

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

30 June, 1978

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On behalf of hon. members, I am pleased to welcome to the Speaker's gallery Brigadier Authur Pike, Divisional Commander for the Salvation Army in Eastern Newfoundland. I know hon. members join me in welcoming the Brigadier to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a matter of privilege which is the usual matter of privilege, and that is I wish to make a very brief personal statement but not raise a substantive motion, which I understand is in accord with the rules of the House.

Sir, I was not in the House yesterday at the time when certain answers were given by the Minister of Industrial Development, the gentleman for Humber East (Dr. Farrell) in respect to certain questions which were asked of him and I have not been able to get the Hansard record because it is not as yet available, so I do not have the minister's exact words. But I have seen the report in The Daily News and I gather what happened is that the minister in response to a question said something like he had been told that at some point, that he understood that all of the ministers in the Smallwood Administration were in the habit of receiving or being offered and accepting cases of liquor from The Newfoundland Liquor Commission or from its predecessor body, whatever the official title of that agency was at the particular time.

A number of my colleagues here in the House who were in the Smallwood Administration stood and denied that any such thing had happened. I was not here, thus I did not have the opportunity to, and I do not want to let the record stand without a denial from me, Sir. I never received nor was I offered any such gift by the Corporation or, may I add, by anybody else during my tenure as minister. And I would think, Sir, that I would speak for all of the members of the Smallwood Administration when I say that no such gifts of liquor were offered by anybody or accepted. And I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that the minister - and I gave him a brief notice before

Mr. Roberts: I raised it, that I would be raising the matter - I do think, Sir, he owes the House an apology. I think he owes those of us in the House who were members of the Smallwood Administration an apology -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - and I think he owes an apology, Sir, to all of the men who served in that Administration, and many of whom are not here in the Chamber and thus cannot speak.

Sir, I do not think any such gifts were given, and I would go further ; I do not think the minister, with all respect, has any evidence to support that. Somebody may have told him that, but that, Sir, that kind of hearsay does not make evidence and that kind of hearsay, Mr. Speaker, does not justify the kind of statement which apparently the minister made.

Now I can understand, Sir, that the minister is under some considerable pressure, and I can understand there has been considerable embarrassment caused to him because of gifts of liquor which apparently were made to him, judging by sworn testimony given at the Royal Commission being held before Mr. Justice Mahoney of the Supreme Court, but, Sir, that, while it may explain his action in making this statement, certainly does not excuse it. Not only do I deny that I was involved in it, I resent having to deny it. I resent very much having to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - stand and deny this kind of broadside, meaningless accusation, an accusation that is certainly irresponsible if not more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And I would suggest though, Sir, the minister - I know him well and he is a man of honour, and I believe a man of probity - and I suggest, Sir, he might want to take an opportunity to apologize for an offense which he committed, but I do not think he intended to commit, and that is an offense which reflected on all of us, Sir, who served in the Smallwood Administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the hon. the member for the Straits (Mr. Roberts), and indeed for most hon. members. And if I have been erroneous and wrong in this, and hopefully I am, that was expressed to me, and if it is stated that no such matter occurred I am willing to retract it, and certainly apologize to the members affected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have heard both hon. gentlemen on a matter of personal explanation, and since both hon. gentlemen have been heard I think there will be no need to entertain any further discourse. I am not sure if the hon. gentleman for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) intends to stand on an additional question of privilege.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will certainly recognize the hon. gentleman but I am myself in the process of ruling on points of privilege which came up last night. I realize privilege takes precedence, but I would think that privileges which are already under consideration I would dispose of now. That will only take a short while and then I will recognize the hon. gentleman.

MR. WOODROW: After?

MR. SPEAKER: After. Yes.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: There are two points on which a decision was reserved last night, two points of privilege. With respect to the first point of privilege brought up by the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons): I have spoken with both the hon. Minister of Health and the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. Hon. members in the House are aware

MR. SPEAKER: no doubt that sometimes in the heat of debate, matters are said which are later withdrawn. I think it is fair to say as well that in the heat of the aftermath of debate when the House is in the state of adjournment, things are sometimes done which are later, if not withdrawn, regretted. The hon. the Minister of Health expresses his apologies to the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) for any inconvenience or discomfort his actions last night may have caused him, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir accepts that apology and that disposes of the matter. I thank hon. gentlemen for permitting me to dispose of it in that manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The second point of privilege on which I reserved decision last night, brought up by the hon. the Minister of Health, on that matter I have reviewed the arguments and, in my opinion, it is not a matter in which the area of privilege is involved. There are differences of opinion, differences of allegation, but not a matter in which the Chair is in a position to make any decision or which comes under the Chair's authority, so that will dispose of the second matter. I am in a difficult position now because I know the hon. gentleman's intentions, but I had said that if the hon. gentleman were going to rise on a matter of privilege I would have no choice but to hear him.

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege, it was reported last night by Mr. Ted Warren of Q Radio that I was not in the House of Assembly when the vote was taken on Bill No. 50. Mr. Speaker, I would humbly ask that you ask the Clerk of the House to read the list to make sure that my name is on the list, that I was here last night when the vote was taken.

MR. SPEAKER: This is another matter of personal explanation. The Minutes were read and I assume that they are accurate. They were adopted.

The Minutes of the House show the hon. gentleman as voting in the division.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege and pleasure this morning to rise on a very important occasion and to recognize the anniversary of the Salvation Army in the world. It is the 100th Anniversary of that organization as the Salvation Army. The organization is older than that, having been formally begun thirteen years previous in 1865 under the name of the Christian Mission, and then in 1878, the founder of what has become the Salvation Army, William Booth, was conferring with some of his top officials, including a gentleman who became known as Commissioner George Railton in the Salvation Army, and they were looking for a new name for the organization. And George Railton suggested that perhaps a good name for the organization would be the Volunteer Army, to which William Booth responded, We are not volunteers here and he took his pen and scratched the word 'Volunteer' and wrote in the word 'Salvation', and so the organization got its name which it has had for 100 years.

Today is the actual date of the event I have just mentioned to you, which took place 100 years ago, the naming of the Salvation Army by its founder, William Booth. He with his wife, Catherine, of course, gave leadership to the Army in its initial years and then they were succeeded by others, and the present General, it is worth noting, the present leader of the Salvation Army is a Canadian, General Arnold Brown. His immediate predecessor, it is worth noting, was a native born Newfoundlander, General Clarence Wiseman, who was born in Moreton's Harbour in Notre Dame Bay.

June 30, 1978

Tape 5003

EC - 3

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is rather important that we salute this organization on this particular day. It begins its own celebrations in London, England today where 50,000 Salvationists from all over the world have gathered, including a couple of hundred from Newfoundland, to begin celebrations of this important event.

The Salvation Army has

MR. SIMMONS:                   been for many years a very vibrant religious and social force in the Newfoundland community. Indeed, half the total Salvationists in Canada reside in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to be associated with any recognition the House might want to give to this organization today and perhaps the appropriate thing would be for me to move a motion that an appropriate letter of commendation, recognition be sent to the leadership of the Salvation Army here in Newfoundland on this occasion, perhaps the Acting Government House Leader would be prepared to second such a motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:           Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD:               Mr. Speaker, we very much would like to associate ourselves with the comments of the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir on the Hundredth Anniversary of the **Salvation Army as known as the Salvation Army.** As the hon. member has mentioned, the Salvation Army has been a force for good not only in this Province or in this Country, but throughout the world, socially as well as in the religious sense and I think all hon. members present, and not only all hon. members present but all Newfoundlanders would on this particular issue totally agree with the comments made by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

The Salvation Army has, in its way, in a very peculiar and unique way, enabled to rise above many of the normal, shall I use the word disputes or frictions that **seem to become a part of religious organizations over the last century, rose above that and have become the main social force and attached clearly with religion as well in the world.** And we over here wish to go on record and to second the motion put by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir to send congratulations to the leadership of the Salvation Army for an excellent achievement record of 100 years and I think it is fair to say that the world is



MR. PECKFORD: better because this organization has been around in the last number of years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the motion put forward by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and seconded by the temporary House Leader. I do this because I have been associated with the Salvation Army in one particular aspect and that is the health aspect.

Hon. members, I am sure, are aware that the Grace General Hospital is part of the health division, if one might term it that, of the Salvation Army in Newfoundland and that this has been one of the major hospitals in the Province, one of the base hospitals in the Province. It has been in operation since I believe 1923 and in particular it is, I think, the premier **obstetrics hospital for the Province**, the major referral hospital in obstetrics, particularly complicated obstetrics and accordingly the ill new born for the Province and this is the area that I am particularly associated with.

One can only have admiration for the activities of the Salvation Army in this particular field. They have done a service to Newfoundland that it is very difficult to put a measure on.

I might say just in closing that the present Administrator of the Grace General Hospital, Major Hammond, is leaving us in the near future and that this is a loss and a great loss but I trust that his successor will carry on the excellent work that has been the feature of that organization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I would be amiss perhaps in my duties if I did not stand here today, Sir, and congratulate

June 30, 1973

Tape No. 5004

MM - 3

MR. CANNING:                   this great organization which has  
done so much for humanity during the last 100 years.

                                  But I will specifically mention  
the fact that during the Second World War, I had the privilege  
to be in the front lines in several evacuations and in all  
landings to relieve Europe and the world of misery. I witnessed  
the work of the soldiers, those young men and women who

MR. P. CANNING: risked their lives for freedom to rescue the world from dictatorship and all the evil that was brought on us in that year. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleague to my right took part in that terrible war. We verify and any other persons within this House who were in the front lines, that side by side with the armies and the navy and the air force, those of us who have had to kill to win saw with us, in most cases on the same ships from which soldiers were fighting this great body of people. In the name of the humanity they were side by side with us, and if not I can assure this House that they followed closely after and bravely faced the same dangers that we did, the bombs, the machine guns, and the mines and whatnot. Mr. Speaker, all during that period I became a great admirer of that body known as the Salvation Army and today I am proud that I can publicly - I have done it so often to those people privately - but today I am glad to stand here and congratulate them publicly and on behalf of myself all those who served, I suppose, from Newfoundland express our appreciation for the greatest group that I saw in the name of humanity working, endangering their lives and suffering side by side with the people who freed the world in World War II.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker it is once more my great pleasure and privilege to have the opportunity to present or beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the students of Memorial University. The prayer of the petition is as follows, "Whereas the students of Memorial University have presented a brief to the provincial government concerning cutbacks in post secondary education spending, therefore we, the undersigned, go on record as supporting the recommendations of the brief and urging the provincial government to take action on the recommendations." Now, Mr. Speaker, this

MR. W.N. ROWE: particular petition itself is signed by 650 names of students at Memorial University which when combined with the names appended to petitions which have already presented to this hon. House brings the total up to within 40 or so names of 4,000 names in total, Mr. Speaker, nearly 4,000 names of students have been appended to petitions protesting the cutbacks of this administration in the field of education. When you consider that there are about 6,000 students registered at the university, already, Sir, two-thirds of the student body have been moved to protest most vigorously by the use of petitions, vigorously, Sir, but in a very peaceful and democratic fashion to protest the cutbacks of this government in the field of education generally and especially in the field of post secondary education and the cutbacks in university spending.

Now, Sir, the brief referred to is one which has already been mentioned in this House, which I will table with the petition when the time comes, is this paper called the Pink Paper which evokes many connotations; of course, when you read through the paper itself you see that it is an extremely responsible, logical, well-thought-out document, vigorously, again, and cogently showing why there should not be cutbacks and why

MR. W. ROWE: educational spending should in fact be increased instead of cut back by this administration if we are going to do our duty to the new generation coming up, Sir, a new generation of educated and trained Newfoundlanders. I especially commend to the attention of members of the House, Sir, if they do not have an opportunity to read the whole brief, which they should, but if they do not the conclusion at the end of the brief which contains the substance of the brief itself. Some of the vital conclusions made are, for example, education must be accessible to students of all social classes not just the privileged elite, Mr. Speaker, but to all social classes. Another point made is that the quality of education must not be allowed to slip even further behind that available to students in other parts of Canada. Another point, Sir, of great importance, a point which has been made here on several occasions but which cannot be made too often, we in this Province, this Province which has not fully developed its resources yet, its natural resources or its human resources, should not allow our educational standards and quality to fall even further behind that already reached in the rest of Canada. We should in fact spend more money and devote more effort and more attention to bringing our standards and qualities not just equal to the rest of Canada but beyond the rest of Canada because, Sir, that will be the ultimate salvation of the Province. The government must maintain educational funding at a level to keep pace with inflation. Now, Mr. Speaker, what could be more reasonable than that? I understand that the cutbacks in education or the non-increases in education to an adequate level will not even allow our educational institutions to keep pace with inflation in the inflationary spiral and the inflationary pressures and the depreciation of the value of the dollar on a year to year basis.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for that whatsoever; the very minimum would have to be at least a maintenance of educational standards and spending and maintenance at least with a par or up to a par reached last year. There is no excuse, Sir, to allow such a fundamental issue as education to go below what we have already reached as a result of inflationary

MR. W. ROWE: pressures and spirals. The government must maintain educational funding at a level to keep pace with inflation, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, and then beyond that there are some recommendations and some facts which are made which show that the students' case is right, Mr. Speaker, There can be no argument on the other side that the students do not have a good case, do not have a conclusive case, that what this government is doing is going to have a very adverse effect on the quality of education in this Province.

