

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

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

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS WHICH NOTICE HAVE BEEN GIVEN:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have some more answers here in response to questions by the hon. member for LaPoile. The answer to Question No. 67, Question No. 11 and the answer to Question No. 46, Question No. 12, Question No. 21, Question No. 53 and Question No. 2, all in the name of the same hon. gentleman, all in the name of the hon. member for LaPoile - the only member over there, Mr. Speaker, who has the energy -

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, about a week ago I asked the hon. Minister of Justice, to whom I am about to direct a question now, asked him whether any reports had been received concerning the possibility of arson being involved in any of a number of fires which took place within a period of a week or so in St. John's and the first one was one which was at the Elizabeth Towers apartment building. So starting with that I would ask the hon. minister is there any report back from the police labs or any other place which have been received by the Minister of Justice or the Department of Justice concerning that fire?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can answer it in this sense that there are no reports back from the laboratories in Sackville received by me or the prosecutorial division of my department. I repeat, if the hon. gentleman will recall that these reports do not come to my department they go to the investigating police force and come to the department as one of the exhibits in the report that is sent in. As of yesterday afternoon no reports had been received on any of these fires by my department. I went to check again when I was coming up here now and the gentleman I had to ask is not back from lunch. So

MR. HICKMAN: with that rider and nebulous qualification the answer is none have been received.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The minister is choosing his words very carefully I notice, Mr. Speaker, exceedingly carefully. Is the minister aware either as a minister or personally of any reports which might have been received by any officials outside his department, the police force or the fire commissioner, the CID, any reports which might have been received from the lab concerning well, to start with the first fire, the fire in Elizabeth Towers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, again that question came up last week and the hon. Leader of the Opposition -

MR. NEARY: Yes or no, that is all.

MR. HICKMAN: - the hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite correct when he says that I have to choose my words exceedingly carefully and I must. I have an obligation as Attorney General to ensure the confidentiality of any investigation that is going on connecting any possible crime in this Province and there is no in between with respect to that kind of restriction that is placed upon me. But I will repeat what I said last week when the question was asked that it was indicated to me when I had inquired within the department as to whether anyone had any idea as to the progress that was being made that some, the extent of which I do not know, some of the reports from the laboratories were coming back to the police. The contents of these reports, the investigations to which they relate I do not know directly or indirectly.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, Sir, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

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

MR. NEARY: You are the only one who asks for supplementaries.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, while on this general topic, one question before I get off this specific topic, Sir. A number of

MR. W. SCHEP: people have indicated to me that they may run into some difficulty with regard to insurance and so on in some of these fires, the Elizabeth Towers fire, for example, unless the insurers have access to information indicating the cause of the fire. Will the hon. Minister indicate - say, for example, no charges are ever laid in connection with any of the fires even though there might have been a report that a fire might have started under very suspicious circumstances but arson with regard to a particular individual is not provable and therefore no charges are laid, do the reports go into the hands of the insurers of any people claiming under insurance policies? For example, do the insurance companies get an opportunity to look at any files, police files, or CID files, or Fire Department files relating to the possible cause of the fire even if criminal charges are not laid in the case of, say, arson, suspected arson?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. A. NICKMAN: I feel reasonably certain they do not, but I do know that, and as the hon. gentleman is aware, in many of these cases where you have a serious fire and where the cause of the fire is unascertainable by the Police - and I will use again as an example: Three years ago when we had a series of fires in the Province involving hotels and nightclubs most of which the cause of the fire was not ascertained, to ensure that every conceivable investigative avenue had been followed the Director of Public Prosecutions at my request ordered magisterial enquiries so that all of these witnesses who had been interviewed by the Police, not under oath, would now be placed under oath. That evidence - a transcript of that evidence because it is certainly a quasi public hearing, in fact I believe it is a public hearing in the strict sense of the word, would be made available to any investigating adjuster. If I can go back to when I was in the active practice of law I can recall being refused time after time, as solicitor for an insurance company, access to

MR. A. HICKMAN: any confidential reports that were made as a result of an investigation into a fire. So for that reason, not having asked specifically, I feel quite certain that the confidentiality would have to be - the confidentiality of an investigation in the event of there not being sufficient evidence to lay a charge would be maintained and would not be available to insurance adjusters. The insurance adjuster has to go out and conduct his own investigation, or her investigation.

MR. M. BOWE: A further supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Original questioner. Supplementary.

MR. M. BOWE: Sir, in this general area of the administration of justice and crime and so on in the Province, the Chief of Police and other people have noticed and announced publicly that there is a rise in the rate of crime being committed in the Province, in the City of St. John's in particular, and especially in the area of vandalism.

Now what I would like to ask the Minister of Justice - I believe the Chief of Police mentioned that a week or so ago, did he not -

MR. S. NEAPY: Ten days ago, Yes.

MR. M. BOWE: - ten days ago, or so, that there is a rising rate of vandalism in the City - what I would like to ask the Minister of Justice is, when was the last time there was a substantial increase in the manpower of the Newfoundland Constabulary and does he think that the existing strength of the Police Force in this City is sufficient to combat the rising crime rate in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. A. HICKMAN: There has not - To my knowledge there has not been an increase in the manpower of the Newfoundland Constabulary in the last ten years. It may even be twelve years. As of today I have never received advice or a request from the Chief of Police, successive Chiefs of Police that there should be an increase, need to be an increase in the manpower. There is certain reorganization going on within the Force that so far has proven very effective in combatting the crime rate

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 3993

PT-3

MR. A. HICEMAN:           increase in the City of St. John's which whilst it is increasing and it is disturbing, it is fortunately still staying below the Canadian average or that of comparable cities and towns throughout Canada. If it is indicated that there is a need for an increase in manpower I feel quite certain that such a request from the Chief of Police would be readily accommodated. There are some other adjustments going on right now which have not been completed as yet and when they are completed they will become public knowledge which again, I think, will indicate and provide a continuation of effective policing in the City of St. John's.

I can go back and say ten years ago

MR. HICKMAN: the ratio of policemen, you know, per capita in St. John's was considerably higher than that of comparable cities such as Halifax.

Now since then I suspect that as we have maintained the status quo and done some adjusting that that ratio, obviously, has changed somewhat. But whilst there has been an increase in certain areas of criminal activity within the city limits, vandalism for one, I think we can take a great deal of satisfaction from the fact that as a result of the special squads that the Chief of Police implemented, designed to respond and police areas where there has been a noted increase in criminal activity, have been most successful and in these areas of the city the graphs are going down. This is a very satisfactory thing indeed.

MR. W. ROWE: A final supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: That answer sounded reasonable, Sir, but to me it is absolutely incredible. The minister is telling us that in a city which must have practically doubled in size in the last dozen years, with all the other additives to the increase in the crime rate, television and urbanization generally and so on and so forth, and with the rate of increase in crime noted by senior law enforcement officers, that there is no need now to increase the police force, after this twelve year period?

MR. HICKMAN: I did not say that.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well the minister says he did not say that, Sir, it certainly sounded like it to me.

MR. W. ROWE: A ten or twelve year period since - and no requests from the Chief of Police. I mean does the minister's officials or anyone else in the department have any ideas on it? Can the minister indicate whether he himself thinks or believes there should be an increase in the police force in order to combat the increase in the rate of crime in the city of St. John's; And also, Sir - well let him answer that first, Sir, and then

MR. D. ROWE: I have one final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, as of today, June whatever it is, 6th., 1978, there has not been a need for an increase in the manpower in the Newfoundland Constabulary. But I draw to the attention of hon. gentlemen that during that period two or three things have happened, one is there has not been a doubling of population. The real population growth in St. John's, the rapid one did not occur during the last ten years, it was the fifteen years immediately preceding that. And the growth today has been the normal increase in population that you will find in any city of the size of St. John's.

Secondly, there has been some fairly major changes in policing emphasis and policing patterns in the city during the last ten year period. Ten years ago the Newfoundland Constabulary, with the same 215 men, had a fairly substantial number assigned to highway patrols, which took them as far as Whitbourne. That was discontinued and these men were all brought back in -

MR. CALLAN: I am glad it was.

MR. HICKMAN: And the hon. gentleman from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) says he is glad it was. These men were brought back into the city and given policing responsibilities within the city. There has also been a lot of adjustment as to the work that is being carried out by shifts. The police are not doing as much prosecuting in the courts as they used to. They are not doing the kind of records and clerical work that police officers used to do down in the Magistrate's Court. All of these free up more and more men to do strictly policing duties.

MR. NEARY: Parking. Parking.

MR. HICKMAN: Some people, at least one editorial suggests that they should be taken off parking meters.

AN HON. MEMBER: They should.



MR. NEARY: I got a summons today for an expired parking meter, nine months old.

MR. HICKMAN: That flies right in the face of the professional recommendations, I might say, of the police officer.

MR. NEARY: Nine months. Long enough to have a baby.

MR. HICKMAN: The problem has never been with the police officers handing out parking tickets.

MR. NEARY: I do not even know where I was nine months ago.

MR. HICKMAN: The problem has been what follows after and we have overcome that to a great extent during the past year.

MR. W. ROWE: One final, Sir, leading from that answer, then I will resume my seat.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Can the minister indicate to us the average amount of overtime that each member of the Newfoundland Constabulary will have say in the run of a year?

MR. NEARY: Also prison warders.

MR. W. ROWE: And the prison warders as well. He might not have this exact information at his disposal, Sir, but if he could find out from his officials and let me know tomorrow, what is the average amount of overtime which a member of the police force would have in the run of a year or had, say, last year, the financial year ending March 31st., -

MR. NEARY: Not last year, the year before because of the strike at the Waterford.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, that is right.

MR. W. ROWE:

Maybe he can give us an average over the last two or three years and what is anticipated this year by way of overtime.

MR. NOLAN: Unlimited overtime in Canada, unlimited.

MR. W. ROWE: Is that right?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Wait now let me answer the question. I have to take notice of this. Obviously, I cannot give the House the amount of overtime that the police during the past two or three years have had, the members of the Newfoundland Constabulary. I would suggest that when I get it you will see a difference in the type of activity. I suspect that the CID would necessarily have more overtime than someone on traffic patrol.

The other appendix to that question which either came from the hon. Leader of the Opposition or his colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), his trusty colleague from Conception Bay South, is whether or not there is unlimited overtime at Her Majesty's penitentiary. I will check that out too but I will be very surprised if that is correct.

MR. SPEAKER: I would now like to welcome to the House of Assembly on behalf of hon. members thirty-six Grade V and VI students from St. Peter's Elementary School in Upper Island Cove accompanied by one of their teachers Mr. William Greeley. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for Bellevue. I realize there are hon. gentlemen who wish to add supplementaries but I have to bear in mind that there would appear to me to be a number of hon. members who wish to ask questions on other subjects and an hon. member is not precluded, of course, from coming back to his subject when he is recognized.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier perhaps the Minister of Justice could answer the question

MR. CALLAN:

or perhaps the minister of T and C. What I am trying to find out is what the status of negotiations perhaps would be a good word - what is the status of negotiations with anybody and especially with the first Arabian corporation in connection with any efforts in trying to reactivate and reopen the Come By Chance Oil Refinery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: The situation, Sir, is much as I described it to the House a week or so ago on my return from the discussions in the U.K. At that time the first mortgage holders, the Klienwort-Benson Group together with the Export Credit Guarantee, a department of the British Department of Finance and the receivers Peat, Marwick told us that they had been talking to the First Arabian Corporation and they had received some suggestions from them. They felt that they had insufficient information to entertain the suggestions as a specific or reasonable proposal, that they were going back to the First Arabian Corporation asking for more details, detail on their background, detail on their marketing, on their management expertise and whether or not they had a reliable supply of crude, on what they based the assumption that they could operate the refinery as a reasonable, viable and profitable operation. They were, in fact, setting forth a whole number of questions and a whole number of orders of detail which they asked the First Arabian or were to ask the First Arabian to respond to.

I would suspect that they have given this list of questions to the First Arabian Corporation by this time. To the best of my knowledge there has been no response. We have not heard from them. I undertook at that time to keep the House informed as I will and indeed this is, I imagine, a series of questions aimed in that direction. But to date there has been no further advance to my knowledge with First Arabian over and above the description I gave of the discussions we had in London a week or two ago.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister can tell us whether or not the First Arabian Corporation have come up with any guarantees from reputable financial people to the effect that they are or will be in a position to reactivate and rehabilitate, I suppose, the defective parts of the refinery and to get it back on the wheels. Have they supplied that information to date?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DODDY: Mr. Speaker, up to the time of our discussion, and I described the situation at that time here in the House, one of the prime areas of concern and interest by the receiver on behalf of the first mortgage owner was, in fact, the very question which the hon. member raises, is First Arabian capable of financing the operation? Do they have the necessary resources behind them? Do they have the working capital to operate the refinery? Do they have the financial capability of rehabilitating the refinery and bringing it up to the standard necessary to operate it as the original designers intended it to be and the sophisticated state which it never did reach? These questions had not been answered satisfactorily up to the time of our discussion but they were among the most important of the

MR. DOODY: questions which were being put to First Arabian, and my understanding is that the First Arabian had undertaken to provide that information through the British. When that is done the British have undertaken to acquaint us of the situation, but to date there have been no specific guarantees given that these capabilities are with the First Arabian and to that extent one has to say that the proposal is no further - or at least the discussions or negotiations are no further ahead than they were prior to our arriving in the U.K. for our briefing a week or two ago.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister then - it has been over two years now since the refinery closed. It has cost the British \$5 million to keep that refinery in mothballs for two years. You know, assuming that it is another two years that is \$10 million just to keep a place in mothballs. The question is, How much longer are the receivers prepared to carry on in the receivership of the refinery, number one? - and could the minister indicate when he expects that another set of meetings similar to the meetings held with the British a week or more ago -

MR. DOODY: Have you finished the last part of your question?

MR. CALLAN: Yes. When does the minister expect that another set of meetings with the British will be forthcoming and does the minister think that the receivers might get - you know, sick and tired of holding on to this? It has been over two years now. How much longer will they hang on to it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: I think it might be fair to say that the British are pretty sick and pretty tired right now, Your Honour, of putting money into the mothballing and maintenance of the operation. The figure that was quoted at the last meeting was not \$5 million - I think it was closer to \$12 million that they have invested to date in mothballing and maintenance to keep the facility up to a standard which would be acceptable to a potential buyer. The indication that we received at that time was that they would continue this sort of support as long as there appeared to be a real customer in the wings who would be interested in taking over the refinery and operating it, and as long as they feel reasonably satisfied that First Arabian are a real potential customer and are negotiating in good faith, then I get the impression that the support that I mentioned will be forthcoming and continuing. How long that will continue, of course, is obviously in the hands of the British Treasury. It is their decision how much money they will continue to commit. We have an undertaking from the Government of the United Kingdom through ECGD that they will inform us well in advance of any decision to discontinue that sort of support, but as of this moment, I can say that the support of maintaining the facility is ongoing and we have no indication as to a cut-off date, although quite obviously there is a limit to the amount of money that any government or any organization or any company can continue to pour into something. And I hope that it is not something that is going to happen very quickly, but we have been told

MR. DOODY: that we will be informed well in advance if such a decision is taken.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir. Would the minister tell the House if there is any foundation to the reports that the Director of Air Services has resigned or has put in his resignation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the Director of Air Services along these lines a few days ago. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the contents of the letter with the Director of Air Services or indeed officially with my colleagues, and I would refrain from answering that question in detail at this point. I would much prefer to have the opportunity of discussing it with the people involved directly and report to the House perhaps in a day or two on the contents.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would assume from the minister's answer then that he has received a letter of resignation from the Director of Air Services. For what purpose would the meeting be held, to ask him to reconsider or is the minister going to accept the resignation? - you know, just what is the status now of the position?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: I know this may seem alien and

June 6, 1978

Tape 3996

EC - 4

MR. DOODY:                   strange to the hon. the member  
for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), but there are some



MR. DOODY: common courtesies which are observed in most civilized societies. One of them is to treat the man who has served this Province well and faithfully for the past ten or twelve years with the respect, I think, that such an employee deserves, one of them would be a conversation with the minister involved to go into detail of the letter that was received and to find out what the background of it is and what the history of it is. I think that the gentleman deserves that kind of courtesy and I have every intention of affording him that courtesy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, who believes in courtesy perhaps the hon. gentleman could also inform the House -

AN HON. MEMBER: - lacking in the Opposition.

