the fishery and whether it survives as a successful resource based enterprise or continues to be an industry that we apologize for over the years. Whether it is the former or the latter will depend on how well we establish new markets. The United States market has always been hefty mind you, large in volume but always a bit uncertain, always the question of new terms always the

MR. SIMMONS: question of to what degree the United States and particularly now the - could begin to meet its own semi-finished requirement without looking to Canada and to Newfoundland in particular for it. So there is a need to look to the market of Europe. And I am concerned on this angle very much in this way. I am told by the British people that they are developing the purchase of hake from Argentina. I have been assured by them that that is only a short term thing. They are only doing it until the codfish shortage is made up by some other nation, preferably Canada - possibly Canada. But what happens, Mr. Speaker - let me raise the question - what happens if we are so long putting our house in order on marketing in Europe that the arrangement between Britain and Argentina becomes fairly permanent and that the hake, which I am told is an inferior fish - and I am not in the position to discuss this - but I am told is an inferior fish to the codfish and which is only going to be marketed for certain of what I will call the lesser products, the fish stick type products, where apparently, all they are interested in is a white fish and they are not particularly interested whether it is cod or not. What happens, Mr. Speaker, if what is to be a temporary arrangement between Britain and Argentina becomes a fairly comfortable and successful and perhaps lucrative long term arrangement? What happens if we allow the Argentine supply to supplant the Canadian supply? - what could be the Canadian supply, the Newfoundland supply. What happens if we find that the market we were sure is there, is there, but it is being

MR. SIMMONS: used by somebody else who can deliver a cheaper, albeit inferior product? And that is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that marketing is important and we do not have a lot of time to get on with it. I have mentioned white fish and codfish. There is a great market in Europe, I am told, for herring. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that the Europeans are not particularly happy with the quality of herring they are getting from us at this particular time.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Europeans -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, the British - I am sorry - the British in particular I am talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I am talking about the British. I am quoting directly from a note I made after talking to a representative of the Findus group in England - Findus - F-i-n-d-u-s, I believe - and he particularly said that they were not at all happy -

MR. PECKFORD: The Scandinavians -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, well, the quote that I made when I talked - I am not sure, I say to the Minister from Green Bay, because there are obviously exceptions - you know, and he and I know that -

MR. WHITE: Six million pounds from my -

MR. SIMMONS: He and I know that operation in Little Bay Islands and, you know, it is a meticulous and well run operation. But I was talking generally and

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1978

June 1, 1979

Page No. 3830

BT-1

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. M. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I must say, when I started my few remarks I had the impression that I would have unlimited time having followed the hon. member opposite who spoke, I think, for around fifteen hours so I looked forward to speaking for maybe at least fifteen, or fourteen, or thirteen, hours but I am told now that my time will expire in about fifteen minutes. So, about one-tenth of the things that I intended to say will have to remain unsaid. But, before I adjourned the debate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair is having great difficulty in hearing the hon. gentleman.

MR. M. CARTER: Before I adjourned the debate, Mr. Speaker, at 5:30 I was referring to the fact that at the present time there is altogether too much dependency in Newfoundland and in Canada on the U.S. market for our fish products, because, as I said, I believe around ninety or ninety-five percent of all the fish produced in Newfoundland ends up in the American market. That dependency, Mr. Speaker, in light of the U.S. declaration of their 200-mile limit, in light of their obvious determination to increase their catching efforts by every means possible, it is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, that their catches will increase, that their production will increase and thereby lessen their dependency on the Canadian producer for their raw material. In fact, I made reference to the fact before we adjourned the debate at 5:30 about the difference in the rate of consumption, the per capita consumption between the average North American as opposed to the average European family. In Canada and the U.S. the average per capita consumption is around twelve to fifteen pounds per person; then, in fact, in Europe that figure is more than doubled. In fact, the total amount of fish imported into the U.S. in 1972, and this amount has been pretty well consistent, was around 3.1 billion

June 1, 1970

Tape No. 3038

07-1

MR. H. CASPER:

tons a year. The potential market in the EC countries would be in the order of 6 million tons a year which, of course, is three times more than that of the U.S. market. That, I believe, proves the need for our determination to look towards Europe for more markets for our product and maybe have less of a dependency on the U.S. market for our products. Indeed, as I said before, it is the objective of the present Government to lessen our dependency on the U.S. market by at least thirty-five percent over the next five years. By that I mean we are hoping to have at least thirty-five percent of the fish caught and processed in this Province going to Europe as opposed to going to the U.S. market.

Mr. Speaker, the joint venture concepts have taken on a certain meaning in this Province and meaning by different people. We talk about the Nordsee-Ocean Harvester proposed merger, we know there is a certain amount of opposition to that concept in the Province, we are not blind enough to ignore that fact, we are not going to stick our heads in the proverbial sand and pretend that all is well, that joint ventures are the accepted thing in this Province; we know they are not, we know that in certain quarters they are not the popular thing to propose. But, certainly, when it comes to the Nordsee-Ocean Harvester proposal this Government supports that concept, that proposal. We do it for several reasons. The proposed merger of the Ocean Harvester and Nordsee companies - We have done that, Mr. Speaker, on certain conditions, seven conditions that have been laid down by the Government of Newfoundland, conditions through which we have made our support possible. Another thing, of course, that we have since imposed upon the principals of the companies concerned is that the Newfoundland Government, the Newfoundland people through their Government will have a five or six percent equity in that company which would deny any one partner the opportunity to gain fifty-one percent control.

MR. W. CARTER:

of that company that, we believe, will allay the fears of certain people with respect to foreign take-over and foreign investment. Mr. Speaker, when you realize the restrictions that are being placed on that company by both governments, federal and provincial, it is difficult to reconcile some of the objections that have been raised to it by people, and some people in prominent places. For example, that company before it can operate a plant will have to apply to the Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland for a licence to operate. We issue the licence to operate the plants, and that licence, of course, can be withheld or revoked if the terms and conditions under which it has been issued are not being adhered to by the company. The company is unable to operate one ship - one ship - without first of all obtaining a licence for its operations from the federal government and, again, that licence can be withheld or, if the terms and conditions under which it has been issued are not followed, then the minister has the authority to revoke that licence. So, if the company does not live up to its expectations or the conditions under which it was granted permission to operate under the Foreign Investment Review Agency, well, they can be actually put out of business by either of the two governments, provincial or federal government. So, certainly it would not be in their interest to start playing games with the Newfoundland fishermen or the Newfoundland people or with the province or with the federal government. It certainly would not make sense. The proposal does have some very worthwhile benefits as far as we are concerned for the province. It will bring with it, apart from the catching capability, three freezer trawlers, worth I suppose if you were to get them built today anywhere from \$10-15 million each, three wetfish trawlers, costing I suppose anywhere from \$5-7 million and other expertise in the harvesting

and processing sectors of the industry. It will provide jobs for 450 people directly in the processing sector, not to mention the 60 or 80 people that will be employed on the ships as crewmen and, of course, in time officers and so on to serve on the ship. It will provide means of the inshore fishermen in that part of the province, Conception - Trinity Bay area; it will provide for them an outlet for their fish during the glut periods and generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, it will provide a lot of benefits. Now talking about the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. CARTER: No, the disadvantages. I would like for the hon. member to point out when he speaks the disadvantages and I will be glad to react to him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do it now?

MR. W. CARTER: No, I am speaking now and I have only a few more minutes left.

AN. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER: The fish to be caught, Mr. Speaker, by the ships operated by that company estimated to be around 15,000 tons will come from the areas where foreign ships will normally fish. So, let us assume that in 1979, if that proposal is accepted, let us say, Mr. Speaker, that proposal were in place in 1979 and that they were capable of landing 15,000 metric tons of fish in their ships, all of that would mean codfish and other groundfish, all that would mean in effect is that the 15,000 tons that they would harvest that would be landed in this province, processed by Newfoundlanders for the sake of Newfoundland, for the benefit of Newfoundland, that fish would be coming out of the otherwise surplus quotas that have been allocated to foreign countries. In other words, in 1978 the total allowable catches, I have said earlier, are 135,000 tons, 35,000 tons of which have been given away to foreign countries without any economic benefit accruing to this province. With the Nordsee operation in place all it would mean that we would still be giving away 35,000 tons to foreigners with no economic benefit. We would

then only have to give away 20,000 tons when, in fact, 15,000 tons of that would have been landed in this province by that Newfoundland company for the benefit of the Newfoundland people. In no way will that operation interfere with the inshore fishery. Surely one is not naive enough to think that these big ships, ten and twelve million dollar ships, and in some cases even more costly ships, will be operating three or four miles within land in competition with the inshore fishermen. That, Mr. Speaker,

June 1, 1970

Tape No. 3840

27-1

MR. W. CARTER: is false, the assumption that they will operate in that way. It is false and misleading.

Mr. Speaker, my time is rapidly coming to an end and -

MR. STRACHAN: By leave, by leave, carry on.

MR. W. CARTER: - if I am allowed to continue I would be very happy to but -

MR. NEARY: The Minister should move a vote of non-confidence in the Government which would give him unlimited time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER: Like I said a moment ago, I would like to end my remarks probably the way I started them by repeating what I have said and what I have said many, many times, that it is the firm policy of this Government to do everything possible to ensure that our fishermen are given first crack at the resource.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: It is the objective of our Government that Canadian businessmen, Canadian investors, be given first crack at providing the processing capability necessary to process the fish that will be harvested by our fishermen. We get very little pleasure out of seeing foreign ships coming in here loaded with fish that is caught within our 200-mile limit while our Newfoundland fish plants are operating at thirty-five percent capacity. It is unbelievable, it is unthinkable, Mr. Speaker, to imagine that in a province like Newfoundland where we have the processing capability of handling 1,200 million pounds of fish a year, 1.2 billion pounds, and that processing capability provided at considerable public and private expense is operating at thirty-five percent capacity while at the same time we are being denied licences to harvest the fish and to displace foreigners who are catching our fish, taking it back to their countries for the benefit of their people, all being done by leave and by licence of Ottawa. Is it any wonder,

MR. M. CASBERG:

Mr. Speaker, that we find it difficult to reconcile the position taken by Ottawa with respect to the issuance of licences to foreign ships? We have fish plants in this province and I could name one in Fortune that has been operating now with down time for quite some time. In fact, the previous owner, Booth Fisheries, were actually driven out of this province - and someday that story will be told, I guess - driven from this province by virtue of the fact that they were denied licences to operate ships to keep their plants operating while, at the same time, this year 1978, right at this moment, Mr. Speaker, there are more foreign fishing ships, more foreign vessels operating within Canada's 200-mile limit harvesting our fish than there are Canadian vessels, which is a complete and utter contradiction of the spirit of the law under which the 200-mile limit was declared and, I believe, is denying the Newfoundland fishermen and the Canadian fishermen their rights because the access to that fish is theirs by right.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is up but I look forward to being able to continue this debate maybe in the Throne Speech debate or sometime before the House adjourns.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member of St. John's West.

MR. KEECHEN:

Mr. Speaker, this is the period in which we examine the financial plan that the Government has proposed to the House and look at it looking for strong points and looking for omissions and weak points. I will spend the first thirty seconds on the strong points and the remainder of the forty-five minutes on other things.

It is hard for a constituency with 10,000 people in it to have compressed into forty-five minutes the needs with respect to the financial operations of the Government.

MR. KITCHEN: So rather than comment on all sorts of items, I have decided to restrict my remarks to two items only, one having to do with the necessity of giving preference to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians within our province. In this respect, I think I would have to agree with the previous speaker that we have to pay much more attention to who gets benefits out of the resources of this province. As I look around, I see in government circles in operations conducted by this government by the civil servants, for example, a great many high-paid jobs which are allocated to people who have no roots in this province. We seem to be bringing people in, paying them very high wages while our own people go without work in many cases, people who could equally well fill jobs. I might mention, and I have mentioned here before, that I believe that this province should look at all institutions which receive government money to see to it that they are giving preference to people who are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. They should look at the university: they should look at the civil service: they should look at Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro: they should look after every, every government-aided institution -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hospitals.

MR. KITCHEN: and not only - and hospitals, good - and not only government-aided institutions, any operation, any business which gets licences from this government or anything else. We should look at, within reason, Newfoundland-Labrador preference, including banks, unions and whatever. There are far too many high-paid jobs being filled by people from outside this Province that could equally well be filled by Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Sickening this past fall to see how one crown corporation was paying in cash and in kind over \$100,000 to a fly-by-night from another country

MR. KITCHEN: who, if he has not already fled, will shortly fly, and the quicker the better. And at the same time, to have come in my office and for me to visit homes in my district where people have not got a pair of shoes to put on without holes in them and men who have not got a pair of pants to wear to get out on the street and look for a job. Now, it is that bad in this province, in this town at this minute -

AN HON. MEMBER: They are either rich or poor.

MR. KITCHEN: They are certainly not very rich.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, I did not say that - you are either rich or you are poor.

MR. KITCHEN: Yes, you are either rich or you are poor, right. And if you are poor, you are probably a Newfoundlander.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. KITCHEN: Another thing I observed at these Hydro hearings having to bear on the same thing has to do with this practice of consultants which governments and crown agencies are used to do. They think that in order to get an opinion they have to bring somebody in from Montreal Engineering or some of those people to give an opinion. They have to bring somebody in from the United States - Morgan Stanley - they have to bring in all sorts of peculiar people to tell us what not to do and what to do and either believe their opinion in any case as it is not worth the time we take to listen to it, let it alone the money we pay them. At these Hydro hearings, I noted that the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro everyone of their consultants were imported into this province and paid \$200 a day and expenses - God knows how much per day. Newfoundland Light and Power - they brought in their consultants from the mainland. The Public Utilities Board brought in some of their consultants from the mainland: and even the Federation of

MR. KITCHEN: Municipalities brought in their consultants from the mainland. Surely to God, there must be somebody in this province somewhere who can give an opinion on something. I think we should be doing that instead of importing these people. The tendency is wrong. And now another wrinkle has been added to this foreign preference, not local preference, but foreign preference; and I refer to what is going on in the public tendering system in this province. I believe that where local construction companies are capable of doing a job, they should get the contract, and that there should be some preference given them up to a certain limit. They should be able to get the contract by bidding a little bit higher if necessary for this reason, that

DR. KITCHEN:

a local company with its roots here, pays taxes here. It has investment in buildings. It has an investment in equipment, machinery and in people that we need in this Province. Its taxes go to the Province. The income taxes of its people go to this Province. It supports local charities, local schools. Outside companies, I know outside construction companies who are getting grants, getting contracts from this government, who do not as much as operate a telephone in this Province, who operate out of a construction shack: No personnel living here permanently, no taxes, no support. And I fail to see why they should be given the same kind of treatment because they cannot do business as cheaply and neither should they have to because they are making a broader contribution. I do not see why we should give contracts to people in New Brunswick when we cannot get contracts in New Brunswick, when New Brunswick construction companies and other companies are protected by a ten per cent plus contract in New Brunswick. I do not see why we should give any contracts to Quebec companies where we are not allowed to tender in the Province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The Collavino Brothers.

DR. KITCHEN: Well you mention them. These are people, there are more than Collavino. There are others, contracts which were let recently and which continue to be let.