The brief concludes with the following: "Furthermore we demand that the Government of Newfoundland at least maintain the present situation" - at least maintain the present situation - "by increasing the operating grant to Memorial University to eight per cent to keep up with inflation allowing for a special funding component to prevent tuition and residence fee increases." Not to allow the financial pressures on students to increase, Mr. Speaker, but to make sure that there is special funding to at least keep tuition and residence fee costs at a level no higher than they have been in the past. And, Sir, freezing the minimum student loan portion of student aid at \$450, freeze it at that level, Sir, and not increase the financial burden on students any further because it can only have the effect of keeping qualified and deserving individuals out of the institution, Sir, where they should be and where they will have a great contribution to the social and economic well-being of this Province.

As was mentioned yesterday, Sir, and I will conclude with this point because we only have five minutes on a petition, as was mentioned yesterday, even if you forget the fair play and the equity involved and the social need and the civilized need to give every qualified individual the right to go to university, Sir, even if you forget that for the moment and think purely in selfish economic terms, the investment made in getting a student through university or through trade school, Sir, is more than recouped manyfold, recouped many times, recouped by the fact that the larger earning power of that student when he goes out or she goes out into the working world, the larger earning power and the larger salary

MR. W. ROWE: and the taxation and so on like that, Mr. Speaker, will bring a greater return to the common pool, a greater return to the government and to the taxation sources and resources as the years go on, Sir.

So, Sir, I must conclude and -  
my hon. friend is -

MR. NEARY: I thought you were going to sit down, boy.

MR. W. ROWE: - very aggressive, Sir, and very welcome to be so.

But, Sir, let me conclude by moving that this petition be tabled in this hon. House, together with the brief referred to therein and that the petition and the brief be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the petition, Sir, presented by my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. This is the third day now in a row we have had petitions from young Newfoundlanders, young men and women in this Province, Sir, who are concerned about the fact that because of financial reasons they may not be able to get a university education.

I think my hon. colleague pointed out that the petitions presented so far represent two-thirds of the students attending the university and the regional college out in Corner Brook. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a time a few years back, seven or eight years ago, when students stood a chance of getting a job in the Summertime. They could come out of university in the Summertime and there was half a chance that they might get a job, but as hon. members know, today in Newfoundland fifty per cent, well over fifty per cent of the unemployed in this Province are between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five, young men and women in this Province who cannot find employment of any kind. And if a student is lucky enough to find a job in the Summertime

MR. NEARY: it is usually a low paid job. It is the kind of a job where they have to work as a waitress or a waiter or some low - it is usually in service industry where the pay is very low. And so, therefore, Sir, it is almost virtually impossible at the present time. Unless you are the son or daughter of one of the high mucky mucks in this Province then you cannot get a job, because here we have an example again of where the doctors and the lawyers manage to poke their sons and daughters into provincial parks and into jobs that cannot be gotten by the ordinary student over at that university. They have not got a chance. Not only, Sir, is the university becoming an elitist univeristy, but the job preference in the Summertime go to the sons and daughters of the big shots. So the student you might say, Sir, hardly has a chance at all of finding Summer employment.

Now, Sir, the Presidential Task Force that has been referred to so often over the last three days contains a number of recommendations that apparently have been ignored by the minister and by his counterpart in the Government of Canada. But recommendation number ten, Sir, in the Presidential Report refers to the Summer savings assessment and it states that the Task Force supports the principle of a Summer savings schedule but recommends that Summer savings be deducted from the loan portion of the students award rather than from the tuition and non-repayable grant position. This would prove to be an incentive for a student to seek Summer employment. It is further recommended that in calculating these Summer savings the Provincial minimum wage be applied to students in all years, rather than the presently operated escalation scale. There should be a minimum amount of earnings before the existing forty-five per cent savings factor is applied. For students working away from home the first \$800 of Summer earnings should be



MR. NEARY: exempt from deductions, with the student being required to save forty-five per cent of the balance.

Now, Sir, that is a very sensible recommendation but as far as I can learn, Sir, as long as these presidential reports have been made that the minister and the government have ignored all these recommendations made by the President of the University and endorsed by the students.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the students came up with the pink paper, they had a meeting with the Premier and I met with the students shortly after and I was told by the students that it was a very good meeting. The Premier was very courteous, listened to what they had to say and then they came away feeling that they had a very good meeting but there was no commitments, no commitments on the part of the administration, even though the Premier came into the House a few days later and supported a petition that asked that the government reconsider the cutback in student aid. But the Premier so far has made no commitment. The Minister of Education has

Mr. Neary: made no commitment. The students have put forward an excellent brief, a brief that would do credit, Sir, to any group in this Province. They have done it in a civilized fashion. There has been no civil disobedience of any kind. It is an excellent brief, very well written and presented by a group of Newfoundlanders that we should be all proud of.

So let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that now as a result of these petitions, and as a result of the serious implications that these cutbacks are going to have on the students that we will hear the minister today stand in his place and tell the House and tell the students, because after all, Sir, they will soon have the results of their Grade XI examinations, and a lot of young people are considering now registering at the University, probably some of them have their letters written in already, they will not know if they are going to be accepted until they get their marks. But further than that, Sir, what is more serious even if they are accepted they do not know if they will be able to financially be able to attend the University in September coming.

So it is urgent. The matter is urgent, Sir. The minister should make a decision on this matter at an early date as possible.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: I just rise very briefly, Sir, to correct a factual error which I made when I was presenting the petition. Just for the record, there were 1,300 names on the petition. I was looking at another figure contained on the page, 1,300 names on that particular petition, not 650 as I said. But the total remains the same, about 4,000 names have been appended to the petitions which have been given to us by the students at Memorial University to date, Sir, 1,300 not 650.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition rose on a matter of correction.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by my friend and colleague, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on behalf

Mr. Lush: of 1,300 students, 1,300 concerned men and women, 1,300 concerned young men and women concerned about their future and concerned about the future of this Province. Because, Mr. Speaker, the education of our youth certainly this is the most important resource that we have and the education of our youth is one of the high priorities of any government. And it is unfortunate that the cutbacks resulted in education is not giving this kind of priority that this Province should be giving to education. So it gives me great privilege to support this petition on behalf of these concerned people, young people concerned about a university education. And as I have said, the cutbacks in the Education Budget this year or in the monies allocated to education is detrimental and harmful to education in this Province.

More particularly I am concerned about the student aid, the money that is available to students, that is my concern. Because, Mr. Speaker, having attended University myself I know the burden that can be placed on a person when that particular person comes from a low income family. When I finished university, or when I graduated at one point I was in the position of owing \$2,000, and, Mr. Speaker, that was back in 1962, \$2,000. Now, of course, students cannot get to university by borrowing every year, by taking advantage of the loans that the University will extend through its grant system and through the Student Canada Loan, that there is no way that they can leave University with that amount of money. But in these times I was fortunate enough to be able to get a job every Summer even though they were difficult then, but they are much more difficult now, and I was able to work during the Summer but still came out owing \$2,000 and I know as I say the kind of burden that this puts on a person when you go to work owing \$2,000 for your education. And as I have said in this particular case that the students concerned are looking at triple that figure and quadruple it, and quadrupled in certain cases depending on the need of the student. It is a tremendous financial burden to put on students and it is discouraging our students from attending university.

MR. LUSH:

It is discouraging our students from becoming trained people to be of benefit to the people of this Province and to the country as a whole. So, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that with respect to, its educational policy, particularly as it relates to the university, as it relates to the students, that the government is completely out of touch with the needs of the people of this Province, completely out of touch by its continual moves to try and put more of the responsibility of the student's education on that student. This seems to be what they are doing. It started in 1973. They seem bent, Mr. Speaker, on making the students of this Province - the poor students of this Province, the ordinary students of this Province - to make them assume the financial responsibility of their education. And, Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong direction, because we have in Newfoundland so many low income families, so many people who cannot afford to send their children to university. They cannot afford it. And with the rate of unemployment so high, the students cannot get a job to supplement their income and now the government have gone on this crazy course, this crazy policy of uping the loan, making the students go more in debt, forcing them to borrow \$700 - ridiculous, Mr. Speaker! And it shows a complete insensitivity, a complete lack of understanding of the needs of the people of this Province. And I would hope that the minister would reverse this stand immediately and freeze the loan as they have said here in their brief, to \$450. Mr. Speaker, even that is going to be a substantial burden on students when they finish owing \$4,000. To become trained people, to become an asset to Newfoundland, it will cost them \$4,000 at the end. They come out in the hole, a deficit of \$4,000, to start paying off that before they can start to live - ridiculous! And as I have said, the policy shows that the government are

MR. LUSH: completely insensitive to the needs of the people of this Province and completely out of touch.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of 1,300 students from the University, Sir, and in doing so I would like to take this opportunity, Sir, to congratulate the students, the 4,000 students representing approximately two-thirds of the University population. I would like to congratulate the students, Sir, in the way they have gone about trying to build and present their case in this particular instance. Sir, there was a time when I can remember all kinds of mass demonstrations and we even had a minister of the Crown, Sir, at one stage - he is now an M.P., Mr. Crosbie - advocate civil disobedience - a minister of the Crown, Sir - an incredible suggestion. Students, on the other hand, Sir, this year have presented petitions to this hon. House; they have prepared and associated with an excellent presidential Task Force report; they have developed an excellent Pink Paper which has been tabled now here this morning in the House of Assembly; and they have held press conferences explaining their case, and they have had meetings with the Premier of this Province and presumably some of his colleagues. No civil disobedience, Sir, no threats, but a very well prepared case for freezing the loan and building a case for making university education available to anybody who is capable of entering the University.

Sir, we have a number of inequities at the present time as a result of the present government policy with respect to student aid. Sir, one inequity is the inequity within the student body or the students in the province itself, and that is whether a student can actually

June 30, 1978

Tape 5009

EC - 3

MR. F. ROWE: financially afford to go to university or whether he or she cannot afford to go to university. In other words, the University appears to be becoming a university for the rich. That is one type of inequity.

Sir, another type is the inequity that we have with respect to the University compared to other

MR. F. ROWE: post secondary educational institutions where, for example, if you go to the College of Trades and Technology you can get certain allowances, some of those allowances almost equivalent to salaries, to get an education; you get paid to get an education in one post secondary institution and in another institution, the university, you go very heavily in debt with the insecurity of not knowing whether or not you are getting a job when you graduate from that university.

And another, Sir, more serious inequity is when you compare the students graduating from this university here in Newfoundland, the numbers and the quality of their education compared with the numbers and the quality of education being received by other universities on the mainland. Sir, it was the intention of the previous administration to make Memorial University one of the great universities in Canada, to stand up there amongst the top rated universities in our nation. But, Sir, with this cutting back on operating grants at the university, raising the amount of money the students have to borrow before they can qualify for student aid, these two things together, Sir, mean that there will be a reduction in enrollment and there will be a decrease in the quality of education in our university. And, Sir, this will only do harm to the social and economic development of our particular Province. And I have mentioned beforehand, Sir, that this is a relatively new university, only twenty-eight years old; we were late in starting as far as university is concerned and, Sir, we have a lot of catching up to do. We have only half the per capita average compared to the rest of the nation and, Sir, the students are making a very modest request in this Pink Paper, not a great massive increase, Sir. I heard the Leader of the Opposition in reading out some of the conclusions. They want simply to maintain the present situation. Sir, how modest can you get? They want to maintain the present situation they want to increase the operating grants to 8 per cent just to keep up with inflation. They are not asking for a great giant step forward financially as far as government contributions are concerned, they

MR. F. ROWE: are actually just asking to maintain the status quo. Sir, nothing can be more modest and more reasonable than that kind of a request. I will end my remarks in supporting this petition by simply saying that the students are to be congratulated in the way that they conducted themselves in building their case and they are also to be congratulated for not asking for excessive demands in this time of restraint and simply asking to maintain the present situation and keep up with inflation and that type of thing. So the students have to be congratulated and I whole-heartedly support this petition.

MR. CANNING:

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

MR. P. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this petition, Sir, I would like if I may refer to some comments that I made in this House on I think somewhere around the fifteenth or the sixteenth of July 1949, twenty-nine years ago next month. I stood in my seat on the government side of the House and speaking to a piece of legislation that was included in the Speech from the Throne of that year in which it stated that we were making preparations that we would during that session elevate the old Memorial College to a status of degree conferring. Mr. Speaker, I have before me the exact words of my speech. I do not intend reading, but coming to that portion of the Speech from the Throne, I referred to the history of the university how it originated, its birth when it opened in 1925 with an enrollment of fifty-seven pupils and we have gone a long way since then. Mr. Speaker, I paid tribute to men such as



MR. CANNING:

Dr. W.W. Blackall, Rev. Levi Cirtis, Dr. V.P. Burke, who at that time was the only living member of those three. I said, "They lay truly and well the foundation of higher learning so that our country may in peace have a noble living memorial to those who gave their lives who fought and died for King and Empire." Then I said, "I feel that the whole House would be only too glad even to work overtime to alleviate the difficulties which bar the way to further growth of the local institution and seat of learning."

Mr. Speaker, at that time that piece of legislation was hailed in this House with some wonderful glowing speeches. We were all glad that what had been this poor little country of ours where we did not have the opportunity to even have a university could be then arriving at the stage where we could proclaim that we were about to have one.

Mr. Speaker, at that time in the district that I represented, I do not think there was one single person there, at least, only those who had gone away, who had a degree. Since then I have had the satisfaction of seeing every degree conferred on students of the poorest of the poor, from every corner of that district. I did not think that I would have to stand up today to plead with the government to hear those petitioners, those young men from the university asking to be helped along towards their degree, towards attaining their desires, what they want to do to make their way in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is anyone on the other side of the House going to get up and support this petition but, Mr. Speaker, I feel they should. Because, though they are not in the House at the moment, there are several of them who probably would not be here if they had not had the advantages that we originated

MR. CANNING: as a Liberal Government, advantages of having a degree-conferring university in their own Province.