MR. S. NEARY: - that the Director of Air Services informed either the minister or his deputy or the Director of Transportation that he was already looking for a job on the mainland before this controversy arose.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: The hon. member is asking me a question that is beyond my capacity at the present time to answer. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Director of Air Services had never informed me of any plans that he might have to seek employment elsewhere or to advance his career in another area. He may very well have discussed it with the deputy or the assistant deputy or the Director of Transportation. If he had, they had not discussed it with me or brought it to my attention, so, therefore, any discussion or any knowledge of plans or ambitions or desires of the Director of Air Services to change his area of employment

MR. DOODY: is beyond my knowledge and so I cannot honestly or truthfully answer the question, Sir.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: My supplementary, Sir, would be for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. No doubt the Director of Air Services will have no problem getting a job flying helicopters around. The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture made a statement, Sir, in this House on May 24, 1977 that the government had located two Canso aircraft, and the minister was doing his Estimates at the time if I may refresh the minister's memory. Actually, he told me twice when he was doing his Estimates that the government had located two Canso aircraft and they were going to buy these two aircraft and have them refurbished and turned into water bombers. Could the minister tell the House where these two aircraft were located that the minister told us at the time the government had found? Where were they? And did the government in actual fact purchase these two aircraft?

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

MR. DOODY: I do not know the exact location of the aircraft that were purchased, Mr. Speaker, I do know that the aircraft were purchased and they were refurbished by - one of them is still being completed by Field Aviation in Calgary. Where they actually came from; I understand that one did come from the California area somewhere but the other one I do not know. We purchased them through Public Tenders and when the tenders came in we then proceeded to get them refurbished through Field Aviation in Calgary.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that that would be the final supplementary so I think I have to pass along to another hon. member. The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Rousseau) respecting the grim labour situation in the Province but particularly I want to ask some questions about the labour dispute in the civil service - public service. First, can the minister very quickly inform the House precisely how many contracts come up for negotiation in the public service this year? It can be done very quickly because maybe they are all one year contracts maybe they are not.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I know there are 124 contracts. I do not know how many are public service ones but I would think probably a quarter or half of them anyway.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: 124 total. Does the minister anticipate any problems with respect to resolving these contracts? Because it looks like, particularly in the civil service to date anyways, all the negotiations have been going through the third party stage, so I am thinking in terms of whether there is enough arbitrators and conciliation men.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The minister or the conciliation officers do not resolve the contracts. Management and labour resolve their own contracts. We provide the mediation services. Thus far, the average load would be four or five cases for each conciliation officer. That is not very many but if it gets to a point where the case load is too heavy I have the power under the new Labour Relations Act to bring in people from outside the public service.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

MR. LUSH: Would the minister indicate as to how many contracts within the civil service or the public service are presently in dispute right now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will have to take that as notice. I will get the answer for the hon. member on tomorrow. I do not know offhand.

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I understand, Sir, that the accounts of all municipalities in this Province are subject to audit by the Auditor General. I notice in the Regional Government Bill a departure from this practice in that it specifies that it is the minister who shall appoint the auditor. Perhaps the minister can shed some light as to the reason for this departure from normal practice. Does he lack confidence in the Auditor General? Does he fear the Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee? Does he wish to be in a position to give the business to some particular auditing firm? Or will this innovation be extended to other municipalities? What are the reasons?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, many times in the run of a year, as a matter of fact, the minister appoints auditors to go in and audit the books of a municipality, because the Auditor General has not gotten around to it. His mandate, I believe, is to do it at least once every two years. So his work load is getting to a point now where he cannot handle all the audits of municipalities and often times I appoint auditors to go in to a town or a community and so on. And it has been going on for, as the hon. member said, for a long time now and it will continue to go on.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3, debate adjourned by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it may come as a surprise to the House, Sir, especially to members on the government benches to learn that I am going to support the vote of non-confidence that was so ably proposed by my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Opposition in the House yesterday, Sir.

MR. W. ROWE: I am surprised.

MR. NEARY: And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the best way to preface my remarks in support of the motion of non-confidence moved by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe), the Leader of the Opposition, is to state, Sir, that this government has not even shown a hopeful sign of a deathbed repentance for the budget tabled in this House of Assembly on the 17th. day of March, in this year of our Lord, Sir, 1978. There was some hint of belt tightening, Sir, in the Budget Speech and austerity for our tax payers, that none for the tax spenders, Mr. Speaker, Nor even a hint of an intention by the minister or by the government, to reduce the horrendous \$2.6 billion public debt at today's interest rate, which means, Sir, a fivefold increase in interest charges alone to be carried on the backs of our taxpayers as compared with what they shouldered six years ago when the present regime, Sir, came on the scene in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the budget contains no real intention of belt tightening by the government itself. If it had any real concern, Sir, for our Province's desperate financial plight, and for the future economic health of Newfoundland and Labrador, it would have introduced in this session some real measures, Mr. Speaker, to restore common sense to the handling of public monies.

First, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and I said this before in this hon. House, that we could lop \$.5 million, Sir, off the annual expense of running this House by cutting back the size of

MR. NEARY: the House, Sir, to thirty-five members, including, Mr. Speaker, four members for our present underserviced Labrador region.

Mr. Speaker, this is a suggestion that has been made on a number of occasions that seems to have met with a favourable response by people, especially taxpayers throughout this Province. Cut back, Sir, the number of members in the House, cut back the size to thirty-five members instead of the present fifty-one members and through economy measures save the taxpayers \$5 million. That, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: would make one member for every 15,000 of population and, in my opinion, Sir, this is sufficient in a province with our tax base. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet would be reduced accordingly. The Cabinet could be reduced, for instance, to twelve or fourteen members for another large saving, Mr. Speaker, by incorporating some departments as divisions of others. Tourism, for instance, Sir, could easily become a division of Transportation and Communications and cut back, Sir, all the current waste on foolish - Mr. Speaker, I am getting an awful rumble, Sir. I can hardly hear myself. Either close the door, Sir, or ask the people in the corridors to cool it. I am trying to make a very serious speech, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member wishes to be heard without interruption and that includes not only members of the House but people who are also in the precincts.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, as I stated, the Department of Tourism could easily become a division of Transportation and Communications and cut back all the current waste on foolish advertising and things like the Norma and Gladys, considered to be public relations gimmicks, to a simple programme of presenting every tourist arriving at Port aux Basques with a cheque for \$50.00 or \$100.00 to help compensate him and his family for their expense of getting here. In other words, Sir, what I am saying is that if you wipe out the foolish nonsense, wipe out the Department of Tourism, make it a branch of the Department of Transportation and Communications, eliminate all this foolish PR like the Norma and Gladys and the other gimmicks that they have, and the huge amounts of money that they are





June 6, 1978

Tape 1999

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:

The government cannot wait now, Sir, to get the House closed. They cannot wait to close her down. And tonight, Mr. Speaker, if we wanted to filibuster on the Budget Speech and the government did not get their estimates through by tonight, the Budget Speech did not end because--for the benefit of those who may not realize it, and some people here on the floor of this House may not realize it, but in order to get money to spend after midnight tonight, the government have to do one of two things, they have to finish the Budget Speech because money cannot be spent until the Budget Speech is finished; bring in Interim Supply because the government only introduced a bill for two months Interim Supply and that is finished as of midnight tonight if not midnight tomorrow night, and so we could hold up the Budget Debate if we wanted to and nobody could be paid tomorrow. Tomorrow is payday in this Province. Nobody would be paid - nurses, doctors,

Mr. Neary: teachers, highway workers, civil servants, nobody would be paid if we carried on the Budget debate for another week, unless the government brought in interim supply, and I do not know of any Minister of Finance that has ever brought in a bill for interim supply the second time.

So we are quite prepared, Sir, to let the government have their supply by midnight tonight, when the time has run out, when the time is expired, we are quite prepared to do that and the reason we are prepared to do it, Sir, is not to let the government off the hook, is not to let the ministers, is not to get the House closed down as quick as possible. If we did not do it, Sir, people on social assistance would suffer because they would not be able to get their mother's allowance or their social assistance benefits and nobody would be able to be paid. So we are quite prepared to let that go through, and we will have other opportunities to debate when the Throne Speech debate is called. And we are guaranteed that that will be called for another week.

But that does not mean, Sir, because we are letting the Budget speech end by eleven tonight, or midnight tonight that we would like to see this House closed down because we do know, and I am sure it must be evident to everybody, to all and sundry by now that the government wants to get the House closed down as quickly as possible. The Premier cannot stand it in this House, and I would not be at all surprised, Sir, if ministers already have their transportation booked to get out of this Province. And so I say another way to save money is to exercise a little stricter control over ministerial and senior officials' travel.

And I would say this too, Mr. Speaker, auction off the government aircraft, the King Air aircraft that was bought from Field Aviation a couple of years back. Have an auction down at Torbay and get rid of that, Sir, and let those, Mr. Speaker, today who get the free transportation on that government aircraft for themselves, and let those, Sir, who transport lobsters, and their salmon, spend a little money with Newfoundland's private air transport companies--

Mr. Neary: and their partiridge...let them spend a little money with Eastern Provincial Airways that could use the business, and auction off that government aircraft and save the taxpayers of this Province literally hundreds of thousands of dollars, I would say tens of thousands of dollars in booze alone. Because I am told, Mr. Speaker, that everytime some ministers step ashore off that aircraft they take a bottle with them when they are going. Then the employees say, "Well, if they can have one, I can have two." And I would like to see the booze bill for that aircraft. So, Sir, there is another way that we can save money. My hon. friend yesterday was talking about \$50 million. No trouble at all, as far as I can see, to save \$50 million.

And, Mr. Speaker, also, and I want to draw a distinction here, Sir, between fund raising and fund raising for political campaigns and political parties. The difference is, Sir, and hon. members on the government benches somehow or other when fund raising comes up, when scandals develop they always say, "Oh, the other crowd was just as bad." In other words, what they are saying, Sir, it is all right for us to do it because the other crowd was just as bad, when in actual fact, Sir, there is no hard evidence to prove that the other crowd was just as bad. For instance, Mr. Speaker, is there any evidence to show that ministers in the former administration were involved in shake-downs, influence peddling, extortion, and fraud? Is there any evidence of that? We have evidence now, Sir, hard evidence to show that ministers on the government benches were involved in fund raising, and I do not know of one example, Sir, in the Smallwood Administration where anyone of his ministers were ever involved in fund raising.

AN HON. MEMBER: They did it.

MR. NEARY: Who was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: They did it.

MR. NEARY: Name them.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were -

MR. NEARY: I checked the other day with the former Premier of this Province, not one of his Cabinet ministers was ever involved in fund raising, and if he was he would have been flung out on his ear.

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible). first.

MR. NEARY: But we have evidence, Sir, we have evidence of ministers in the present administration, ministers mind you, not bagmen, ministers shaking people down in anticipation of future business, getting donations.

MR. J. CARTER: Where is the evidence?

MR. NEARY: We have the evidence.

MR. J. CARTER: Present it.

MR. NEARY: The evidence has been presented, some of it, and the rest of it will be presented in due course if the police report is not controlled.

MR. W. ROWE: Sat on.

MR. NEARY: Or sat on, installed.

MR. NEARY:

And so, Mr. Speaker, there is a vast difference in the way, Sir, parties raise funds. This party, to my knowledge, and I had it from the gentleman who was in charge for twenty-three years, did not condone in that twenty-three years ministers going out and peddling their influence to get party donations in anticipation of work for the future. But we have evidence of this crowd doing it, this hon. crowd. And so, Sir, I would say that ministers should be barred from any connection with political fund raising and then, Mr. Speaker, watch the prices of construction and tendered services drop, save the taxpayers of this Province millions of dollars a year. Then, Sir, I would suggest as another economy that the government take a finetoothed comb and go through Newfoundland Hydro and other Crown corporations for evidence of feather bedding and payroll padding, especially in Newfoundland Hydro, where people have been hauled in out of the rain recently because their businesses failed and because they had buddies on the board of directors and in Newfoundland Hydro were hauled in and put on the payroll, fabricated jobs, high paid jobs at that, Sir. What it reminds me of, Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of a sort of a provincial senate. In Canada if you support a certain party and the party happens to be in power, or they want to do you a little favour they put you in the Senate. In this Province, Sir, we have our own provincial senate, we have Newfoundland Hydro, we have the Public Service Corporation, we have the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation.

MR. FLIGHT: We had the Linerboard mill.

MR. NEARY: We had the Linerboard mill. We have our own senate in this Province and that is how the present administration reward their friends. They do not have to go up to the senate in Ottawa, they are put in the provincial senate, Newfoundland Hydro. It is used to pay off party hacks and debts of personal

MR. NEARY: gratitude. I say, Sir, now that we are appointing a new chief executive of Newfoundland Hydro, let us be realistic, Mr. Speaker, in the matter of a salary and fringe benefits and let us abandon the idea that such a job is a political plum and entitles the incumbent to all the trappings of -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you reading a speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I have ever read a speech in this House. I do not believe I have ever read one. Well maybe when I was moving the - what is that on opening day?

MR. NOLAN: Address-in-Reply.

MR. NEARY: You move the Address-in-Reply on opening day, I believe that is the only time I ever read one. I have notes in front of me.

MR. J. CARTER: Table them.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I would be glad to, and I would be glad to put the hon. gentleman on the table. I would be glad to put the hon. gentleman on the chopping block.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us get away from this idea of thinking that this is a political plum to pay off one of your friends and that he be paid, Sir, a salary and be given fringe benefits in line with the going salaries, the going rate of pay in this Province, and in line with our ability to pay, and keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we have the second lowest per capita income in the whole of Canada. And let us see the government, Mr. Speaker, exercise some control over the growth of the public service. I do not have the numbers in front of me, Sir, but I would say that in both numbers and expenditures over the last say four or five or six years, that there has been a tremendous percentage increase in the number of public servants

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4001

NM - 1

MR. NEARY: and, Sir, in the salaries paid and the total cost of operating the public service.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder, when you look at the - and I do not have the figures in front of me but they must be tremendous, is there any wonder, Sir, that we are borrowing our way to the poorhouse and placing

MR. NEARY: a dreadful burden, Sir, on the taxpayers of this Province for the future - the future, Sir, when some day we will have to answer to these international Shylocks who will ultimately want their pound of flesh. Mr. Speaker, instead of finding ways to economize in the past five years, the chief concern of our provincial braintrust down on the 8th Floor seems to be to find new ways to squander public funds. They are so busy, Sir, trying to find out ways to spend the taxpayers' money that they overlook the tremendous opportunity to economize and to save money - some of the examples given by my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition yesterday and just a few that I have thrown out now in the last few minutes. Fifty million dollars, I would say, is a very conservative figure with a small 'c'. And, Mr. Speaker, what about all the programmes that are available from Ottawa? What about, Sir, the tremendous opportunity afforded to this Province by federal government economic aid and 'make work' programmes. Instead of squandering tax dollars, Sir, on abortive programmes, as my hon. friend indicated yesterday, the setting off of the dynamite on either side of the Straits of Belle Isle, the spruce budworm spraying programme which will only benefit a few 'come from away' pilots and the chemical companies, we could be employing thousands of men, Sir, on a federally assisted programme of cutting, transporting and stockpiling wood from already infested areas ready to be fed into our paper mills and even into the Stephenville Linerboard mill.

Mr. Speaker, the vote of non-confidence, Sir, also refers to corruption in government. And I would submit to Your Honour that there are members



June 6, 1978

Tape 4002

EC - 2

MR. NEARY: sitting in this House today, people listening to me in the gallery, and I would not be a bit surprised but that there are people even sitting in the press gallery, who are not aware, Sir, that this government came into power rotten to its very core, rotten to the foundation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: This government came into power, Mr. Speaker, on a payoff, by paying off a member who had been elected after that 1971 election when there was a saw-off, and I refer to Mr. William P. Saunders, who at the time was re-elected the member for Bay de Verde. Mr. Speaker, the story of Mr. Saunders has never been told.

MR. W. ROWE: It will be.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, it will be some day. And every year as long as I am in this hon. House I am going to refer to the Saunders scandal. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen should be aware one of the reasons, I think, and this is only a suspicion on my part, one of the reasons, Sir, that I think that Mr. John C. Doyle who the Premier refers to so often as the fugitive from justice the reason, Sir, that gentleman has been banished and kept in exile was because that gentleman happened to be in Mr. Richard Green's house back in 1972 when Mr. William P. Saunders' letter of resignation was delivered to the hon. the Premier who was in the same house at the same time.

MR. SIMMONS: How about that?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that is true.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true, Sir. It is true, Mr. Speaker. If that hon. gentleman could have the immunity of this House, be brought before this House, instead of being banished and put into exile, if he were allowed to come back and give evidence, Mr. Speaker, that same gentleman, by the way, who up to that time I only knew from a distance, called me the day the House had opened,

Mr. Neary: called me about 1:00 o'clock in the morning to tell me that William Saunders had resigned. The government had paid him off. He even told me what the price was, \$200,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: \$100,000 delivered in cash, and \$100,000 in trust. And, Mr. Soeaker, let me remind the hon. the Premier if he laughs over there, if he wants to laugh, that Mr. Saunders, Sir, came to a Liberal Caucus meeting a couple of days before that, and told the caucus, I was sitting there, my hon. friend was there, on Monday - the House opened on Wednesday - Mr. Saunders came to the Laurier Club on Monday and told the caucus that he had been in the Premier's office on Monday morning, that the reason he went up was because he was broke, he owed money and he wanted the Premier to open the House so he could pay his bills.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right. That is what he told us.