I am afraid of this Hinds Lake Development. I would like for the government to look at certain points in this. Is this a dumping operation where a large Ontario company - you know what dumping is, where a company with manufacturing has its overhead covered in its own province, in its own territory, in its own country and then it decides that it will make a few extra things which they will sell in another country. They have got their overhead covered, they have got their managers covered, they have got it all covered: All they need to recover is the cost of the direct material that they are exporting, so consequently they can export at a cheaper price. It is called dumping and there are laws against it in Canada and there are

DR. KITCHEN:

laws against it in the United States and most any other country. But dumping of construction contracts, it is the same thing, where a company is covered and it wants to get a few extra bucks, it does not have to cover any overhead or a little overhead and so it tenders at a very low bid in a strange country or a strange province merely to get a contract and any dollars it gets keep their personnel employed for a bit longer. They do not have to make any profit at all to be better off and if they do happen to make a slight profit it is very good.

I think our tendering system should have built into it some preference. Now we should not build it in to the point where our industries are not competitive. That would be wrong. I do not know what the appropriate figure is. New Brunswick has ten per cent. Quebec has the doors barred pretty well. I believe too that people are telling me, that there are other reasons, other more sinister reasons why some companies are working in this Province. But certainly there should be a law, there should be some sort of an understanding in this Province that our own companies get preference up to a point and that up to a point will give them the opportunity to have skills in this Province which we need for the future, that will enable them to take their part in the Newfoundland and Labrador society as any other business and to have some measure of fair play. We have to keep a strong construction industry in place.

MR. W. ROWE: They say they have ten per cent.

DR. KITCHEN: Well if they have ten per cent there are a large number of companies in this Province who have not heard tell of it yet.

Another point I want to make -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. KITCHEN: The other point I want to make besides this preference rather than the elimination of local talent and the elimination of local

DR. KITCHEN:

companies, the punishing of local companies, is the question of housing. I want to have a few remarks now on this whole question of a very serious matter that is in this Province and which I noticed has not been mentioned once in this budget. Not once in the Budget Speech has the question of housing been mentioned and this is a most serious question.

I have travelled this Province from one end to the other and I represent a district in this city. And throughout this Province there are many fine houses. There are many people who have great pride in keeping their houses up and who have the skills to keep them up. But there are also people who are unable to keep their

MR. MITCHELL

This past spring and

this past winter, dozens and dozens of people - it is the biggest single complaint that I have as a member, housing problems. I was called to one house during the winter by a man who had no heat and he could not afford to buy any heat and his youngsters were doing their homework around the table with their overcoats on because there was no heat in the house. The other day I was called back again to a house where a lady and her family could not afford to heat the house, and what they were doing, they were going to bed during the day. It must be great but at the same time they were going to bed during the day so that they could save heat. Now, this is happening in St. John's in 1978. First when I was elected in this particular district, I think one of the first calls I got was from a person whose house was not really fit to live in and it took us eight months to get that person moved to a proper location. People phone me from districts other than mine. The other day I received a call from one hon. member's district where the person was complaining about rats. I can remember when I was a young fellow living in Millertown, a rural area, we had the odd rat running around and what we used to do - four-legged rats - and that we did, we used to catch them in various ways. I remember we used to be paid five cents for every two rats we caught and we did not get very rich on it but we knew how to do it. If you do not want to use a trap you can use a snare. And I had not seen a rat snare from that time until the other day when I visited this house. He had rat snares all over the place and he was catching rats too. Not only that, he used to stay up at night to keep the rats off his youngsters and he used to have a gun. Well, I would not use a gun but at the same time the seriousness of that is in this city right now.

Even more recently, I got a call from a lady with two children and the pipes had broken in this house that they were renting. She was on Social Assistance and she was renting this house from some - I think it was some medical doctor, or something, I am not too sure, some of those landowners who have lots of property -

DR. KITCHEN: and she was telling me her problems, that the furnace had broken and the water was leaking all over the place, so she was living in the kitchen, one little room, and down in one corner was a mattress and the kids were asleep on the mattress and she was trying to putter around the house, trying to keep it going. She could not send her youngsters to school, there was no heat, no money. This sort of thing is happening in this province. It is a serious question. Now, that is a few and I can give you many more examples of what is happening, and I am sure other hon. members here in this House can give other examples.

There are serious housing problems in this province, serious housing problems in this province that are simply not being met and many people find themselves between two things:- On the one hand, between the housing authorities which are operating more and more like landlords these days, if you do not pay your rent on a regular basis you may have to leave. Where does that leave the Social Security recipient? Surely, you cannot expect someone who has no job to be a good credit risk. That is why they are in Government subsidized housing. Well, with the Government housing agency operating very much like a private landlord, booting the people out when they cannot pay, booting the people out when they are having trouble, it leaves us in a very bad situation. I have known people not to be able to get into the subsidized housing and not to be able to get the Welfare to look after them. Caught between two Government departments, each of which can back itself up with regulation after regulation. But, what the person? What happens to the person? What happens to the children? What happens to any person who is caught in that situation? I believe we have to realize and ask ourselves, "Why are we here? What is the purpose of a government?" Part of the purpose of the government surely has to be to see that people are housed, to help them be housed, housed, fed, and presumably to do a few other things, but we have a responsibility, I submit, to people to see that they are well housed.

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3742

RE-3

MR. KITCHEN:

Now, I remember a case which is not so bad where a lady who was living with her son who was sick, a disabled son, complained that her house was

MR. KITCHEN:

falling down - the sills were falling out from under the house. The inspector from the Department of Social Services went around, "Nothing wrong with your house, my dear, look"; felt up under the sills; "Number one, number one". She had a little more sense than the inspector and she got a few friends of hers in and she could see very well that the floor was sagging. That we appealed: we appealed that to the Social Assistance Appeals Board and the board, they actually crawled up under the house, two of the members of the board crawled up under the house and saw that the sills were rotting, as I saw, and as anyone could see, and the case was corrected. But had she not phoned me or any of the other members if it happened in some other part, she would still be in that situation. I do not want to blame any civil servant: everybody does the best he can, but I am saying that we do have in this city and in this province some very serious housing problems. Now, a word on subsidized housing. In this city we have a number of subsidized housing areas. We have some which are quite good, in my opinion, but I want to comment on the location of some of the others that are going up. Remember, subsidized housing is for people who are, generally speaking, people who have less money than most everybody else: that is why they are living in subsidized housing. That is why they need government assistance to pay the rent. A number of these new units going up in this city are built in remote areas, far from schools, far from churches, far from supermarkets. Now, how in the world are the people without cars going to make use of these things very easily.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Where are the latest ones going?

MR. KITCHEN: Well, some are going way in in the west end and some are going up in the Hunt's Lane area and they are going up in on New Pennywell Road and very often they are not close to schools and very often they are not close to other things. I believe, and I do not know who to blame for this, I do not really mind about allocating blame, what I would like to see is subsidized housing built and constructed in areas where it is convenient, where there are things nearby so that people who do not have cars or cars that do not work all the time can walk or where bus service is adequate or whatever. It is not enough just to call tenders and stick up some buildings. It has to be planned and the city or municipality has to be involved in the whole planning process and so have the school boards and so have everybody else. It has to be a planned thing rather than something else, and I believe that there has to be more consideration given to the location of some of these subsidized housing areas because many people, while they like the unit, the beautiful units in some cases, they just cannot avail themselves of them because they are not convenient for living. I might mention that one of the most popular areas is the Buckmaster's Circle area. Many people in my district would like to move into that area because it is convenient. It is convenient and it is, generally speaking, a very good family atmosphere there for many people. One of the problems that the people there raise has to do with recreation and I believe it is a good, straight-forward thing. There is there this great Buckmaster's drill hall which has been converted to a recreation centre by the city, but it is not for the use of the people of the area. It is open to anyone in the city who has the price to hire it largely, and it is a common complaint of people there that they should have some recreation area nearby, particularly that one, where their youngsters can play and where they can do what they want to do and should be doing. I believe that when housing is

June 1, 1973

Tape 3844

GH-3

MR. KITCHEN: talked about, not only schools and churches should be involved, but so should recreation, the recreation of youngsters, particularly for people who have low incomes and very often do not have adequate transportation. We have to provide more than just - we have to think beyond just shelter; we have to think beyond shelter, and in areas where people have thought beyond shelter, things are very good. Another complaint that people make in that area has to do with the way in which the rent is calculated - you pay on the basis of last year's income. And if you are lucky enough to have a few hours overtime this year, brother, you will pay extra rent next year. It does not make sense because overtime is not something that is regular: overtime is something that is very often this year but not next year, and the year you pay it the higher rent may very well be the year you do not get any overtime. That is a minor complaint but it is a common complaint from people that I talk to all the time.

DR. KITCHEN:

I believe too - I do not know; perhaps I will have to do this or try to encourage it - but I believe that the Tenants' Association should be encouraged so that people can talk back to the landlord on equal terms.

I want to comment on the St. John's Housing Authority. Not on the civil servants who are there, because I find that the people who work there are very good. They are very cordial and they do the best they can under the circumstances and I think they are great. But I do not think I like this very much, this business of having the St. John's Housing Authority, a board completely independent, virtually independent of any government. They are like so many things that are happening these days where you give responsibility to some group and put it off to get it rid of political interference. And all that means is that they do not give a damn about what they are doing. And that is what bothers me about it. They are not accountable to anybody.

I wrote a letter to the chairman. Just let me read to you from it concerning one person who was having a bit of trouble. This is what I got back. I will not read the whole thing because it will take too long. "I should first of all make the observation that we are always quite happy to have a representation made in behalf of an applicant. The board is quite anxious that every aspect of an applicant's present accommodation and other circumstances be taken into account in establishing both the points score and any exceptional circumstances which may justify a decision one way or the other where two applicants are on the road to the even footing from the points score standpoint.

"I should also assure you that both the board and the officials will not yield to political pressure or persuasion. The point score system is in use in many parts of Canada as an accurate and impartial assessment of an applicant's needs for public housing based upon the quality of their existing habitation and its suitability to their needs," and so on. In other words,

DR. KITCHEN:

go to hell.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was the chairman at the time?

DR. KITCHEN: The Chairman of that, the man who wrote the letter, is named Paul Johnson. I am not commenting on the individual. I am commenting on the nature of an institution which takes out of the political realm, out of accountability to the people and pokes it to a board who operate on a point system. You do not deal with points, you deal with people. And if your point system is not correct - supposing there is a person who is not covered by the point system, asthmatic children, things of that nature. What do you do about people like that? There has to be a way by which the minister -

MR. MURPHY: Which board?

DR. KITCHEN: That is the St. John's Housing Authority. By which the minister -

MR. MURPHY: The Authority now, not the Corporation?

DR. KITCHEN: No, no, the Authority. By which the minister can interfere, politically interfere because that is what he is there for. He should be able to politically interfere and say in this particular case we are going to throw out this point system because the points system is not adequate. We have to have some protection from people who are hiding behind rules and regulations and that person is the politician. I would rather have political patronage from a politician than from a civil servant and believe you me there is political patronage in this Province by civil servants, much more so - I will not say much more so but often much more so than by people who are called politicians.

MR. HICKMAN: Was the hon. gentleman talking about the federal minister?

DR. KITCHEN: No, I did not really.

MR. HICKMAN: I mean, it is the minister in Ottawa, is it not?

DR. KITCHEN: No, it is the minister here.

MR. HICKMAN: Is it?

DR. KITCHEN: Yes, well it is both federal and provincial. This is

DR. KITCHEN:

the problem. This is an authority which is half provincial and half federal and this is why I am not blaming the minister. It is a wrong way to do it. It is a joint thing which means he is not responsible to this minister or to that minister in Ottawa. He is not responsible to anybody except to his own conscience I presume.

MR. MURPHY: Who makes the Authority responsible?

DR. KITCHEN: Well, I am not saying they are irresponsible. I am just saying that there is no way that the poorly treated tenants can get at somebody to correct the situation. And that is happening. It is happening in Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. It is happening in all these Crown and semi Crown corporations where the politicians who is responsible - gosh if you do not do a good job for your constituents they flick you out and that is the way it should be. If you do not do a good job in the St. John's Housing Authority they should be flicked out too but who is going to flick them out. Is this man going to flick them out? Is that man up there going to flick them out? This is the whole point. And I am not commenting on this particular thing except to say I use this only to indicate that they are very proud of being free from the politicians and I think they should not be proud of that at all and neither should we because there is no way to get at an injustice except through the politicians.

MR. HICKMAN: I have on occasion some people who ask me to recommend them to Crown corporations, federal-provincial, for a recommendation. They would be better off without a recommendation from anyone in politics.

DR. KITCHEN: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: All we do is pay the bills.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, that is right.

MR. ROBERTS: And answer.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. MURPHY: What I am trying to say is we lash it out.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: And we answer.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: And so we should, we were elected.

MR. HICKMAN: There was a court action the hon. member will recall when Mr. Diefenbaker was Prime Minister and Mr. Smallwood was Premier over that St. John's Housing Authority and the right to appoint members.

June 1, 1979

Tape No. 2046

RT-1

MR. ROBERTS: By the way, it is ninety days under the Criminal Code in Ontario.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, it has been amended.

MR. ROBERTS: Not since 1972.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, and there is a second amendment too.

I was going to correct that.

MR. MURPHY: Anyhow, the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) is making sense for a change.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, a couple of more points I would like to make on this housing thing. The Federal Government - I do not know if I should comment on it; I want to say it and I am going to say it anyway - has had MIP programmes and this PAP programme and on the surface they seem to be good but they are most unfair. I tell you what makes them unfair. They are great if you have one but terrible if you have not. We are having now in this province, for example, rural communities designated, and a person living in a designated community can get a loan up to \$10,000 and have up to as much as \$3,750 forgiven plus low interest rates on the balance. If you happen to be living in such a community it is grand, but if you do not, if you happen to be just as poor, in just as bad a house in another community there is nothing for you. Similarly, within the City here, we have parts of the City which are designated as MIP areas and the people there have been able to do good things. We have, in other parts of the City, non-MIP areas where the people are having just as bad a problem with their houses and they cannot do anything about it.

Now, I believe that goes against the fundamental principle of government which is that equals should be treated equally. And that is not what is happening. As I say, the only way I can blame the Government across is that perhaps they have not pushed hard enough, but I do not know if that is fair. It may not be fair. It is a Federal programme but I do say that it is unfair and it has been very difficult and it is still being very difficult. I do not know

June 1, 1970

Tape No. 3846

PT-2

DR. KITCHEN: What we have to do about it but we have to do something about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have 10,000 buildings in Canada under this program.

DR. KITCHEN: Yes. Well, it would be great if we had it going and we could have everybody participating but if everyone is not to participate then the people who need it most should get it rather than be in the area. It should not be done by area, that is the point I do not like this programme for that reason.

AN HON. MEMBER: The same as RAP.

DR. KITCHEN: It is really the RAP programme that we are talking about. Although, in order to get the RAP programme in the City you have to be in a VIP area. This is the problem.

Another problem that I believe many people have and I do not know what the Legislature can do about it except perhaps pass a law about it, or put the boots to the insurance companies, is to allow fire insurance on homes with very large deductibles - \$200 deductibles, I know, are on the go - \$250 - but I believe there should be perhaps as high as \$2,000 deductibles.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can have a \$10,000 deductible.

DR. KITCHEN: Perhaps you can. I have been unable - Is there an insurance company that does that? Would you care to commercialize a bit, to name the company? Because I have been unable to find, for anyone that has asked me, an insurance company who will do -

AN HON. MEMBER: I will name the person. T. J. Eaton.