MR. WHITE: That is right.

MR. CANNING: They would not be prepared to come into the House. There may be lawyers over there who took advantages of that. I am sure there are ex-teachers who took advantage of it. I am positive of that. And I think that these men themselves because of the opportunities we gave them will now stand in this House and back up the university students of today. We did it then when we did not have very much funds. We had a lot of priorities, a lot of them, a lot of crying needs in this Province, but the men who got up in this House that day on both sides if the House, were prepared to work overtime, as I stated there, they were prepared to dig into the little funds that we had in a poverty stricken Province to give us a degree-conferring university to try to close that gap between ourselves and the mainland, the other provinces where they already had universities for years.

I think the history of that university - when we see around us men holding positions today who took advantage of the free education, I think if they believe in Newfoundland, if they believe in the future of our students, they will stand now and be grateful for the advantages that they have had owing to that bill that passed here on that day, or a few days afterwards, that made that Memorial University, a memorial to the dead, a degree-conferring university.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my support to the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition containing about 600 -

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, 1,300.

MR. WHITE: - 1,300 was it? - the names of 1,300 students. Mr. Speaker, that brings the total, I suppose, to about 4,000 - is that the correct figure? - 4,000, two parents each, representing 8,000 parents in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, altogether about 12,000 people. If you consider brothers and sisters and grandmothers and grandfathers, I suppose those students who we have spoken on behalf of here represent 70,000 or 80,000 or maybe even 100,000 people in this Province who are directly, Mr. Speaker, concerned about this particular problem because they are concerned about the welfare of the students, their children, their grandchildren going to university and trying to get a decent education.

I am sure Your Honour knows as do most members in this House that with our generation, as we were growing up in Newfoundland, the talk was, 'Now, get an education, and try to get an education'. Now some of us, Mr. Speaker, were fortunate enough in being able to, as I did, work in the lumber woods to make some money to go to university. I know other members did as well become involved in various vocations during the Summer months and so on to get enough money to go to university. But that has changed now.

MR. WHITE: All those particular places of employment are unionized and they are barred to anybody new getting into that kind of work. So it is very, very difficult, Mr. Speaker, nowadays for a young person who gets out of grade eleven to go to university, to make some money to go to university. And even if he does get a job in the Summertime, the amount of money he makes compared to what he must spend at university is really insignificant anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the effects that the government cutbacks are going to have on education in this Province and I am concerned further, Mr. Speaker, about how far the government might take this particular educational cutback. We have heard talk, Mr. Speaker, this year about the possibility of the medical school being phased out. I sat at a meeting in Grand Falls with the Premier, and the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), when a lot of encouragement was given to the people of Grand Falls with respect to a new hospital based on the possibility that \$7 million might be saved if the medical school were closed and the Premier was very insistent on his point in Grand Falls but when I questioned him about it here in the House he sort of withdrew a bit on that particular point. But since that I have heard the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) up in this House questioning the validity of a medical school and I am just wondering at what stage the medical school will go and to what degree the university will be cut back. And I am just wondering if it will be cut back to an elitist university with about 1,000 or 1,200 students. And I am sure no one would want that in Newfoundland. Because, Mr. Speaker, any cutbacks by government has a serious effect on students who want to go to university and I might refer to the pink paper presented by the Students Council and they outline very graphically, Mr. Speaker, what kinds of effects government cutbacks towards education has on the university. The same scheme, the same cutbacks came in 1973 with disastrous effects on university enrollment and many students' lives. At that time the

MR. WHITE: cuts were to save the government,  
Mr. Speaker, and I am quoting from this pink paper, about \$1.6 million.

The twelve per cent drop in enrollment instead of a moderate increase as forecast by Statistics Canada resulted from this change immediately costing more to the university over \$400,000 a year in lost tuition fees, \$400,000 just through cutbacks. In addition, by the time the twenty-nine per cent drop in first year enrollment had worked through the system at least \$550,000 more had been lost to the university. So we see what is happening. Not only are students affected but the university is affected, the number of faculty that can be at the university is affected, so the whole gamut of Newfoundland society is affected. I am glad to support this petition, Mr. Speaker, because of the great deal of concern I have for the future of education in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MRS. MCISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this. I believe that we cannot afford to increase the tuition fees for university graduates any more than we can afford to cut back our student-teacher ratio, or increase it. We have people now who even taking advantage of the loan system cannot afford to go to university. While they have been able to borrow a certain amount, that certain amount is not enough to put them through university and they have to turn to their parents for the balance and in this day and age, and certainly in a district such as mine where there is very, very low employment, practically nil, the student has to do it on his own. And it is very difficult even with the student loan to be able to put yourself through university. And now this increase from \$450, I think it is, to \$700 is something that the student just cannot handle, just cannot manage, and the parents cannot do anything about it and it is just going to

MRS. McISAAC: drive these students completely away from university and we are going to wind up some day in the not-too-distant future with nothing but a bunch of labourers or no further than Grade XI in this Province. And if we have Grade XI we certainly cannot get Grade XII in the districts where we live. You may be able to get it here in St. John's and in Corner Brook, but we cannot get it. And we have to send our students in here at the highest kind of rates and sacrifice to no end to be able to try and put them through. And even if they borrow the \$7,000 loan under the new system, they have a monthly pay back of \$91. And I am reading from this Pink Paper, the total loan cost is \$10,374 for a year. Now I cannot see for the life of me how our students can afford to do it. They go out, they are all going to be dropouts. And do not forget that the students of today are the leaders of tomorrow, and God knows, we need leaders badly enough.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, we saw that.

MRS. McISAAC: We know that. Yes, we saw that and we know that we need leaders, and if we drive them all out of university, if we have a bunch of people out in society who have Grade XI or less, I mean, it is wonderful to make fishermen and farmers out of them, but, you know, there are only so many fishermen, so many farmers and what do we do with the rest of them? It is alright for the doctors and lawyers and people who are on high income, maybe they can get their students through university. I do not see any way that I can get mine through, not with the expenses I have, and I cannot see any way that she can put herself through without going in the hole for years and years and working forever and a day. And those young people come out, they have the right to live a natural life. I do not see any way that they could ever hope to get the

MRS. McISAAC: things out of society or live the lifestyle that we can live or that people on high income can live. There is no way they can afford to get married and take on a wife and a family, they cannot afford a car, they cannot afford anything.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MRS. McISAAC: Now I say that we have to do something to help those students. I do not know where it is going to be, but one place that I think it can be done is by watching the Public Tendering Act. And I think this is maybe a little bit out of order, but it still does have an effect on the students. And I want to say to the minister that while he does not have control over the Public Tendering Act as far as school building is concerned, he certainly should have the authority to step in when he sees that there is extra money going into contracts, money that should not go into those contracts, and the minister knows full well the one that I am speaking of where there is \$9,200 wasted on one particular contract - and I say wasted. There is just no way that we can allow this thing to go on. We have to cut it back and cut it back somewhere and it has to be taken charge of by the minister's department. The minister is responsible and if the Public Tendering Act comes under him or if there is anything else that comes under his department that can help save a few dollars and probably put it in the pockets of those students who want to go to university then I say to the minister, 'Do it.' And I fully support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, in the late 1950s and the early 1960s, John Kenneth Galbraith, perhaps one of the greatest known economists in the world today - he is still living, still very influential when it comes to structuring

June 30, 1978

Tape 5013

EC - 3

MR. R. MOORES:

economies of developed and semi-developed countries all over the world. Now

I understand some of his philosophies are being incorporated in the third world countries of Latin America, South America and Africa. He came to Newfoundland in the late 1950s and early 1960s and at that time he met with the former Premier of this Province and he urged the Premier of this Province to undertake a great educational reform:



Mr. Moores: "Educate your people because it is an investment in the future of your Province, and in the future economy of your Province."

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MOORES: Thus began one of the greatest educational revolutions this Province has ever seen in our 481 years. The twenty-three years - not quite twenty-three years; let us call it fifteen - of the former Liberal Government saw the flourishing of education, the development of the intellect and mentality of Newfoundland students, particularly the poor ones, because inherent in the educational development of this Province is the proviso that our people, our students, do not have the money because their parents did not have the money. So Smallwood, the former Liberal Administration, incorporated the basic, fundamental principle that in order to develop the future of our Province and its economy we have to supply student aid to our students. And thus was introduced the greatest financial assistance programme and package for Newfoundland students - the likes of it was never seen in this country before - and up until 1972 that economic assistance to students of this Province continued almost unabated except for the salaries programme.

When this government came to power, however - bang! - the whole principle of investment in the future of the economy of this Province and its students was thrown out the window, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: - first with the Crosbie package in 1972 when he was Finance Minister, and later this was followed up in 1973 with further cutbacks, not only to student aid, and student assistance, but also to the development of the University. Post-secondary education in this Province has suffered intolerably, inhumanely, and uncompassionately under this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: And now with the latest teacher cutbacks they have started the last and final destruction of education in this Province. They are going now to the secondary schools, from the Kindergarten students, to the music, to the physical education, and anything that they can destroy in education they will destroy it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I should draw to the hon. gentleman's attention the rule precluding debate, and require the hon. gentleman to speak to the petition.

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

I was speaking however somewhat indirectly on the plight of the students in this Province. And the plight of the student of a secondary school and Kindergarten is fifteen years from today the university student tomorrow. So indirectly I was talking about the plight of the university students.

The Parsons report, which the Minister of Education is quite familiar with, recommended, I think six or seven years ago, that if student aid continued to fall the student enrollment at the university would continue to fall, and the future of this Province would be detrimentally effected. This minister, this government has turned a blind eye and a deaf ear not only to members of the general public but to members of the University, to the academic body, to the administration of the University, and now I predict that they will turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to 4,000 students of Memorial University who have petitioned this hon. House.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that if the Minister of Education does not come up with some concrete changes in his attitude toward student aid and the University in this Province education generally is finished. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's South followed by the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented on behalf of the students at Memorial University. And in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to actually look at the paper, the so-called pink paper that accompanied the position. My reading of that paper in no way leads me to think that the students meant to bring in any blanket condemnation of this government's financing policies in regard to education.

DR. COLLINS: It is a very carefully drawn up brief. I might mention that recommendation two - (I am sorry, recommendation four is an adjustment in the way assistance is distributed throughout the year. In other words, it would be more front-end loaded just so that they would be able to handle their finances more expeditiously. Recommendation number six relates to the mechanisms for applying for assistance as opposed to increased amount of assistance or anything in that order, but just how the mechanisms are brought into play. Recommendation number seven refers to appeals, that the appeals be handled in a more mindful fashion but actually does not request additional assistance as such. Recommendation number eight that the Corner Brook campus, the assistance there be handled more efficiently. In the supplement, then, recommendation number one that the interest payments be delayed if the graduate is unemployed for a period of time; just a delaying tactic there to assist in that regard. And in the supplement, recommendation number two, that there be certain other helps in making applications for assistance. So these students drew up a very careful brief, they saw there were some administrative and technical defects in the plan as present in effect and they wanted these things remedied.

Now in addition to that there were other requests in the brief that dealt more with actual added assistance, but even these added assistances were not blanket added assistances in most instances. For instance, recommendations numbers nine and ten referred to the deductions that might be brought into effect for assistance in regard to scholarships and Summer earnings. This clearly did not apply to all students but those who were on scholarships and those who did have employment. Recommendation number eleven referred to bringing part time students into the programme, and again it was not a blanket call for extra financial input by the government but a selective input where there was particular need. Recommendations number twelve, thirteen, fourteen and fifteen referred to certain changes in the assistance regarding residence allowances, transportation costs, books and supplies, moving expenses - again the students did not irresponsibly just ask the taxpayer to give him any sort of a blank cheque

DR. COLLINS: but he said that here are specific needs, specific difficulties - and I am paraphrasing now - and I humbly ask the government to look at these changes, we ask for to make the assistance being given more effective in our regard.

Now the recommendation number one, of course, is perhaps the one that people tend to concentrate on more so; that is, that the assistance, the loan requirements should not go up to \$700 per semester but that they should be limited to \$450; and this, I think the students did want this to apply to all students, so this was clearly a blanket request, this one out of those seventeen recommendations.

This does bring up a certain number of matters that I do not have time to go into now but one is in regard to the type of university we wish. Are we looking for a monument or are we looking for a university specifically designed for this Province? I suggest that in some respects the university is looked upon as a monument. I think that this is wrong. I do not think that as a Province we can afford to erect millions of dollars of monuments. We want a university which will come in on the needs of this Province and give us the graduates that the economy and the social life in this economy needs.

I support the petition.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Carbonear who spoke just a few minutes ago I believe made an excellent case for the quality of education as it existed in this Province before this administration took office. Indeed I was looking across the floor, reminiscing on the events of the last few hours, and I realized that nobody on the government side could argue his case that indeed there had been real quality education. When you realize, Mr. Speaker, that it produced the government whip, for example, that education system did, it had to be quality education; to have

MR. SIMMONS: produced the Minister of Education and the Minister of Mines and Energy it must have been quality education, Mr. Speaker, if one can judge by the way they put their education into effect last night.

Now this petition, Mr. Speaker, signed by 1,300 students at the University is just the latest of four such petitions we have had this week in this House with a total of 4,000 signatures of university students both here and at the Corner Brook campus; students from all over the Province, principally, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, from outside the city of Corner Brook and the city of St. John's, people who are really depending on financial assistance to be able to get a secondary education; people, Mr. Speaker, not only from the outports but people also who have very limited financial means within their family and therefore are unable to attend university without the kind of assistance that the Liberal Government made available to them in past years and which this government have cut back on and reneged on.