MR. NEARY: And two days later he resigned. He does not even - if he had come into the House for one second that day just to get sworn in he would have gotten a pension for life.

MR. W. ROWE: Plus his \$10,000 -

MR. NEARY: Plus his \$10,000.

MR. W. ROWE: He gave that up,

MR. NEARY: The man told us he was broke. He was broke - he has not worked a day since and then all of a sudden he takes off for Florida.

MR. W. ROWE: Buys himself a Lincoln Continental.

MR. NEARY: Buys a Lincoln Continental, gets the bank manager out of bed in the wee hours of the morning so he can get his travellers cheques so he can take off for Florida. Not bad for a man who is broke.

And let us see what the former Premier of this Province said about the gentleman Mr. Saunders, when the Premier was campaigning in his former district of Bay de Verde. Let us see what he said. Mr. Smallwood told the meeting in Bay de Verde that Mr. Saunders resignation was pre-arranged with Mr. Moores, and that the Premier delivered his letter

Mr. Neary: of resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor. He said the letter, in an unsealed envelope, was dated February 28. Well that is true, Sir, because I have the letter here in front of me. And for the first time in this hon. House I am going to lay it on the Table, because that is not the last we are going to hear tell of it. Because, Mr. Speaker, I may as well say this now that I have grave suspicion, Sir, that some of the \$200,000, the money that went to pay off Mr. Saunders came from contractors who were working on the Health Sciences Complex. And so if you want to get to the root of the scandal in connection with the Health Sciences Complex you have to go right back to square one, to day one, the Saunders resignation that was so expensive. And the government were so desperate, it needed the money, it went to some of the contractors who were on the Health Sciences Complex. I am told that one of the contractors put up \$100,000 to pay off Mr. Saunders so Mr. Moores and his crowd could get the government.

Mr. Smallwood continued over in Bay de Verde, he said, "The letter in an unsealed envelope was dated February 28." And that is true, Sir. "A few hours after the Legislature had been called in this Session, and the Speech from The Throne read, it was not delivered so that all Newfoundland could listen in on the television and hear that political manifesto," he said. Mr. Smallwood said he spoke with Mr. Saunders on the telephone on the night of February 28, and he told me that the last thing in this world he would do would be to desert the Liberal Party or me or the new Leader. He also said, that Mr. Saunders was broke, owed some debts, and had no money, and yet forfeited his \$10,000 sessional pay, and even gave up a lifetime of pension to which he would have been entitled had he even made an appearance in the House. "Two days after the Legislature was dissolved," he said, "Mr. Saunders and his wife flew to Florida and have been there ever since. How fortunate Mr. Moores was, was he not? How lucky he was, and how thoughtless Mr. Saunders was. How careless was he to give up \$10,000 and the pension for the sake of waiting for the House

Mr. Neary: to open. Mr. Moores will have to answer for that one day." And, Sir, he will have to answer for it one day. That government will not be there forever. There will be eventually a change of government. The Minister of Justice will have to answer for it one day, the Minister of Transportation and Communications will have to answer for it one day, that payoff. And here is the letter, Sir, dated February 28, which was a leap year by the way, Monday February 28, two days before the House opened, and it is addressed to Hughie Coady, Clerk of the House of Assembly, Confederation Building.

"Mr. Coady:

I hereby tender my resignation as the member of the House of Assembly for the Electoral District of Bay de Verde effective immediately." Effective immediately, February 28. "I have advised His Honour, The Lieutenant-Governor

MR. NEARY: by way of similar communication as of this date, Yours respectfully, William P. Saunders." Now, Mr. Speaker, was that letter delivered to Mr. Coady on February 28th or to the Lieutenant Governor on February 28th? No, Sir. I am told it was delivered to none other than the Premier of this Province and the Premier of this Province carried it around in his pocket and the Premier of the Province brought it down to the Lieutenant Governor on Wednesday, two days later when the House opened after, Sir, carrying out one of the greatest conspiracies ever perpetrated on the public treasury of this Province, a one hour sitting of the House that cost the taxpayers a half a million dollars.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Involving the Queen's representative.

MR. NEARY: Involving the Lieutenant Governor, the Queen's representative.

And that night, Sir, late that night, Wednesday, two days later the letter was delivered to Mr. Coady at his home in the wee hours of the morning or late evening, twelve or one o'clock. After the Premier had gone to the Lieutenant Governor the letter was then sent to Mr. Coady who gave it to the Speaker of the House and that is where I got the letter from the Speaker's records. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a matter in this Province that should be investigated this is it. I do not have time to go through the scenario again, I only have forty-five minutes. I wish I had more time to tell you all the things that I know about this resignation. But I can tell hon. gentleman now that the former Premier also knew about this resignation before the letter was delivered by the Premier to the Lieutenant Governor. And I might say, Sir, another interesting fact is that this letter was sent to Mr. Hughie Coady by a messenger from the Premier's office. How does that strike the hon. Minister of Justice? Is that enough to warrant an investigation into it? Mr. Saunders has never worked a day since to my knowledge. Ah, it is a great big joke, great big joke. Got the bank manager out of bed, got his travellers cheques -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Million dollar rip off.

MR. NEARY: -and has been living comfortably ever since. Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: the reason I raised it now is because I think, Sir, I think and this is only a theory on my part, suspicion that some of this money that was paid to Mr. Saunders came from the contractors on the Health Sciences Complex. And here is a letter, Sir, that has never been put on the table of this House before. We should put it on the table of the House for posterity if nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, it was one of the greatest scandals, Sir, in the history of this Province. What a way to come into power and my hon. friend referred to it yesterday in his vote of non-confidence. They came in, Sir, rotten to the core and they have been rotten ever since. Now, if the hon. gentleman wants another example let us talk about these two planes that I asked the hon. minister about today, these two aircraft that were purchased. Provision was made last year in the estimates to buy these two Canso planes. The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, when he was putting his estimates through the House, told the House that \$780,000 had been allocated for capital expenditure to buy two Canso aircraft. I asked the minister today if he would confirm what he said a year ago that he knew where there were two aircraft and the minister got up and said yes. As a matter of fact, a year ago he said, "We have two lined up that are available." That is one question I put to him. Then I put another question to him and he told me an answer, this is May 24th, 1977 and he said, "While I did not think there were any Cansos left either, Mr. Chairman, we did find two that are in good condition. There is no problem or very little problem with spare parts for these Cansos." The minister said the government had found two aircraft and the next thing we know, Mr. Speaker, the government called public tenders after they found the two aircraft. They did not go out and buy the aircraft themselves or take adoption on the two aircraft they found, they called public tenders and this was all very cosy and very convenient because the only bidder they had was Field Aviation and Field Aviation happens to be doing eighty per cent of their business with this Province. So Field Aviation came into it now, a middle man and, Mr. Speaker, for a

June 6, 1975

Tape No. 4004

JM - 3

MR. NEARY: Cause aircraft that the government could have gotten for \$110,000 plus a couple of hundred thousand dollars for refurbishing it and putting the water bombing equipment on it that Field have a patent on apparently -



MR. NEARY: \$110,000 and \$200,000, \$310,000 maximum, the government should have paid for that aircraft. Well what did they pay for it, Mr. Speaker, the one they have now delivered here? They paid \$535,000, they paid \$225,000 more than they should have paid. How did Field get jammed in the middle? Now the minister can argue that we called public tenders and they are the only ones who responded to the tenders.

MR. W. ROWE: It was a set-up.

MR. NEARY: It was a set-up, Sir, it was set-up, it was all prearranged and I can prove it. I do not have the time now but in the Throne Speech I will prove it, Sir, because I called the airline yesterday who sold this Canso to Field Aviation. They did not know of the government tender, they had already advertised the aircraft for sale themselves in the Aviation magazine so the government should have been aware of it, I am sure, if the Director of Air Services was reading these aviation magazines. And on the other aircraft, Sir, which was bought I believe for \$140,000, the government paid \$335,000 and they have got to pay another \$193,000 to get it refurbished and get the water bombing equipment put on it - \$140,000 and they paid Field \$558,000 and they never touched the engine on either one of the aircraft, Sir. So the government is paying out \$1.2 million for these two aircraft ready to fight fires, between \$500,000 and \$600,000 more than they should have paid. Now, Sir, is it any wonder that I criticize the Director of Air Services who attended the opening, with Field Aviation, of these public tenders that all looked so nice and all looked so legal when in actual fact, Sir, it was a put-up job? And that is why I have no sympathy with that particular gentleman for allowing the public treasury to be ripped off for \$500,000 or \$600,000 and God only knows how much of it found its way into other pockets along the line. Then the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has the gall and the nerve to get up and say, "Oh there they are over there smearing and crucifying public servants"

MR. F. B. ROWE: He blamed everything on the Civil Service.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4005

AH-2

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman got up the other day and blamed everything on the Public Service. It is our job, Sir, to protect the Public Treasury and as long as I have an ounce of strength and my health holds out that is what I will continue to do.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications should look into this matter and the hon. gentleman I must say has been most co-operative up to now, most co-operative.

MR. H. COLLINS: We are all co-operative.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not blaming the hon. gentleman by the way, the hon. gentleman has been most co-operative. But, Sir, I am going to find out why Field Aviation were jammed in the middle when the government could have gone and purchased these two Canso planes direct if they knew where they were. The minister told us a year ago they knew where they were and they could have bought them for between \$500,000 and \$600,000 less than what they paid for them. Now, Sir, that is not a bad saving for the Public Treasury, that can buy a lot of shoes for the people my hon. friend from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) was talking about the other day.

I am not finished with my research on this one yet, Sir, but I will tell you one other little interesting fact. I am told that the same lawyer that represents the company that sold this Canso to Field Aviation also represents Sealand Helicopters.

MR. W. ROWE: Where? What city is that?

MR. NEARY: In Toronto.

MR. W. ROWE: There must be (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Not a bad coincidence either. The things that you turn up in your research, Sir, would make your hair stand on ends.

MR. W. ROWE: Are they the same bankers?

MR. NEARY: I do not know if they are the same bankers or not, I will have all the information before I am finished. But, Sir, I am running out of time now and I will deal with the matter again at a later date.

June 6, 1976

Tape No. 4005

AH-3

MR. NEARY: This budget, Mr. Speaker, represents the floundering death throes of a government which lost even the ambition to cope with problems and opportunities. And the kind of thing, Sir, to themselves and to the ordinary citizen of the Province that could be done by members on both Your Honour's left and Your Honour's right, the kind of thing, Sir, that could happen at the end of the debate on this motion of non-confidence would be for members on both sides of the House to give full support to the motion so that the people of this Province may elect a government which will stop mouthing-off about priorities and planning and really get down, Sir, to the formidable task, the formidable job of governing Newfoundland and Labrador honestly with dedication and common sense, with the determination,

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to budget for success and not budget for failure and with the firm resolve, Sir, that we will set our financial House in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) The hon. member for St. John's.

DE. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I can assure the last speaker that he is in good health and strength. I think he gave a forceable delivery as he always does. As a matter of fact, I always have been a little bit amazed at the hon. member. Most members in speaking they will speak in a certain vein then they will reach a height and then they will go down then they will reach another height but the hon. member goes full blast the whole time and quite honestly I do not know how he does it, he seems to sustain a full head of pressure throughout. My approach perhaps will be somewhat different than that. Different in another respect also.

We are speaking on the Budget, in other words the finances of the Province and one way of checking on the financial position of the Province or the use of the monies available to government in governing the Province is to see if the money is well used or not. Now, it seems to me that the Opposition tends to concentrate on whether it is poorly used on the basis of, perhaps, skulduggery or outright waste. and I think this might be a legitimate attack to take. I think if there is proof for it or, indeed, if there is reasonable suspicion for it I would not object to that at all. I think, if it is done without suspicion, if it is done on whim or if it is done, really, without many facts to suggest it—I do not demand absolute proof because often the proof only comes out in the discussion - but if it is done with very little basis I would think that would be rather irresponsible. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend

DR. COLLINS: to go that way in my remarks. I would prefer to look at whether the money is being well spent or not in looking at some program. See if the program is appropriate not if there was wrongdoing in administering the program but see if the program itself is appropriate and doing what it is supposed to do. We all take our own particular interest in regard to the finance of the Province and I do not think it would come as a surprise to hon. members if I wish to talk in regard to the health field.

The question I want to get into is are we getting our money's worth from the money we are putting into some of the health programs?

Now, before I go into that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words about my own district, the district of St. John's South. There are a few particular points in regard to my district that I would like to discuss with hon. members. The first one is the CN dock. Hon. members will know that the CN dock has been on hard times in the last few years for a number of reasons. I will not go into these. But great efforts are being made to turn it around and the management there I think is a very good one at the present time. One of the measures they are taking is to try to get the contract for the refitting of the Russian fishing fleet which has become possible since the 200 mile limit came in. And hon. members will have noticed that there was an experimental program of two Russian trawlers brought in this year. I am informed by people in the know at the dock that this has gone very well. They did not quite get the amount of work per ship that they were hoping for because the contract means, or part of it means that the crew themselves can do some of the work and this was a saw-off. I suppose it was a compromise that had to be arrived at so that they did not quite get the amount of work they had hoped for but they got

June 6, 1978

Tape 4006

DM - 3

DR. COLLINS:

certainly sufficient to continue the program and they hope to improve on this performance in the future. In other words, this experimental phase was a success.

Now the next point is related to that and that is the question of a Synchronlift for the dock. I know that hon. members on the other side or at least some of them feel that this might be a threat to other areas of the Province. The best information I have is that it proposes no threat whatsoever, that any work that a synchronlift will do at the dock at the CN will be work that will not be done here if that synchronlift is not brought into operation and will not take work away from elsewhere. As a matter of fact, it is very likely to enhance the total work available to the Province taking away from places like Cuba, and so on and so forth and that in actual fact it will be

Dr. J. Collins: good all the way around.

Now regrettably the decision has not yet been made by the federal authorities to fund the synchrolift. All the information has gone up there. The Provincial Government has given its blessing to it, as a matter of fact it has given its strong support to it. And I was pleased to see that when I made representation to government to emphasize that report there was no hesitancy in doing so. And I am informed that the federal authorities have this as a high priority but that in actual fact it has not yet come to pass.

The dock also has a big refit job due this Fall, that is on the Robert Bond, and I was very pleased to see that. I made great efforts at one time to make sure that there was suitable provision made for the refit to be done in St. John's. This is something that our dock has always done, but there was danger of it going elsewhere, and I made an approach to the General Manager of CN Marine and finally got a commitment from them that even though the conversion of the Robert Bond for the Labrador run was being done elsewhere, the annual refit would come to our CN Dock.

The conversion itself is being done in the Province of Quebec and I think this is a pity but it was probably unavoidable. The CN Dock was originally instituted for this very reason, that is to take care of the coastal fleet in our Province, and here was the biggest job to be done on the coastal fleet. It was a \$4 million conversion job and it had to go outside of the Province. Now this was a great shame, but the time constraints were such that our dock could not handle it. They could have handled it if the job had not to be completed towards the end of the year. In other words, if this season did not have to be taken care of, this season on the Labrador run. But the word was that it had to be ready for this season, so that it did go outside of the Province. I will be most interested to see if the contract that was let is lived up to, and that in actual fact the Robert Bond conversion will be

Dr. J. Collins: completed in time to start on the run in the first week of July, which is just a few weeks away. And if it is not ready for that and we do miss this season, I would think that a word of reprobation is due to someone that this job was not done, this major job was not done in the Province of Newfoundland.

I would like to turn now just very briefly to another area of my district, and that is Fort Amherst. I have mentioned this a number of times in the House. Perhaps the hon. members are a little bit sick of hearing about it, but it never ceases to amaze me that a capital city of a Province of Canada there is an area which is without water and sewerage. You know, that seems a most incredible thought that there are people living in the capital city of a province that have to be serviced by, I think, it is a honey cart and a water truck in this day and age. I have made representations to the Municipal Council a number of times over this and finally I think, that it is in their proposed budget to do something about it.

Now, this raised a very interesting point. If these worthy families, some thirty to forty families, hard working, I do not think there is one family on welfare, were in any other area of the Province, certainly in any unincorporated area, there would be no problem in getting money for water and sewerage, at least there is a very good chance of getting it. But the very fact that they are part of a major municipal authority and that authority could not see its way clear to supplying these essential basic services meant that they had to do without them all this period of time. You know, there is something wrong there. So what does one do about it if the municipality cannot reach on it, and you have to believe them when they say they cannot reach on it? The only thing to do, really, is to go, despite the fact that these fall within the ambit of the municipal authority, the only thing to do is to go to the Provincial Government. And this is what I did, and I am glad to say that the Provincial Government, in the person of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, did very gratifyingly come through with a measure of support.



Dr. J. Collins: I am not exactly certain of the details, but a measure of support which, I think, will allow the municipal authority in St. John's to get on with at last supplying water to Fort Amherst.