DR. KITCHEN: A \$2,000, or a \$3,000, or a \$4,000 deductible. Do some are doing it? Very good. Perhaps they all should.

But that is a big problem for many people, that is the price of home insurance these days.

Another problem which I believe is still a problem is the question of land speculation that has to do with housing. I know that there are many people who are making a lot of money by holding

June 1, 1972

Tape No. 2046

BT-2

DR. KEMMEN: on to land other than the original owner, and that has to be driving up the price of housing very greatly. One housebuilder whom I know has said that there is more money in assembling land than there is in building houses and I am sure that is correct. There is, I suppose, some skill in assembling land but there is very little put into it. I can see a builder making an honest profit but I really cannot see why people who speculate in land should be allowed to make outrageous money, and there is a lot of it going on. If we can get the land speculation prices down we probably can reduce the cost of housing considerably in this Province. It is not only in this City but in other parts too. Sixteen thousand dollars for building lots, fifteen thousand dollar building lots, for what?

Another question that bothers me very much as far as housing in this City is concerned is the tremendous number of fires.

MR. KITCHEN: I do not know what has to be done here but it frightens me, it is really scary the number of fires that take place in this city and when you realize that so many houses are joined together and so many of them are inadequately protected. Perhaps we will have to make some law in this House or toughen up our laws so that people can live in houses which are relatively safe, and there are a lot of people in this city, and possibly other places, but certainly in this city because I have been in a lot of houses that are not fire-safe, far from it, and I do not believe that anyone should be - I think the legislature can correct that through legislation which is enforced to some extent, to some extent. We cannot allow fire traps to continue to exist and people to die, particularly poor people who have to live, usually have to live in these places. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a great deal that has to be done in the area of housing in this province. One of the things that we have to do, and it has not been done, is to get an inventory of the housing in this province from one end of her to the other. What are people living in? What are they living in? What is it like? Let us classify it, categorize it and see what people are living in. See how many thousand houses we need that are - that should not be inhabited by people. How many houses are fine houses but they are no good for modern living. People do not live now like they did a hundred years ago and houses which were good a hundred years ago are not acceptable to people now. Neither should they be because life has changed.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were not good then; they are not good now.

MR. KITCHEN: There are some that were never any good, right; but lifestyles have changed too, and perhaps the houses are obsolete as well, especially if they are a hundred years old there in many cases. I believe

MR. KITCHEN: we should have an inventory from one end of the province to the other of the housing. We should have an inventory of how they are heated; how they are insulated. We should have an inventory of safety to see what the safety hazards are, what needs to be done. I do not believe this would be very expensive to conduct, it has to be thorough, but it is not going to cost very many hundreds of thousands of dollars to have a comprehensive housing inventory so that we will know what our housing stock is like in this province. When we know what the housing stock is like then we can see what has to be done to improve it, both for the present and for the future. We can have fair projections of what may take place in the future as good as we can and we should project that. Unless we have some sort of inventory, some comprehensive inventory, no housing policy can be built on anything except on whim and self-interest seeking. I believe we should have that inventory and it should be taken soon. I believe then that if we had that inventory, I asked the Newfoundland Hydro people that "Did you do an inventory of housing?", because electric heat is there: they are in the business of providing electricity and one of the big means of heating is electricity and if we get Lower Churchill power into this part of the province and throughout Labrador, then it is possible that electric heat will become once again economical for many people. We have to look at our housing stock and see how we can heat the houses, but Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro had no plans to conduct any inventory of housing, had no plans to look at insulation, had no plans to do anything like that. So, they do not have a policy and are not intending to have it; maybe they are not the agency. Perhaps it is the Minister of Municipal

June 1, 1978

Tape 3847

GH-3

MR. KITCHEN: Affairs and Housing, his department, who should conduct that survey. It is not just a survey of the condition of the houses, it is a survey too of the whole problem of heating. What do modern families want in rural areas? What do modern families need in the city? What other alternative sources of heat are there? What areas of the province can very well be heated by wood-firing and what others can be heated by oil? What about the electric heat prospects? I think once we get the inventory of housing and the inventory of the heating problem, then we will be a long ways away, then we will be far along the road to developing an adequate housing policy. But as it is now, the housing policy of the

8667

DR. HUBERT KITCHEN:

provincial government and the federal government, as it applies to this province, leaves a great deal to be desired.

A couple of other points I would like to make and one concerns people who are on social assistance. There are a great many people in this province who are on social assistance and I suppose we have to expect that with the unemployment rates that we have at the present time. Unemployment is very serious in the province and while we have people who can not work, because there is no work to do, we are going to have people on social assistance and daily, brought to my attention are some terrible examples of what human beings are reduced to in order to live in this province. I do not know precisely what has to be done. I raise the problem that for many people the allowances that they are receiving by way of social assistance is far too little for them to exist on. People who have nothing left to heat and nothing left to eat in many cases, old people who if they are sick and have to buy drugs, and many do many diabetics have to do that, many people with asthma have heavy drug bills and if their only income is social assistance or an old age pension then they can not eat, heat their houses and at the same time buy their drugs. It is a pretty serious situation for many, many people in this province and I would like the budget to have dealt with this problem on a specific basis. I believe that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) should have more power, more flexibility and his staff should have more flexibility so that they can or someone can. They are not bound by the regulations. Almost daily I phone some welfare officer in the city of St. John's to try to get them to bend a little bit, somebody desperately needs this and somebody needs that and they do. I do not phone for old nonsense we phone only after we investigate a case, not investigate, go visit a person. That is a terrible term go and investigate a case, we go and

DR. HUBERT KITCHEN: visit the person, we talk to them and realize that there is a real serious problem. Now that the churches have pulled out of the welfare field almost completely there is not too much other source for a poor person to turn to except the government. I believe that in deserving cases, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and some of his top officials should have leway to move in there and do what has to be done. There really no reason why anyone in this province should have to go without a pair of shoes. There is no reason why any person in this province should have their youngster sitting around the table in their overcoats trying to do their homework, that is unnecessary in this province. Put the taxes up, put the income taxes up if necessary, take it from us all, reduce our salaries down to their's but for gosh sakes let us not allow people to go hungry, to go without drugs, to die. I know a woman who died the other day because she did not get enough drugs because she could not afford to buy them. I suppose I should not say I know that is why she died, that is not what the medical people would say, but I believe that is why she died because she could not afford to buy the drugs she needed. I know that drugs are subsidized for people on welfare but if you do not quite make the welfare lists then you are out and some people can not do it. I do not believe there is any need for that and I believe that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and some of his officials - it should not even be necessary to have to go to the minister, that high up, to get a pair of shoes for somebody. I have been trying for the past three days to try and get the minister to get a pair of shoes to some fellow and they say you can not do it, you can not break the rules. I think they should break the rules. I would break the rules if I were in there. I guarantee you sir, if someone came to me and wanted a pair of shoes, he would have them. I do not care what would happen, Auditor General or no Auditor General,

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3848

CW - 3

DR. HUBERT KITCHEN: he would get the shoes. That is what
has to be done in this province. We are not there to serve the law,
we are there to serve

8670

DR. HUBERT KITCHEN:

the people, that is what we are there for. There is no other reason for this House to be open except to represent the people that we are here to represent. There is no other reason for government. It is not a bookkeeping job. I am not nearly as uptight about this appropriation of government funds as some people are on this side. It does not bother me very much as long as it does not go into the pocket of a person. It does not bother me very much if it is done in a worthy cause, perhaps it should be done on a worthy cause and then defend it. You have to defend it, you cannot go doing it holus-bolus, break the rules but when you do you should be able to say, "Yes, I did it. Wouldn't you do it under the same circumstances?" "Yes, boy, go and do it again, we changed the rules on that." That is what has to be done. We have to respect the law but we have not got to enshrine it. This is what has happened, I believe, in this administration in too many cases. Perhaps it has happened in other administrations too, but it certainly is happening in this one. It is certainly happening in Social Services and it is certainly happening in the St. John's Housing Authority and it is happening in many other areas as well. We have to remember who we are and who we are serving.

One of the problems of housing that I neglected to mention and I should have mentioned, because it a very serious one, has to do with the pentioner. I have a lot of pensioners in the area that I represent, people who built their houses and they are good, well constructed houses, the husband built it or had it built, probably built most of it himself and moved in from wherever he moved in, from St. John's or wherever they were from. An awful lot of people from outside St. John's in the district that I represent, have moved

DR. HUBERT KITCHEN: in and have been there twenty, thirty, or forty years and they built their houses, lovely houses, as you go around and look at the doors they are all nice and different, but the man dies, there is one pension coming in and here she is, the children are gone away and here she is in the house, a nice house, with one pension trying to maintain this house. She has an alternative; she can close down the house and say, "I will go to an old age home, I will go on the government and go in an old age home." She will cost the government several thousand dollars which the government will gladly pay but they will not give her a copper to live in that house and maintain her life and her pride and her dignity and to have people to come and to maintain this house. I believe that there should be more flexibility in that respect too, in the way that old people are looked after. That brings up a whole series of questions. How are we going to handle this question of accomodation for old people? A lot of old people whom I know now want to move into subsidized housing, they do not really want to, they would rather live where they are but they cannot so they try to get where it is subsidized. The problem is the cost to government. As the years go by, as the population gets older, and it will get older in this province, the government will be forced to pay to subsidize more and more the housing of older people. It will become a very great burden in this province and I do not know how we are going to handle it. You will not have to but we will, I guess, we will have to handle that, my colleagues on this side, I suppose.

MR. HICKMAN: That is why we are into your laps right now.

DR. HUBERT KITCHEN: Whenever.

MR. HICKMAN: There will be about twenty percent of the Canadian population supporting the other eighty percent.

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3849

CW - 3

MR. RIDEOUT:

There will be close to one third just after the year 2000 in Newfoundland.

DR. KITCHEN:

How are we going to handle this? I think we have to explore other ways of doing it and I believe this moderate subsidy to the old age pensioner for housing might be better than sticking him in a two thousand or what ever it is. Now then if the person gets sick, you can be sick and still live in your own house, but supposing you get sick and have to move into a place where you have to have hospital care or nursing care, it is going to cost that much more. So this whole question of housing is related to age, health and many more things. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should spend a great deal of time, in the years ahead, and in the days ahead and much more time than the government has at this time on this whole area of housing. Thank you.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to the debate on the budget which I think should be made before we are all finished with it and have passed all the dollars and cents that are in the budget. Before I get into the main point of what I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to a matter that was brought up by the member to some degree, the last speaker, the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) and by other people in this House over the last number of years and it is being addressed very often now by commentators across this country and it relates to the proliferation of the bureaucracy especially through Crown corporations and corporations in general. There is a strong feeling both in Ottawa and in many of the provinces now that the Crown corporation route and the proliferation of the bureaucracy has become so great, it has such a strangle hold on a lot of the system that it is counterproductive and it is not really doing the country any good.

I was reading this evening somewhere, and I was just trying to find it, about the increase in the public service in Canada relative to the percentage increases in other industrialized countries in the world. I think Canada now matches with Britain and West Germany, is way below and France and Italy and the United States. But Canada in the last ten years or so has succeeded in mushrooming its bureaucracy to such a degree that it is just totally unbelievable and incredible, absolutely incredible. Where I think I can best illustrate clearly is anybody goes to Ottawa on a federal-provincial conference now, or has in the last several years, will soon realize that there is a - I do not know what they call it up there now; an intergovernmental secretariate or something of that sort. I asked two years ago when there were 680 to 750 people working in this intergovernmental secretariate -

AN HON. MEMBER: Employed.

MR. PECKFORD: Employed. I used the word working very loosely. I think the gentleman who is head of that secretariate now is a fellow by the name of Davis.

MR. HICKMAN: Henry Davis.

MR. PECKFORD: Henry Davis.

MR. ROBERTS: Do they wear purple coats?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, all kinds, not only purple ones. You name the colour.

MR. NEARY: They asked Joey one time how many people were working in Confederation Building and he said one.

MR. PECKFORD: Me, is that what he said? If hon. gentlemen remember recently there have been a number of documents produced by the federal government as it relates not only the proliferation of Crown corporations and the proliferation of the public service and whether we are really getting good worth for our dollar as it relates to the numbers but also the whole role of Crown corporations. And there is a recent document out which I commend to hon. gentlemen on this whole question of Crown corporations, their direction, control and accountability.

MR. ROBERTS: It is probably marked confidential, is it?

MR. PECKFORD: No, I think it was published by the federal government.

MR. ROBERTS: It is probably still marked confidential.

MR. PECKFORD: In which it tries, the federal government tries to address itself to - they are into now three or four different kinds of Crown corporations and three or four kinds of rules to deal with all those different Crown corporations. I cannot help but agree in a general way with the whole idea that it looks as if we have mushroomed our public services to too great a degree, that there is proliferation of corporations and agencies and so on. I mean the St. John's Housing Authority and others are indicative of the system where a citizen has real difficulty or a member for that matter getting to having action taken on a pretty serious

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3851

CW - 1

MR. PECKFORD:

listen to CBC Radio this evening when the CBC Radio at seven o'clock

MR. SIMMONS:

Radio or television?

MR. PECKFORD:

The CBC Radio at seven o'clock. Well,

I beg to disagree.

MR. SIMMONS:

A lot of gentlemen did not hear it.

MR. PECKFORD:

Well if the honorable gentlemen did not

listen to CBC Radio he missed something and I am going to tell him about

it. They had on a gentleman by the name of Jeff Caruthers, who is a

freelancer on the energy scene in Canada, and they were asking him

questions about the latest dispute between Ontario and Quebec as it

relates to heavy water plants and the financing of heavy water plants.

His analysis of the energy scene in Canada were A.E.C.L. Crown Corporation

and its overall and total commitment to nuclear energy and how every-

body in Ottawa, who is anybody, is so committed toward nuclear option and

now we find ourselves in a position where we have more heavy water than

we have reactors to use it and the federal government financing on one

hand heavy water plants in Quebec and not financing them in Ontario.

Now Ontario has found out and is mad they did not get the same financing

package which has been available now to Quebec. So you see the A.E.C.L.

and the role that these powerful crown corporations are playing in our

society and that they can determine really, because they are so large

and because they are so persuasive and the bureaucracy in the corporation

alone is so built up that it can overpower a government and force a

government into a policy which is not necessarily the best policy for

the country. It happens all the time and it lives off itself, the

uranium industry, the mining industry, for the sake of creating jobs in

some parts of the country and it is just unbelievable what happens.

New Brunswick now has its nuclear plant going ahead and all the rest

of it. It really causes all kinds of problems for the country and for

MR. PECKFORD:

governments. As I say, the problem is that very often, and we see it now on the nuclear side in Canada, we are in a position where we have too much supply of heavy water, where the policy enunciated by a crown corporation overpowered or was able to run rampant for a number of years and now we find a situation in our country which is not at all healthy. At the same time it discourages, because it is a national policy and by its very nature does not totally reflect local preferences and local developments, Newfoundland and Labrador gets overpowered and it is crying in the wilderness almost for some sanity in developing hydro power first. Where does Hydro Power Newfoundland then enter the picture into this Canadian policy which because of its nature because of the nature of Canada, because of central government role, because of a federal crown corporation, can overpower us, and has in the last number of years overpowered us to the extent that there is a strong - if anybody in Ottawa believes in additional power development they only believe it and was even articulated by our member in the federal cabinet for it all to go west, that that might be the best way for it to happen. Even if they think about Lower Churchill and Gull Island and other power developments it is only in light of feeding the industrial heartland of Canada, if they think about it at all. Here is Quebec on the nuclear side saying if you really want to go ahead and build a heavy water plant, then be our guests, but you are going to have to give us some money to build it. So Quebec is the beneficiary and recipient again of additional federal money over and above what was given to Ontario. The power of corporations in this country is absolutely fantastic and then it breeds upon itself, absolutely no question about it. The cost and the environmental problems and all the rest that are associated with it become secondary, very secondary. So what the honorable member from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) and others were talking about for the past several weeks

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3851

CW - 3

MR. PECKFORD: about crown corporations and so on, I have a fair amount of sympathy with them. I think it is something the governments really have to address themselves to.