Mr. Speaker, this petition draws attention once again to the policy of this particular government and its Minister of Education, and you stand back and look at it, Mr. Speaker, and you realize that there is something almost sinister going on here. They are destroying everything - destroying the work ethic, destroying our great University - and you would almost get the impression that it was a deliberate thing, that they had set out to be mischievous. Our University is being destroyed, our human resources are being destroyed, not being permitted to get an adequate education, our work ethic is being destroyed. What kind, Mr. Speaker, of sinister crowd are we dealing with over there? How diabolical must their minds be? And now the minister, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education himself, of whom you would expect much better, is clearly and openly

MR. SIMMONS: aiding and abetting this destructive process, this tearing away of the human resources of our Province, the youth of our Province, their chances of getting an education, tearing away at the very fibre of the University. It is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, a sad day when a petition from 1,300 youth in this Province comes before this House and is so completely unheeded by the one spokesman they have in the halls of government, the Minister of Education. This is the fourth petition this week and once again, on behalf of the Opposition, I invite him to get up and say something substantial on this point and tell us what he is going to do, what he is going to say in Cabinet, whether he is going to urge his colleagues to do something to alleviate the plight of those 4,000 people who signed that particular petition.

MR. NEARY: Challenge him to get up. He does have an obligation and a responsibility, you know.

MR. SIMMONS: You are making an excellent speech, keep going! I thank the table.

AN HON. MEMBER: Your turn for a haircut, Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, could we not hear from the minister? Could we not hear that he is going to do something at last? He is going to redeem himself before his friends in Education; he is going to go to Cabinet and say, 'Look we have been all wrong on this. We have to stop socking it to those 4,000 people who are out there who signed this petition. We have to do something for them. I have been wrong; I want to stop destroying the University; I want to stop destroying our human resources; I want to stop fooling up the chances of the youth of this Province to get an education.' Would he do that now?

MR. NEARY: No, too weak-kneed.

MR. SIMMONS: The opportunity is his.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Now before recognizing the hon. gentleman from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), I would like to welcome to the galleries some students who are participating in the same exchange programme under which a number of students were in the House of Assembly yesterday, and that is an exchange programme organized by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews. There are in the galleries ten Newfoundland students and ten students from the Province of Quebec.

Speaking in the French language, Mr. Speaker welcomed the visitors.

I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these visiting students from Quebec and the Newfoundland students to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition and in doing so, I would like to follow along with the remarks of the former speaker that the case has been well made both by students in their petition and by the other remarks that have been made in the last four days in this Legislature,

DR. KITCHEN:

the case has been made and all it requires now is some action from the minister.

Now I would like very much for the minister to get up in his place after I sit down and tell us what he is prepared to do, and I will even tell him what he can say, because we have made suggestion after suggestion after suggestion as to how students can be helped to go to university at less cost to themselves than is presently the case. We have indicated that there is fat in the Education Budget that can be pared and I will help them pare the fat in the Education Budget. I know there is fat there. I used to be Minister of Education and there is fat in the budget, and it can be pared. There is fat in the post secondary budget that can be pared and I will help them pare it. We will go down through it together, item by item, and I will show them how to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

And we will find money for students. We made suggestions here yesterday that we might look at the interest rates that students have to pay and see when the loan has to be repaid and see if we can work on it from that angle. Now also there is the income tax angle that people have to pay. That can be looked after during the repayment stages. But what has to be done is that there has to be some will, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House to do something about these very earnest pleas and petitions from all over the Province with respect to education and particularly now on this question of post-secondary education and the cost to the ordinary Newfoundlander and the ordinary Labradorian of going to post-secondary education.

Now I believe it can be done: It can be done. Perhaps what the minister might do, and I hope he gets up now in a minute and say he will do this, do one of two things; set up either a whole sweeping enquiry into education, a sort of royal commission which has been suggested on this side of the House, and that



DR. KITCHEN: has to be done. That will not report immediately but that has to be done. It is a long range thing. But more immediately I believe he can set up a small committee of this Legislature and I for one would volunteer, if that is the procedure, to serve with him on that committee and there is another Minister of Education former, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) over there. He has great ideas. He might have a few bingo games or something. We might get this thing going and I believe Your Honour was a former Minister of Education. Perhaps the four of us could be a committee, and other hon. members as well, or a small committee which would zero in on this particular problem of the plight of the university students and then we could do something about that and bring back the report to this Legislature in the Fall sitting, if there is to be a Fall sitting, and get on with the job.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in support of the petition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: - in support of the petition and the principle of the petition and the pink paper that was presented by the students and also the President's Task Force Report regarding student aid.

I want to preface what I have to say; it seems that we are getting some conflicting debate, and it is debate in a lot of cases, from the other side. One person is saying that we have a lot of fat in Education that can be pared off and the other group is saying we are not getting enough. We are also getting conflicting statements I think in terms of the fact that during my estimates it was recommended by some members on the other side that we close the School of Education in Memorial. Now incidentally I might add, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons for student population being down is basically because of the fact that there is now an over supply of teachers. Because when

MR. HOUSE: we had the high peak of students in the university, basically the largest group of these students were teachers.

I want to point out that we will be meeting as a government with the university people regarding the university costs, and another thing I want to say there is if we have been socking it to Education, the budget that we have in the university this year, when it is hitting close to \$50 million I do not think that is socking it much to Education. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, too that a lot of the points brought out in this President's Task Force that relates to the Department of Education in this Province, a lot

MR. W. HOUSE:

of that work has been done; it is ongoing yearly. But with regard to basic exemptions, what exemptions the students can be given, that is a federal/provincial committee that decides on that and we do certainly agree, for instance, with that \$800 being deducted first but of course we cannot get the student loan on that basis because we have to fit in with the standard across Canada. But yesterday people were saying -

MR. S. NEARY: You are not going to give them support.

MR. W. HOUSE: I am saying that we are supporting because we are doing a lot of the work that was recommended by the students in this particular brief.

MR. S. NEARY: No, you are not.

MR. W. HOUSE: A lot of it is being done. I want to -

MR. S. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it is true because of the fact that I know it is true.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true.

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Yesterday there were some statements made about the other provinces giving the grant first and the loan last. Now Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely wrong and I -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: There he goes again, Mr. Speaker; debate every since he has been on his feet about three minutes ago. He takes a sentence that somebody is alleged to have said and then he refutes it. Now in my language that is debate, Mr. Speaker, that is clear debate. He is not addressing himself to the material allegations in the petition. He said rather lukewarmly he supports it, and then every sentence he says after contradicts himself. He is obviously against the petition, that is one issue, but the issue on which I rise is that the gentleman is now debating. I want, I would love to have a debate with the

MR. SIMMONS: Minister of Education on this one, if he would persuade his government to allow us to have a debate on education which they will not do up until now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: But the petition period, Mr. Speaker, is not the period to engage in a debate or to get up and pretend to support a petition which you are against. And either he should support the petition, Mr. Speaker, at the very least he should not enter into a debate at this particular time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: You know this -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Do not bungle this one now.

MR. PECKFORD: - is really a foolish exercise, Mr. Speaker.

I have here this morning sat in my seat and listened to hon. members opposite, almost all of whom supported and got up and spoke on the petition, and thought I was being reasonable in not getting up on points of order, which were perhaps very technical points of order, as they related to debate on the petitions as I have on other days, to have the relaxed comfortable atmosphere as has pervaded the session this morning: to allow members to get up and have a fairly, free-wheeling, debate on this petition. And now as the Minister of Education gets up to try to respond to some of the comments made directly to him and about our post-secondary programmes, to try to respond to that in five minutes, and now he has very little left, I think it is being totally unfair and if one wants to be technical, sure, the hon. member might be correct, but I do not think he is living up to the spirit of the debate that has been engendered here this morning.

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

Certainly our rules in my opinion probably need refinement but they are there and I have to apply them as they are, and our precedents are there. My own inclination is to give the benefit of the doubt in favour of freedom of speech where

MR. SPEAKER: there is an area of doubt and that is as operative the hon. minister as it has been to other hon. gentlemen. In my opinion the tone of his remarks is substantially similar to that of other hon. members who have spoken and he would have the right to continue.

Hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to point out that in Newfoundland if we go ahead with what we have planned this year we will be asking students to borrow \$1,400 and of course they will be eligible for up to \$2,000 if they are single and in complete need. And for married students it will be \$2,500. In Prince Edward Island, for instance, they have to borrow the first \$1,800 for the year, and then they get a grant \$1,000 and the other Maritime Provinces are similar.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Are you for or against?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the other point I wanted to make is that we have been continuously working with the Federal Government, all the provinces.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about B.C.?

MR. HOUSE: I am not talking about B.C. I am talking about our equals.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Alberta?

MR. HOUSE: Alberta! The other provinces, we have been working with the Federal Government because they do not give anything to students except interest for a period of three or four years. They do not give anything, and what we have been asking them to do is to look at the total cost of university student education and to share it with the provinces. But their answer is this, that we give a loan-

MR. NEARY: What are you saying? You are not going to (inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: Keep quiet and let the man speak.

MR. HOUSE: I said that we will be looking at this brief in conjunction with the meeting we are having with the University officials.

MR. NEARY: When?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am being intimidated from across the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out that the hon. gentleman's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. PECKFORD: They do not want to listen, you know.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a new petition so if there are any more people who wish to support the -

MR. HOUSE: I will Table the (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: I will yield to the minister. I will yield to the minister.

MR. STRACHAN: What was that? What?

AN HON. MEMBER: 'Graham' go ahead.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a new petition signed by only nineteen people. The prayer of the petition is for presentation to the House of Assembly is, "We the undersigned do hereby protest the high insurance rates for mobile homes." Now, Mr. Speaker, although the petition is only signed by nineteen people it is the total number of mobile homeowners in this particular mobile home court. But I suspect it represents thousands of Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, who are living in and have bought this past four or five years since mobile home living has become a way of life and represents thousands of Newfoundlanders who are getting victimized by the high cost of insurance.

The cost of fire insurance on a mobile home in Newfoundland today is three to four times more than the cost of insurance on regular residential housing. And, Mr. Speaker, they are

Mr. Flight: getting victimized or ripped off one or two ways.

Now there are two reasons: either the manufactures of mobile homes are manufacturing the homes to such a low standard that the cost of insurance is legitimate because of the structure of the trailer or the design of the trailer that the risk of fire and the risk of a total loss is so great that the insurance company must indeed have high rates, or else the insurance company is just making a bonanza and victimizing and ripping off the people who are living in mobile homes. And, Mr. Speaker, whatever the cause the Department of Consumer Affairs have badly let down the people of this Province in this area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: If the fault lies with the manufacturers of trailers, then it is the responsibility of Consumer Affairs to disallow trailers that are so substantial, and that will cost the people who buy them in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: - those kind of rates, they should be stopped coming into this Province -

MR. MURPHY: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: - and, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) the federal (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: - it is the responsibility of Consumer Affairs in this Province. There is no doubt that some mobile homes are designed to a higher standard, and thereby require lower rates. It should be the responsibility of Consumer Affairs to list, publicly announce and advertise the homes that come closest to the standards required for decent or cheap insurance rates, rates that can be afforded by the people of Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, if it is not, and that may indeed be so, but there is a great danger that the insurance companies are taking advantage of every trick in the book and just unilaterally charging the people of this Province \$400 and \$500 more on an insurance policy on a mobile home than in a residential. And Consumer Affairs should investigate that aspect of insurance in this Province. It would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Consumer Affairs could tell us in this House today how many mobile homes have been destroyed by

Mr. Flight: fire in this Province over this past year. Now with insurance rates anywhere from \$300 or \$400 per year, this petition alone nineteen petitioners represents an income to the insurance companies of \$8,000. Now the maximum cost of a mobile home in this Province today is \$20,000. And when you consider that the insurance company will only pay out a percentage of that face value of the policy it will be interesting to see what mobile homes in this Province fires have cost the insurance companies. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the chances are that the insurance company is making a bundle regardless of whether the risk is there or not. The insurance companies are making a bundle of money off mobile homeowners in this Province today. And the people in the mobile home market are getting it both ways, Mr. Speaker. We have got into a position where you can buy a mobile home today cheaper than you can buy a lot of land to build a house on. And with the high cost of land, the high cost of mortgages, most of our people, and particularly our young people cannot even visualize the possibility of ever owning a home. So they listen to the advertising, they go to what is being billed



MR. FLIGHT: the perfect way of life, the mobile home, and they are buying them and they are being victimized, Mr. Speaker, they are being ripped off and Consumer Affairs in this Province whose chief responsibility it is to protect the consumer of this Province have done nothing about it. The Minister of Consumer Affairs launched an enquiry into insurance in this Province a year ago, set up a board and we have not heard a word since, no report has been tabled. It was supposed to be wide ranging, covering automobile insurance, mobile home insurance, fire insurance - not a word! They set up an inquiry and that was supposed to take care of it. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Department of Consumer Affairs is badly letting down the people of this Province that that department exists to protect.

Sir, I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). The fact that it is only signed by nineteen names should not, Sir, be taken as an indication that it is not an important problem because it is for everybody who has purchased or lived in a mobile home.