Mr. Speaker, there are other matters in my district which I think are worthy of comment, but time being such I will just mention one other and that very briefly, that is, the NIP and RRAP programme

Dr. Collins: in my district. It covers a very large part of my district, and I think it is one of the best things that has happened in St. John's for many a year. I am informed that street work in the NIP area of St. John's South will commence this month. And also, tenders are being let for the Brother Eagan Field which will be a major new recreational area badly needed in an area of St. John's that has almost no recreational area. I should not say none because there is Victoria Park, a rather rundown minor plot of land with a bit of grass growing in it, that has been all that has been available to the citizens of my area for years, so there has been something there. But the Brother Eagan Field will become the major and much needed recreational area in that part of the city. It will include a softball field, a soccer field, two plissé tennis courts, tennis courts which may be flooded in Winter for skating, changing rooms for all of this, and off street parking. And, I think, it is a measure of the times that these facilities are being designed to accommodate the handicapped as well as the average person.

Mr. Speaker, I could say more on my district but I feel I should go on to the other points that I wish to make. I suppose it would be not unexpected if I did say something about the spray programme that is imminent, and in particular in regard to the motion that was passed by the Newfoundland Medical Association recently. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that motion advocated that water supplies in the immediate proximity of human habitation be avoided, not that it was ever intended that these areas should be sprayed. I think the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has already pointed out that there was to be a buffer zone around water supplies and around communities, and as he said this is for psychological reasons. There is really no basis in fact or in reality for doing this. I think that this can be readily understood if one said, suppose you were not spraying this material but you were spraying a known toxic substance, perhaps a bacterial substance, perhaps cholera or a food poisoning substance, would people be reassured, as the NMA would seem to indicate they were reassured, that it was alright to spray

Dr. J. Collins: this stuff as long as you did not go within a mile or two of a community or a mile or two of a water supply? I think, you know, we would not countenance that for one second.

So the point is that if you are going to spray because you do not feel that it is a danger, spray and you could spray right into the community itself. If you think that it is toxic or dangerous you do not spray anywhere, leaving a little buffer zone might be a good psychological point as the minister says, and I do not downgrade this psychological aspect, I mean that is what, presumably, politics and public relations and salesmanship is all about. But in actual fact we should not base all our attitudes on the psychology of the thing, we should base much of it on reality. And, I think, a realistic point is this, Mr. Speaker; the people in Gander have shown a concern about their water supply, which is Gander Lake. Although this concern is legitimate to have it is quite unrealistic.

I have done a little sum which I think shows this quite clearly, and members can check the figures if they wish, but I have done so, and I am quite convinced that they are valid. Gander Lake from which the town draws its water supply is approximately - now these figures are approximate, but they will do to serve the purpose - Gander Lake is approximately twenty-five miles long, about a mile wide, and at a conservative estimate, 150 feet deep, an average area. If one does a little sum he can see that this Lake contains 584 billion gallons on that basis, 584 billion gallons. The Canadian Safety Standard for Matacil, and this is a standard,

DR. J. COLLINS:

this is a dilution of the material which can be consumed safely so we are told, and we have to accept these, these are the authorities, over a long period, over a year and you are still safe. Now using that Canadian Safety Standard which is 100 parts per billion for Matacil, it means that we could put 58,400 gallons into Gander Lake to reach that level. This means - I am not certain how much is in the drum, is it 100 gallons?

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty.

DR. J. COLLINS: Fifty. All right, we will take it fifty. That means you could put over 1,000 fifty gallon drums of Matacil straight into the lake and you would still be within the safety limit .

Now, the area is going to be sprayed twice at an ounce per acre. That is two ounces per acre. Using that yardstick and the figures I have given you could spray 9.5 million fluid ounces which would therefore cover 4.75 million acres to reach that safety level. In other words, to pollute Gander Lake and therefore be a danger to the water supply, to be able to do that, one would have to spray 4.75 million acres, all the runoff would have to end up in the lake and there would be no breakdown of the compound in the interval. This does not even allow for the runoff, the normal runoff down the Gander River, the lower Gander River and so on from the lake. So I mean this is clearly quite unrealistic. There is absolutely no danger if this was a toxic substance to the degree thought about, there is clearly no substance to that fear, and I am really surprised that the NMA went for the old potato of a little buffer zone around the lake and around the town.

MR. J. COLLINS:

Now just one other word on the spray programme. I will do this very briefly. Hon. members will have received a circular from Ecowatch dated May, 1978 and it says, "Ecowatch, Corner Brook" and it is entitled, "Spruce Budworm and Newfoundland Environment Study." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone through this and I can say without a shadow of a doubt, I think I can anyway, that there are some quite distinct untruths or misinterpretations or whatever you would call them in this. On page 15 of this document it is stated here, "In 1974 Dr. Crocker produced Reye's Syndrome in mice." Now, Mr. Speaker, that refers to an article written by Dr. Crocker and associates in a scientific journal called Science on page 1351, volume 192 and I reviewed this article.

And whilst Ecowatch comes out and says he has produced Reye's Syndrome, a reading of this article does not state that at all. A reading of this article states that there were changes in these mice under experiment. It says as follows; "There are two patterns of fat distribution in the liver of our experimental animals, a diffuse fine pattern seen in these animals treated with the carrier. That is not the drug itself but the emulsifier and the solvent and then injected with virus and the virus is the organism which causes brain damage. So these mice were injected with substances plus a potent virus. So there was a fine pattern and then large fat globules. And the statement is made that the pattern of fine dropped liver cell staining has been stated to be characteristic of Reye's Syndrome in children.

DR. COLLINS: This is a misinterpretation to say this; this is much too strong. Crocker himself did not say he produced Reye's Syndrome in mice. He said he produced changes which were suggestive of Reye's Syndrome in humans, he did not make this statement that is said in Ecowatch. Now even more important than that, the figures are wrong. Ecowatch states here, "Dr. Crocker produced Reye's Syndrome in mice by exposing some to fenitrothion, some to DDT, and others to a combination of fenitrothione and DDT, and then injecting them with a sub-lethal dose of known Reye's Syndrome virus. Mortality rate in the fenitrothione group were six to seventeen per cent, in the DDT group four to nine per cent, in groups where both insecticides were used thirty-three to sixty per cent. A controlled group exposed to corn oil and injected with the virus resulted in no deaths."

Now, Mr. Speaker, one can go back to the actual results produced in this paper, and it will be seen in this that in actual fact rather than no deaths in the group treated with corn oil alone there were in fact a mortality rate of six per cent up to twenty-six per cent depending on the dose of virus given. The animals were treated with corn oil and then given various doses of the virus and, depending on the dose, there was a mortality, a very distinct mortality. As a matter of fact, it was greater than the mortality that one saw by injecting the virus into mice treated with DDT which was only five to fifteen per cent, greater than that in mice which were treated with fenitrothione which was zero to six per cent. Where the Ecowatch went wrong was that in the group that were treated with the emulsifier—that is the solvent and the emulsifier, not the medication—the mortality was higher, it would range from thirteen per cent up to ninety per cent. I think it is interesting to note the comments made by the authors. They said, "The mortality rate was much higher in animals exposed to the mixture of solvent and emulsifier and subsequently injected with EMC virus than to those given corn oil alone or pure insecticides. The results shown in figure 1(c) indicate that the fenitrothione would appear to have a protective

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4010

AH-2

DR. COLLINS: affect on the lethal reaction. This protective affect has been observed with structurally related organo phosphates in other toxicity studies. So than rather than the Matacil - I will not say that, I am sorry, This is not Matacil; this experiment was not conducted in regard to Matacil. This was conducted to another but related insecticide, Rather than the insecticide itself causing a disease that may be related to Reye's Syndrome, in fact it had a protective affect and if there was an affect at all it was from the emulsifier and from the carrier. So that the information given in this thing in certainly that respect, and I have a few others that I will not take the time to go into now, was quite misleading. This is not a scientific document even though there are all sorts of references in it, Looking at it, it is not even drawn up in a way that a scientific document is drawn up. This would never get into a scientific journal. I see that the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Kitchen) agrees with me. So that is all I would like to say on the spray programme.

Now going to the main topic I would like to discuss - and I think my timing has not been too good - the health care field, the financing of , that is the method of financing and whether we are getting good value for our money, just a few figures.

The cost of health services here in this Province in 1969-1970 was \$59.3 million. This rose to \$80.4 million in 1971-1972, that is when this administration took over control. So there was an increase there from roughly \$60 million up to \$80 million. From that period in time up to the present time, that is 1977-1978 - I have not got 1978-1979 in my figures here actually but

DR. COLLINS: I think the more confirmed figures are the ones for last year - the cost in 1977-78 was up to \$220 million. In other words, there was a rise of approximately 400 per cent from the period 1969-70 up to 1977-78. That is an enormous rise, of course. Now this does not mean that this rise implied these were all new services being added. I think hon. members will fully realize that many of these services were being supplied previously by private individuals in the private sphere and this rise really was largely because health services were being taken over from the private sphere and brought into the public sphere. In actual fact if one looks at the proportion of money spent on health services, the proportion of our budget which comes to nineteen per cent, this is not outlandish not by any means. I have a few figures here for some budgets in other provinces. In British Columbia in 1976 there was twenty-three point nine per cent of the Provincial budget went on health services. In Ontario in 1976 it was twenty-eight point one per cent. In New Brunswick in 1975, much similar to ours, theirs was nineteen point eight. In Nova Scotia in 1975 it was twenty-seven point three. Also the amount that we spend in Newfoundland per capita is not out of the ordinary. We have spent about - It comes to roughly seven per cent of the Gross Provincial Product is spent on health services. So these total figures are not out of the ordinary. We do not seem to be spending more than other provinces on health services. Now perhaps the other provinces are spending too much, I do not know, but certainly we are not out of step. That is not the point I am questioning.

The point I am questioning is are we getting value for the money we are spending even though we are not spending more than other places are spending. Now of course when we talk about spending on health services we are talking of two things nowadays. We are talking on Medicare which is the exhibition of medical care services, and we are talking on the hospital services. These two makes up the total health care package with some others, with some administrative costs and so on and so forth. But these are the bulk, really. As a matter,



DR. COLLINS: fact if I might just quote another few figures, in the year ending 1978 hospital services cost this Province \$165 million approximately whereas medical care, that is the services given not through the hospital mechanism, the cost is just over \$36 million and that makes up something eighty-five, ninety per cent of the total health cost budget.

Now I think we should look at the effects on people of this expenditure. Now just let us look at the indigent and compare him, how he was before we began to spend all this money within this public sphere, compared to how he was when there was relatively little spent within the public sphere as most of it was spent within the private sphere; that was before Medicare and before Hospicare came into effect. And in terms of the indigent there has been very little change because the indigent previously had his health care services free anyway. The health care package was such that if you could not afford to pay, if you were a legitimate, if that is the right term, a legitimate indigent you were not charged either by physicians, by hospitals and by other health agencies. So that with the coming in of these two expensive care mechanisms, the indigent would only benefit in terms of how the general health mechanism itself developed. They got no specific help from these two mechanisms.

Now let us look at the next group, which are the poor people and I use that rather bald term which is not a very pleasant term, but I think it serves our purpose here. Now these are people who are not indigents. In other words, they are not within, shall we say, the Social Services category but they are in the grey zone. They are not by any means well off. They have a struggle to make ends meet. Now how do they fare?

DR. J. COLLINS:

Now I think they fair well in terms of the acute medical care. Previously if someone had a relatively acute or a relatively minor illness he went to his physician or whoever it was or he went to his hospital and he had to pay the shot and this was a hardship on him, there is no doubt about that. So these schemes we have gotten into have certainly helped these people.

Now if he is cronicallly ill or very severely ill how is he helped? I would say he is helped but inadequately. He is not adequately helped by the arrangement we have. For instance, I might use an example here, suppose you have a carpenter, a good carpenter who makes a good hourly wage; he may make, say, \$20,000 a year. Now supposing he developes a duodenal ulcer, he has to go to his medical advisor. He has a series of tests. He is given a course of treatment for which he has these medications and so on. It is unsuccessful, so he needs surgery. So he goes into hospital and he has part of his stomach out and he is in hospital for a number of weeks and he is cured, shall we say, and he goes home and he has a period of convalescence. And say he lives in Collinet and he has his operation in St. John's and his specialist surgeon is in St. John's. This is not an unusual situation. There are lots of similiar people like this who live outside the main urban area and travel into work.

Now how is that person affected by his disease and how does our medical and hospital care system assist him? He is severely affected. For one thing, he is off work for I do not know how many months, and remember he is on an hourly wage so his annual income does not go on. He does not get any sickness benefits and

DR. J. COLLINS:

so on and so forth. Once he stops working he is without income. Secondly, he has large medical bills to take care of in terms of medications and perhaps dressings and so on and so forth. These are not covered by our present system of health care. Thirdly, he perhaps has to go in and visit his doctor and sure his doctor's bill is taken care of, whatever it is, \$6.25 for an ordinary office, is it? twenty-five dollars, whatever it is, for a specialist, is it? He does not have to pay that but he does have to pay to get in from Collinet, get out again and so on and so forth.

In other words, if you are in what I call rather, a poor term, the poor category and you have other than just a simple, straightforward illness for which really all you need is a visit to a doctor's office and certainly Medicare will take care of that, if you have other than that, if you have a significant illness, you suffer and our present scheme does not nearly cover the main financial burden on such a person.

Now let us take the well-to-do then. How do these schemes affect them? Firstly, in terms of acute health care our present scheme gives funds to such people with acute health problems which is quite unnecessary. And again I could use an example. Take, say, our friendly banker or our friendly doctor or our friendly engineer or our friendly teacher, whoever is, and he wakes up in the morning with a wry shoulder. Now in previous years he might say well I will work this off and so on and so forth. But now why should he do that? He can go to his local physician, be seen, perhaps have an X ray, perhaps even a blood test where the total bill might add up to twenty-five or thirty dollars. Who pays this bill? The taxpayer pays it.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Is it necessary? Quite unnecessary. He is quite able to pay it himself. The next night he would have no hesitation in perhaps taking his wife out to a restaurant or going to see a movie or you could name many other things which would cost him the same amount of money. And if he does not mind spending money on those sorts of things surely he would not mind spending it in his own health regard.

So it is quite unnecessary to give money to that individual. In terms of his severe and chronic illness, how do these schemes help him? They really have not made any difference whatever because that sort of individual had health insurance previously and he was not severely strapped by these health costs previously and all we have done now is to take it out of the health insurance field and put it into the public treasury, put the burden on the public treasury which the taxpayer has now to discharge.

So that those present schemes we have are beneficial in some regards

DR. J. COLLINS:

but there are great gaps in them and, secondly, much of the money we spend is quite unnecessary and quite unproductive.

Now another way of looking at whether this is true or not is to look at certain health indices. Perhaps the health index which is used practically universally in mortality rates in the early phases of life. Now this is not just an index of the health status of a community in those ages. This really reflects the whole complexion of health care in the community. Now in 1969 the stillbirth rate in Newfoundland was 12.5. In 1974, one of the latest figures I have - I have not got them quite up to date and there may be some change in more recent times but this illustrates the point - in 1974, now this was after at least five years Medicare and after something like seven or eight years hospital insurance care, the rate was 12.4. In other words, it was 12.5 in 1969 and 12.4 in 1974, almost no change. In other words, certainly in this aspect, in this index, expending that amount of public money in the health care system or, to look at it another way, taking a large part of the health care system out of private hands and putting it into the public has made no difference in the rate.

I might mention that in Canada the rate was 7.3. So we were not quite double but nearly. The neonatal death rate in 1968 in Newfoundland was 13. In 1974 it was 12. Again very little change, where in Canada at the time it was 9.7. In the post neonatal death rate in 1969 it was seven. In 1974 it was 6.2. In Canada it was 4.6. I think that this again illustrates that we have not really got much value for our money with these enormous

DR. J. COLLINS:

increases in public health expenditure through the two mechanisms we have in place.

Now another way of looking at the effect of these two schemes is to see what they have done to the system itself, and I have a small list here of the effects as I see them. Firstly, as I mentioned the institution of these schemes have led to the inclusion in the health care field of many personal care items, items that previously used to be taken care of within the family circle or by your religious advisor or by your local pharmacist or what have you. These items no longer are taken care of in a relatively inexpensive and just as expeditious way by these other agencies. They are almost all now done through the health care system at , as you will understand, considerable cost.

Another effect is that laboratory and X ray examinations have skyrocketed. This has been a point that has been underlined many times in the scientific literature. In other words, there has been a lowering of the threshold for doing these investigations. One certainly could argue that to some extent this was good, but I think if you look at it you will see that in many cases it was extravagant. In many cases it was doing through the laboratory, through relatively expensive means like laboratory and X ray, what previously used to be done through examinations, through a relatively inexpensive mechanism. And these schemes are such that they leave themselves open - I do not like to use the word 'abuse' because when people do these things they are not doing it for personal gain, they are even doing it

DR. J. COLLINS:

with very good motives. But nevertheless it is not the proper way to handle these things. These schemes leave themselves open to the abuse of these mechanisms, if you want to use that term.