Mr. Speaker to get on points more relevant to this particular budget that was brought down some time ago by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Hickman), my colleague. Let me first of all deal with the issue of employment or unemployment in this province. The whole question of unemployment or employment, as people like to call some of their departments now,

MR. PECKFORD:

is one that permeates all of the Western World and of course all of the world for that matter. It is a problem that all governments have at whatever level and Newfoundland has had it since day one. I suppose the only time we had an unemployment rate below three or four per cent was back in the very early days when everybody was fishing and that was only seasonal then I suppose. But in any case it has been a part of our system for a long, long time and most economists have come to agree that the question now is just one of degree and not one of kind. There is no such thing as total employment almost except in places like New Zealand and a few others where they say they have it. But economists usually use figures now. If you have a four or five per cent unemployment rate you have for all intents and purposes in modern society no unemployment. I mean this is the way they are talking. It is all relative. It is all a matter of degree.

Of course our problem is that we are so far above what is the national average which runs now around seven and eight per cent unemployment and we are up around fifteen and seventeen and it even hits twenty per cent on a provincial average, and in many parts of the Province much, much higher. Of course the other factor and variable that comes in there is the business of the nature of a Province or of a region which will therefore dictate the kind of employment opportunities and the kind of jobs that are there. Fishing is such a major part of our economy that by definition we must have people unemployed in the fishing industry because you cannot get out all the year around. It is a seasonal occupation. It is a seasonal job .

So you have a lot of factors that go in to make up the whole unemployment picture in this Province. Then it is incumbent and it has become a common attitude by most people in the Western World and especially in Canada, more so in Canada than the United States, much in Britian as well, a governmental responsibility

MR. PECKFORD:

not only to create the environment to allow private investors to invest to the degree that you will reduce your unemployment but to do it also directly to enter the market place directly. And we have as most people say now, a sort of half and half kind of system where we are not totally capitalist orientated nor are we totally socialist orientated. We have a bit of both. We have the best or worst of both worlds if you will as it relates to how we do it and so therefore it is incumbent not only upon the national government who because of their fiscal powers have the major responsibility for creating jobs in this country but it has become a natural and a common attitude by every citizen that the government must do something, that the provincial government must do something and in many cases the municipal government, the larger ones must do something to bring down unemployment, to create more jobs and that the government must get involved directly into the economy. Not only must they create the right environment to allow private investment but at the same time do something themselves. They even come to the point where many commentators are even suggesting, you know, desperation measures, very short term things to get people off the unemployment rolls or off the unemployment insurance rolls or off the welfare rolls into some kind of "productive" employment for a short period of time to try to get them back into the work force.

Very often these things backfire and it is not to the best interests of the economy in the long term but it is incumbent upon governments to do that very often. And we have become very social orientated. A community in Newfoundland now feels awfully good if they have a water system coming or a water and sewer system coming because the boys can stay home now and work on that project for a year. Once again a lot of it is social orientated which is not good for a lot of areas because then local initiative is hurt because of it very often, that people who would invest a few dollars and try to start some kind of local industry to employ ten or fifteen people very often do not because they cannot really

MR. PECKFORD:

compete with the water and sewer system that is going through by the contractor or whatever. But it is becoming incumbent upon government.

So it is part of our way of life here in Newfoundland now that governments must invest heavily to create jobs through primarily social programmes. And of course this government as well as previous governments and governments to come will continue to do that. I would like to think that as this budget sort of points out to try to orientate ourselves away from as much as we can, that kind of an approach and more into the rural development type of approach, more to stimulating proper programmes for fishery development and bring about job creation, the core of job creation through stimulating the economy and allowing the private sector to get in there and do its work.

On the social side, you know, this year, Mr. Speaker, the highways budget in this Province, all things considered - Dree, Trans-Canada and our own provincial funds - is a massive

MR. PECKFORD:

injection of money into the economy this year. I heard talk about well over \$60 million into Trans-Canada Highway improvements, into the DREE roads, Burgeo road alone is around \$4 million - \$4 million alone.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, federal? Much better federal member than I have in my area and I got two.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now, now.

AN HON. MEMBER: I got three.

MR. PECKFORD: I got a real good federal member, Mr. Speaker, I got a real good federal member, the member for Gander-Twillingate, and I have a very mediocre member, and that is the member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: but the member for -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: the member for Gander-Twillingate is a very, very hard worker and gets the job done. Sometimes I even wonder, Mr. Speaker, but how, but that is another question that we will get into some other time. But we are spending a lot of money on highway construction, reconstruction, of paving and so on. This will provide jobs over a fairly long period of time, especially as it relates to the Trans Canada Highway Agreement and the three years that will be ongoing. We must try, even though this is necessary and must form part of the social infrastructure of our province, we must orientate ourselves and it is a difficult adjustment, Mr. Speaker; this government here recognizes that, where in the last two or three budgets we have taken some pretty stringent decisions, measures to try to reorient the government away from short-term, quick-money social programs

MR. PECKFORD: which are still needed and there must always be a high percentage there because our facilities are so much less both on housing, water and sewer and roads and so on as they are in other parts of Canada. But after saying that and trying to give the balance here that any other measures besides those basic social ones which we must provide as governments, that outside of that the rest of government's time must be spent stimulating the economy indirectly by creating the right policy, by providing the right programs, but letting the private sector go in and do the work. That is why I was extremely happy and pleased with the Minister of Fisheries' announcement this present spring as it relates to financing of more processing facilities in this province for both the small entrepreneur and the larger company, both of which he announced since this House is open; and that will mean a major thing for government to guarantee the financing but not getting in there directly. We are all after saying, I have said since I got up, this proliferation of crown corporations and the public servants is not a way to solve unemployment, is not a way to increase productivity, is not a way to develop your wealth. It is a way to develop sometimes some human resources to a very comfortable existence until they are old enough to retire. But after you commit yourself as you must to the social things which government has to do, like your - I am talking about your social assistance and your housing which must be a part of it and your municipal works and other public works that you have to do and your highways, the thrust towards solving unemployment must remain in the private sector and government's job is to create that kind of climate. Now, in the Newfoundland situation, we have been, and this is our dilemma so often, so fiscally strapped that

June 1, 1978

Tape 3853

GM-3

MR. PECKFORD: that the flexibility has not been there to create the kind of climate to allow the kind of investment and security to investors that they need to get on with the job: and we have got to turn that around. Mr. Speaker, if anybody ever thinks that we can start spending money and creating environment with something other than the fishery as our primary resource development, he had better leave the province now because the fishery will always be the major economic development lever that can be used to create jobs and create new dollars and to properly stimulate the Newfoundland economy. There is no other single resource in this province that is so important as the -

MR. PECKFORD:

fishery. It is both the short term, long term and whatever for the Province and that must always be the foundation of any economy strategy. Hence the ongoing increases in programmes that this administration has announced for the fishery have significantly changed the face of rural Newfoundland along with its other emphasis on rural development in any case and the two go hand in hand. It has significantly changed it. And it will not be seen in the short term again. It is a more long term thing. Fogo Island was almost written off three or four years ago and now it is back stronger than ever and will continue so in my view based on the fishery.

Then we build, Mr. Speaker, after that for our employment strategy, and as the budget points out, on the fishery. We build on that not with that, not along side of that but on it which then recognizes the primary importance of the fishery. On top of the fishery go the other programmes and strategies and policies that a government develops, that this government or a provincial government must develop, on top of it, after the fishery policy is in place in other words. That is what I am saying. On top of it goes. Then you start looking at your other resources and your forestry resources and maintaining it at a high level and your mining resources which the budget points out is about thirty-two or thirty-four per cent of the gross provincial product.

The mining industry of this Province contributes more towards the gross provincial product than any other single resource but -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: I know it is misleading in the sense that there are many other factors to take into consideration there but on top of the fishery goes your forestry, goes your mining which will be up and down and so on. Mines will close down and mines will open and so on. And your small agricultural industry. And, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to waste money on the agricultural industry. We must

MR. PECKFORD:

concentrate the monies we spend and spend we must and programmes to develop on agriculture in those areas that have the potential. Not everywhere. You cannot have farmers all over this Province, commercial farmers. You are going to be wasting the taxpayers money. You have got to identify land that is suitable for agriculture, suitable for growing particular crops and grow those crops and stimulate it that way. But not to every Tom, Dick and Harry all over the Province where agriculture can never be hardly anything. I think that is one of the mistakes that have been made over the years, that very often we have had a provincial agricultural sort of policy on spending money when there are only three or four areas of the Province that really can get into it and develop. And we should really encourage those people because they are going to be the farmers. They are the ones who have the acreage. They are the ones who can be bona fide farmers. That is where most of our money should go on the agricultural side.

Then whatever else will come, Mr. Speaker, two other major things, one of dramatic importance that can change the face of Newfoundland and give us the fiscal flexibility is the offshore oil and gas potential and additional hydro power development. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say here on the hydro side first that the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) in his short address to the legislature this evening made a statement which to me is indicative of an attitude which has got to change in this Province, that is the hon. gentleman said and I will just try to reflect truly what he said, that perhaps when Gull Island power comes on electric heat and electricity in this Province can be used again for heating because it is going to be more than competitive.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a widespread attitude.

MR. PECKFORD: That is a widespread attitude. It should be true but it is not true.

MR. FLIGHT: That is an awful switch around for you fellows, is it not?

MR. PECKFORD: But it is not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, can I just speak in silence. I am not throwing barbs at anybody. I am trying to talk about the issues of the Province. I am not going to throw a barb at the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) or nothing. I just want to talk about the issues as I see them and what I know about certain issues on which I think I can speak with some authority.

On the hydro side there is this widespread belief still around that once we got Gull Island power on stream across the Strait of Belle Isle, down into the Island all our problems are solved or just about all of them. That is going to stimulate major industry.

June 1, 1970

Tape No. 2055

EE-1

MR. BECKFORD: And right now, Mr. Speaker, if Gull Island was built tomorrow morning it would be at least fifteen mills on site and here in St. John's it would be from twenty-six to thirty.

MR. HON. MEMBER: And going up.

MR. BECKFORD: And going up. It is still very competitive with other forms of power but not cheap.

MR. MURPHY: It will not be flowing out of our ears.

MR. BECKFORD: That is right. There is no more cheap power. You can only talk about competitive power. Competitive. And you have to watch it then. You are within a range of five or six mills per kilowatt hour of almost any form of generation now. Almost. The long-term advantage to hydro developments if they are competitive when you build them is that the escalation factor is not there after they are built. That is what always gives that advantage to hydro developments over other kinds of energy generator, or electricity generation. No question about that. But there is no more cheap power. It is gone to Quebec for three and a half, 3.3, for sixty-five years - forty-five and twenty.

MR. HON. MEMBER: It is too bad.

MR. BECKFORD: I am not blaming anybody; I am just saying that is where it is if there was any chance. Hydro power developments per se, or even the industries that they might likely attract after the development, are not in my view going to be a really significant part of the long-term industrial and economic development of this Province. It could assist in certain regions to be fairly major, but Provincial wide, not, in my humble view. And so that when you put that on top of the fishery, with the forestry, with the mines, overall rural development, and then some hydro development for short-term construction jobs, five or six year jobs at the most, there is only one other area which because of its visibility and because of the dramatic way in which it develops and most importantly because of the revenue that can accrue, can really, really, in the short-term help this Province and that is oil and gas.

MR. BECKFORD: There is no other single resource, or even all the other resources together - Supposing we did everything right on the fishery in the next ten years, supposing we did everything right on mining in the next ten years, supposing we did everything right on forestry in the next ten years, everything right in rural development, everything perfect, one hundred percent right and one hundred percent revenue, everything just right, a perfect government right out of Nova, we would not as significantly accrue revenue and be closer to a 'have' province, doing everything right, one hundred percent right on all the resources, as on one resource, oil and gas. On oil and gas with jurisdiction over it and the regulations now in place applying we can in the next ten or fifteen years do what it is impossible to do doing everything perfect with all other other resources in the next twenty years.

MR. HEARY: We could win Loto Canada, too, you know. It would be the same thing.

MR. BECKFORD: Loto Canada?

MR. HEARY: You could be a millionaire overnight.

MR. BECKFORD: A million dollars will not go very far.

MR. HEARY: You will blow your chances of it.

MR. BECKFORD: Chances are a lot better on commercial discoveries of oil and gas than they are on winning Loto Canada.

MR. HEARY: Well, I do not know.

MR. BECKFORD: Besides, the prize is a lot higher on the oil and gas side.

MR. HEARY: (inaudible)

MR. BECKFORD: I know, but you -

MR. HEARY: You cannot gamble on it.

MR. BECKFORD: No, you cannot gamble on it, I agree. All I am saying is that is why I left it as last because it is high risk. That is why I left it for last but the point of it all being that when we are looking at employment and unemployment, looking at short-term and long-term

June 1, 1973

Tape No. 2055

SI-3

MR. BROWDER:

and all the rest of it, and looking at social programmes to assist in a very, very, very short-term, three and four months that is all, the long-term future - it is not only economic because without that you do not have any social - the long-term future of this Province must be directed at developing those resources that are very characteristic of this

MR. PECKFORD: and are very characteristic of this area of the world and done on a very rational, sane basis to give the best return to the people of this province. As I said, it is a yeoman task; it is a massive task to create permanent jobs in this province and that the single most important area that we must continue to work on and put every dollar we can and do it in a wise and sane fashion is the fishery. We cannot do it in oil and gas; we have got the regulations and have created the environment for industry to come in and do it, and they are starting to come in and do it now and will start this year and will increase it next year. It is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, that next year there will be as many as five drill rigs off the coast of the island of Newfoundland and Labrador, as many as five. It is quite probable that Eastcan will have three, and Shell Texaco one and Imperial one, and Mobil is even optimistically considering now doing additional drilling on their acreage because of the number of structures that are there and the seismic work that they have done over the last couple of years. So, there is going to be a fairly high level of exploration activity over the next few years, whether it turns up enough to commercially develop, of course, is the \$64,000 question, but the whole employment business is one that is easy to talk about and criticize but very difficult to solve in a sane and rational way making the best use of your money - a very, very difficult one and has to be done on a long-term plan by governments putting whatever dollars they can get into the fishery, forestry, mining and rural development, trying to get major hydro projects off the ground. It is no good to get them off the ground and sell it all west at a cheap rate where there is very little return because you are going to get four or five years' construction work out of it. That is no good. It is just as well to let it flow to the ocean as an insurance policy

MR. PECKFORD: until some day you can put together the right package. It is better to do it that way. It is better to keep it flowing than do it any other way. ten times better. Our emphasis, as a people, must always be along those lines. Mr. Speaker, two or three major events that affect me and of which I am fairly proud over the last number of (I do not know how much time I have left) the last number of months has been for the first time this past year, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation came before the Public Utilities Board and was scrutinized in its application for rate increases on hydro wholesale power to other utilities in the province, number one, which is a major change of policy and shift for the better -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: for the better for the province. Number two, the introduction in this session of the House of the Mineral and Impost Bill which attempts, and will succeed, to get concession holders in this province to either spend more money on their acreage to find new mines or pay a tax which we think will force them to relinquish some of their acreage and give other companies who are standing in the wings a chance to go in and develop. It should increase the exploration effort in this province over the next five years significantly. It has now.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the Occupational Health and Safety Bill and the accompanying changes in the mining regulations which will come about to reflect the changes in the Occupational Health and Safety Bill and then all workers will be under the same kind of

MR. PECKFORD: principles in health and safety standards and gradually the mines inspection division will move over into that new occupation, health and safety division that is coming under Labour and Manpower. The only reason now, Mr. Speaker, today that the mining regulations have not been tabled to reflect the same thing that has happened in the occupation, health and safety act is that the steelworkers' union has not been in a position to meet with us. We have been trying to meet with them for three to four weeks and they have been very busy and have not been able to meet. I think the meeting now which has been delayed two or three times, not because we are not able to meet, this is a two-year process that is just about to be finished, because they want to have their man down from Toronto to be a part of the meeting, and it is set up now, I think, for next week some time.