Mr. Speaker, why should the costs, the premiums for insurance on mobile homes be so disproportionately high compared to insurance on other homes - stationary homes, I suppose, is a way to describe them, and those, God knows, are high enough and getting too high for the average citizen today - why should they be so high? I do not want to cast any aspersions on the insurance industry, I would assume that that is competitive and that there is the normal competitive pressures obtain there as in most other areas, that they are trying to give the best rate they possibly can, although that may bear some investigation and the minister of Consumer Affairs should investigate that aspect of that. But if it is, as my hon. friend has indicated, if there is the possibility that mobile homes are more flammable, less able to resist destruction by fire or severe damage by fire compared to the ordinary home, the stationary home, Sir, if that is the case then there is need for a full-fledged investigation by

MR. W. ROWE: the Minister of Consumer Affairs into this whole area. Now when my hon. friend was speaking, the minister, who has now left the chamber for some reason or other, flicked out a statement to the effect, ask your federal member or something. I do hope the minister, Sir, who is now taking his brief case and leaving the chamber, I do hope, Sir, that the minister does not try to pass this responsibility on to the federal government as well. There may be a federal responsibility but he is responsible as our protector of Consumer Affairs here in this Province. We know, Sir, he has given up trying to protect us as far as the environment is concerned, as far as the spray programme, the poisonous-matacil spray programme is concerned. He will not even answer questions in the House and he will not have anything to say about that. I hope, Sir, he has not given up on the other side, the Consumer Affairs protection side of his department. Maybe he has, maybe he has grown tired. He has indicated that he is going to retire from the House, maybe he has given up all interest and concern with matters affecting the consumer of our Province as well as all matters concerning the environment, the protection of the environment of our Province. I hope that is not so but I fear it is. If it is so I would ask other hon. ministers, colleagues of the minister, the Premier, if he is within hearing distance, I believe he is back in the building today -

MR. NEARY: In the Province.

MR. W. ROWE: - in the Province, at least, for a short temporary visit to the Province. I would ask him, Sir, to have this matter investigated because if insurance rates and premiums are high for mobile homes compared to other homes there has to be a reason for it. I am prepared to assume that insurance companies are doing the best they can. I may be wrong in that assumption, but if my assumption is correct then it can only be because the mobile homes themselves are less immune to destruction by fire and that in itself, inherent in that assumption, Sir, is the corollary that human life may be in greater danger and certainly property damage is more likely the case with the mobile homes. If that is so, Sir, it should be investigated and no mobile homes that are not up to good standards as far as fire protection

June 30, 1978

Tape No. 5020

AH-3

MR. W. ROWE: and lack of flamability is concerned, Sir, fire resistance in mobile homes, none of these homes should be permitted to go on the market. And I do ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs to try

MR. W. ROWE: to galvanize himself into some interest in protecting the consumers and look into this matter and come back with a report to this hon. House, Sir. I support wholeheartedly the petition presented so well and competently by my colleague, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support with real enthusiasm the petition presented by my hon. friend. And the fact that there are nineteen names signed, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition indicates, is all the more reason why members should address themselves to this petition, unless we are going to fall into the trap that we will only support with real enthusiasm very massive petitions that come before this House. You know, I mean, it is the weak in our society, the small, minority groups we have to concern ourselves with.

Now I am very, very sorry to say that in regard to mobile homes there is a sort of a snobbishness towards those who live in mobile homes that I find absolutely appalling, and I do not mean this merely as a diatribe against people in the House of Assembly; I mean, there are people I know who live in so-called permanent structures who feel that people who may live in a mobile home are sort of second class citizens. Now what kind of class elitism is this at all? And the fact is that mobile homes are misnamed, they are misleading. They are not mobile really, because although they are transported on wheels to the site oftentimes, the fact is that these wheels are removed. I have been in them; I have friends in them, for example, who have a full basement

MR. NOLAN: underneath -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NOLAN: - concrete structures, concrete walls. Also they have guide wires and so on if they do not have all that I have just referred to, so that they are safe from wind damage and so on. But we have to come to the very, very serious conclusion that those people who are living in mobile homes are living there oftentimes for pure economic reasons. I mean, what is wrong with people attempting to live within their means? This is what we are always shouting and bawling in here, is it not? And then they go and do it and we in our own high fashioned way feel that they are another group of citizens altogether. Now surely, I mean, it is foolish for me to even have to say it. A person or a family who live in a mobile home are as important as someone who lives on Rennies Mill Road, are they not? You would think so.

Now there are enough mobile home owners in this Province right now to be a very viable and very forceful political group if they would only come together under one heading. I am afraid that in all too many instances amongst the public that they are split, the divide and conquer system, and they have very little strength as individuals or as small pocket groups.

The nineteen people who are signing this petition should be affiliated in some way - and my friend is familiar with what I am talking about - in a provincial organization without any great, massive bureaucratic caucus involved, to protect their rights. I am saying they are being discriminated against. My hon. friend knows what I am talking about. There are thousands and hundreds of thousands of people throughout the world who are living in mobile homes, and I wish they would drop the name altogether, in fact, because they are

MR. NOLAN: not truly mobile homes, they  
are permanent -

AN HON. MEMBER: Prefabricated.

MR. NOLAN: Prefabricated homes is perfectly  
correct. And I believe that whatever weaknesses there may  
be in structural building and so on can be very easily  
remedied. But we should be advising people on these things.  
We are so used to saying 'no'. We have to help people.

Now on the insurance there has  
to be a good, hard, close look at this situation. In fact,  
I believe that nationally there should be, if the people  
in mobile homes in other provinces suffer the way the people  
in my Province are suffering, there should be a national  
group of mobile homeowners who, if necessary, will start  
their own insurance company.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: But for God's sake let us do  
something. And let us stop sweeping this problem aside.  
I have countless problems daily with people who live in  
mobile homes with one complaint or another. In fact, I  
might say that in one particular case that I know about  
we succeeded through an official in the Department of  
Consumer Affairs in having one individual up before court  
and we got it straightened out.

But I am afraid that the people  
who live in mobile homes feel that they are a forgotten race,  
a forgotten class, that they are not worthy of the attention  
of those who come to this House of Assembly or those who  
are elected to govern. They feel that the only time anyone  
ever knocks on their door - the politicians

MR. NOLAN: do not mind going up over the aluminum steps or whatever it is and knocking on the door at election time. But it is not just then that they need our help because then we are looking to them, it is now. And I am telling you now, Mr. Speaker, that this is a most serious and urgent matter. These people are under any inexorable, crushing economic situation and they are asking for help. They are asking for guidance. They are asking for concern and they are asking for assistance and they are asking for it now. These nineteen people are important and they are only nineteen of thousands of our fellow Newfoundlanders who live in mobile homes. And I believe they are important and that is why I support the prayer of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. J. COLLINS): The hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, just a few words from me on this. I want to say that in supporting this petition that there are a great many people in this Province who live in trailers or mobile homes or whatever you - prefabricated houses, whatever you wish to call them, and quite a large number. In some districts of this Province there are hundreds of mobile homes. In other areas of the Province there are very few. I do not know what the total population of people in mobile homes might be, but it is very, very large. ~~and~~ There are two things that we should keep in mind, I believe, that they tend to occur in traditional areas of the Province where land is in short supply; where it is difficult to get a bit of land people erect mobile homes, bring them in, and also in areas of rapid population growth, these two sections of the Province, really, and what has to be done in my view is that the Department of Housing, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has to take a broader look at this question and it should not just be left to the Department of Consumer Affairs. The Department of Consumer Affairs may look after certain aspects of it, but this is part of the housing policy that the

DR. KITCHEN: Province does not have, and we should have a realistic housing policy.

There are a great many things wrong with the housing policy, we do not want to get into that now, but this is part of the whole question of housing in this Province and it has to be looked at; the difficulty of getting houses, the difficulty of getting land, the land speculation that is going on in this Province right now is part of this problem of housing that is related to mobile homes. There are people in this Province who are buying land for resale and they are doing it in various areas of the Province and in my view it is immoral and this is forcing people to get smaller pieces of land, where they can, and erect houses, erect mobile homes. And this is part of the problem of higher insurance rates because people cannot afford to pay the excess rates.

As I have been travelling around this Province, I suppose this is the one question that comes up over and over and over again. Everybody who lives in a mobile home either cannot get insurance or is paying far too much for it in their view, and I tend to share that view. But the problem is broader than insurance rates. The problem has to do with land speculation, with an inadequate housing policy and this is just another example of a government, Mr. Speaker, that is bankrupt of ideas and devoid of action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. J. COLLINS): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I rise just briefly to support the petition in regard to mobile homes. I have done a lot of work in the last couple of years, particularly in the Stephenville area, relating to the problem of mobile homes. From a manufacturer's point of view, the manufacturer states that they cannot provide a saleable product that would be accepted by the people without increasing their price substantially. And the insurance people, on the other hand, state that the mobile home is substandard in the material that is put into the



MR. MCNEIL: home; for example, the electrical is substandard compared to an ordinary permanent dwelling, the material that is used in the house is highly inflammable. And these many factors that the insurance companies say is an added risk costs the person who owns the home, cost him more for his monthly insurance. But, Mr. Speaker, either way the consumer pays because if he does not pay more when he first originally purchases his mobile home he does over a period of years by paying high insurance. And I think that this government, the minister in the Department of Consumer Affairs should take a stand.

In our committee, especially in the Stephenville area we have set up a mobile home group and we have evaluated the reasons why the insurance company stated why the mobile homes were substandard. So we went through the whole gamut and actually, Mr. Speaker, the mobile home in itself is substandard to the permanent dwelling. The areas that the insurance companies' rates for an area say like in Stephenville area, like a protected area, close to a fire protection area, the amount of wind, we even went as far as to do an average of the amount of wind and as you - the wind resistance in a mobile home is over seventy-five miles an hour and doing the wind factor on a yearly basis the area of Stephenville was below this. So the insurance company in this particular Stephenville area could not state that we did not have the proper protection, that the mobile home park was in a protective area but still many of the people had to pay

MR. MCNEIL: high insurance rates and also make it worse. Some could not even get insurance. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the department should take a stand and if we cannot get the manufacturers to upgrade their product we should not allow it into our Province. I think the minister has fallen down on his responsibility to protect the consumer of this Province by allowing substandard mobile homes into this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier, who I am glad to see is back in his place. No, he is not in his place; he is in the House Leader's place, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Demoted.

MR. W.N. ROWE: If the House Leader had been there last night we probably would not have seen such a bungled job. Or the Premier. The poor old Acting House Leader bungled it last night for sure.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier a question. It has to do with the Hinds Lake development, proposed development, and the contracts for the construction of that work and the calling of tenders thereon. Now, Mr. Speaker, as is well known Collavino Brothers made a demonstrable error in their bid and then the government announced subsequently that Collavino Brothers would be allowed to retender along with everyone else in the Province or anyone else in the world, for that matter, on the work at Hinds Lake. Now, Sir, my question to the Premier is this, does he not think that in the face of very vigorous protests by the Canadian Construction Association and equally vigorous protests by the Newfoundland and Labrador Construction Association against this procedure being used, Mr. Speaker, does he not think that the

MR. W.N. ROWE: government should reconsider what it is doing and in keeping with apparently normal procedures exclude Collavino Brothers from the retendering process and allow the other tenderers to submit new bids?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, two points as regards the Leader of the Opposition's question: First of all, as was pointed out when the reason for recalling was brought up, the \$4.5 million differential is one that the taxpayers of this Province we felt should not have to pay if it was not necessary, Sir.

Secondly, if we were advised by the consultants, or Hydro were advised by the consultants that were drawing up the documents for tender and the procedure for tender, they advised Hydro to the effect that this to them was normal. This was the manner in which they had done it in other areas and in other places and for that reason the people who bid on the first contract were eligible to bid on the second.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sir, would not the Premier agree - I do not want to cost the taxpayers of this Province any additional money and I do not think anyone in the House does-but would not the Premier agree that in principle and in the long run the procedures which have been outlined publicly by the Canadian Construction Association and the Newfoundland and Labrador Construction Association, which are designed, as I understand it, to prevent a person from having a second go as the the Collavino Brothers will now have, Sir, presumably they will merely correct their error, a demonstrable error, correct their error and get the contract. Now if that is permitted, if the procedures which the Premier is allowing are permitted, Sir, in the

MR. W.N. ROWE:                   the long run it will cost this Province additional money. Because in principle it is wrong to allow a construction company to correct an error which it has made, Sir, and this has been time tested by the Construction Association of Canada and Newfoundland. As a matter of principle you should not allow that to happen. They should be excluded from further bids

MR. W.N. ROWE: and this will serve as a warning to future tenderers that they cannot make this kind of error and expect to be given a break or a second chance; and in the long haul and on principle it will save this Province a great deal of money if the recognized and established procedures of the Construction Association of Newfoundland and Canada, which are designed to protect the industry and no one contractor, if these procedures are adhered to rather rigorously in this particular case and that the whole matter should be reconsidered.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as I said in answering the first question, giving Collavino a second go, and I am certainly no supporter of Collavino as such at all, but the people from Hydro, the accountants and the legal people and the consultants went to the Collavino office unannounced to check on the error itself on the first bid and to their satisfaction - and they also have no axe to grind and I think all members will agree to that - to their satisfaction the error made was a legitimate error.

The practice has been that once that error is made the person's bid bond is returned and immediately thereafter it is given to the second lowest bidder. Now in this particular instance here giving it to the second lowest bidder would have cost an additional \$4.5 million to the Province. That, Sir, Hydro felt, and we concur, that would be \$4.5 million, once again as I said, of the taxpayers' money that this Province can ill-afford to pay if it does not have to.