The third effect of these schemes has been a number of affects on the proportion of workers in the field themselves. There has been a proliferation of the administrative side of health care. We have many more planners now, many more administrators now, many more committees are set up now. All these activities take people away from the exhibition, direct exhibition of health care. There has been an orientation towards institutions rather than to the patient. In other words,

DR. COLLINS: people say now I belong to a hospital or I belong to a group or what have you. They do not say I am a doctor or I am a surgeon or whatever it is dealing with patients. There is an orientation towards the institutions and away from the patients. And the third thing of course in this particular area is that there has been increasing encroachment of the Medical School into service medicine. Now again this is a mixed blessing. In some respects it is good but in other respects I am afraid in my view it is empire building on the part of authorities within the health care field. They are unnecessarily and expensively and rather clumsily taking over aspects of the ordinary clinical service health fields which are quite unnecessary. Bringing it under the ambit, bringing it under the orbit, the umbrella of the Medical School quite unnecessarily does not enhance the teaching ability or the researchability or any other aspect of the Medical School but it does make the whole thing more expensive, rather more impersonal and certainly is not in the best interest of clinical care.

And the final thing in this area what these schemes either have done or at least been associated with is that there has been an accentuation of the structure of unions and associations. I do not have to bring to hon. members' attention that we now have, say, a union which is not above striking, regrettably, in the nursing field and we have now an association in the medical field which is not above excluding a member from medical practise if that person does not wish to belong to the association. We, and when I say we I mean this administration, has handed that power to the association. So these associations and unions and groups have had an accentuation of power since these schemes have come into effect.

Now let us look and see what effects have not taken place which one might consider desirable. As I mentioned, and this has been mentioned by other hon. members in this House - It has been mentioned by the hon. member for St. John's North and it has been mentioned by the hon. member for St. John's West and it is something that I have already alluded to. These mechanisms, the medical care



DR. COLLINS: mechanism and the Hospicare mechanism have not extended beneficial effects into other areas of ill health such as, I mentioned, into the giving of drugs where drugs are needed, the giving of transportation where transportation is needed, the giving of in many respects home care when home care is needed. Our schemes have not gotten into these areas. There has been little effect on industrial health. There may be a few other more people interested in public health as a sideline and there may even be one or two physicians who are now taking up industrial health as a career, but if so it is a very minor movement after a decade of public health care. And there has been minimal promotion of health. One could run down the whole gamut of ages in terms of people likely to be affected. For instance, the pregnant mother and the newborn: There has been very little done to promote good health in these areas. We are still seeing mothers who have gone or are going through pregnancy in poor states of health, poor states of nutritional health. Their infants when they are born are undernourished and otherwise compromised for this. There has been very little effort or very little attack from our health schemes to remedy these faults.

In school health, very little has been done there either in terms of increasing the fitness of our school children through suitable recreational programmes. I say this even recognizing that we do have a Department of Recreation - R and F - and Rehabilitation but despite that the health scheme itself should make more effort in this area. Our scheme should be orientated towards increasing the fitness of school children, increasing the nutritional state of our school children. In the youth area -

Dr. J. Collins: alcoholism, traffic deaths, drugs, unusual and abnormal lifestyles, there has been very little specific approach made to remedy these faults.

In the mentally retarded and handicapped areas, again we have done something there, but after ten years, and these are major health areas, we have not attacked them, we have not set up adequate schemes to bring much benefit in these areas. Similarly in the aged, we have done little to overcome the alienation and the feeling of disuse that the aged feel.

Now in summary, therefore, our present arrangements of health care have assumed the financial responsibility from the private sector and they have spent quite excessively, in my view, on many non-essentials, with the result that there has been undevelopment of new and innovative areas of health care. We all recognize that the tax dollar is limited, and certainly the tax dollar can be given to health care is limited. And if you spend excessively in areas that are not necessary it means that you do not have the money to experiment and to spend in new areas that are necessary. Whereas if certain aspects of health are left in private hands - well, this is a matter of discretion, personal discretion - you can spend all you want or you can spend as little as you want within certain limits, and it does not affect anyone but yourself. And I would say that government funds should not be spent in unnecessary or marginally beneficial areas. Money that is raised from taxes, through that onerous system of taxation should be spent only on real needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is just about up, and I will leave it at that. Perhaps during the debate on the Throne Speech debate I will have a few more words to say in this area, I make these remarks not in gloom and doom; I merely make the remark that we should look at our present mechanisms for supplying health care, take what is good in them, do whatever is necessary with the things that are in the public area that should not be there, and this means returning them - and we have to face that this is not an easy choice; it is probably not going to be a popular choice - we should return some of them to the private sphere so that we will loosen up funds that

Dr. J. Collins: can be used for areas of ill-health and illness that are presently being neglected and should certainly be taken care of.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. W. MCNEIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on the non-confidence motion put forward by my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. And just to refresh hon. members minds the motion reads as follows: "Owing to the Government's mismanagement of finances of the Province, resulting in the raising of taxes above the acceptable level, the downgrading of essential public services and a crushing public debt; and owing to the Government's misuse of public money, resulting in police investigations, public enquiries and the laying of criminal charges, this House, reflecting the will of the vast majority of the people of the Province, has no confidence in the government."

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the Moores P.C. Government has been the biggest disaster to hit Newfoundland. Since their years in office it has been one disaster after another. They say one thing and do another. For example, in the area of private enterprise, and this area they stated that they want to strengthen, the private sector, and in so doing they made a decision last year to close the Stephenville Linerboard mill because they said it was not economically feasible, and that the government have no place in running the operation. Now I can agree with him that I think government should not run the Linerboard mill but there is nothing wrong with a government owning the mill if they are not running it. I will leave that question of the Linerboard

MR. McNEIL:

thing aside for a moment and take for example any of the smaller private businesses which are trying to get established here in this Province.

What encouragement do this government provide? I would say there is very little and to give you an example I will go back to my own district.

Just last month we had an opening of the Bay St. George Community College. The college is designed - actually there has been no new building put there up-to-date; it is only a co-ordination of the facilities and programmes of the former Adult Education Center and the Stephenville Crossing District Vocational School - the concept was put forward to establish a community college and I believe that the idea is worth a lot of merit. But just on their opening year we have seen when this budget was brought down at least a reduction in their operating budget of at least \$100,000, not a very good start for their first year in operation.

But apart from that, Mr. Speaker, the college is spread out over the community in Stephenville with five separate buildings and one in Stephenville Crossing. A proposal was put forward by a local entrepreneur, he put forward a proposal to the government showing them without a shadow of doubt whereby they could save money. He suggested and recommended that they consolidate their five buildings in Stephenville under two buildings and in so doing and taking this other building that was suggested, put forward, it would give the college room for expansion, it would give them much more flexibility in their administrative area. The idea was put forward by this local company, a Stephenville development group, they showed the director of the college whereby if they consolidate under this one building, Building No. 360 - I think some hon. gentlemen are familiar with the building - that they could save money on a yearly annual basis and in the long run improve the operation of the whole college. This proposal was put forward at least a year and a half ago and to date we have no action on the proposal but instead what we have, we have the government stealing the idea from this local businessman; the idea is so good that they now feel that they should do it themselves,

MR. McNEIL: have their Department of Public Works do the work themselves and convert this Building 360 into a permanent residence for the Stephenville Bay St. George Community College.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is the way that the government is going to treat the small businessman, the backbone of our country, when he has an idea, puts it forward to this government, has that idea stolen and he himself by putting this idea forward has lost an economic venture. Now, Mr. Speaker, the proposal that was put forward would not cost this government one penny. If the private entrepreneur would borrow his money elsewhere, he would rent the facility to the government on a rent-lease basis for X number of years, all the government would have to do is agree to the rental agreement. He showed the government whereby what they are paying out today annually he could save them in a new building which was more efficient to operate under and the government turned him down. Why? Because the idea was so rational and so good that they wanted to build it themselves.

Now in order to do that, Public Works or this government would have to borrow the money and the amount that they would need to borrow and the interest rate would actually be no advantage. So the proposal is in the government's interest, the people of this Province's interest to go with the private entrepreneur. Now also, Mr. Speaker, if the government would approve this programme it would guarantee jobs in a sagging economy in the Stephenville area,

MR. MCNEIL:

It would not only improve the community college concept but it would also provide badly needed jobs during a down time period. Now I feel confident that the Linerboard mill will reopen again but it is a question of time, and during that period when there is a lag the government should be doing everything possible to make sure that the economy does not go under completely. And then when you have the Linerboard operation ready to go in operation, you do not have to start from scratch again. You want to at least keep some of your good people in the community and have qualified people who are going from one job to the other rather than promoting the P.C. relocation programme which this government has already done so by having our citizens leave this Province altogether and settle elsewhere in Canada and, worst still, in some other part of the world.

The Minister of Justice when he was out for the opening ceremony stated that if the College Board of Directors could show him without a shadow of a doubt where there was a saving, a financial saving, that he would be for the project. Now I understand that most of the people in the Department of Education are for that project and have recommended that the government accept the proposal from Stephenville Developments.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Justice had the time to look at this project in detail and I hope that he will soon make his position known so that we can get on with the development and get work started so that next year the college could have a facility equal to any in Newfoundland. I cannot overemphasize, Mr. Speaker, the importance of

MR. MCNEIL:

getting on with the project now. We need jobs now in the area. At the end of June when the school season closes there is an estimated number of families that are supposed to leave the Stephenville area because of no work, around 190 to 200 families.

Now no community in Newfoundland should have to sacrifice its people, should not be in a position where they have to sacrifice human development for economic well-being. But people in my district in order to advance economically have to sacrifice human development. And by that, Sir, I mean that they have to leave their families, they have to leave the area that they grew up in, they have to leave to get a job. And that should not be here in Newfoundland in this day and age.

To give you another example of how callous this government is, in the Stephenville area after the mill closed the local people have gotten together and done a lot of ground work in trying to help themselves because they realize that this government is going to do very little to help them. So in the area of fisheries they have set up a Stephenville Fisheries Committee. They have initiated, in conjunction with the community college and the Fisheries College, courses in navigation and fishing gear repair, etc, and there is a whole new breed of people in the Stephenville area getting involved in the fisheries. At the Committee's request we have had several sites chosen for development. We had the regional Manager of Terminal Facilities do a complete survey of the Port Harmon to establish a site which would be ideal for the fishermen not only on a temporary basis but on a permanent basis. Five different sites were evaluated and then the recommendation came back

June 6, 1978

Tape 4017

IB-3

MR. MCNEIL:

from the Terminal Facilities Manager for a location about 300 feet from the existing dock. And the recommendation was given that we should be looking in terms of the whole West Coast in the Stephenville area.

The fellow who was doing the survey was amazed, He said he did not realize, he could not find any background information of the port's potential. Just to give you an example of one of his findings he states



Mr. McNeil: in his report, and I quote, "Port Harmon has more waterfront space than the Port of St. John's." Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Port of Harmon - most people speak about the Port of Harmon but very few people spent good of it, they try to downgrade it. But, Mr. Speaker, we have in the Stephenville area a port, and as the manager of the terminal facilities has stated, "Port Harmon has a waterfront space larger than the Port of St. John's." So this port space it should be at least a permanent fishing facility to accommodate a lot of the fishing boats on the West Coast. As you know, on the West Coast there are very few places that when a storm comes up, where a dragger or a small boat can go in for shelter, as many times we have seen in Port Harmon a lot of these small boats in the area.

Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, we have now a local entrepreneur, a local businessman, a very highly respected businessman in Stephenville getting involved in the former Pac-Atlantic plant. Mr. Speaker, this plant was closed down because the people of the day stated, and the company that was operating stated, that the operation was not feasible, and that there was no fish in the Bay St. George area, and that the plant was in the wrong location - almost a repeat of what we are seeing with the Labrador Linerboard situation - and there was no market. Only a couple of years after it was closed down all the machinery was moved out of the plant, but we see the same crowd back again and saying that it was a mistake to take the equipment out of that plant, it was a mistake to close it down, our problem was just bad management.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that story sounds a little bit familiar on a small scale when you compare it against Labrador Linerboard. And now we have this local man getting involved into that plant, and I am very pleased that he is getting involved because now it looks like there will be stability in that operation. He is going to start off on a small scale and eventually work his way up. But just nearby we have a fishmeal plant, and a gentleman has made a proposal to this

Mr. McNeil: government on several occasions to get that operation on the ground, and to date he has met with very little success, the main reason being that this government believes that he does not have a viable operation-or someone is blocking his application. They give two major reasons why the operation is not feasible and they turned down his application for a small loan, the Department of Rural Development,because,they state, the Department of Rural Development, that he has no long term supply of offal, fish offal. And, secondly, he has a short fall in finances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if he did not have a short fall in finances why would he be going for a loan, why would he be looking for assistance? And on the second point of fish offal,in the whole Bay St. George area we do not have a fish meal plant of any size, and as a result we have a lot of the offal going on the beach, into the water, polluting the area, which is against environmental regulations.

Now on the question of the feasibility of his plant,the gentleman has put into the plant now this gentleman I am talking about was, according to a news report I heard about a month back. he was the technical man in the Blow Me Down plant

MR. MCNEIL: in the Curling area. John Tibbets from Industrial Development has stated that one of the reasons why the plant failed is that they lost their technical man and this technical man now has put forward a proposal to operate the Stephenville fishmeal plant. He has already put into the operation of his own money, \$30,000. He has spent the last eighteen months in rehauling the equipment inside and repairing it. And he states that he firmly believes that the plant can be viable and he asks me, he says, "If I thought it would not be viable, would I put my own money into it?" \$30,000 already sunk into it; his time of eighteen months repairing the equipment that is not tablated at all. Would he put that much time into it, and money, if he did not believe that it could be a success? And when he comes to the government asking for a little help, they tell him that they refuse his application because of a lack of financing and a shortage of long term supply of offal.

He also states, Mr. Speaker, I will just read a paragraph here from one of his letters. "Therefore, I cannot understand the Department of Rural Development when they take the position that no long term supply of offal would be available. If they want to play the numbers game, no person can say with any certainty how much fish is going to be caught anywhere in Newfoundland in the forecoming season. Yet when it comes to Bay St. George and the Port au Port region, we are supposed to predetermine the amount of fish that will be caught even before the season opens." Surely, Mr. Speaker, even the people in Bay St. George do not possess this facility. Mr. Speaker, I think it is just total discrimination; this government has discriminated against this gentleman's application.

The Department of the Environment has given a letter of support to the gentleman and stated in their letters they state that they see no reason why his application should be refused

MR. MCNEIL: and they make a recommendation to the Department of Rural Development to support his application.

Weeks ago I asked the new Minister of Rural Development to review the application and he did so himself, took it into his own hands, which I appreciate, and he gave back a letter stating on the question of a supply of offal, he stated that National Sea, one of the officials from National Sea Products, who do most of the fishing in that area, who have their own plant up in LaScie, he stated that they are not willing to provide their offal to the Stephenville plant.

I am not sure what official he was speaking with or who gave him that information, but let me just quote a statement from the West Coast Supervisor of the National Sea Products Limited, and he states, "We recommend that Mr. Rursted be given permission to open up this plant in Stephenville. It would also create possibly up to six jobs, which I am sure would be needed in any area at any time."

Again he goes on and he states, "A small plant such as the one proposed by Mr. Rursted in Stephenville could handle the smaller quantities even if Blow Me Down By-Products found itself in a position to pay for the fish meal at a price that other plants cannot and would not pay."

Mr. McNeil: There are six production plants in the Bay of Islands, and they can produce a lot of offal. Therefore, my opinion is that Blow Me Down By-products could not take care of handling the offal from the six plants in the peak periods if every pound of offal was kept out of the waters of the Bay of Islands. Mr. Rursted is not asking to get this plant going in the light of getting his production from the Bay of Islands plant, but certainly in peak periods I think he would be asked to handle some, and then again we have our slow periods when a big plant like Blow Me Down would not want to start up if only for a small supply. Again Mr. Rursted is planning to operate his plan on groundfish offal from Picadilly, codlin from Cape St. George area, and some other grains from the brewery here at Stephenville.

Mr. Speaker, that plant should be in operation today. The reason why it is not in operation is because the Moores P.C. Government would not give that gentleman the assistance he required. He is a highly qualified man. And if I may just quote from another letter, from the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, the Chairman, Mr. Prince, and he states, "I have not been able to come up with a clear cut reason why he has been refused his small additional loan from government. I have known of him ever since he arrived in Canada to work for the old Inter-fish Pac-Atlantic Organization. In my estimation he is one hell of a qualified engineer and businessman. And if the present trend in the meal and oil market continues its upward trend I cannot see why the reduction plant cannot turn a tidy profit. As for raw material, there would be no problem in obtaining enough or more than enough from the general Port au Port region to ensure a fairly lengthy operational period. I have not taken into account the potential from the herring fishery carried out along the South and West Coast. The plant is not that large certainly in comparison with other similar plants in the Province, and therefore I feel that it can operate quite profitably on amount of possible raw material available in the immediate area. I presume that the environmentalists, federal and provincial, have had their say with regard

Mr. McNeil: to the many controls etc. which must be placed upon the plant before the plant can operate, and trust there are no problems in this regard. If Rursted was not so damned qualified I might have had a reservation of two; however, I am quite convinced that Rursted will make a success of the venture if given half a chance."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is from a very respectable man, the Chairman of the Fisheries Industry Advisory Board, Mr. Prince. And surely if he believes in the operation we should give the application a little bit of credibility.