MR. PECKFORD:

But in any case, within the next couple of weeks we will have the mining regulations reflecting all the new principles contained in the Occupational Health and Safety Bill so that all mine workers will have the same protection under the mining regulations as do all other workers under the Occupational Health and Safety Bill. And then within a year the Mines Inspection Division will be brought physically and totally into the new Occupational Health and Safety Division. The mining regulations then will no longer apply but will be incorporated then and attached to the Occupational Health and Safety Bill which is another fairly major achievement, Mr. Speaker, to bring together these bits of legislation which will reflect changing conditions in the working place environment of all workers, not just mine workers but workers wherever they work especially in any industrial enterprises in the Province. I think the government has a right to be proud of the achievements made in those areas through legislation and through changes in regulations.

So, Mr. Speaker, this year through this budget there is increased highway construction which is going to reflect in a higher number of jobs in the highways sector than for a long time. There is going to be a gradual increase of workers on the Hines Lake project reaching 400 to 500 by this September. There is going to be increased work generated because of the offshore exploration. There is going to be increased work as a result of new policies brought in by this government as it relates to fisheries development, both as it relates to small entrepreneur fishery development and large ones and the major programme that has been announced by fishery products for many parts of the Province as it relates to its plants.

In the field of rural development we are continuing our efforts to create jobs. Every two weeks there are another fifty or sixty jobs brought on stream by fairly well researched small and medium sized projects throughout the Province. And, Mr. Speaker, to go along with some of those things we have been successful as a government over the last number of years to sign a mineral development

MR. PECKFORD:

agreement which is four times better than the one previous. Our ongoing roads agreement, a rural development agreement of about \$20 million which will be signed very shortly, a tourism agreement that has been signed, an ongoing forestry and agricultural agreement and a working with the people of Labrador on the massive agreement on Labrador development totalling \$130 million which is now being debated with the people in Labrador, with the various associations in Labrador and the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. So that we have done a fair job in trying to finalize major agreements on the resource side with Ottawa to help do the kind of thing that I have talked about in stimulating the resource parts of our economy which are common to us and which we can really work on doing something about.

I think the tourist potential, for example, with this large infusion of money should really assist in those areas that it is going to affect first and in other areas of the Province. So that we have gone a fairly long way to putting most of our agreements with Ottawa in the resource sector and most of our dollars now in a gradual shift away from a total concentration on social, important though that is. But with any additional dollars to put it into where it is really going to matter, in the long term. That is in the fishery. That is in the forestry. That is in the mining. That is in offshore and that is in hydro development. That is where our future lies and then with that kind of concentration and with that kind of rational development it will create the new dollars so that then we have the better social infrastructure that we all want so that we can say to Upper Canada that we have facilities and roads and everything else in this Province to compete with them. But you cannot do it on the backs of the Canadian taxpayers totally. You must try to do it through sane, rational resource development policies with an ongoing social programme to meet the needs. But any additional dollars that come your way, through

MR. PECKFORD:

borrowing or whatever must go into resource development. Otherwise you are committing yourself to a sin like you would not believe, to try to move along the same path with high concentration of your dollars going into social programmes with no corresponding resource policies to ensure that you create new dollars to pay for all that stuff, to pay for all your social side.

So you must have that kind of emphasis. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the per capita potential

MR. PECKFORD:

of Newfoundland and Labrador is higher than anywhere else in Canada. I do not suppose if you divided, if you could work out a scheme whereby you divided, put a dollar value on your wealth potential, which is possible in the next ten years, and get some experts to do it for you divided by the number of people in the Province that you would come up with a dollar figure for each individual higher than in any other Province in Canada. I do not know where you can go in this country of Canada and work out using that criteria where it would be larger than it would be in Newfoundland. And so we have to try to put it all together. We have to put an emphasis on the concentration, on resource development whenever possible not only to create the jobs but simultaneously and obviously to create the dollars which are needed to pay off and help finance all the additional social programmes that are so badly needed. To try to do it the other way around ignores any future and condemns us to always being hardly any better off than we are now and that to me is an unacceptable aim and objective for a Newfoundlander or for a province or for a government to have. And we must continue to repeat over and over again that kind of balance with the emphasis on the resource side to our people. To do otherwise is to hoodwink them and to be a traitor to your own Province. You have to look at it that way. We have to put it on the fish. We have to put it on the trees and we have to put it on the mines and so on and develop the right policies and the right programmes, to take advantage of all the money we can get to put it into that with the Federal Government and then these new dollars are not the same dollar turning over, the same one. We are trying to cut it even finer and finer and split that dollar into many more pieces, the same dollar and we have to bring in new ones. And it is only in this way that we are ever going to be better off, a little bit better next year than we are this year and so on and so that we are climbing up a ladder towards an aim of being better off and progressing and to being some day a have province.

MR. PECKFORD: And to me, Mr. Speaker, that is you know what we must all as members of this House address ourselves to in talking about a budget, in talking about developing the Province which is the vehicle, the budget, Sir, which we are trying to do that. We must do it in this vein and with this kind of concept in mind. Some other point in the process of the legislature talked about are how our districts fit into that and in the more practical everyday political debate that goes on. But as it relates to the budget to me it is the one good opportunity because you can talk around it of developing the Province in a way which will do the most good not just to us but for those who come after and who might want to stay here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here tonight and I suppose after the kinds of debates that have gone on in the House the last three or four months things have sort of cooled down a little bit and probably it is time they did and it might be a refreshing few minutes to get into some of the thoughts one has on his mind. I was sitting there a minute ago, Mr. Speaker, thinking that, you know, today I did Provincial Affairs on the CBC for Friday night, I did five minutes on the free time political telecast on the CBC and I sat down at the typewriter today and I typed up four and a half minutes and went over to the CBC and recorded it for broadcast Friday night and I just wonder - You know, I have to stand here now for forty-five minutes and make a speech and I just wonder what will have the most impact on the collective consciousness of Newfoundlanders, my five minutes on the CBC Friday night or forty-five minutes that I will stand talking about a few things that are on my mind here tonight. I am not going to try to take the skin off the government necessarily, Mr. Speaker. I think that has been done fairly effectively during this

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3858

JH - 3

MR. F. WHITE: session and I think if we took any more skin off the government they would be naked and I am sure we would not want a naked government.

I would like to congratulate the previous speakers on the comments they have made in the Budget debate. The gentleman from St. John's West I think gave a very good speech and one that I can relate to very, very much and I

MR. F. WHITE: can see more and more, Mr. Speaker, where there are a lot of problems that are now been articulated that exist in St. John's that heretofore we did not hear too much about, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that some parts of St. John's today are probably like what rural Newfoundland was in various places many years ago because I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there are as many places in rural Newfoundland in the critical condition that some places in St. John's are today and I have seen some of the places myself.

MR. S. NEARY: Ron Pumphrey says there are 100,000 stories in the naked city.

MR. F. WHITE: Yes. 100,000 stories.

Because, Mr. Speaker, and I will come to this later on but I will just make the comment, I think there has been a switcheroo in the last few years with respect to the economic base of this Province; it has changed dramatically from the time it was the urban centre, being the main source of employment and the main economic base of our Province. That is changing rapidly and since the declaration of the 200-mile limit and the increase, Mr. Speaker, in the Fishery there has been almost a complete change in this Province. Today the bulk of the unemployment, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is in the urban centres of the Province and not in the rural areas. I can speak with a great deal of knowledge with respect to that because I represent a predominantly rural area that is far better off than some of the areas in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk about the Budget Speech. We are into the Budget Speech and I was noticing here in the highlights of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, there are twenty-one highlights in the Budget and not a single one of those highlights in this Budget does anything for the largest majority of people in this Province who I think are being overlooked by the decision makers in Newfoundland today. And, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the young people in Newfoundland today who are probably the most disillusioned and

MR. F. WHITE: disappointed group of Newfoundlanders that have grown up in this Province in a century. I would like to give the House a few figures, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the young people and the age groups in Newfoundland today, and I am sure that members, a lot of members here, are not aware of the tremendous numbers of young people that exist in this Province and that have come up with the postwar baby boom, and so on.

Under nineteen years of age in this Province today, Mr. Speaker, under nineteen years of age - forty-three per cent of the population of this Province is under nineteen years of age, forty-three per cent.

Under twenty-five years of age are fifty-five per cent are the people of Newfoundland. Fifty-five per cent of the people of this Province are under twenty-five years of age.

Forty-two per cent of this Province have not yet had the opportunity to be able to vote because they are not of voting age.

When the Minister of Mines and Energy was speaking there a few moments ago about the things that may come about in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and may come about with respect to oil and gas, and may come about with respect to hydro, I just wonder how long the young people in this Province are going to wait for this so-called panacea to come to us in Newfoundland. We have been waiting a long time, Mr. Speaker. We have been waiting long enough that I am now reaching the state of middle age, I hate to admit it but I am now nearing that state, and we have the largest percentage of the people in this Province under twenty-five years of age and nowhere to look for jobs and with all the graduations that are going on today. They must be very, very disillusioned, Mr. Speaker, not only with the state of the economy but also with politics generally, Mr. Speaker, and how they perceive politics. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the way politics is perceived in Newfoundland, particularly by the younger generation. I do not think politics is, in fact, how it is perceived by the young

MR. F. WHITE: people of this Province. I think the perception of politics in Newfoundland is what we have to change, or try to change. It is not the politics as it exists because I think politics as it exists today is the same as it has existed for hundreds of years and will exist for hundreds of years to come. But it is the widespread false perception of politics and politicians in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that concerns

MR. WHITE:

me a great deal and I think that we should collectively try to do something about this perception. And goodness knows if some of us have not tried! But, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to try harder and try to change the perception because as we look around, and I am not trying to be philosophical or anything else, Mr. Speaker, but as we look around the world and we see the Baader-Meinhoff gang in Germany and we see the Red Brigades in Italy and we see all kinds of youthful terrorists movements growing up throughout the world, we must be concerned about what the young people in this Province are thinking about as they grow up. And when we sit here in this House and we sit here in this Province and realize that millions and millions of dollars of hydro electricity are flowing along the lines into Quebec, money that we could be having to put Newfoundlanders to work, I sometimes wonder how long the young people of this Province are going to wait, Mr. Speaker. I just wonder how long, for how many years, how many decades they are going to wait before they resort to some tougher and more radical kind of action than simple negotiations with Ottawa. And I am not talking about a political decision to throw a switch or something like that. But I think if the reality, Mr. Speaker, if reality of present day becomes imbedded in the consciousness of young Newfoundlanders I think they are going to be very vicious when they reach an age where they are going to be looking for jobs.

It takes so long, Mr. Speaker, to change things in this Province with respect to giving a different perception to the widespread feeling or the widespread view that politics is dirty and that all politicians are in it for the grab and all this kind of thing. I do not know how we can change it, Mr. Speaker, unless we take some drastic measures and drastic measures we have to take. Now a year ago, Mr. Speaker, I put on a private member's motion on the Order Paper in this House that we agree to bring television into the House of Assembly. Last year the private member's resolution never

MR. WHITE:

got debated. This year it is not going to get debated. We are still on the single private member's resolution that first came up, the one involving Labrador.

So I just wondered, Mr. Speaker, what we as individual members of the Legislature can do to try and get a point across in this House. What can we do? The system to me has got to be radically changed. It has got to be radically changed or it is just as well to have a Board of Directors running this Province. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that General Motors got about twice as many employees as the entire population of Newfoundland and they probably run it with a Board of Directors of eight or ten people. Yet here we are, all fifty-one of us standing up here in this House and half the time, ninety per cent of the time, Mr. Speaker, except when things such as what the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been involved in and my colleague here to my left and the Public Accounts Committee, those kinds of things where you ferret out singular and isolated cases of political corruption or misappropriation of funds or that kind of thing, then I can see very little else, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition can achieve or that an Opposition member can achieve or for that matter a government member on the other side of this House, very little that can be achieved. We are glorified ombudsmen in many respects trying to solve minor things for our constituents, and I do not argue with that, Mr. Speaker. If that is our job, that is our job.

But I would like to think that here we are a group of fifty-one men and women representing the people of this Province, that there is a larger and a higher role we can be playing with respect to the running of this Province. And I would like to find some way, Mr. Speaker, and the one simple little thing that I have interjected into the Orders of the Day in this House and that is the private member's resolution on television, I would like to get some way to get that debated in the House. And I do not know how to do

MR. WHITE:

it unless the government decided they would bring in a government resolution on that because I think it would change things in this House, Mr. Speaker. You have cable television now. Half the time on two of the cable channels you see nothing only community and social notes. The House of Commons in Ottawa is run for almost a continuous basis on Channel 3 on the cable television. And as cable proliferates throughout the Province I think, Mr. Speaker, that more and more people would be interested in seeing some of the debates in the House of Assembly. And I tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, I think that television in the House would change a lot of the debates in the House. If

MR. WHITE: people in the House knew, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province could see them on television and see them as they operate in the House, there would be a lot shorter, plainer debates in the House, Mr. Speaker, and a lot more members would be trying to make a point, Mr. Speaker, and trying to get their views across to the people of this Province.

Now I am suggesting -

MR. NEARY: No more smear tactics from the other side.

MR. WHITE: That is right. That is right. No more smear tactics, Mr. Speaker, of any kind, shape or form, just questions, Mr. Speaker, and answers. That is what we have been looking for and I am sure that is what we will continue to look for.

Mr. Speaker, some people are of the view, and this view was held by the hon. gentleman who sat to my right in last year's session of the House of Assembly, Mr. Smallwood. Mr. Smallwood was of the view that TV should not be brought into the House of Assembly unless it could be covered in its entirety, unless every word went out over the airwaves. Now I totally disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. While I do not have a large number of accolades to hold out to the press of this Province at the present time, I do say, Mr. Speaker, I do say that we should have in this House television, and let the discretion on what should be used be up to the people who are working in the media of this Province. If they feel that I should be used with a clip in the news well let them make that decision.

MR. MURPHY: Unedited?