The business that it will cost more in the long haul, I cannot see the reasoning behind that, Sir, because if we continue to get the lowest tender in any methodology of bidding, obviously, the Province is going to

PREMIER MOORES: save money and I do not see where in the long haul it is going to differentiate from that.

Whilst the construction Association say certain procedures are followed, I think, Sir, certain procedures are followed but with the amount of money that is involved, even after the error has been added back, we are still talking \$4.5 million and that I would suggest, Sir, is most unusual anywhere in the construction industry in Canada.

As I say, the consultants have advised us as to what they would recommend, the Hydro Board have followed through with that recommendation and we have accepted the recommendation of Hydro Board.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A final supplementary on this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. W.N. ROWE: If the - I am not recommending this. I should stress this, Sir, I am not recommending this, but since the Premier and the government have taken a certain line of reasoning on this, Sir, would they not accomplish the same thing if Collavino Brothers' error is a demonstrable error and can be shown to be so, and can be proved to be so by, say, an independent third party of arbitrators, for that matter, would it not be a short cut and save everybody a lot of money if the government merely allowed them to correct their error and get the contract? I am not recommending that because I think what we should do is adhere to the procedures laid down by the Canadian and Newfoundland Construction Association. I think that that keeps everyone honest and that in principle and in the long haul it will be beneficial to this Province if everyone is kept honest in that regard. But, Sir, if we are going to follow the procedures outlined by the Premier why go through all the rigamarole again? What we are likely to get is merely a correction by Collavino Brothers of the \$4.5 million

MR. W.N. ROWE: error, they will have been given a second chance. Not only will they have been able to save their bid bond, which they could do because it was a demonstrable error, but they would be given a second chance which, I would submit, is not usually accorded in such circumstances. They will add their \$4.5 million on to it, they will get the contract, presumably, and they will have merely corrected their error.

Now, what I say to the Premier, and I am not recommending it, but if he is going to follow these procedures, why go through the rigamarole, why not just let them add on their \$4.5 million, correct their error and give them the contract, save everyone trouble? Do through the front door what the government is trying to do through the back door.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely incorrect of course and that would be a blatant disregard for procedures if that were done. If you took that situation - the fact is now that all the others have an opportunity to bid

PREMIER MOORES and if they have the same efficiency to do the job they have the same opportunity to get the job. The fact is, Sir, it has been rebid to give the others a chance and to do otherwise, as the Leader of the Opposition suggested be done, would be totally flying in the face of the Tender Act. Just to add on that amount for Collavino, as I said, would be a blatant disregard for the whole procedure. It is the sort of thing that I suppose can be twisted in such a way as to make it look appealing, but the fact is, Sir, the bidding system under the tendering Act will give us the best price for that particular job.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: It is a two part supplementary, actually, to the Premier. It is obvious now that the recalling of tenders which Hydro intends to do will delay the project, will interfere with the schedule of the project of the Hinds Lake development. Can the Premier tell the House just to what extent it will delay the start up of the Hinds Lake project? I would like to have dates. Hydro was using August 1st originally. So what are we looking at now? Are we looking at September 1st, October 1st? I would like to have that date. I will let the Premier answer that question and I have one more supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: We are advised by Hydro, Mr. Speaker, that August 1st is still the date that can be met as far as the timing of the project is concerned, that the project itself whilst the tender was let will be delayed obviously for three or four weeks, the fact is that the project itself will not be delayed. It was precalled to cover that sort of eventuality, Sir,



MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the Premier indicate to the House if for the purpose of the Hinds Lake project is the local company, in this case, Lundrigans, eligible for or will the 10 per cent preferential treatment apply to Lundrigans on this project? Because we are talking about \$2.5 million on a \$25 million contract, and adding on their \$4.5 million that could bring Collavino very close to Lundrigan. And in this particular case Lundrigan was the second lowest bidder. So it would be interesting and very, very important as to the final outcome of the letting of this tender if Lundrigan is indeed entitled to the 10 per cent preferential treatment that we allow local contractors.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all, it was Lundrigans-Loran, and Loran was certainly not a local company any more than Collavino is, and certainly not as much, I would suggest. And most of the companies that bid -

MR. FLIGHT: Not as much.

PREMIER MOORES: Loran Corporation is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: No, not at all. Far from it. Quite the reverse.

MR. SIMMONS: We went out of our way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the man has a problem. The fact is, Sir, that any contractor who gets the job is going to have to employ local workers. In a straight bid

PREMIER MOORES: the government policy has been 10 per cent for local companies and that remains the government's policy.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear a final supplementary from the hon. gentleman from Windsor - Buchans and then I believe the hon. the member for LaPoile is on a supplementary as well. The other hon. gentlemen are on different questions.

MR. FLIGHT: This is a very, very straightforward question, Mr. Speaker. It only requires a 'yes' or 'no' answer. Is Lundrigan, for the purpose of bidding on the Hinds Lake project, going to receive the 10 per cent preferential treatment that we allow contractors in this Province?

AN HON. MEMBER: Lundrigan - Loran.

MR. FLIGHT: Right. Is Lundrigan - Loran going to be treated as a local company on the Hinds Lake project and therefore have the 10 per cent preferential treatment provided? - 'yes' or 'no'.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: That is right. I do not think there is any question about that. One of the remarks that was made across the House by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) regarding this government being against Lundrigans, the fact is, Sir, that this government not only are not against Lundrigans, but insisted with the federal government because they were a local company that they get the arterial road when they were not the lowest bidder. That is where we stood as far as Lundrigans and local companies are concerned, and to say otherwise is absolutely misleading the House and the public of this Province.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier indicate in the retendering if there has been any additional work included in the tendering? Have the specifications in any way been changed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is more familiar with the detail of that to answer.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been some change in the design in order to allow recalling. Now we will include some other temporary accessroads that have to be built that are ready to go into the new tendering call, so that we are not talking about essentially the same sets of plans and specifications as we had in the original tender, which therefore, of course, means that in retendering we are including all the people who bid the first time around because the design plans and specifications are not exactly the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now that we have learned, Sir, that it is practically a new tender call, in the answer the Premier gave there a few moments ago, why does the government in the interest of saving taxpayer dollars, why do the government now not go to public tendering again instead of restricting the tendering to the group who tendered originally? Why not open it up again and go to public tenders if the Premier is so interested in saving taxpayers dollars? Because this is the way to do it,-

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is a very -

MR. NEARY: - competition alone. There will be savage competition and there will be a savings to the taxpayer. So why does not the government take that route?

MR. PECKFORD: There is, Mr. Speaker, now going to be savage competition as it relates to that second tender, this tender call, this retendering. And for the hon. member's edification, if he does not know, and obviously he either does not know or he deliberately indicates his ignorance, and that is that all the work on Hinds Lake, and especially on 05 and 06 contracts, went through a pre-qualification period. And the five contractors who are bidding and who will now bid again on the new tender are the ones who were pre-qualified to bid. That we went through a whole process because there are hardly any other companies around, there is none in Newfoundland,

AN HON. MEMBER: Collavino (inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: - and hardly any in the Mainland of Canada who were, number one, interested or, number two, if they were interested went through the pre-qualification period. So if we went through the whole process all over again we would be down with the same number of companies who are now bidding again on the new contract.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Could the minister now tell us, Sir, in the light of the new information that we have, and new work being included in the tendering and so forth, what is the anticipated start up date of the Hinds

MR. NEARY: Lake development now?

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

MR. PECKFORD: We have already answered that question, the hon. the Premier has in a previous question, and that is we are talking about August 1. And we are also saying and indicating now that we believe that the whole schedule for Hinds Lake will not be seriously disrupted and that the on date of power will still remain the same.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier; it is a district question and a rather serious one, and it is not going to take much time to get it answered. For a couple of weeks I have been attempting on behalf of a large delegation in my district from the Lewisporte Chamber of Commerce, the Lewisporte Council, and the Comfort Cove-Newstead Council and the Campbellton Council to set up an appointment with the Premier for a delegation from this group. I went through the regular channels, Mr. Speaker, through Mrs. Nugent, whom I know very well, and through Mr. Callahan, whom I know very well, and I have not been able to set up this appointment.

Last night there was a meeting in the area and 300 people agreed that they would charter buses to come into St. John's to sit on the Confederation Building steps to wait for the Premier. So I am asking him now -

MR. SIMMONS: They will be waiting a long time.

MR. WHITE: - if he will agree, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, without all those people coming in, to have a meeting some time next week with a delegation from that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday when I was in Grand Falls I met the Mayor of Embree and other people from the hon. member's district, and certainly I am only too glad to meet with delegations when they come in as long as we know in advance what the subject is so the ministers who can be of meaningful, direct benefit and their officials can be present at that same time.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could get some direction from the Premier with respect to setting up this meeting for next week? I wonder if he could tell me who I should go see because I did tell him in my original question that I spoke to Mrs. Nugent about three weeks ago and Mr. Callahan in the interim. So what would he advise me to do to set up this meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I suggest that he would call me in the office and set it up at that time, Sir, rather than do it here.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon.\* the member for Burin-Placentia West followed by the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. the Premier. My question is based on a letter sent to the Premier by the Town Council of Marystown on June 4, 1978. According to the letter, Mr. Speaker, the Premier promised that Council in 1975 when they recalled the contract for the first phase of water - a project for Little Bay, a part of their town of Marystown - and at that time, so the letter states, he promised them that that issue would be given top priority in Newfoundland when water and sewer is being considered in the future. And this year they have been turned down on the request, and they asked the Premier if he would reconsider his decision

MR. CANNING: Has the Premier reconsidered his decision or his he going to finance the second phase of the water for that part of Marystown?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I will have to take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of supplementaries for the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. He was not in his place yesterday during Question Period and again today. I understand he is in the building. I understand he is within a few feet of the House. I wonder could he come in so we could ask him some questions which are pressing and which are immediate, which require some immediate answers. Certainly we would delay for a minute if he would come into the House. I understand he is in the Government Common Room, or he was about five minutes ago. If not, Mr. Speaker, his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development would probably answer some questions until we are able to get the Minister of Manpower into the House where he can answer some questions. I do have some questions for the Minister of Industrial Development as well. They relate Mr. Speaker, to matters which I raised here in the House yesterday in response to a question I put to the minister. He made some reference to a list; he said that indeed he had drawn up a list and he had consulted a number of people concerning drawing up that list. I wonder now would the minister indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, and of course I am referring to the list of preferred electrical and mechanical contractors that we have heard so much about in the Public Accounts Committee and now the enquiry before Mr. Mahoney, I wonder could the minister indicate whether at any time he consulted the Premier as to what names should be on those lists?

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

DR. FARRELL: Your Honour, in answer to the question, I presume I will be at that enquiry and at that time I will have - as much as I can remember, the people came to me as far as the lists are concerned, I will be glad to give it at that time.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister indicate to the House whether at any time he received an instruction from the Premier as to what names of companies should be on those lists? Would the minister indicate to the House whether at any time he received an instruction from the Premier to put a particular name or names on those lists?

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

DR. FARRELL: The same answer applies, you know, and at no time do I remember the Premier giving any strict instructions.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister indicate to the House and I realize that he will in all probability be appearing before the enquiry, whether he wants to or not is another question, but he may be less delighted when he is finished with the enquiry, Mr. Speaker, but that is another issue. But he will get the opportunity to appear before the enquiry, I am sure. But in the meantime his position is Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, relates more to the support of the House than it does to support of any enquiry and his first responsibility as he knows is to this House. And I would invite him to give an answer to the following question, Mr. Speaker, did he at any time discuss with Mr. Fred Noel, of Noel's Electrical and Noel's Mechanical, two companies which got together over \$2 million of untendered work in one year, the year '75-'76, for example, did he at any time meet with



MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Noel concerning untendered work from the Department of Public Works which might go to the Noel companies?

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

DR. FARRELL: I did not know Mr. Noel for several years after he was on that list, to my knowledge, and at no time did I discuss untendered work with anybody.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The answers are interesting even if only because they contradict so completely the evidence being given by Mr. Noel himself.

Mr. Speaker, did the minister at any time, either through a telephone call or in conversation or otherwise, did he at any time give any assurance to Mr. Noel, or representatives of his companies, any assurances that work would be given to the Noel firms without tenders?

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

DR. FARRELL: Well, Sir, to the best of my knowledge, no Sir, and again I am going to have to state that I will be appearing before the enquiry and I do not know if this line of questioning is correct. I am trying to answer to the best of my ability at the present moment but -

MR. SIMMONS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Sir, I submit that the line of questioning is pretty correct. I am not sure about the line of answering.

Mr. Speaker, another question the answer to which ought to be given first in the House, no matter that the minister may well be appearing before the enquiry: Mr. Speaker, was the minister at any time offered any payment for delivering on promises to get untendered government work to particular contractors?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is the same as yesterday, it is out of order. It is suggesting some type of activity of a nature which is unbecoming of a minister and a member and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member should not be permitted to carry on that type of line of questioning.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: I submit there is nothing unbecoming at all either of the questioner, in this case myself, or the minister, nothing unbecoming for one to ask whether someone has been offered, and particularly so, Mr. Speaker, and it is not at all a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker, I submit.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if I may have the floor? The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) has got his come-uppance last night and if I were him I would be good and quite today with his vicious charges about elevator tampering and that nonsense which I did not do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Scum! Absolute scum! That is what you are.

MR. WHITE: That is what he is. He should resign.