MR. P. CANNING: The Advisory Board are not taking his advice.

MR. MCNEIL: They are not taking his advice. Correct.

MR. P. CANNING: That sometimes happens.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, these two projects in Stephenville right now, the building of the Bay St. George Community College or the renovation of Building 360 would give the college a greater footing, give the college a little bit more of a sense of presence in the community. It would be much better from an administrative point in the community. It would not cost the government of this Province any money to have that facility. They are paying out that money annually to upkeep the other buildings, they will be able to give them back. This building would also turn over revenue in the community because the community could tax the landlord whereby right now it cannot do the other buildings because they are government owned. So from a general principle, from a general good of the whole area the project should go ahead, especially when this government is suppose to be in such a financial position. They want to save every penny. Well this is a way where they can use somebody else's money to create a new facility that you can be proud of.

And in this application of Mr. Rursted, I think that it should be given every consideration, and government should not put obstacles in front of this local entrepreneur who has demonstrated his belief in the operation, who has demonstrated

MR. MCNEIL:

his belief in the fisheries, and if the government puts such strong emphasis on the fisheries why are we not helping this gentleman? He has demonstrated his own belief. But the government in their Budget Speech, they state that the fisheries in Newfoundland constitute its greatest resource and its vital force and we must have faith in a bright future, based upon the natural advantages of the Province and the prospects of growth and development which they offer.

Now here is a gentleman - what more do you want! who has put his money in, he is putting his expertise on the line, he has asked the government for a little assistance, he has asked in the area if he is lacking of the financial aspect of it, why cannot the Department of Rural Development or Industrial Development state, "We will put an accountant in your operation until you get on your feet. We will have an accountant monitor your operation until you pay back the money that you are requesting." But no. Why? Is it because people in another plant, just sixty mile away, have an inward track with the government and they are making the decisions to stop this man? Do we not believe in free enterprise? And when the government on the other hand takes the Linerboard mill, throws the whole community out of whack and tells the people. "We believe in free enterprise. We were trying to put that operation back in free enterprise but still you will not help the little man." Mr. Speaker, the Moores government is very hypocritical, very hypocritical.

Mr. Speaker, just last week we had an appointment of an industrial development officer in the person of David Hollatt, I think. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state quite clearly that I welcome the appointment of Mr. Hollatt as an industrial development officer for the Stephenville area, the Port au Port area as well, but, Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference of which he has to work under are very narrow. We are asking this man to be a superman. You are going to take a man from here, you are going to place him in Stephenville

MR. MCNEIL: for three months or so, then you are going to bring him back in St. John's for the remainder of the two year period that he is stationed as a development officer. Now if he is going to be a development officer and he is going to help the community, he must come into the community, live in the community, feel the community, the pros and cons, the developments, the fears that people have over the years, you have to try to come in and understand, and you are not going to understand a community in the community of Bay St. George by sitting here in an office in St. John's. You have to get out and live and rub shoulders with the people and find out their basic fears, their reservations, why they do not trust this government? Why they do not believe that the government will help them out? Why they feel they have been let down?

The industrial development officer, if put under the control -and here again is another area. The Harmon Corporation when it was first designed came under the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. During that period the corporation had the residential section, the landlords and the residential section which is now in the hands of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, and the industrial section, and do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Harmon Corporation has the third largest industrial complex in Canada? And what are we doing to promote it? This government could make many brownie points by promoting that region. They always had it difficult in that region. Why? Because you are too far away. An important person like your development officer could make great gains for this government if they place a gentleman in the area to work for the betterment of the area and not play a political game where the people get kicked around, the people. Governments should be for the people,



Mr. McNeil: for the betterment of people, not the select few that surrounds the Premier. The Industrial Development Officer now is just coming in. It is only a token gesture. The poor man - well, I cannot see how he can function, really. The community are together: you have got your Industrial Development Commission group of people, you have got your Chamber of Commerce; they are working closely with your Harmon Corporation, all the emphasis have been put on the corporation because they are the ones who are promoting industrial development. As in the past they were just landlords, but now they are promoting, they are out in front, and if you put this industrial development under their wing, station the gentleman in Stephenville because he is not only going to have to travel here in St. John's, he is going to have to travel to Ottawa. He is going to have to travel around the world talking to private enterprises trying to attract industry into the area. But no! This government have not got enough faith in the individual; they want to keep him here in St. John's so they are keep an eye on him so they make sure he is doing his job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MCNEIL: That is terrible.

Mr. Speaker, the Bay St. George area has a fantastic amount of potential. It could be one of the areas in Newfoundland that could be out in front helping the sagging economy of our Province. If you can create a job, I do not care what community it is in, it is a help. And here in this area you have got a large airport. the landing - the size of the airport would be something like 12 50 which makes it one of the largest runways in Eastern Canada. And just at the end of the runway we have a port, and as the report stated which I read from a minute ago, it has port space larger than the Port of St. John's. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not something that is just laid in your lap to develop, I do not know what is.

The hon. gentleman for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) last night mentioned the concept of a free port where he stated about Shannon, Ireland where they are making such fantastic headway. As

Mr. McNeil: a matter of fact they have grown so fast and so rapidly that they cannot control it, and the jobs that that has provided has been enormous. And in an area like Stephenville where we have that facility that was left by Uncle Sam, left to the taxpayer of this Province and Canada for \$1, and the Moores Government are not taking advantage of that gift. We are willing to play little petty politics. If we capitalize on the potential of that area, its unemployment would be solved. When you go to the Manpower Centre in Stephenville and you ask them how many people you have unemployed, and when they state back 5,500, Mr. Speaker, we have got a fantastic problem in this Province. And our government, our Moores P.C. Government, the government that states, over and over again, they are stating that the people got to have confidence, got to believe in the future of this Province, when they themselves cannot believe, they do not believe where they are going.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right!

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, when the Linerboard mill was closing people in that region said, " Hold off. Give them a chance, give them a chance, They will come through, they will not let us down. They are not that cold. They are concerned with the human part of government. They are human." And I stated again, and I said, I will bite my tongue, I will keep quiet. I told them that they were cold, cold fish. They care for nobody but themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: The people of this Province I do not think even come second place, last place. People have to be given a little bit of direction. The government has to give a little bit of direction. But what is this government doing?

June 6, 1978

Tape 4023

EC - 1

MR. McNEIL: This government is blaming the problem that they are presently into on the Opposition or the former administration. What a compliment!

AN HON. MEMBER: Or Ottawa.

MR. McNEIL: Or Ottawa, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the minister and the Cabinet would reconsider the terms of reference of the industrial relations office that they are going to place in Stephenville. I would ask that they would put the Harmon corporation under its rightful place, put it in a department of Industrial Development - that is where it should be - and that is what the development office should work closely with, the Harmon corporation. One time I could understand why it was with Municipal Affairs and Housing. Today that is no longer the case. It should go under the Department of Industrial Development. It is an industrial corporation and it should be involved in promoting and bringing in companies, and by them being out in front it would reduce the unemployment rolls and it would help our region greatly - and not only help our region but I am sure it would help the whole Province. And this must be the aim of the government, to reduce the unemployment rolls, to create jobs - it should be to create jobs. If we can create 1,000 jobs in Stephenville or one job in Stephenville it helps another community which is looking. We are all one province. The government is supposed to administer the full province and that means every little region.

In the past week when the Tourist Agreement was signed, the Moores P.C. Government thought about the Bay St. George region. They left it totally out of the agreement, bypassed the whole region as if it did not exist - again, kicking the people while they are down, that whole region. If you had the opportunity to see the

MR. McNEIL:

C.B.C. programme Here and Now,

it was a documentary done on the Sandy Point area - a local group, a community of interested people doing their part again, trying with all their might and getting nowhere, putting forth the concept of the Heritage Village. And they brought out very interesting historical facts about the Sandy Point area. It was the center of commerce for the West Coast years ago. And it is a really interesting area and I am sure if the government took the time - or not even the time, the interest, and suggested to other people to take the time to promote that area and to see what potential that it has in the tourist area, that would add a great deal. It would add more interest for people from outside who want to come in when they hear of stories as far back as the pirates and the ships that were being wrecked on the coast when they had to come in. And when you hear about this bedside confession from a senior magistrate who was living in some part of France where he stated that in the early days he and his wife ran a tourist home and they had killed off some of the crew and ships and had stolen their treasures and he made a bedside confession - these are very interesting facts and this could be shown or presented to the people from other parts of Canada and show that we have a very interesting background, a period of piracy which I am sure every member could probably relate sometime along the history of their forefathers.

AN HON. MEMBER: What pirate have you descended from?

MR. W. MCNEIL: I am a direct decendent from the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Pirates.

MR. W. MCNEIL: No, no. I do not know what kind of pirates I am from. I am a direct decendent from the residents of Stephenville. Mr. Speaker, this government must take a little bit more initiative and time to look at the problems in the Bay St. George region and to help out where they can and it is not going to take a great amount of effort. Some are just going to be sitting down and listening and telling their people that they have working with them to move as rapidly as you can for the betterment of the region and Newfoundland as a whole.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is running out and there were other things I was trying to get in, but I did not realize how short forty-five minutes are when you are talking and getting involved in your district. But I hope to come back on this subject later and I hope to maybe speak a little bit more in depth on the Linerboard situation. I am going to wait until the weather gets a little warmer so I can haul off my coat. So without getting into another topic I will wait until the Throne Speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

DR. R. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, before getting into the text of my remarks, I just want to dispose of an incidental part of my speech which is that I declare myself as voting against this motion of non-confidence in the government and leave it at that. Mr. Speaker, as a newly elected member of the House of Assembly I must announce my disappointment over the debate of the last month. I entered politics on the premise that fresh thoughts and clean ideas would have a place in this debate. However, I am deeply disturbed by the antics, moves and tactics of the Opposition that have recently occurred. Any new man like myself who would contemplate politics as a career are disgusted, chagrined and angered. The most savage effect of the debate which has occurred is that the best in this Province may be intimidated by the frenzy, viciousness and callousness

DR. R. WINSOR: of the current debate. Those people who debase politics by the cruelest methods have only themselves to answer to. But let it be a warning that good Newfoundlanders are weighing their methods, that good Newfoundlanders may personally be left out of the system by this mode of politics and I say again that the best may not come forward and that is the real cost of this effort.

The Opposition have lost their creditability.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege I wish to raise is completely unrelated to the remarks that the member for Mount Scio was just making. It is the point of privilege of which I gave notice yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize to the member for interrupting his remarks, but this is the first opportunity I have had to proceed.

AN HON. MEMBER: This eats up his time.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the clock has stopped because the matter I am raising is not related to his speech at all.

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to hon. members that our precedents and customs on points of order and points of privilege do count within the time allocation. Adjournments do not, but quorums, points of order and points of privilege always have.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is raising a point of privilege at the earliest possible time and it unfortunately corresponds with the speech of my colleague across the House. I think by leave of the House we can agree that any time taken on this matter of privilege will be deducted from my friend's speaking time.

MR. NEARY: Will not be.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Will not be included.

AN HON. MEMBER: No included.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, Right, Sir, Will not be included in the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the time on this matter of privilege

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4024

JM - 3

MR. SPEAKER: will not count from the speaking time of the hon. member for Mount Scio?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Right, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. That certainly appears to be extremely equitable, especially since the matter has absolutely nothing to do with the hon. gentleman.

MR. SIMONS: Yes, Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thought in fairness I should point that out at the beginning because

MR. SIMMONS: it would otherwise have implications for the member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) and that was not my intent at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am raising a matter of privilege, a matter which I believe affects both my privileges and the privileges of the House itself. I am glad that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is in his seat at this time because the matter which I wish to raise is based on remarks which he, the member for St. John's East, made in the House last Friday, that is Friday past. I am raising the matter at the first possible opportunity. The House will recall that I gave notice yesterday that I would do so as soon as I had an opportunity to check all the appropriate Hansard transcripts. I received the last of the relevant Hansard transcripts only in the past hour or so, and so I submit I am now raising the point at the first possible opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the matter I am about to raise is a very serious one. It has become all the more serious because the statements to which I shall refer, made by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), have received widespread circulation outside the House.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of my speech in the budget debate, I referred to the Province's financial position and/or the escalating public debt of the Province on at least eight separate occasions. I say at least eight occasions, because the transcripts of night sittings, as members are aware, have not yet been typed and I am therefore unable at this time to document any references I may have made during night sittings to the Province's financial position and/or the escalating public debt of the Province.

The eight references which I made to these two subjects, Mr. Speaker, are to be found in the Hansard transcripts as follows: I shall not read the complete references of course,



MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in the interest of conserving the time of the House, since the total references by me to these two subjects represent no fewer than forty-one pages of Hansard transcript. To assist Mr. Speaker in making a ruling I shall nevertheless refer to each of the references by page and that will give him some direction if he needs it in making a ruling. If the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) wishes I can read the entire speech. It was such a good one that it bears repetition.

Mr. Speaker, my first reference was on May 23, found under the page labelled, tape 3407 - JM (1) down to tape 3408 - IB (1) and that reference was a three page reference relating to the public debt of the Province. On May 25, tape 3526 - PK (3) and then a second reference on that day, tape 3527 - EC (2), down to 3528 PK (2), a three page reference there, Mr. Speaker. And then a third reference on the same day, May 25th., beginning at tape 3540 - APB (1) down to tape 3546 - IB (1), a total of nineteen pages in that particular reference to the financial position of the Province and the public debt. On May 30th., Mr. Speaker, you will find the first reference by me in tape 3708 - DW (3); there was only one reference on that day. On June 1, Mr. Speaker, the fourth day, and I spoke during part of four days and I have given you the references for each of the first three days, and on the fourth day, Mr. Speaker, the day I concluded my speech in the budget debate, you will find my references to the public debt and/or the financial position of the Province under, first of all, tape 3809 - EC (2), down to 3809 - EC (3), a two page reference there; and then a second reference Mr. Speaker, on that day, beginning tape 3814 - PK (1), to 3817 - DW (1),

MR. SIMMONS:

a nine page reference there to the finances of the Province and the public debt. Then, Mr. Speaker, the same day another reference, my third reference for that day and my final one in the speech, beginning at Tape 3819, IB-2 down to 3820, NM-1, a total of a three page reference there, making a total, Mr. Speaker, approximately of forty-one pages in Hansard transcript of references to these two important issues.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not made any reference to the asides or the one sentence references. These are areas where I had some comment on the subject. There are digressions at times as one will understand when you are dealing in a House such as this, one where you are taken away from the beaten track by various members and by your own thoughts. These are the references, Mr. Speaker. I ask the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) to wait and see whether or not it is a point of privilege. All I have done so far is to document, Mr. Speaker, those references I made during the course of my speech in the Budget Debate, a total of eight references, at least eight excluding any reference I may have made at night, covering forty-one pages of Hansard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in speaking last Friday said, and I refer, Mr. Speaker, to Tape 3895, Page 1, apb. I quote him. "It seems to me incredible that after seventy-five hours of estimates and being treated to a marathon debate by the chief financial critic of the Opposition, I do not believe there was one word spoken concerning the excruciating and worsening financial position." The words I wish to draw Mr. Speaker's attention to and the House's attention to is he says in part, "I do not believe there was one word spoken concerning the excruciating and worsening financial position."

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I quote from June 2, Tape 3895, Page 2, apb where the member, just to put the thing in context, refers earlier in the paragraph from which I will quote, refers to the size of the public debt and then goes on to say, and I quote, "I do not believe there was a reference to the contents of it in the finance critic's

MR. SIMMONS:

fifteen hour speech." Then, Mr. Speaker, quoting again from June 2, Tape 3896, DW-2, quoting the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and I quote, "Now the obvious question arises as to why did not the Opposition draw this problem sharply to the attention of the House." That means talking, to put it in context, about the financial position of the Province. "Now the obvious question arises as to why did not the Opposition draw this problem sharply to the attention of the House. I mean this surely is a function of an Opposition, certainly an Opposition critic on finance. Not a word, not a whisper about it."

Mr. Speaker, it is clear of course that I did make a number of references to the two very important subjects and it is equally clear that the member for St. John's East has said quite unequivocally that I have made no references to these matters, notwithstanding the fact that I made forty-one pages of references to the two important subjects. Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne and Erskine May both have something to say on the matter at hand and I would like to quote from them.

First of all, page 130 of Beauchesne, the Fourth Edition, paragraph 154, (3). This paragraph you will note is setting out items which are unparliamentary, and paragraph 154 (3) says in part, "Misrepresenting the language of another."