MR. WHITE: They can edit what they like. I do not care what they edit. I do not care, Mr. Speaker. They can edit what they like as far as I am concerned. If they want to use ten seconds,

MR. WHITE: if they want to use twenty seconds, fifty seconds or two hours, as far as I am concerned they can do it. There is not a bit of difference in the world, Mr. Speaker, there is not a bit of difference in the world. There is a guy sitting up there and he hears a speech here, and if he wants to take the first ten minutes that I speak and print it in the paper he can do it, if he wants to take one sentence he can do it, if he wants to take one word he can do it. And I would suggest if I swore right now that is probably the only word that would end up in the newspaper tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or call somebody a name.

MR. WHITE: Or call somebody a name or something like that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the - shall I say the controversial sentences, the controversial name calling and that kind of thing that makes it way onto the front page of newspapers every day of the week, would disappear if we had television in this House. The cut and thrust of debate would continue. The probing questions would continue. The arguments back and forth would continue.

MR. NEARY: - might be more obvious.

MR. WHITE: That is right, Mr. Speaker. I do not think you would see the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) sitting down in his seat refusing to answer the Leader of the Opposition if we had television in this House. He would be on his feet so quick you would not believe, Mr. Speaker, and that is my opinion.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on with a few of the suggestions that I have with respect to us politicians putting in order the perception that some of the people of this Province, particularly the younger generation have of us, the perception. I am not saying there is anything wrong with politics in this Province. There are some things wrong, but nothing that a few laws could not change.

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a province in Canada that needs to cut out every single bit of political donations it is here in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, if the government of this Province would bring in a law saying that it is illegal for anybody, any firm, or any group to give one single cent to any political party I would be the first on my feet to support it.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: For years and years and years, and I have read a fair amount of Newfoundland history, going back to the late 1800s, up through the 1900s, Mr. Speaker, there has been - in just about every House of Assembly there has been political corruption and charges of political corruption. And here we are, a very small province, the highest rate of unemployment in Canada, and yet we are being the major news items, invariably Mr. Speaker, the major news items in recent years has been corruption and charges of corruption. And, Mr. Speaker, they almost always - they almost always relate to donations to politicians or political parties, almost always, almost every single charge of political corruption, almost every single conviction of political corruption in this Province can be traced back to that one cancer, Mr. Speaker, that one thing, and that is donations to political parties from groups, individuals and companies and I think -

MR. W. ROWE: Under the table.

MR. WHITE: Under the table of course.

MR. W. ROWE: Behind closed doors.

MR. WHITE: And I think, Mr. Speaker, that this Province, this Province above all others in Canada, should bring in a law that completely makes it totally and absolutely illegal for anybody to give one single cent to a politician or a political party. It should be done

MR. WHITE:

and it should be done soon and that would do more, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, more to try and as I said earlier, take the perception of politicians and politics in this Province, to clean it up in the eyes of the young Newfoundlanders everywhere. And I think that should be done. And I would commend the government if they would only do that, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know why they do not do it. I do not know why some of the younger Cabinet ministers on the other side do not force the government into bringing in legislation.

MR. MORGAN: It is going to be done.

MR. WHITE: I know you are going to bring in a law putting the sealing on political donations, that companies can only give \$2,000. That is not what I am talking about. Make it absolutely and totally illegal for anybody to donate anything to a political party and that includes money being used to run political headquarters and everything else or pay political staffs. Every cent of it should come out of the purses of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador because it does eventually anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about a minor party?

MR. WHITE: Well a minor party trying to get started, obviously the details would have to be worked out. Maybe on the basis of membership or something like that. I do not know. But somehow it would have to be done. It has got to be done somehow or this political corruption stink will never leave us in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something else that has got to be changed and that is this thing here called the Elections Act because we should tear it up and scatter it to the four winds because I do not think it is worth the paper that it is written on. There are a lot of things in here that I could argue about that have caused by-elections, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, people not following the rules and so on. But that to me is a lack of education. The major items in here, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to see changed are with respect to pressuring people into voting for one candidate or the other. And I would say that it is pressure and I saw evidence

MR. WHITE:

of this during the Twillingate by-election, Mr. Speaker. There was not that much of it during my campaign in Lewisporte because there was a provincial election. There were a lot of things on the go so therefore the big wigs of parties could not zero in on one particular area. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that even if the rules that are stated in here today, if they were carried out during the Twillingate by-election, Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure a couple of members from this House would not be in jail. Now, Mr. Speaker, I go as far as that right here.

Every person is guilty of an offense who gives or promises to give to any person money or any other consideration to induce an elector to vote or refrain from voting for any candidate or to refrain from voting at an election. Now, Mr. Speaker, that I know if it were in a court of law, people would be arguing back and forth and so on but Mr. Speaker, evidence. I saw at least a half a dozen cases that I could produce affidavits on, Mr. Speaker, during the Twillingate by-election of where people were told, either you vote for the Tory candidate or you get nothing. Now that to me -

AN HON. MEMBER: Or you will lose your salmon licenses.

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind promises being made. That to me is part of the political game and I do not mind promises being made but when you go into a fellow's house and he is sitting there, Mr. Speaker, and one gentleman in particular - I do not know if anybody in this - I wish the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) was here because I had a few dillies, because he was the ring leader, Mr. Speaker, and here he is quitting now. I will come to that a little later on. He quits over a promise that the Premier did not keep. What about some that he made during the Twillingate by-election? Where is he now? Anyway I will come to that later on, Mr. Speaker.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, about a case of an hon. gentleman in Twillingate, Mr. Speaker, a God fearing Newfoundlander, a one armed Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, who still shoots turrs. And I do not know what his political belief has been down through the years. And he sat

MR. WHITE:

in his House, Mr. Speaker, with his wife and kids there while the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) stormed up and down saying, if you elect Bill Rowe not one dime will you ever get in Twillingate district, not a dime. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is a breach of the Elections Act. I submit that the Elections Act should be enforced. Are you going to see the Elections Act enforced, Mr. Speaker? Not likely, Mr. Speaker. That is why this thing should be changed or torn up because it is absolutely scandalous and ridiculous. And I call upon the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WHITE: I said to the hon. gentleman, I told him many times that I was going to do it

June 1, 1978

Tape 3863 (Night)

EC - 1

MR. WHITE: it is true what I am saying.

MR. MURPHY: That is just one example.

MR. WHITE: And if we wanted a select committee into it, I could get the people to come in here and tell me. And I know people who were going to vote for the other side until they heard that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: - you know, and it is absolutely scandalous and ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, and I bring it up now because it is the first time I have had a chance to stand in this House and get a few of those things off my chest.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that Ernie?

MR. WHITE: Yes, Ernie.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) he did in Philadelphia.

MR. WHITE: Yes, I know. It is a wonder he did not - lost about fifty votes.

AN HON. MEMBER: - Wild charge.

MR. WHITE: It is not a wild charge, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will find out.

MR. WHITE: I do not have anything to table. I am just telling you what God-fearing Newfoundlanders have told me - prepared to sign affidavits, you know. So I am just telling you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) table it.

MR. WHITE: And I would not be a bit surprised if the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) would not stand up and admit to it. I would not be a bit surprised at all if he would not stand up and admit to it.

MR. WHITE: And did you not see the Premier on T.V. during that election saying, 'Well, if our candidate is elected obviously he will get more things for the district than if the other side is elected.' What do you call that? I call that political bribery - that is what it is - you know, how can we clean up politics in this Province if that kind of thing is going to continue to go on? I mean, the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) must agree that that is wrong.

MR. W. ROWE: Do you remember what the Premier said afterwards? Twillingate Island turned down our programme.

MR. WHITE: Yes, turned down our programme. I mean, it is shocking, Mr. Speaker. I think it is fine for a candidate to go out and say, 'This is the programme we will present to you for the next four years, not based on whether you elect that man or you elect that man, but here is our programme. And we are the government. We are going to put this programme into effect regardless.' The promises that have been broken in this Province the last few years, Mr. Speaker, are unbelievable. I know the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) is going to stand up one of those days and say it went on for twenty years. Maybe it did, but Mr. Speaker, people should start remembering what they promise. They really should do - and not make promises that are going to deceive people. It just bothers me to no end, Mr. Speaker, it really, really does.

So, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Elections Act should be changed. It should be changed for the sake of lots of people in this Province. I would like to see it with more teeth, a lot more teeth than it has, and I would like to see it enforced. And I do not

MR. WHITE: know how it is supposed to be enforced unless you make a charge under the Elections Act. You know, I 'phoned up enough complaints to Harvey Cole during the by-election, but I guess they are forgotten and that is it.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is time the Elections Act were changed. The Minister of Justice is talking about bringing in amendments to the Elections Act. I would like to see them, and I hope they do not only deal with detail. I would like to see them deal with all aspects of it, particularly pressure on people to vote one way or the other, and I think it should be done soon. And that will help as well, Mr. Speaker. That would help as well to clean up the perception - and I again say the perception of politics and politicians in this Province that everything is not above board and so on, because I think half of it, Mr. Speaker, is the perception and not the fact.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to spend a minute talking about what I would call the feeling in many parts of this Province that freedoms are being lost more and more every day. Mr. Speaker, instead of more and more freedoms being given to people, I think the feeling is abroad in rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker - rightly so - the feeling is abroad that they are very rapidly losing all the freedoms they ever had. Now I am going to hear something from the other side, as the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) shouted out the other day when we were talking about the Crown lands, They want us to baby-sit the people out there. We do not want to baby-sit the people out there, Mr. Speaker, but my main beef is that regulations are being brought in and

June 1, 1978

Tape 3863 (Night)

EC - 4

MR. WHITE: not given time to be understood by people and are being immediately being put into force and charges laid if they are not complied with.

I think that when new regulations are brought in there should be a period of time when they are explaining to people - that a concerted effort is made on the part of government to make people aware of what the situation is with respect to new regulations and so on.

The recent Crown lands regulations are a case in point. Everywhere I go, I hear complaints about that. Everywhere I go, I hear more complaints about that than I do about lack of jobs - I really do. I mean, I can read you a letter here, Mr. Speaker, that is unbelievable, and I just think I will go ahead and do that. It comes from Stoneville, which is a place where there are a lot of industrious people working, but they are very close to the wilderness as well, and one of the last communities on that particular shore that have a road. It was where the Horwood Lumber Company - used to be part of Horwood - Horwood South and Horwood North one time. The Horwood Lumber Company started up there a long time ago, thus the name Horwood, Mr. Speaker, and part of the old mill is still there. It says, "We the people of Stoneville are deeply

MR. F. WHITE: concerned regarding the government's policy on crown land. From what little information was forthcoming before the legislation most people thought the law would affect crown lands within a community or along the highway and that it affected only the ownership of land and that a person would not be barred from building on crown land but only that he would not own it. Now we find that the government will not permit even the building of a temporary camp on crown lands without going through a lot of red and expensive tape. Most camps in this area are used by their owners only two or three times a year and I would like to emphasize this to people who have never been in the woods in their lives, to people who are not used to the kind of country I come from, most camps in this area are used by their owners only two or three times a year. However, these camps ensure the fishing or skidooring public that there is a place of shelter if their machines break down. These camps are as necessary in the woods as motels along the highway. We spend millions of dollars on search and rescue operations but that is not of much use if the person or persons are frozen to death before help arrives. Only last winter a resident of this community, Mr. Frank Hodder, broke his leg while skidooring on Big Pond and he was taken to a camp on another pond nearby where he was unable to be moved because of the pain. He was rescued the next morning by helicopter. Can you imagine what would have happened if there had not been a camp where this gentleman could have gone? These camps also help promote tourism as people from the Mainland who have moved from Newfoundland to come back to the island to go in the country with their brothers and so on rabbit hunting."

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that that letter, which comes incidentally from the principal of a school, a very well educated young man down in Stoneville, emphasizes what I am talking about with respect to freedom in rural Newfoundland, the feeling that their freedoms are disappearing, Mr. Speaker. I completely go along with the theory of government that crown land and everybody who has a cabin on crown land that it should be registered and the whole thing.

MR. F. WHITE: I go along with that. I mean that is not something that I can argue with but all I am suggesting is that the time period in which those regulations are brought in should be extended. Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is that the time period should be extended so people know what is going on and are given a chance to get their house in order so to speak before everything comes down on top of them. Because it is not only the Provincial Government and I know the Federal Government has done things and rightly so. They have put cut offs on fishing licenses and lobster licenses and all that kind of thing and I agree with that but when you are dealing the society of people who grew up with the view and the feeling that they could do whatever they darn well like - they could fish where they like, fish for anything they like and usually had to do that in order to make a living then you cannot in two or three years which has been the case just clamp down on every single freedom that they ever had in their lives. And this word about the disappearance of freedom I am hearing more and more all the time throughout this Province particularly, Mr. Speaker, in rural Newfoundland and it is a very grave concern.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: You sounded so much like Peter Cashin.

MR. F. WHITE: No but it is true. I mean it is true and it has happened in the last three or four or four or five years because people when they grew up as I did in a rural community were taught that if you do not get an education you have to try your best to make a living whatever way you can. If you get a few rabbits in the winter and sell them, you get a few lobsters in the summer and sell them, you get a few codfish and sell them or you make a few quintals of fish, you make a living whichever way you can and a lot of people today are looking in the same direction and you cannot change years and years of a mentality being developed and being moulded in a matter of two or three months as in many cases this government and the Federal Government have tried to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not go along with that at all and I hope that eventually people will see that you have to bring new regulations into effect less quick, Mr. Speaker, and less severe

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 3864

JM - 3

MR. F. WHITE: than we have been doing in the past. Mr. Speaker, I
just wanted to make one or two references on this

MR. F. WHITE: spraying program, the budworm spraying program, the spruce budworm spray program, because I did not have the opportunity to do so the other night when the debate was on and I wanted to get into that but I did not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say from the start that I am absolutely and totally opposed to any spray program at all, period. That is a feeling I have and that is my view, and I do not care what views this party would take, or anything else, I just have to say that I am absolutely and totally opposed to spray programs. I just feel that way. I just do not think that we should be spraying poison down on top of anything, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that I should express those views because I want to express those views and I want to get my chest clear with respect to that, that I am totally opposed, probably it is my liberal mindedness, Mr. Speaker, or my environmentalist mentality, or whatever, but that is my view - nothing, no spray program at all, and let nature take its course.

Now I know that is a hard way to look at things but that is the way I feel about it particularly, Mr. Speaker, now in this Province when you have statistics that I do not think came out here the other night about the egg mass counts of the spruce budworm in this Province. I hate to dredge this up again but nobody, I think, stood up and talked about how the spruce budworm has declined in Newfoundland over the last year. Now the egg mass counts, and I am sure most people know about the egg mass counts, it is the number of egg masses of the spruce budworm in a ten square metre area and the 240 egg mass count is the danger point.

Let us look at some figures. Western Newfoundland in 1976 had an egg mass count of 495. In 1976 there was an egg mass count of 495. Last year, 1977, the egg mass count had gone below the dangerous level to 182. The danger level is 240. Last year in 1977 when the surveys were done it went below the danger level of 240 and is now down to 182. That was a decline of sixty-three per cent in the egg mass counts of spruce budworm on the West Coast.

MR. W. ROWE: No spraying.

MR. F. WHITE: No spraying. Nothing. That is just a natural decline on the West Coast. Now you can argue that it is because a lot of the good timber was eaten so the budworm moved on. But that has nothing to do with the present argument. All I am saying is that in Western Newfoundland the egg mass counts have now dropped below the dangerous level and stand at 182 egg masses per ten square metres which is below the 240 danger level, a decline of sixty-three per cent.