MR. SIMMONS: Behave yourself or leave, boy. You made a fool of yourself -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I really cannot allow the authority of the House, not of any person, the authority of the House to be undermined,

When the Chair calls "Order" hon. members will have to desist immediately. Now the matter is so simple, so clear and so obvious that there is really

MR. SPEAKER: nothing further that I can say on it. There is not much sense reading tomes of anybody and I call that to the attention of all hon. members.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking to a point of order and I was saying that the matter I have raised is not at all hypothetical. The answer may well be no, but that does not make the question hypothetical. It has become a very practical question and one, if I were the minister, I would like to give answer on because testimony now part of the public record has indicated that such payment has been offered. I am now giving the opportunity, I submit, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, the opportunity to get into the record his version of the matter under questioning, and the matter is simply was he offered any payment at any for delivery on promises to get untendered government work for particular contractors? That was the question but, Mr. Speaker, might want to rule on the alleged point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to questions, questions may not among other things, page 147, 'contain imputations and reflect on or relate to character or conduct of persons other than in a public capacity' and also 'contain or imply charges of a personal character.' Now as I understand it those limitations apply essentially to the member - may not make imputations against a member or a minister in this case of improper conduct. As I understood the question it was not a question which asked the minister whether he had done something improper, because that I think would be out of order, that would be an imputation, but the question was whether somebody else who was not in this House had done or attempted to do something improper. So the question dealt with an impropriety of a person not in the House so that would put the question in order.

MR. SIMMONS: I believe the question actually is on the record and the minister may want it repeated. Mr. Speaker will be relieved to know that the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) actually agrees with his ruling for a change. The question, Mr. Speaker, was whether the minister at any time -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

June 30, 1978

Tape No. 5028

AH-3

MR. SIMMONS: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: How long, Mr. Speaker, must we put up - but anyway, to saner issues. The question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Industrial Development, not for the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan): Was the Minister of Industrial Development at any time offered

MR. SIMMONS: any payment, offered any payment for the delivery on promises to get untendered government work for particular contractors?

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

DR. FARRELL: Sir, that question is beneath my contempt and obviously the answer is no, Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as the minister is aware we have already put a question to the Minister of Manpower similar to which I will put to the Minister of Industrial Development because he at this point in time has not been given an opportunity to answer this particular question. The question relates as much to him as it does to the Minister of Manpower and my brief preamble is that in view of the number of allegations being made now, which have become public, concerning the minister's conduct as a Minister of the Crown, and again I say to him, as I did to the Minister of Manpower, it is not a question of whether he is guilty or innocent of these allegations, I hope for him and for the sake of government in this Province he is quite innocent, but it is not a question of guilt or innocence, the question I ask him is now whether in view of the public nature of these charges and the effect it obviously has on his ability to perform as a Minister of the Crown in a very sensitive position of public trust, to perform with his staff and his department and before the public generally, does he not agree that the only sensible thing to do at this particular time is to vacate his post as a Minister of the Crown until such time as these allegations have been publicly cleared up and the public mind has been set at rest? Does he not agree that the appropriate, the sensible, the advisable thing to do would be to vacate his post until such time as the allegations have been cleared up publicly?

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

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I will just answer that with a simple no, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. PECKFORD: The Summer Games Bill, No. 74.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 26, Bill No. 74, the adjourned debate thereon.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Last night, Sir, when this bill was introduced the minister who introduced the bill who was filling in for the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation came very poorly prepared for the introduction of this bill and as a consequence of that we were unable to get very much information from the Minister of Mines and Energy.

It is a very important piece of legislation, Sir, inasmuch as it is now going to commit the government to picking up the deficit for the Summer Games which is a substantial deficit. The deficit for the Summer Games is \$159,700, and I understand that the Province, the public, the taxpayers of this Province will have to pay eighty per cent of that deficit and that is according to Judge Steele's report, the Steele Report, \$159,700.

AN HON. MEMBER: Deficit?

MR. NEARY: Deficit, according to the Steele Report, I had it on my desk here - well what is the deficit? We were not told last night. We have not been able to find out and I had to refer to Judge Steele's Report. And according to Judge Steele's Report I would think the deficit is even more than that.

MR. HICKEY: May I interrupt for a moment?

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentleman can give me the information.

MR. HICKEY: My hon. friend is, I do not know if he is thinking of some other figures pertaining to operating costs which might have been mentioned in that report but the deficit of the

MR. HICKEY: Canada Summer Games exceeded \$1 million and \$300,000 came from the federal government already, and reduced it - as of March 31st., reduced it to \$725,000 and of course there are operating costs of one form and another which has continued on since that time. So at this point in time it must be in the vicinity of \$750,000 or a little in excess of that, and as I indicated in response to a question some months ago, the Chairman of the Canada Summer Games Committee have informed my department on a number of occasions, we have held many discussions on it, that they feel and they are pursuing with the federal government for a further \$350,000 of a grant which they claim the federal government made a commitment to.

Mr. Hickey:

So what the final figure will be is undetermined at this point in time. But I can tell my hon. friend that certainly the grand total at this point in time is in excess of \$750,000, not \$150,000.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I am referring to, Sir, is the deficit on the operating costs, the maintenance and operating \$159,700. Now the deficit itself at the moment is \$700,000 as the minister indicated, so we are talking about roughly \$860,000, \$800,000 or \$900,000 of a deficit, and it is expected, Sir, that the Province will have to pick up 80 per cent of the cost of this deficit. In other words, Sir, the taxpayers all over the Province, Western Labrador and the Great Northern Peninsula, the Southwest Coast, the Burin Peninsula, Central and Western Newfoundland, will have to pay for this facility in St. John's. And this I claim, Sir, is unfair, although, Mr. Speaker, the thing is a mess, the whole thing is a complete mess; it looks to me like this bill may have to go through the House otherwise the place will sit over there and rot out.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. MCNEIL: While it is closed it is costing \$12,800.

MR. NEARY: It is costing \$12,800 a month for every month it is closed.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is terrible.

MR. NEARY: And it is going to cost approximately \$300,000 a year to operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MRS. MCISAAC: What about the Linerboard mill?

MR. NEARY: As the hon. gentleman says, the quicker you get it opened the better. Well that may be true, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that when it is opened that it will not become a happy hunting ground for the sons and daughters of the high mucky-mucks in this City, because they will be the only ones who can use it. And, Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is look at the track record of synchronized swimming in this Province, competitive swimming,



Mr. Neary: water polo and you will find out, Sir, that the boys and girls who participate in these sports which in the main will be carried on at the Aquarena that they are the sons and daughters of people who are in the middle and upper income brackets.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: That the families of sons and daughters of the ordinary Newfoundlander, Sir, cannot afford to participate in these sports. And I would submit that if whoever takes over this Aquarena if they do not watch it what will happen, Sir, it will become a happy hunting grounds for the sons and daughters of the middle and upper income bracket, people in that bracket.

MR. R. MOORES: A private swimming club.

MR. NEARY: And we can see it all over the city.

Mr. Speaker, if we were going to build facilities in this city, Sir, the Aquarena would be the last kind of a facility that you would build.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: We have already, Sir, got right across the road a swimming pool, and we pointed this out when they were planning for the Summer Games, we pointed out that the Aquarena should be located in another part of St. John's, and we pointed out several other things. We pointed out the lack of public tendering. We pointed out the ripoff on the purchase of the land for the Aquarena, and yet those of us who had the courage to try to protect the Public Treasury, which is our first duty, we were condemned by one or two sports commentators in this Province, 'Oh, they are against sport? Well let me make it abundantly clear now, Sir, that I am all for sport and recreation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: But I am not for the Public Treasury being ripped off by a little clique in this city.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And that is what I am against. I am all for sport and recreation, and will do everything I possible can to foster it. And I

Mr. Neary: hope as a result of my few remarks on this bill that I will not hear anybody going out on the radio and television saying, 'Oh, there they are, the politicians are up there again, the know-alls are up there again, they are condemning sport and they are trying to down this, and down that.' We are all for sport and recreation, Sir. But we have to protect the Public Treasury and, in my opinion, in the carrying out of the plans for the Summer Games, the Public Treasury was not protected, was not protected, Sir.

And here we have a mess on our hands, and this bill will no doubt have to go through the House to get the facilities opened up again. It is unfortunate, Sir, because it is going to be done at the expense of taxpayers all over the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: And I can hear them again saying, Oh now we will be proud of it. That the boys and girls will be able to come in from Labrador and come in from other parts of the Province, and they will be able to have their competition over in the Aquarena, that, Sir,

MR. NEARY: is balderdash and hogwash!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I hope I do not hear any intelligent Newfoundlander saying that that is going to happen. But we will hear it. We will hear it all now from those who thrive off sport and earn their living off it and fatten off it. We will be hearing it now - 'oh, listen to the politicians again!'

AN HON. MEMBER: Big dinners.

MR. NEARY: And get their big dinners. They are well versed in that, Sir. And travelling you can hardly get onboard a plane but you do not see some of them jetting across this Province and across Canada at public expense. It is too bad we could not get one of the distilleries or the breweries to go over and take over the Aquarena, they are so fond of trying to get their little bit of advertising. There cannot be much mileage for the distillers and the breweries to take over that Aquarena. There cannot be much mileage for them or they would be down there grabbing it, to get in the limelight so they can advertise their beer and their whisky and their rum.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will be able to keep going?

MR. NEARY: Oh, sure, no problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep it up.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Mr. Speaker, as I say, we are all for sport and we are all for recreation, but we are all for the right kind of sport and the right kind of recreation, and I do not think that the kind of activity carried on inside that Aquarena or that will be carried on is the fastest growing sport in this Province. You have the University swimming pool right next door and it is too bad that the promoters of the Summer Games did not heed the advice of the politicians who are considered to be the unnecessary evil in society by these people. It is too bad

MR. NEARY: they did not take our advice and put the Aquarena if they had wanted to build it - and they were so fond of getting all these people into this Province who never turned up, empty hotel rooms during the Summer Games - it is too bad, Sir, they did not locate it in another part of the city where more children, more boys and girls, would have access to it. Mr. Speaker, if we were going to put up a facility that would be the last kind of a facility that should be put up in this city. The fastest growing sport in St. John's today, I would say, is racket ball and handball and you have to go down to the Recreation Centre in Torbay to play racket ball and handball.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: It would be far better instead of putting this multi-million dollar monstrosity over here, Sir, if they put up one or two racket ball courts around the city.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: And fix up the tennis courts.

MR. NEARY: And make tennis courts accessible to boys and girls in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we are still in the age in this Province, as I said last night, where sports like everything else in Newfoundland - certain kinds of sports now I am talking about - tennis, curling, racket ball, swimming are just for the sons and daughters of the aristocrats, the snobs -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - the eliteists - just like they are trying to do with the University over there, make the University of the elite. They cannot afford to participate. Go down to Pleasantville, down by the Royal Canadian Legion, Pleasantville branch, if you want to see activity in sport. They are down there kicking the soccer ball around, playing

MR. NEARY: baseball. There are more people down there on a Summer evening, and right here in the corner on King's Bridge Road, girls playing softball, more people participating in that kind of sport than you will find over here at the Aquarena which is costing and will cost the taxpayers of this Province a fortune. And I know, I can hear the argument now, they will say, 'Oh, yes, but Ottawa paid a certain percentage of the cost. We had to grab these facilities because Ottawa paid us a certain percentage of the cost.' Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be true. Ottawa may have paid a certain percentage of the cost, but the Newfoundland taxpayer paid the most of it, paid a heavy price for that Aquarena and the baseball park and the Canada Games park. The taxpayers of this Province paid a pretty heavy price, Sir, taxpayers all over Newfoundland who will never be able to use that facility. And, Mr. Speaker, I say this now and I say it sincerely and I mean it, that if the government had brought in this piece of legislation

MR. NEARY: accompanied by a companion piece of legislation offering assistance, the same kind of assistance that people in the rural areas - for instance, if the government had come in and said, Look, out in the Bay St. George area there is a recreation centre out there including a swimming pool that has been closed down now for over three years operated by the R.C.Parish, taken over from the Americans, it was a beautiful facility - they tell em, by the way, that the usage of that pool was the highest in Newfoundland at the time.

MR. MCNEIL: That is true.

MR. NEARY: That is true. My hon. friend says that is true. But it has been closed down for three years. Why is it closed down? Why did they not have a commission to get their few doolars to open it up? Why did they not? Because it is out in Stephenville but this happens to be here in St. John's. The people out there have begged and pleaded with the government to open up that facility and the government said, No, we are not going to open it.

And we have another one - where?

MR. R. MOORES: Carbonear.

MR. NEARY: In Carbonear. There is one out in my own district in Port aux Basques. The Kinsmen have been building it now for over five years - they have managed to get a few handouts from the government - five years and it is not opened yet, struggling and begging and borrowing and working tooth and nail, night and day trying to get that swimming pool open so that the kids out on the South-west coast can enjoy a swimming pool.

We have all kinds of swimming pools in St. John's most of them, by the way, underused. I happen to know because I have three kids who swim just about every day of their lives, they are in synchronized swimming, and competitive swimming, and there is no trouble to find a

MR. NEARY: pool in this city vacant. Out in the rural areas, out in Port aux Basques and out in the Bay St. George area, down in Carbonear, out in Buchans Junction, people, Sir, the children, apart from getting in a river or a pond or a stream have never had the privilege of jumping into a swimming pool. So if the government had brought in an accompanying piece of legislation saying, Look, taxpayers of this Province, we want you to pay for the Aquarena to get it open, and the Canada Games Park, we want you to pay for this, we want the taxpayers, you the taxpayers in Labrador and on the Great Northern Peninsula and Central and Western Newfoundland and the fishermen, we want you to pay for opening the Aquarena, but in return we are also going to give you a programme whereby your children can enjoy a little sport and recreation, then I would find it very difficult to criticize the government for this kind of legislation. But that is not so, Sir, it is not so.