Erskine May, Mr. Speaker, on page 145, the very bottom, the paragraph beginning just beyond the center of that page, first of all, Mr. Speaker, makes particular reference to the publication of false or perverted reports of debates, etc. In part it reads, "Analogous to the publication of liables upon either House is the publication of false or perverted or partial and injurious reports of debates or proceedings of either House or Committees of either House."

MR. W. ROWE: Especially perverted.

MR. P. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if you just skip - the rest of the paragraph is fairly relevant although it gets into some examples but I am not skipping it for any reason of motive, I just want to go quickly to my point. If the House desires I can read the full item but I want to go to the bottom of that page 145 to the last two lines.

The following are instances of misconduct in connection with the publication of debates which has been treated as a breach of privilege. And I refer to the first one on the top of page 146:- "Publishing a false account of proceedings of the House of Lords." That is the particular example given there, publishing a false account of the House proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is an issue that has not come up before to my knowledge or since I have been in the House, the matter of the publication of - to put it another way, Mr. Speaker, the publication of a false account of the House proceedings. Since it has not come up before, Mr. Speaker, I think it is an important issue that bears some close looking at. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is a very important principle at stake here. Is a member of the House to be permitted unchecked to misrepresent another member and to present a false account of House proceedings?

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the assertion of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), his assertion on at least three occasions last Friday that I had made no reference to these important issues of the financial position and the public debt, his assertion in those three statements by him, Mr. Speaker, cannot be said to be inadvertent, or made in passing, or off the cuff. He stated, Mr. Speaker, on three separate occasions that I had not dealt with the important issues of the Province's public debt and the Province's financial position. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the member's statements cannot be construed as a difference of opinion with my expressed views. It goes well beyond that. He has not asserted that he disagrees with my stated views on a particular subject. He has

MR. P. SIMONS: asserted that I have stated no views on the subject. It then becomes, Mr. Speaker, not a matter of difference of opinion between two members but a matter of fact.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for your usual careful consideration that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in making the statements to which I have referred has breached my privileges as a member of this House and has also breached the privileges of the House itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. P. SIMONS: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have established a prima facie case and, should Mr. Speaker rule that I have, I am quite prepared to move an appropriate motion that the member for St. John's East be disciplined by the House for his false statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Surely, a more tiresome and petulant point of privilege has never been brought up in the annals of this House before. I mean, you know, how spurious and how ridiculous! Because the hon. gentleman does not agree with what is said, perhaps my speech was a little more potent than I thought it was because it drove the poor hon. gentleman out of the House for a couple of days and that obviously was a plus for the proceedings of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to get up and say, you know, a point of privilege is raised. The hon. gentleman wishes to quote Beauchesne, he quotes Beauchesne along the lines, you know, the imputation of bad motives and misrepresentation of another. But look, what the situation is, what we are talking about here is a point of privilege, the hon. gentleman rises up on a point of privilege and there is no doubt, first of all, that a point of privilege has to be taken at the earliest possible opportunity.

MR. MARSHALL: He has raised a point of privilege of the House. I would point out to Your Honour that when I spoke there was nobody on the other side who raised objection either as a point of order or a matter of privilege. Well, even though I do not think the hon. gentlemen on the other side will admit the fact, I think think they would probably agree with at least the tenor of my remarks which was to the effect that fifteen hours of debate, as the editorial in The Evening Telegram said yesterday, was most unnecessary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. gentleman to keep his remarks with respect to the submission on point of privilege and to avoid extraneous references to extra parliamentary sources in the various journals and daily newspapers.

MR. MARSHALL: I thank you, Your Honour, for your guidance. It is very difficult to keep oneself on a point of privilege when one does not exist, but I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, Paragraph 104(3), Page 95. First of all, it says: "A matter of privilege which claims precedence over other public business should be a subject which has recently arisen and which calls for the immediate interposition of the House." It cannot, Your Honour, I would submit, be allowed to interrupt the proceedings some three or four days later. Second, on Page 104(5): "As a motion taken at the time for privilege thereof is given precedence over the prearranged programme of business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that there is a prima facie case where breach of privilege has been committed," and I would suggest that the precedents show that where privilege is quoted or alleged, Your Honour, that it has to be stated briefly and Your Honour decide whether there is a point of privilege. You do not have a long argument.

MR. MARSHALL: 105(3) goes on: "A matter of privilege must be one which has recently arisen," and it goes on to say, "A dispute arising between two honourable members as to allegations of facts hardly fulfills the conditions of a privilege." And I could go on and on, Your Honour, with the authorities, but there is no doubt about it that this is a specious, petulant and tiresome point of privilege which does not exist, either personal or of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: I thank members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and I would point out, as I have usually done in these instances, that after the initial matter has been raised and then the initial reply, I will then request hon. gentlemen to keep their matters strictly relevant.

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, it is a very important matter and rightly raised in this House by my friend and colleague, Sir, as a point of privilege, because the privileges of this House - he is a member of the House - and this House itself, have been violated by that hon. gentleman over there, the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). To come in here, Sir, and to state publicly as a matter of fact, not his opinion, Mr. Speaker, but as fact, to spread abroad in the land as a fact, not his opinion, something which was untrue, which was false, which he knew was untrue and false when he said it, Sir, is a breach of the privileges of this House. He wilfully, Sir, misrepresented -

June 6, 1978

Tape 4028

EC - 3

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the allegation of wilful misrepresentation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: I withdraw 'wilful', Mr. Speaker, and say because it is unparliamentary to say 'wilfully misrepresented', I withdraw it. He misrepresented, Mr. Speaker, and since I cannot say 'wilful' because it is unparliamentary as a word, let me try to get the concept across, Mr. Speaker, without using unparliamentary language. He misrepresented to the people - to the public, to this House, in a manner where he was heedless, I would say, Sir, and careless of the truth of what he was saying, negligent as to whether what he was saying was true or false or was correct or a fact or not, Sir. He misrepresented to the people of this Province the position of a member of this House. He did not say, Sir, what he had to say about the Budget was wrong or that he was off his head or that he was erroneous, Mr. Speaker, all matters of opinion, he said that the hon. member, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, that hon. member, Sir, did not say anything, did not



MR. W. ROWE: member, Sir, did not say anything, did not make a statement, did not say a word about the finances of this Province or the budget of this Province, which, Sir, is wrong, palpably wrong and can be demonstrated to be wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: Opinion.

MR. W. ROWE: Not opinion, as a matter of fact, Sir, and that hon. member knew when he was saying that it was wrong.

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

MR. NEARY: It was done to smear.

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to hon. gentlemen that the first requirement in this area is an opinion or a decision by the Chair on the prima facie area. And that any argument on the substantive area should follow such a finding, if indeed there is an affirmative finding, because then it is the House which determines whether there was a breach of privilege or not. Here now in this particular instance, the substantive argument would be out of place and merely the prima facie decision on whether the area of privilege is in fact involved. I would ask the hon. gentleman to bear that in mind.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, Sir, that is right. We are trying to establish a prima facie case, that the privileges of this House have been violated and Sir, it is patently clear that that hon. member, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), has violated the privileges of this House by publishing, Sir, by making public a false and perverted report, as my hon. gentleman said, with the emphasis on perverted, in this particular case, report of what a member of this House said or did not say. A clear breach of the privileges, Mr. Speaker, of this House. To add insult to injury, Sir, an hon. member who is never in the House, down practicing law when he should be in the House here, Sir, and coming in here and trying to tell the members of this House and the public what went on in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Get on with it.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, this is on a point of privilege and I would assume, Sir, a serious matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. gentleman to avoid references which are irrelevant to the matter now before the Chair.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Restrain yourself.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if there is a point of privilege raised it is a good point of privilege because the privileges of the House have been violated in a most heedless, careless manner by the hon. member for St. John's East, by, as I say, publishing this false and perverted report on another member, the member, Sir, from St. John's East, Sir, the reason I brought in the last extraneous piece of information, Mr. Speaker, is that if he did not do it deliberately, which I am not permitted to say, and I do not say, then he did it, Sir, carelessly and heedlessly because he is very seldom in the House and does not know what transpires in this hon. House and therefore, Sir, when he made that statement he did it in a very careless, heedless and negligent fashion. He should have made sure of his facts.

MR. SIMMONS: He might not have known any better.

MR. W. ROWE: He could not have known any better because he is never here, he is downtown practicing law. How could he know what transpired in the House, Mr. Speaker? That is the point I am trying to make and therefore, Sir, whether he did it willfully or not, and I am not allowed to say he did it willfully, he did it carelessly, negligently, without knowing the full facts and that itself, Sir, would be a breach of the privileges of this House, publishing this false and perverted report on a matter of fact concerning my hon. colleague, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. Minister of Justice and will hear him. Then I will have heard two hon. members, both sides of the House, and would ask hon. members not to expect recognition for further submissions.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may have but a word with respect to this frivolous and vexatious point of privilege, which it is. I could say right now that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has been on his feet for the past three minutes and he has said nothing about the point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: No, this is not the -

MR. HICKMAN: Nothing, absolutely nothing, not a word, not a mumbling word came out of the hon. gentleman from the Leader opposite and the simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that anyone knows, Your Honour knows, all hon. gentlemen know here, that time after time after time when some hon. member gets up and makes a great oration, or something less than a great oration, a boring oration or a tedious oration, or a lengthy oration, or one that is not at all on point, or one that totally skirts or fails to deal with the issues that are before the House, that some hon. gentleman will get up and say, "The hon. member opposite got up and he spoke for an hour and he did not say one word about the budget."

MR. W. ROWE: Debating the budget.

MR. HICKMAN: Not one word. Is that a breach of parliamentary privilege? Is that libelling an hon. member? In fact, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if it would even fall into the category of a difference of opinion. It is a pathetic bit of prose that we have not heard in this House for such a long, long time. I thought when the hon. gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) got up.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4029

MM - 4

MR. HICKMAN: - that he was going to make a prima  
facie case on some great revolution, some great breach  
of privilege of the House and all he said was that the  
hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall)

MR. HICKMAN:

said, Mr. Speaker, that I spoke for fifteen hours and did not say anything. Well now, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: And I would hope that the hon. gentleman for St. John's East does not become so unkind again. But to say it is a breach of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is stretching the rule so broad that to even say that there was enough there to consider whether there was a prima facie case for a breach of privilege would certainly be ignoring all the rules and traditions and customs of this House where we are trying to maintain some order and dignity and get on with the business of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I thank hon. gentlemen to my right and to my left for their submissions. My decision will be based on two references in Beauchesne which are practically identical, but there are two there. I will give both of them. Just preparatory to that I will say that my understanding of Beauchesne, 145 under the heading, publication of false or perverted reports of debates, etc., my understanding of that section which starts about the middle of page 145 and ends at the middle of page 146 is that it is a reference -

AN HON. MEMBER: To May.

MR. SPEAKER: To May rather, yes, to May, page 145 and 146. That it is a reference to publication not in the sense of an hon. member speaking in the House but in the sense of dissemination through a printed media or I think electronic media or circulation outside of parliament. In other words, it does not refer to publication in the general sense that whenever one speaks one can be said to be publicizing something. I do not think it refers to what hon. members say in the House of Assembly, in the parliamentary body, but to reports or publications thereof outside. And the instances given there would appear, in my opinion, to substantiate that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Beauchesne, page 96 at the bottom of the page states that a dispute arising between two hon. members as to allegations of facts hardly fulfills the conditions of privilege question. And page 102, almost identical, "But a dispute arising between two hon. members as to allegation of facts does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege." Bearing that in mind and bearing in mind the precedents of our House in which not infrequently hon. members have quite different views or expressions on matters not only of opinion but of fact, bearing that in mind and as long as there is no evidence of imputation of motive, then in my opinion the references to Beauchesne and the precedents of the House would not put this particular matter in the area of privilege which means that not having found a prima facie case a motion for the debate thereon would not be in order. If the matter obviously is to be pursued further it can only be done by a motion of which notice is given.

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon me?

MR. MARSHALL: I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL: Another point of privilege. Your Honour, it is a rule of parliamentary debate that persons should not rise and interrupt the proceedings of the House unless they are matters of very serious import requiring the intervention of the Chair. And I quote Beauchesne, page 114, paragraph 126 (1) -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Well, this will only take a moment, Mr. Speaker, 126 (1), "Speaker Brand has declared that interruptions on points of order are very often themselves disorderly." I would submit to Your Honour that we have had

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4031

BT-1

MR. V. MARSHALL:

many of these but this takes the cake, as it were, this particular point of privilege, and that the hon. gentleman himself is out of order in raising such a spurious and frivolous point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I make a decision on that matter. The rule as stated by the hon. gentleman is obviously a valid one. I would not be prepared to rule the hon. gentleman out of order for having raised it.

Hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. P. WINSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to summarize my opening remarks in case anybody has forgotten them -

MR. S. NEARY:

Tell the truth.

DR. P. WINSOR:

It is all the truth. The fact that I do not really think that the Opposition really know the effect of their tactics, their political tactics over the last few weeks and months in this House -

MR. S. NEARY:

Tell us all about that tomorrow night with the taxpayers' money.

DR. P. WINSOR:

- the long term effects that it will have on the political process in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has lost its credibility. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must ask the gentlemen on both sides of the House not to interrupt the hon. member.

DR. P. WINSOR:

The member for LaPoile exposed his true character while he was a member of the previous Liberal administration in the Bell Island episode and in other instances.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. P. WINSOR:

He is -

MR. S. NEARY:

On a point of privilege, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4031

BT-2

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has attached some kind of a motive to me when I was a minister, Sir, in connection with Bell Island. That matter has been adequately dealt with, in my opinion. Now, is the hon. gentleman making some kind of a charge or just trying to smear, follow the Premier's example of character assassination and smear tactics which are unparliamentary and not allowed in this House, Sir. Would the hon. -

MRS. H. MCISAAC: They are assuming this -

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has by -

MR. W. ROWE: Just snide innuendo, that is all.

MR. S. NEARY: - imputation has attached something to my motives. Now would the hon. gentleman have the courage to state it or just not mention it again. He has to state it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Read it.

MR. W. ROWE: He does not have the guts.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes. I will read the book and -

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

I am not aware that there was any matter on which the Chair is in a position to make a decision.

MR. S. NEARY: He does not have the guts, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. S. NEARY: Smear tactics. -

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

I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his latter remarks.

MR. S. NEARY: Okay. I will do it.

DR. R. WINSOP: I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did show his true character while a member of the -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is unparliamentary.

DR. R. WINSOP: -Cabinet in the previous administration.



June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4031

PT-3

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I can clearly hear the hon. gentleman. I cannot really say -

DR. P. WINSOR: He is now showing it again by associating with fugitives from justice and by becoming a puppet in this House. I and the people of Newfoundland must ask that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I must insist that the hon. gentlemen restrain themselves. The expression, 'the hon. gentleman is a puppet', must be withdrawn. Every hon. member is assumed to be here as the spokesman of his own views and not the spokesman for anybody else. I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

- and that I will ask the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to withdraw the quite unparliamentary references he made. So if we take them in chronological order, the hon. gentleman from Mt. Scio (Dr. Winsor) and then the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will be recognized.

DR. P. WINSOR: To expedite things I certainly withdraw the allegation that the hon. member is a puppet.

MR. S. NEARY: You have to withdraw, not to expedite things. Withdraw, no strings attached.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

My understanding is the hon. gentleman has withdrawn the allegation.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4031

RT-4

MR. S. NEARY: I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Both hon. gentleman have withdrawn. The hon. member for Mount Seio.

DR. R. WINSOR: The use of the smear tactic and innuendo are used daily in this House and it will have to stop but a political -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I must ask hon. gentlemen not to interrupt.

I can see, and experience, if hon. members will recall, will show, that this is but the greatest single factor which contributes to disorder and especially when one notes there is tension in the House then that rule, I think, has to be enforced even more strictly. So I will insist that hon. members not interrupt when another hon. member is speaking.

DR. R. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The men, in effect, who are using these tactics are destroying their own political party and I say this to the members opposite, your leaders are not offering a viable alternative to the Government by offering new ideas but are

DR. R. WINSOR: attempting either by pressure or direct involvement with some people to destroy the political system by refusing to let it function as it should.

MR. NEARY: Did the Premier tell you to say that?

DR. R. WINSOR: No, nobody told me what to say except that I speak for myself.

MR. NEARY: Well it -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

DR. R. WINSOR: The House of Assembly is being used as a forum to smear and destroy people in public life and recently -

MR. W.N. ROWE: A point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is a clear rule of this House, Sir, and I will refer to paragraph 144 of Beauchesne, page 124 of the fourth edition, Sir, it is a rule in both Houses of Parliament that a member must address the House orally and not read from a written previously prepared speech for the reason that "if the practice of reading speeches should prevail members might read speeches that were written by other people"-

MR. NEARY: Gary Callahan, the Premier's mirror.