In Central Newfoundland, in 1976, the egg mass counts were 706 - 706 egg masses per ten square metres, and in 1977 that declined to 376 egg mass counts per ten square metres, a decline of forty-seven per cent.

In Eastern Newfoundland -

AN. HON. MEMBER: They shut the door. They shut the door after the horse got out.

MR. F. WHITE: That is right. Now -

AN. HON. MEMBER: What is your source of information?

MR. F. WHITE: The Department of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Yes, boy. The Department of Forestry.

MR. F. WHITE: Now in Eastern Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, watch the trail of the budworm as it comes across Newfoundland. In 1976 when it hit Eastern Newfoundland first, the egg mass counts were 861 per ten square metres and that is a heavy scene. Now last year, 1977, that had gone down to 543 egg mass counts were ten square metres, and that was a decline of minus thirty-nine per cent.

For the entire Province the egg mass counts went down 678 for 1976 to 360 for 1977, a decline of forty-seven per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture refutes those particular figures, or not, but to me those figures indicate that the spruce budworm infestation in Newfoundland is on the decline, and it declines after it has its major impact on an area, and I would say from this decline we have seen across this Province that in Central Newfoundland this year when the

MR. F. WHITE: surveys are done it is likely the egg mass counts will be below the 240 danger level. I would say that a year from now in Eastern Newfoundland it is likely to be below the egg mass count danger level.

Now if those figures are true then we should not be having a spray program of any kind this year. And I understand they are true, I understand they came from the Minister's Department and that is all I can do about that.

MR. G. FLIGHT: We will be perpetrating the budworm in Newfoundland.

MR. F. WHITE: In other words, in Western Newfoundland it has already declined below the danger mark and it is headed in the same direction in Central Newfoundland. So the trend is there, Mr. Speaker, irrefutable

June 1, 1978

Tape 3866 (Night Session)

DW - 1

MR. F. WHITE: facts are there, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think we should be having a spray program in Newfoundland this year. But, Mr. Speaker, I think I know why they are having a spray program in Newfoundland this year because I think they are being told by the paper companies to have a spray program I think the government is listening to the paper companies at least once too often and I am getting sick of it. I am getting sick of it, Mr. Speaker, we should be masters of our own house we are either men or we are horns, Mr. Speaker, and we have got to stop listening to the multinational corporations and making our own decisions. And on that basis I congratulate the Minister of Mines and Energy for holding out with the oil companies. We won that battle and I am sure we will win other battles if we hold out with the multinationals.

I am told this year that Price (Nfld.) made about 40 million bucks because the Canadian dollar is down. Forty million bucks extra profit. Forty million dollars because the Canadian dollar is down on the US market. I am also told my contractors with one particular paper company that it will be three years before they get in to the spruce budworm infested timber. Three years before they reach they will point. Why? Because the paper companies do not want their costs to go up for delivering wood to the mill and therefore they are cutting the wood the closest to the transportation linked with the mill. That is what they are doing.

MR. FLIGHT: High grading.

MR. F. WHITE: Yes, of course they are.

Mr. FLIGHT: High grading.

MR. F. WHITE: High grading, that is right. They are still getting the best wood and getting out as fast as they can and as cheap as they can instead of spending some of their money invest in a little more of their profit into Newfoundland

June 1, 1978

Tape 3866 (Night Session)

DW - 3

MR. F. WHITE:

And they are talking now - that is right everywhere - they are talking now about the herring money, right? the herring money. The herring money they are talking about it in the stores and the business people I sit down with they say the herring money is coming in and even I was talking to a guy from a Lions Club the other day and he was saying that at a dance the other night for some young people there was ten times as many hot dogs sold because the herring money has started to come in.

Well, one fish plant in particular has been operating twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week since January 15. Twenty-four hours a day seven days a week since January 15. They have exported so far 5 million pounds of herring. It is unbelievable what is happening out there. Now my concern is this that my district is slam bang in the main spawning area for herring. The main area of Newfoundland for herring reproduction is the Northeast Coast from Cape Freels to Cape Bauld that area it includes Green Bay and Notre Dame Bay in particular and parts of Bonavista Bay.

What concerns me now is that we are not having enough regard for the spawning herring and this has been expressed to me by the fish plant owners as well. The herring are now going to shore and spawning and the bays are being barred off by longliners. I had a call a few minutes ago and they tell me that the longliners have now barred off what we call Chapel Cove, which is the major spawning area, and the entire bay is full of spawning herring. The entire bay.

MR. PECKFORD:

Do you know what happened in my area? (inaudible) same herring bonanza that you are now describing in your area. There is no herring there this year.

June 1, 1978

Tape 3866 (Night Session) DW - 4

MR. F. WHITE:

But they are moving around and so what I am concerned about is that they are going to collect up all the spawned herring and away it is gone. The herring fishery is destroyed and I am going to speak to the Minister of Fisheries about it because I do not think they should be allowed to do it. They have gone into this big cove that is about a half a mile long and they have nets right across it it is full of herring and they will spend their days and they will

8726

MR. WHITE: collect up every single spawn herring that is in that bay and then next year we will have no herring fishery. The same thing happened in the North Sea, exactly the same thing. The herring stocks were completely depleted and it is going to be four or five more years before the North Sea herring stocks are rebuilt and when that happens of course we are going to be in trouble here again because that is the main source of supply for Germany, the North Sea, except that the North Sea herring stocks disappeared, ours built up and now you are going to see the same thing happen to our herring stocks here in Newfoundland, they are going to be depleted.

Mr. Speaker, my time has run up and I will have a few words to say later on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, first of all I am going to say to the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) that it has been somewhat refreshing to listen to him, a very concise, well thought out speech, having being subjected to some twelve hours from his colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. N. WINDSOR: It is most refreshing indeed to be able to listen to the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White). He had some points to make, some things that he obviously believed in very deeply. I may not agree with everything he said, Sir, but I think he spoke well and I congratulate him on quite a good speech.

I would like to talk about - or just make brief reference to a number of things that he talked about and one thing he mentioned and I think it is something that perhaps all of us here in the House of Assembly are thinking about now is what exactly can a member accomplish, particularly, say, here in the House of Assembly. And I think about it - here it is

MR. N. WINDSOR: ten-thirty at night, I stand up to speak and I am grateful for a few faithful Newfoundlanders in the galleries who were staying here at this hour of the night to listen. The media people are here, of course, but I suspect that by now they have had almost as much as they wish to hear for one day. I do not intend to make any sensational statements so I do not expect any headlines.

I am going to make a few statements, talk about a few things that relate to my own district in particular. I doubt if any of these will be reported. I doubt if very much of what the hon. gentleman said will be reported.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, some of this stuff is quite important. The hon. gentleman made some very good points and I hope that perhaps I will make some good ones as well, but unfortunately I am not going to expose any scandals, any great sensational headlines or anything of that nature so I will get very minimal coverage. It is unfortunate, and I do not want to be overly critical of the media, their job is to sell their newspapers or their television advertising or radio advertising or whatever, but it seems, Mr. Speaker, that any constructive statement recently has very little importance. I will give you an example that in fact happened to me just yesterday. I issued a press release yesterday afternoon of a road reconstruction programme, widening of Topsail Road to four lanes. A good programme in my district, I have been fighting for it for three years. I am quite proud of the fact and quite happy that the government has agreed to do it this year. I issued a press release yesterday afternoon, it is a programme of some \$636,000 the contract was, it went to all the media. One radio station used it. One

MR. N. WINDSOR: radio station used it as if it came from the Minister of Transportation and ignored me completely. The third radio station I do not think used it at all and neither one of the printed media have yet used it so it shows you what level of importance perhaps the media put on announcements that are constructive, that are saying, this is going to be done. And it may not be great provincial news but it certainly is important to the 15,000 people in my district and perhaps another couple of hundred thousand people who use the Topsail Road quite regularly.

The hon. member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy), and I am sure the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and pretty well everyone of us, I think, at least from this area, have constituents who use that road regularly. So I thought it was a fairly important announcement. I am just using that as an example. You make a positive statement and it is most unlikely that it will get back to the people of the Province who really should be kept informed. So I lay that as a minor criticism perhaps of the media.

The hon. gentleman talked about television coverage in the House, Sir, and I must say I think perhaps it might be a good idea to try it. Because I think perhaps what we would see is we would not see hon. gentlemen speaking for four and five days. I think they would tend to be much more concise. We would have speeches such as the one we just listened to, very concise, very straight and to the point. And, Sir, I say if you cannot speak or say what you have to say on a particular topic in forty-five minutes then you are really not making any

MR. W. WINTSOR:

sense at all. I cannot envisage anything that would take me twelve or fourteen hours to talk about, to say something that would contribute in any way to the work of this House.

MR. HICKMAN:

Churchill used to say, any person who spoke for more than twenty minutes had nothing to say. It is more stupid
(inaudible)

MR. W. WINTSOR:

The hon. gentleman obviously was quite a scholar.

Sir, just before I leave this trend of thought dealing with the House of Assembly in general I am somewhat concerned, Sir, about the way the House has been performing in recent weeks. I am somewhat concerned that hon. members on both sides really do not have any protection. Any hon. member can stand up and make any charges that he wishes. They need not be entirely accurate. We could say, "I suspect", "I think something is happening", "I think somebody is doing something." We saw it yesterday in relation to this bugging of telephones and trailing people, and so forth. No evidence was put forward. I am just using that as an example, I do not wish to attack that statement in particular.

MR. WOODBY:

Your turn is coming.

MR. W. WINTSOR:

Oh, my turn is coming, I have no doubt.

MR. WOODBY:

I speak for the -

MR. W. WINTSOR:

I have been threatened three or four times. I am most disappointed. The hon. gentleman from Burgess Bay (Mr. Speer) during his debate, several times, said, "Now, the hon. member from Mount Pearl should not get too excited, I am going to get to him, I am going to have a little dart at the Mount Pearl group and expose a great scandal in there." And I sat here, Mr. Speaker, for twelve hours frightened to death waiting for this great expose and it did not come. We did not have time. We had unlimited time. We spoke for twelve hours and he did not have time. It is going to come. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that is just another puff in the wind as were the tapes, the great

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 1968

27-2

MR. M. WILSON: expose my hon. friend from Kilbride (Mr. R. Wells) that he had to suffer and wait out, and that was no more than a - I will not say it.

MR. MURPHY: Give a Newfoundland expression for it.

MR. M. WILSON: That is right. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there are a few points before I get to purely into my district things, a couple of general comments that I want to make about a couple of matters concerning the Province today. One thing I want to get into is provincial parks. I have been talking to the Minister of Tourism on this and some of the regulations that have now been placed on people who use those provincial parks, and I will say at the outset that some of them I disagree with. I have said so to the Minister, I have said so to his officials, and the Minister has agreed to have a good look at them. Hopefully, if not changed then at least we can find out the rationale for them. Giving an example, Mr. Speaker, somebody who checks into one of our provincial parks now has to check with the gate each day. Sir, I know we must have a certain amount of control in our parks but, Sir, if I had wanted to go to military camp I would have gone to Camp Borden, or somewhere else. But, to have to go - Let me use an example, say, Butterpot Park, where if you are camped down in the campsite area it is something in the order of two miles to get back out to the admittance gate so you have to drive that two miles every day, or walk it if you are so inclined. So what happens, Sir? Let us seize a few situations. What happens, for instance, to the person who has one of these mobile homes? These large outfits are twenty-seven, thirty feet long, self-contained units. What happens if that person sets up his mobile home? Everything that he has secured when he is transporting the thing he is using now and dishes and so forth and left loose, or whatever. He may have some sort of an anteroom that he attaches, a tent sort of affair, maybe a flyscreen sort of thing that he sets up a picnic table in to eat, or whatever. In order to go up and check in every day, has he got to dismantle all that? Or how about the person, Sir, who c'd's into one

June 1, 1978

Tape No. 2068

PM-2

MR. M. MIBSON: of our parks and perhaps decides he is going to stay there for two or three weeks, I think ten days is the maximum that you can stay at any one time, at any rate - What happens if he decides, Sir, that he wants to take his canoe and his pup tent and go up the river? Say, he is near Terra Nova River and he decides, well, fishing around the provincial park or within reasonable distance is not too good, "I think I will take a little trip up the Terra Nova River now in my canoe and take my pup tent along."

MR. N. WINDSOR: What does he do? Does he have to check out of the park? Does he leave his trailer and his car out, totally without any supervision at all, on the side of a highway while he travels off up there, or should he not be allowed to leave it? You know, he is going to stay overnight perhaps, or maybe two days even on this little venture.

It is not an unusual thing. I know a number of good friends of mine have taken the trouble to go up the Bay d'Espoir and come by canoe all the way down the Northwest Gander, right down to the Gander Lake in Glenwood. It is a tremendous trip and I think it takes two to three days. Somebody who was in a provincial park could not do that sort of thing.

MRS. MCISSAC: They do not have to take them up, do they?

MR. N. WINDSOR: You have to check in every day.

MRS. MCISSAC: That must be a new rule then.

MR. N. WINDSOR: It came in last year.

Previously you could check in for ten days and pay for your ten days and there you were. Now, I want to get both sides of the story. Obviously, the rationale is that a number of people were setting up their trailers on a Thursday and they were leaving them there, they were using them that weekend and they were leaving them all the next week and coming back the next weekend.

MR. HICKMAN: Keeping somebody else out.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, they were keeping somebody else out but only during the weekdays when the parks are not full anyway, during the weekdays when the parks, with some exceptions, there may be a one or two week period during the middle of the Summer where a particular park is full all week, but I would suggest, and the figures here in the statistics of provincial parks released by the

MR. N. WINDSOR: department for 1977, looking at those it would seem to indicate that there certainly are periods when the parks are less than full, and I would suggest that certainly during the week they are not full. I think Butterpot Park is perhaps one of the most popular and I know from some experience that there are normally, during the week, campsites available.

So what about the person - and let us use Butterpot Park as an example again because a lot of people do go there because it is convenient to the city. People go up there, as I have said, and they want to set up their trailer and stay there for the weekend and they want to leave it there next week because they are only going to come back to the city for maybe three days, maybe Monday was a holiday and they are going to be back in there again Friday afternoon, they are going to skip off lunch time Friday and go back in, so they are only leaving it for three days, it is cheaper for them to pay their two dollars a day, or whatever it is for three days, than it is to tow that trailer or whatever back to town. Because you are going to burn ten to fifteen dollars worth of gas to haul a trailer out to Butterpot Park and back, so it is much cheaper for them, much more convenient to go back next week. And they do not have an hour or so of work to get their trailer levelled up and get it set up, and get the jacks underneath it and get everything hooked up again, it is all set to go. And maybe during the week they would want to take a run in for an evening and have a cookup and it is there ready for them.

Or in another case where some senior citizens perhaps - you know, the amount of work involved. It is quite unreasonable - if they could set it up for any length of time.

I know of a case that is very close to me and my hon. friend opposite knows what I am

MR. N. WINDSOR: talking about, where a particular lady, my mother, let us be honest about it, who loves camping, has a trailer and since my father passed away a few years ago, of course, she will not drive a car with a trailer behind it, but she loves to be out in that park with her trailer. So it is quite common for me to tow her trailer out there and set it up for her and leave her there for ten days. And she might come back during the week. But if I cannot leave it there now for ten days then it means that I have to go out on Thursday and set her up for two or three days and bring her back again and bring her out again the next week and bring her back again.