They are asking the taxpayers all over the Province to pay for the Aquarena and pay for the Canada Games Park and to pay for the baseball park, that is what they are asking. It is rank discrimination, discrimination of the worse kind. I have no doubt - if anybody thinks, Sir, that there is any doubt in my mind that this bill is going to go through this House or is not going to go through this House, if anybody thinks that, I want to put their minds at ease right now. The government have the majority and this bill is going to go through the House and the Canada -

MR. SIMMONS: If they can round up their crowd.

MR. NEARY: If they can get the crowd in, and I think they have learned their lesson after last night.

MR. MCNEIL: We want commitments on the other facilities that are lying around idle.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And the Aquarena

MR. NEARY: will be opened and it will cost the taxpayers of this Province \$300,000 a year. That will be done.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will that do it?

MR. NEARY: No, there is no doubt about that. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope when that is done, I hope when this piece of legislation goes through this House, Sir, and that the Aquarena is opened that all the other facilities in this Province that are desperately crying out to this government for financial assistance, either for completion or to up grade the facilities, or to build new facilities, I hope that financial assistance will also be offered these communitiies. That is the weakness in the proposal that we have before us. My hon. friend should know that.

I know the bill is going to go through. It will go through and anybody who is worried about it, anybody who wants to go out and take to the airways and say, Oh, you know, there are grave doubts up in the House of Assembly as to whether we are going to bet the Aquarena opened or not because the Opposition have a little criticism to level at the way the



MR. NEARY:

Canada Summer Games was handled, at the way this particular policy on the part of the administration is being handled, and it is very doubtful whether we are going to get the Aquarena opened or not because Neary got up and shot off his face and did not know what he was talking about. Anybody who thinks that can just relax. This bill is going to go through and the Aquarena is going to be opened. I do not know how many people will use it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible) - nice comment for the weekend.

MR. NEARY: What is a nice comment for the weekend?  
What I just -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: All the facilities (inaudible) used to maximum benefit.

MR. NEARY: It will, Sir, I am afraid, unless we change our thinking toward sport and recreation in this Province, and I guarantee if I wanted to there is quite a bit I could say about it, unless we change our attitude, Sir, that aquarena will become a happy hunting grounds for the sons and daughters of the elite of this city, the middle and upper income groups.

MR. W. ROWE: Right.

MR. NEARY: It will become another Bally Haly.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Look at your buddies to your right and your left.

MR. W. ROWE: The elite.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, curling in Newfoundland is for the elite. Curling is for the elite. Out in Western Canada, Sir, you can curl side by side with an ordinary worker.

MR. W. ROWE: I do not golf. I do not curl.

MR. NEARY: Golfing in this Province is for the elite. -

MR. W. ROWE: I do not do a lot of things.

MR. NEARY: - the likes of the Premier and Craig Dobbins

MR. NEARY: and that crowd, the elite, the snobs.

It costs you a fortune to join the thing.

Look, Mr. Speaker, you talk about building facilities. Up here at Nagle's Hill a group went up and formed a little company themselves, up here on Nagle's Hill and it turned out to be one of the most popular forms of recreation that there is in this city right now. They do not even have eight holes I do not think up here at Nagle's Hill. They may have eight holes but it is pretty rough and pretty rugged, putting the ball around -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well they do not, or nine whatever it is. Nine I am sorry. Nine holes, Sir. The hon. gentleman has been in Las Vegas more often than I have. I have never been there. So the hon. gentleman has been down to Craig's place golfing and he knows more about it than I do.

MR. CALLAN: Down in Dallas.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Sir, up there they built these facilities -

MR. W. ROWE: Las Vegas kid, look.

MR. NEARY: They did it themselves. They started off from stratch up on the Halliday farm and I will bet you, Sir, I will bet you there is more pleasure and enjoyment, there is more pleasure and enjoyment up there on Halliday's farm on Nagle's Hill than there is down here at Bally Haly. The hon. gentleman should go over on a Sunday morning. He might meet some ordinary people over there. He might be able to rub shoulders with the ordinary people who are out doing a little golfing -

MR. SIMMONS: He would not know what to do.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Spend my weekend with the boys (inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Oh yes; in Las Vegas.

MR. NEARY: That is a good form of recreation too.

MR. NEARY: Golfing in the main, apart from the -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Take a \$1 million helicopter to the ice.

MR. NEARY: - here and in Corner Brook and in Grand Falls golfing is a game for the snobs, the aristocrats and the elite. The hon. gentleman knows that. And I hope that this place up here at Nagle's Hill succeeds and I hope to see more places like that built around this Province instead of big monstrosities like the Aquarena that we have over here.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Who said they did it all themselves?

MR. NEARY: They did pretty well all of it themselves because I happen to know some of the group and I have talked to them fairly regularly and I know how hard they have worked. I know how hard they have worked on that project and are still working hard on it, mostly volunteer labour -

AN HON. MEMBER: \$60,000 -

MR. NEARY: Well so what? There is over \$6 million in the Aquarena and that could build a lot of these golf courses for these ordinary people, if they wanted to use them.

MR. PECKFORD: That is incorrect. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. A point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Bungler is up.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, a point of information, a point of explanation, a point of clarification, whatever other points, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: You bungled it last night, now sit down.

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) just said that there is \$6 million of government money in the Aquarena. That is an incorrect statement and he should correct it.

MR. NEARY: How much is in it? Tell us how much?  
\$5.5 million?

MR. PECKFORD: You make statements and then ask somebody else a question?

June 30, 1978

Tape No. 5033

NM - 4

MR. NEARY: Is it \$5.5 million? \$5 million?

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: I would like to speak to the point of order raised so ably by my friend from Green Bay, so unbungling by my friend from Green Bay, Mr. Speaker. He has obviously turned over a new leaf today. He has not

Mr. Simmons:

bungled yet today and it is nearly 1:00 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that unless we bring in the government accountants before the Bar of the House and see the actual figure and have them audited here, whether the figure is \$6 million or \$5 million and some thousand, it is really a difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: My colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been known to speak in round figures to make his point on many occasion. He speaks in round figures just to make the point. My friend for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) has been known to be a stickler for detail. All his friends over there are praying ~~that~~ last night he ~~were~~ more of a stickler for detail -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I will ask the hon. -

MR. SIMMONS: - than he was, Mr. Speaker. And it is just a difference of opinion I would submit, Mr. Speaker, between the able member for LaPoile and the able bungler for Green Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel that it is not a point of order, but a point of explanation on behalf of the hon. minister.

MR. NEARY: I am going to repeat again what I said, Sir, and I hope the hon. gentleman if he is wrong will admit that he is wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: When will they (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: What I said, Sir, the taxpayers of this country and the taxpayers of this Province and the taxpayers of this city between them have put more than \$6 million in the Summer Games facilities in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: The taxpayers of Canada, the taxpayers of Newfoundland, the taxpayers of the City of St. John's between them together have put upwards of \$6 million in the Summer Games facilities.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the deficit over \$6 million, So now will the hon. gentleman apologize for his point of order?

MR. HODDER: He cannot count any better than he could last night.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has asked me to apologize, and so I would like to have the floor?

MR. NEARY: No, no, Sir. No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not intend to apologize.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman said -

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. member said there was \$6 million in the Aquarena. There was not \$6 million in the Aquarena and the hon. member is misleading the House.

MR. NEARY: I wish to carry on with my speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. member for LaPoile, I thank him Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to clarify a very important position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sit down, bungler.

MR. W. ROWE: The bungler should sit down, should he not?

AN. HON. MEMBER: It got a few laughs.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the whole thing now is just one big mess. And now, Sir, we have to try to sort it out and the way that the City Council -

MR. W. ROWE: When did Peckford learn to count?

MR. NEARY: - and the government -

MR. W. ROWE: He could not count last night.

MR. NEARY: - tried to get themselves of the hook was to set up a Commission of Enquiry under Judge Steele to try to sort out the mess and do something about -

MR. W. ROWE: 'Peckford' the mathematician.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not know what happened to him last night, but -

MR. NEARY: - getting -

MR. SIMMONS: - fourteen became twenty-eight.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, they were seen double.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: There is a figure here now, Mr. Speaker, this is in the Spirit of 1977. Let us see what they say here.

MR. W. ROWE: Spirit is the right word for that crowd.

MR. NEARY: 'The second facility in St. Pat's Field was acquired through a special arrangement with the Irish Christian Brothers, The Association paid \$100,000 for the land with an agreement that as of September 1, 1977 the area of the field hockey venue would be leased to the Christian Brothers for twenty-five years at a nominal rate of \$1 a year. The Games also released cost figures amounting between \$10.5 million to \$11 million for the running of the 1977 Canada Summer Games.'

MR. W. ROWE: There you are.

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible) it is not  
\$6 million (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I said upwards of \$6 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. ROWE: Over six.

MR. NEARY: This is August 7.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend got up to try to leave the impression that it was below, below \$6 million, \$10.5 to \$11 million.

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

MR. NEARY: - for the running of the 1977 Canada Summer Games.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend when he -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I would like - if my hon. friend -

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a point of order, sit down!

MR. NEARY: If my hon. friend wants to give the House some information -

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, do we recognize a point of order any more?

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member for LaPoile to take his seat.

MR. HICKEY: I think we should make it clear that when my hon. friend quoted the figure \$6 million he was talking about the Province. And then when challenged he said the country and the city and the Province -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: He is still wrong because the figure if you take in all three is over \$10 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Obviously these points may be made but they will be made by participating in the debate.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman seems to be proud of that, Sir. The hon. gentleman should be ashamed of it. But if the hon. gentleman is so free with his information perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us about all of the little souvenirs that were made during the Summer Games, the Games medal and the coins and all of the other trash that they had floating around. What about all of this? Has all of that been disposed of? Is it put away somewhere now for safe keeping? Has it been given away? We have not been able to get an accounting of any kind in this House about the Canada Summer Games.

MR. HICKEY: Would the hon. member yield?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HICKEY: Would the hon. member yield?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to yield, I am going to carry on for another few minutes.



MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, now we have established the fact, Sir, that it is going to be closer to \$12 million or \$13 million by the time it is finished.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) round it off.

MR. NEARY: No, I will not round it off.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the trouble is, you see, that we have been unable to get any information in this House about the Canada Summer Games. It is one of these situations, Sir, where an organization sprung up, came out of nowhere, answered to nobody. Down at City Hall they said the Province was responsible for it. Here in this House the government said that the City of St. John's was responsible for it and then once in a while they would pawn the responsibility off on the Government of Canada - just a group going around spending \$10 million or \$12 million of the taxpayers' money and responsible to nobody - no public tenders - and now we have the mess on our hands and between the Province and the City they have to set up a Royal Commission to try to sort it out and to get the Aquarena opened before she rots out over there.

I remember, Sir, before the Summer Games started, a group of kids went over there -

MR. W. ROWE: It is \$4.5 million for the Aquarena itself.

MR. R. MOORES: (Inaudible) Hickey. He is misleading you with this \$10.5 million.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and there are so many figures flying around. I have two reports in front of me now that say 'the \$4.5 million Aquarena.' That is what I am talking about, the Aquarena - \$4.5 million and I said it is going to be upwards of \$6 million.

MR. R. MOORES: The Aquarena is going to be the most -

MR. W. ROWE: Well, what cost \$5.5 million?  
MR. NEARY: Where was the other \$5.5 million?  
MR. W. ROWE: Or the other \$6 million.  
MR. NEARY: Or \$6 million, whatever it is.  
AN HON. MEMBER: He does not know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now I am getting muddled and confused, Sir. I have to go back now to my original figure that the Aquarena, Sir, cost - and I was quite right the first time - between the Government of Canada's contribution, the provincial government's and the City of St. John's, the Aquarena cost upwards of \$6 million. Is that correct?

MR. W. ROWE: And the McConnell rip off will cost more now.

MR. NEARY: We have been trying to get the information, Sir, for several years past. I claim, Mr. Speaker, there should be an inquiry into this whole matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman was up in Ottawa when the rip off took place on the land over there where the Aquarena is built and I have all the documentation down in my office. I would like to show it to the hon. gentleman sometime. The hon. gentleman was up in Ottawa -

MR. W. ROWE: Approving it.

MR. NEARY: - probably approving it, and we were here trying to get some answers to questions in connection with that land and with that property. And we feel the taxpayers were ripped off on that piece of land. And the hon. gentleman pounds his desk and says that is great.

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible) Royal Commission (Inaudible)

MR. WHITE: No judges left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have the two police forces in Newfoundland right now tied up investigating scandals in the government. We have practically all the judges of the Supreme Court tied up in inquiries and investigating scandals.

MR. SIMMONS: The RCMP had to bring in extra people.

MR. NEARY: The RCMP, we are told, had to beef up their commercial and fraud squad, had to take on twenty or thirty extra girls to try to cope with all the scandals that are on the go.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: But I guarantee you this, Sir, that one thing this crowd has to remember, that governments do change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And they can cover up and they can sweep these things under the rug all they want to.

MR. SIMMONS: They are running out of rug.

MR. NEARY: And I remember when, I believe it was Ray O'Neill, raised a matter down at City Hall and I raised it here in the House and, my God! - we were unpatriotic; how dare we criticize! The Summer Games is going to be the best thing that ever happened to Newfoundland! Look what it is going to do for Newfoundland's image!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And I move the adjournment of the debate, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until Tuesday at 2:00 P.M.

On motion, that the House at its rising stand adjourned until Tuesday, July 4, 1978 at 2:00 P.M.