MRS. MCISSAC: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes.

MRS. MCISSAC: Well, suppose you set her up in Barachois Park in my area and she decided to spend three days in there and you came back here and she decided to come home for the next three days, what happens to her setup? Do you mean it has to be moved out of the park?

MR. N. WINDSOR: She cannot leave it there. She cannot leave it there unless she checks. Now, I will tell you what is happening here in the city, in Butterpot Park, a number of people are going out there and they are setting up their trailers and they are leaving them there for the week and they are driving to Butterpot Park once a day just to go in and say, Hello, I am here, I am in spot number 57. So what are you accomplishing? You have the people to whom you are trying to say bring your trailer back to the city with you and leave that space vacant, all you are doing is forcing them to spend ten dollars or fifteen dollars on gas every day just to drive back and forth. It is just ridiculous. I do not know how many people are doing that, but I do know there are people who are

MR. N. WINDSOR: doing it.

How about another example where, say, a couple go out and set up their trailer in Butterpot Park hopefully for ten days. The husband is still at work so the wife and kids decide that they would like to stay out for the week so he comes on back to St. John's and goes to work for the week, how then does the wife get that two miles or three miles or whatever it is to check in? How does she get up there to say, Look, I am here? The car is gone. If it is a nice day the kids could walk up, I suppose, but if it is a rainy day what does she do? She could hitch a ride, I suppose, with a neighbour. Obviously the point is that he parks are designed for everybody's use and so forth, but I

MR. N. WINDSOR: would suggest that some of these regulations now are getting a little too stiff, they are taking it a little too far. We go to the country, to our provincial parks to relax and get away from all of this regimentation and now we are regulating our parks to the point where sometimes you wonder if it is worthwhile.

MR. DOODY: Losing some revenue.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right, losing revenue. I cannot back that one up with a statistic because I checked it here and Butterpot Park was exactly the same this year as it was last year. Some of them have gone down and some of them have gone up.

MRS. MCISSAC: A few people's abuse makes it bad for everyone else.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Sure! Yes.

The pros and cons, you know, some people probably are happier. Obviously the department had a lot of complaints that people were leaving their trailers but they could only leave them for a maximum of ten days anyway, and if people were willing to pay for ten days then I say they have a right to leave their trailers there for ten days, and if they want to leave it for one or two days in that interim period, that is their business.

I will say that the solution to the problem is very simply that we need more camping spots in the Province. By far our camping parks, and if you look again at these statistics you will see that there is a very high level of utilization of our camping parks and we need many, many more made available to people who wish to participate in that particular sort of recreational endeavour.

While I am out in the country, so to speak, I want to just make brief mention of something that I became quite concerned about last year while out on a

MR. N. WINDSOR: fishing trip. What really pointed it out to me was this simple fact, that I had taken the day to go troutting with my daughter who was seven years old at the time, and we had been driving around all day from place to place, and stopping here and there doing some fishing and having a boil-up and so forth and she turned to me and she said, "Daddy, how come every where we go there is garbage?" Now, a seven-year old. Out of the mouths of babes. And there is garbage. The hon. the Minister of Environment, I am sure, knows what I am talking about. Anywhere that there is a grassy area by the side of a river where somebody might wish to stop and have a boil-up, there is garbage, bags of garbage, loose garbage, tin cans, bottles, anything at all.

Sometime ago you could travel the Province and in many of these areas you would find a picnic table, you would find a garbage container and so forth, but most of these are gone now the policy, of course, being that the provincial parks have now been built and we are hoping to encourage people to use these properly regulated and properly administered facilities where garbage disposal facilities are there and toilet facilities and so forth. But let us be a little more realistic than that, let us realize that some people do not want to go to a provincial park where there are 1,500 or 1,000 people in that same small area, some people still want to go to these little grassy areas by a bridge or by a pond or whatever and they are going to use them. I am not so sure that we could not provide a few garbage containers. The hon. member is solving my problem, he is passing me a litter container.

MR. MURPHY: I will get you a big one for your car.

MR. N. WINDSOR: All I need now is a Chinese army to walk around Newfoundland with these and our problems

MR. N. WINDSOR: will be solved.

But I do want to go on record as being extremely displeased with the state that some of our public areas are in and I call upon our fellow Newfoundlanders to take a little more pride in their Province. If I ever saw one of my children throw a chocolate bar wrapper on the ground on the side of a highway, Sir, or anywhere, it would be the last chocolate bar they would see for about twelve months.

MR. MURPHY: I am hoping to introduce a litterbug contest.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well, I would encourage any efforts that the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment would make in that regard because I think it is something that is drastically needed in this Province and I would support any efforts he would make.

Now, how are we doing? I have fifteen minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Mount Pearl or -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Do you want me to go into Mount Pearl?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, go ahead.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The hon. minister wants me to talk about Mount Pearl. It just happens to be one of my favourite topics, Mr. Speaker, and I was just coming to it. It just happened to be next.

First of all I just want to say one brief word. As all hon. members, I am sure, know

MR. N. WINDSOR: we had our municipal election in there a few months ago. We now have a new council and I would like to congratulate these new councillors. They are an excellent council. We have had a number of meetings with them, had excellent liason. The minister and his officials have met with them. I am sure the minister will agree we have an excellent working relationship going and we are looking forward to accomplishing some very great things in the town of Mount Pearl itself.

When I talk about Mount Pearl I have to separate here, Sir, my district. I have to talk about the town which is the incorporated part of my district and then the other part of the district of Mount Pearl, of course, which is not incorporated. I will deal with, first of all if I may, Sir, some matters affecting the town.

One of the major problems, of course, the town is facing is the financial problem as the minister well knows, we have had many discussions on it. And there are a number of reasons for that, Sir, primarily I would suggest because Mount Pearl is essentially a residential community, it is a dormitory town, a satellite to the City of St. John's. We have not developed the way that perhaps we had intended when in 1958 the municipal plan was first drawn up. Certain changes came in such as the development of the New Town and the Donovan's Industrial Park and changes were made in accordance with the adoption of those plans to the Mount Pearl municipal plan. As a result Mount Pearl now is something in the order of 95 per cent residential. Its tax base is 95 per cent residential. The population of Mount Pearl is approximately 10,500, one of the largest communities in the Province.

Our tax incidence, by the way, is on the average \$415 per unit.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is it that much?

DR. WINSOR: That is higher than most others.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, one of the highest in the Province.

MR. HICKMAN: That is that now?

MR. N. WINDSOR: The tax incidence in Mount Pearl, \$415 per unit, on the average which I would suggest, Sir, is high. I would suggest that the people in Mount Pearl are certainly paying their way and yet -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: \$415. That includes water.

MRS. MCISSAC: On the average.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is on the average.

MR. PECKFORD: Oh, that included water.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, that includes water.

MR. PECKFORD: How do they work out the water tax?

MR. N. WINDSOR: The water tax is \$90 per year. So you are looking at \$325 for property taxes and \$90 for water.

MR. WHITE: We have a better deal than that.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I am sure you have a better deal than that and this is my whole point.

MR. WHITE: So our tax base of 3,500 people is better than yours with 9,000.

MRS. MCISSAC: (Inaudible) service fee.

MR. N. WINDSOR: There is a service fee but that is not included there.

MRS. MCISSAC: That is property tax.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, this is real property tax. There is a service fee which is -

AN HON. MEMBER: For single people.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, that is right, for boarders, people who are working, but it really produces very little revenue. The cost of collecting it is almost as you would get

MR. N. WINDSOR: out of it. It is a nuisance, in fact.

So the point I am trying to make, Sir, is that the people in Mount Pearl are by all means, paying their way and why then do we have financial problems in the town? First of all, as I mentioned, because we do not have enough industrial or commercial tax base and the reason for that is because of the changes that were made to accomodate the New Town development and the Donovan's Industrial Park. So the obvious solution then is an expansion of Mount Pearl's boundary to give it back the industrial base that it should have had, that it needed. The industrial park that was planned in 1958 in Mount Pearl was rezoned residential in 1969, when the New Town plan was being adopted and being planned in favour of Donovan's Industrial Park, so there lies Mount Pearl's industrial tax base.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is unfortunate that it was forced on the town.

MR. N. WINDSOR: It was forced on the town. I do not know if it is fair to say that it was forced on the town, they did not have too much choice, but it was negotiated, it was suggested that this was the logical thing to do. And I support that suggestion, by the way, and I support the decision that it was a logical thing to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: If Mount Pearl's boundaries were expanded.

MR. N. WINDSOR: If Mount Pearl's boundaries were expanded. And this was the one point that was missed in 1969-1970, or something in that area. Yes, by all means rezone it residential, that land, that property is much better as a residential area and the industrial area is much better at Donovan's where it has access to the Trans-Canada Highway directly, the property is much better for rail access and I think some 60 or 65 per cent of the

June 1, 1978, Tape 3871, Page 4 -- apb

MR. N. WINDSOR: industrial land out there will be serviced by rail, so it was a very logical decision to make provided the town boundary was expanded and that was missed, it was not done and that, Sir, is the reason for Mount's Pearl's dilemma.

Not only that, I have to say again as I think I mentioned during the debate on the estimates for the Department of Municipal Affairs, that

MR. N. WINDSOR: the town is paying a very high per unit assessment and better than 75 per cent of the town's revenue is raised locally. Less than 25 per cent comes from the provincial government by way of any sort of grant.

DR. KITCHEN: Which is again one of the highest.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Which is, again, one of the highest. I will quote you some and these are the figures from the Henley Report. I am sure all gentlemen have them. They are certainly available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: These are Whelan.

MR. N. WINDSOR: These were Whelan, sorry. Although some of them were in the Henley Report as well, these are the revised ones from Whelan.

Paradise 35 per cent raised locally.

MR. MURPHY: 35 per cent?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Raised locally.

MR. MURPHY: Raised locally and 65 per cent from the Province.

MR. N. WINDSOR: And 65 per cent from the Province. Petty Harbour - Maddox Cove, 47 per cent raised locally; Flatrock 38 per cent raised locally; Conception Bay South 55 per cent locally. These are 1976 figure here, by the way.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, well if you had it now, the figures today, there would be less contribution by the municipality and more by the Province.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right.

Now, Sir, the House passed -

MR. MURPHY: Is St. John's on that, by the way?

MR. N. WINDSOR: St. John's is difficult because it is under a different system.

MR. MURPHY: I was just wondering, you know.

MR. N. WINDSOR: They would be in the order - I did have a figure -

MR. DINN: It is different because of the fact that you have the fire and police protection.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right. If you add the fire and police protection I think it would be around 27 per cent from the Province or something of that order.

MRS. MCISSAC: What is it?

MR. N. WINDSOR: 27 per cent.

MR. MURPHY: Is St. George's on that one?

MR. N. WINDSOR: No, these are just in the St. John's urban region.

MR. MURPHY: The Northeast.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes. I am sure the minister would have the figures available in his department.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) now would be about 20 per cent.

MR. N. WINDSOR: So what I am saying, Sir, is that the town of Mount Pearl by all means has a case to present to government for a higher rate of subsidy and, indeed, the new municipal grant structure that was passed by the House two years ago, I think, which has not been proclaimed -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Last year.

MR. N. WINDSOR: - but has not been proclaimed, Sir, if that formula were applied the town of Mount Pearl would receive quite a bit more revenue from the Province than it is receiving and in fact, Sir, would be in a very solvent position, very solvent. Even as it now is, even without the industrial tax base it would be solvent. So, so much for the financial woes of the general budget of the town.

Now, let us talk a little bit

MR. N. WINDSOR: about a capital projects programme for the town of Mount Pearl this year, things that need to be done. First of all let us have a look at what is being done. A \$1.2 million trunk sewer, a Mount Peary by-pass sewer, a federal-provincial programme - and I compliment the minister, Sir, on this - is part of the regional services that have already been started by the department. The minister realized, and his department, and government realized that we could not wait for regional government to be put into place before we started some of these major services and I compliment the minister and his officials and Cabinet in general for taking this very logical, very reasonable approach, and the Government of Canada, for that matter, for their contribution.

MR. WHITE: Are any of those reasonable approaches left open?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Always a reasonable approach. The minister always takes a reasonable approach to a reasonable request.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes.

So that is one good project. I mentioned a few moments ago the project that was jointly announced by the Minister of Transportation and myself yesterday, the \$636,000 contract for the widening of Topsail Road.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Sir, that is a major breakthrough. That is not the correct term but as the minister said, it is long overdue. It is one of the major highways in the Province, in this area at least, serving a tremendous number of people.

MR. MURPHY: Conception Bay South has been the greatest beneficiary of that in the past.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Unquestionably.

MR. MURPHY: People trying to get back and forth.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes. I am sure the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) supports that project entirely. Hopefully, Sir, that is just the beginning - or that is actually the second phase - last year we had the widening of the Blackmarsh Road - Topsail Road intersection, some \$70,000 worth of work, that was the beginning, that was a good start. This year is the second phase from Blackmarsh Road to Commonwealth Avenue and the intersection.

MR. PECKFORD: Let us hope for ten phases.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well, I am hoping it will be three phases, that we can complete it next year, but we will have to take a realistic attitude to that next year when we look at the Province's budget. But we will be trying, we will be fighting again to get some more money for that particular project.

To look at the Town of Mount Pearl itself, the capital projects there, Sir,

MR. N. WINDSOR: three years ago, or four years ago I think it was, the town started the reconstruction of Park Avenue which was the first road in Mount Pearl, was the only road in Mount Pearl at one time and which is still certainly one of the main roads. I think it was \$1.2 million or \$1.3 million that was spent over two years reconstructing part of that. We still have about one-third or a little better than one-third not reconstructed and it is absolutely essential, Sir, I say that that work begin this year. It is absolutely essential. The condition of Park Avenue is disgraceful at the moment, it is not fit to drive a horse and buggy over. It is a project, Sir, that will cost, perhaps, in the order of \$600,000.

MR. MURPHY: At least we can bring a helicopter over it.

MR. N. WINDSOR: A helicopter is the best mode of travel on Park Avenue today, I can assure you.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$680,000.

MR. N. WINDSOR: \$680,000 is with engineering and that sort of thing, yes. The figure I have here is \$591,000. That is just the capital amount. A number of other streets, Sir - I wonder if I have time? I have a minute or so - a number of other streets, particularly in the older section of town, Sir, are very narrow. All the streets in Mount Pearl were paved in, I think, 1965.

MR. MURPHY: An election year.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Absolutely! An election campaign.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was following an election.

MR. N. WINDSOR: It was a promise made by the hon. the former Premier and he, I must admit, kept good his promise and McNamara came in and paved every street in Mount Pearl in record time. It did not matter if it was mud or sticks or stones, whatever was there down went the

MR. N. WINDSOR: pavement and as a result we now have curb to curb potholes. We need a major resurfacing programme, reconstruction, basically in most places.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Do you want to adjourn the debate?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Pearl has adjourned the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Just for the record, one of the things we have in Newfoundland - I suspect we are the only place in the free world that has a wooden bridge that is paved. It is going into Marystown and it was done in the 1971 election. It goes right over the wooden bridge and when you drive over it now you are - anyway, Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, June 2, 1978, at 10:00 a.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Friday, June 2, 1978, at 2:00 p.m.