MR. W.N. ROWE: "And the time of the House be taken up considering the arguments of persons who were not"-

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sir, I am on a point of order. If you can control that member, if he is deserving of the appellation, opposite. "And the time of the House be taken up considering the arguments of persons who were not deserving of their attention." Now, Mr. Speaker, the citation goes on for about a page or so giving reasons why hon. members are not permitted to slavishly stand up in the House and read from speeches probably prepared for them. In this case I am sure prepared for that hon. member, because he is talking about something completely out of character with that hon. gentleman, anyone who knows him. He is reading from something prepared for him probably

MR. W.N. ROWE: by the member for St. John's East or probably the Premier because the Premier is going to go on television -

MR. NEARY: It was written in the Premier's office.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, the Premier did not write that one.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The Premier's press man probably wrote it because the Premier is going to go on television tomorrow night and deliver the same speech with public money being spent to purchase the time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour to direct that hon. member to speak, make a speech, not to read, because it is against the rules of the House to read a speech because it was written by somebody else in all likelihood.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. HICKMAN: Number one, I am quite certain that the hon. gentleman from Mount Scio is more than capable of making a speech, that he can prepare himself, that he can think through himself and that if he refers to some notes he certainly is within the rules of this House and staying closely within the rules of this House. What the rule with respect to delivering speeches was aimed to get at, and unfortunately they do not have to be written in order to do this, is to try and bring speeches back to the point. So, as Beauchesne says, that we will not have the delivery of speeches of great length, having the character of carefully and elaborately prepared written essays, and indulging in voluminous and often irrelevant extracts because that is destructive of legitimate and pertinent debate upon public questions and it is a waste of valuable time, unreasonably lengthens the sessions of Parliament. If there is one hon. gentleman in this House who cannot be accused of unreasonably delaying the session of Parliament or unreasonably delaying debates is the hon. gentleman from Mount Scio.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague raised a point of order, Sir, that the hon. member for Mount Scio was reading a speech.

I believe Your Honour, and anybody who was watching the hon. gentleman,

MR. NEARY: Sir, as he squirted out his poison, obviously, Sir, saw the gentleman reading it from a text that was no doubt prepared outside the House in the Premier's office because that is the same tone, the same wording, Sir, that we heard so often when the Premier came into this House to read a speech written by his hatchet man. And, Sir, I contend that it is against the rules of this House to read a speech. Now if the hon. gentleman, Sir, wants to get up and read, the hon. gentleman must realize that when the hon. gentleman is reading a speech that is written by somebody outside of this House the hon. gentleman has to be prepared to stand behind the statements that that hatchet man outside the House is making.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman is now entering into the area of debate.

MR. NEARY: And so, Sir, I agree with my hon. colleague and I am sure Your Honour must have been watching. It is against the rules, Sir, to read speeches in this hon. House. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are times when we do not mind it. We do not mind a new member or a member who is nervous and, Your Honour,

MR. NEARY:

sometimes we turn a blind eye, as Your Honour knows, we turn a blind eye because a member may not be able to handle himself on his feet. There are people like that, Your Honour. There are people who could not make a speech if they did not have it written down, so you have to practice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I have to tolerate this? But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice, the government House leader, just told us that if anybody in this House can make an off the cuff speech it is the hon. member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor). So therefore we can only assume, take the government House leader at his word, that the hon. gentleman should not have to read a speech. And if the hon. gentleman does read a speech or he is reading somebody else's speech, he has to stand behind it. That is why the hon. gentleman is running into trouble right now because the hon. gentleman is doing exactly what we have been saying for weeks, lowering the decorum and the dignity of the House by using language that is unparliamentary, prepared by somebody outside the House. Whereas if the hon. gentleman was giving his own speech he might be able to do it within the rules of this House.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If the hon. gentleman for Mount Scio who is directly involved wishes to make a submission I will certainly hear him. There will not be any need to hear anybody else. It would be improper not to hear the hon. gentleman if he wishes to make a submission.

DR. WINSOR: I refute the allegation, Mr. Speaker, that anybody has written a speech for me. I am referring to fairly extensive notes. I have done this intentionally. I have heard the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) repeat the same speech many times in the past three years and I did not want to fall into that same trap.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am prepared to make a ruling on the matter. Certainly it is inappropriate to read a speech. It is not inappropriate to refer to

MR. SPEAKER:

notes or to refer to copious notes. Hon. members may well be aware that when this matter usually comes up or has come up, the ruling is with reference to that an hon. member may use notes. So I think I will leave it at that. The hon. member may use copious notes.

The hon. member.

DR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to repeat this House of Assembly is being used as a forum to smear people. The Director of Air Services has been the most recent. Mr. Speaker, the Director of Air Services was not in Antigua does not know and has never known Andrew Davidson.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) a puppet (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. WINSOR: Was not in Antigua with Craig Dobbin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The same term when attributed to an hon. gentleman to my right with reference to puppet was required to be withdrawn, and obviously it must be withdrawn when it is attributed by hon. gentleman to my right to the hon. gentleman to my left. So I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw.

MR. SIMMONS: I withdraw. I would like him to explain it further but I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

DR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, again.

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will hear a point of order although I will say before I hear it that there comes a time when the Chair will have to give serious consideration to whether a point of order will be heard because I have to be assumed to follow what is going on, to be aware of what is going on and not to be deaf or incapacitated.

MR. W. ROWE: Unlike members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: If point of order follows point of order follows point of order, and I am hear and aware of everything that intervenes between

MR. SPEAKER:

them, and in my opinion nothing has intervened which could constitute a point of order, then I think I would have a responsibility to an hon. member who has this specific period of time to exercise that discretion. So I will hear the hon. gentleman's point of order but I will say that I am not aware that anything has, you know, transpired between the last point of order and this particular one. But I will hear the hon. gentleman but I felt that in fairness to members of the House I should point that out.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the hon. gentleman, Sir, made a statement that violates the rules of this House, that was unparliamentary Sir, and one of the worst crimes, in my opinion, that you can commit in this House. And that is, Sir, he accused the Opposition of smearing a public servant. That is what the hon. gentleman said, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: Which was done, Sir.

MR. NEARY: No, which was not done, Sir. It was not done and that is exactly the point, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition



MR. NEARY: did not smear a public servant and the hon. gentleman should be asked, Sir, to withdraw that statement. If in the process of exposing extravagance and waste and possible wrongdoing in connection with the public treasury, we had to implicate public servants sobeit, Sir, but we smeared nobody. I have not heard anybody on this side of the House smear a public servant and the hon. gentleman, Sir - it is a very serious charge - and the hon. gentleman, Sir, should be asked to withdraw it and apologize to the House.

Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: That is not a point of order. The hon. member is rising, you know - if the hon. members opposite do not like what is said that is one thing, but that does not constitute a point of order itself. The hon. gentleman is giving his interpretation of events that have transpired and happened in this House. He is not casting insult or infringing the rules of the House by doing it. And the hon. gentlemen opposite feel that if they disagree with anything that is said that they can get up on a point of order and I would submit that I would refer Your Honour to paragraph 126, again of Beauchesne, to the effect that points of order certainly of this nature, and I have already read it to Your Honour, well paragraph 126, "Speaker and has declared that interruptions on points of order are very often themselves disorderly." And I would submit that this type of point of order is disorderly and that the hon. gentleman should be allowed to continue with his speech even though the hon. gentlemen there opposite may not like what is said or may disagree with what is said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

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

The allegation that hon. members, an hon. member or some hon. members may or may not have smeared a public servant, I would regard to be in the area of difference of opinion.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman has rights he may obviously enforce but would he have to do them in the way provided by the rules.

The hon. member for Mount Scio

DR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just repeat again that the Director of Air Services was not in Antigua, has never known Andrew Davidson, was not with Craig Dobbin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. WINSOR: And is now possibly leaving the civil service and, Mr. Speaker, I think the reason, possibly one of the main reasons why he is doing this, his career has probably been jeopardized by the allegations of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, the estimates in this House were a shambles, Sir, with no viable criticism -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I would ask hon. gentlemen not to interrupt and I would ask the hon. member if he could speak more loudly please.

DR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, the estimates while going through this House were a shambles. There was no viable criticism of government spending, just personal attacks on ministers and civil servants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I predict that this tactic will be stopped by the decent people in the Liberal Party, and there are many of them inside and outside this hon. House, many who would question the tactics of the members for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

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

DR. WINSOR: I have been accused by the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir for obstructing the operation of the Public Accounts Committee recently. This, Mr. Speaker, is an absurd charge. As a government backbencher, and speaking to my colleagues here on the back rows of the government, we are involved in many caucuses involving legislation which is to come before this House. The backbenchers in this government, Mr. Speaker, have input in the legislative system.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: I do it not to obstruct the House in any way, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Yellow.

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

MR. SIMMONS: I feel rather badly about this because the member was in the House the other night when I raised this issue and I made it very clear, and Hansard will bear me out, that I in no way assigned any of the blame to him. He, as I said, Mr. Speaker, was but the willing tool of others. He did not in any way, he has not to this date, Mr. Speaker, in my view, obstructed the Public Accounts Committee. He has done everything he can to expedite the work of the Committee but he has been obstructed by others who do not want the Committee to meet. He is not one of them and I want to make that clear, Mr. Speaker. He is not one of them. I have never accused him of obstructing the work of the Committee. He has always told me he is prepared to meet at any reasonable time. Indeed he and I last night agreed that we would have a meeting sometime next week on the subject. He is not an obstructress, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes he falls in the trap of taking his instructions from other people instead of acting on his own as a member of the House. But that is another issue for which he will have to answer.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4034

NM - 4

MR. W. ROWE: He is a tool of the administration.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion it is obviously not a matter  
in which the Chair has a decision to make.

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. WINSOR: We do have many caucuses in this Party,  
Mr. Speaker, not to pilot the latest smear technique that we  
are going to use but to have input into the government process.  
The backbenchers on this side of the House have excellent  
liason with the Cabinet ministers and their departments and  
with the Premier, something

DR. R. WINSOR:

that was certainly not heard of in the previous administration. We do take our responsibility seriously, Mr. Speaker.

I resent the allegations of the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) in the sense that he has given the impression that he, alone, against all odds, uncovered irregularities in the Public Works.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. R. WINSOR: I must report, Mr. Speaker, that the report of the Public Accounts Committee -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Hon. gentlemen on both sides are asked not to intervene.

DR. R. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must stress again, that report of the Public Accounts Committee was a unanimous report, Mr. Speaker. The government members on that committee are just as concerned as the members of the Opposition on the Public Accounts Committee in uncovering any possible irregularities in any facet of government.

There are facts that must not be overlooked, Mr. Speaker, that this government in this past year is the first Government of Newfoundland that has ever had a function in Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. R. WINSOR: This government also appointed the Mahoney -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

June 6, 1978

Tape 4035

EC - 2

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I find it very difficult to hear the hon. gentleman, and if hon. members interrupt it is impossible.

DR. R. WINSOR: The P.C. Government appointed the Mahoney Public Inquiry into alleged wrongdoing in Public Works when certain issues were brought up in this House. And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the government members on that Public Accounts Committee tried to keep the balance of responsibility while the Chairman was grandstanding in his quest for the Liberal leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. R. WINSOR: I must caution the Chairman of the PAC that if he is to continue in that responsible position he must refrain from personal attacks on private citizens. If he has proof of wrongdoing he must go through the proper channels, either through the PAC or table it in this House or present it to the RCMP. His attack on the Gaulton family was sickening, disgusting, that he is trying to connect the unfortunate fire on Signal Hill in the public mind -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: This has gone far enough, apart from the abusive language which tends to create disorder.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) headlines.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, it is alright, Mr. Speaker, if the attack is on people that were - it is kind of all right. But a member sits there and says that I have made an attack on a family. Now, Mr. Speaker, the damage is done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: The damage is done. It has been said and it will be quoted that somehow I attacked a family, and I play into his hands by getting up and reinforcing it, Mr. Speaker. That is all I do, but I have to. I cannot sit here forever and take this vile, this gutter language, this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that somehow I have attacked a family. Mr. Speaker, this cannot be allowed to continue. I submit my privileges are violated if I would expect the least from the member for Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor). Who is writing his speech? that is the question. To suggest for one fraction of a second that I have attacked any family! Now I reject that, Mr. Speaker, out of hand. I reject it completely. The member has to withdraw. He is violating my privileges. If he is allowed to stand there and say that kind of thing, then I can get up and say anybody in this House is attacking any family. Now, Mr. Speaker, how much longer is he allowed to go on? Because he stands there in his pious, educated terms, does that make it better? Does that make it acceptable, that he stands there and makes all kinds of accusations without any documentations, accusations which are unparliamentary, accusations which break every rule in the book about abusive language, about insulting language, about making charges at members of the House? And I sit there and I have to take it, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to take it. I have no intention of taking it. I have made no attack on that family which he mentioned or any other family, and that is a despicable thing, I say to him, Absolutely despicable, and he should withdraw it without any further discussion at all. Absolutely low, despicable, gutter language. I have never heard anybody talk in lower, more gutter terms than I heard the member for

June 6, 1978

Tape 4035

EC - 4

MR. SIMMONS:

Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor)

in the past few seconds - absolutely vomiting, Mr. Speaker.  
I cannot find the words to describe it, That I would  
be accused, Mr. Speaker, by a gentleman who I thought  
was a gentleman, to suggest that I have attacked any  
family!



MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, he has done what he just accused me of doing. He has attacked me in the vilest terms. It is sickening, absolutely sickening and an end has to be put to it, Mr. Speaker. I believe I have established my case and I will make the appropriate motion that he be disciplined for doing something that is unprecedented. I know we have had a rowdy debate in this House, Mr. Speaker, but I have never yet seen anything as rowdy, as disgusting, as low-down, as unprincipled as that suggestion a minute ago that I had attacked some family. I reject it outright, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having raised it because I only reinforced his gutter tactics by doing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think I should hear the hon. gentleman who was involved.

DR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. member for his kind remarks. I certainly sat here in this chair and heard questions raised in Question Period a short time ago asking the Minister of Justice, I think, whether some investigation had gone on into a fire on Signal Hill and whether the intimation was there, the intention was there to seem to apparently connect the fire at Elizabeth Towers on the same day as the other fire and this is what I was referring to.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The question before the Chair is whether an allegation or a statement by the hon. gentleman to my left that an hon. member to my right attacked a family, whether that brings privilege into operation. I have always understood privilege as those matters which affect the ability of hon. members to properly function as elected representatives where harrassment, intimidation, bribery, attempted bribery, coercion, matters like that. Whether the hon. member attacked a family or did not attack a family does not in my opinion come within the area of privilege. It would appear to be a difference of opinion which obviously can be debated, but I do not see it is a matter on which the Chair can make

MR. SPEAKER: any finding or any kind of contribution. I think it is a matter sort of outside the ambit of the Chair's decision making capacity.

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. SIMMONS: I probably used the wrong term. It is certainly a point of order and I will raise the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Would the hon. gentleman please take his seat.

I have made a decision on the matter.

MR. SIMMONS: Why did Mr. Speaker say it was not a matter of privilege? I raised it improperly as a matter of privilege. I was going to submit that I think it is a point of order at least. I believe it is out of order for a member to stand there and accuse another member of attacking a family.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

I mean, Mr. Speaker, if this is allowed to go on there is no dignity left to this place. I do not even want to be here, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SIMMONS: I believe it is out of order for him to say that and he should withdraw it.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: If not, if it is an open season, Mr Speaker, let all of us know. Our language will not be as gutter as that fellow's, of course.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman, if he wishes to make a submission.

DR. WINSOR: No. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think these points put the Chair in an extremely difficult position. The Chair cannot make determinations on matters of fact in this area, while obviously the allegation of one

MR. SPEAKER: hon. member of another that he attacked a family is perhaps far from pleasing and that there have been numerous allegations, and I am aware of an hon. member say of another that he, you know, this hon. member attacked this committee or this viewpoint or this concept or this idea, and certainly there could be, if there were more - if one were to say, meat on the bone, then it could very well be unparliamentary. you know. But I think all we have now is an allegation that an hon. member attacked a family. There is no suggestion of a sexual attack or assault and battery or anything like that. I am just trying to find - what I am suggesting is a very general thing, just an allegation that an hon. member attacked a family. I presume what he means is that - I do not know what he means. It is too vague. I cannot make any ruling on it. I cannot rule it out of order in that particular concept.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have probably picked a very bad analogy there so if hon. members would just ignore it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The point I am trying to make is that the Chair obviously on the question of fact can make no decision and the allegation as it now is is of such a vague nature that I cannot rule it out of order. I will have to leave it at that.

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could say, Mr. Speaker, I have known members of that family personally. I know how upset some of them are. If the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has proof of illegal activity of Gaulton Electric he should produce it in this House or apologize to that family. We have had enough of this type of politics, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland. He cannot combine that type of gutter politics with an nonpartisan role as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. The Public Accounts Committee will continue its role of monitoring the public accounts of this Province in a responsible manner with or without the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. WINSOR: It is his choice, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the two reasons that I have said outside this House why the Public Accounts Committee has not met this year—and I will repeat them here—one, as I indicated earlier, the workload of a backbencher on the government side of the House, and particularly this year, has been very, very heavy, and the impossibility of the Hansard people to cope with the transcribing of the Public Accounts Committee meetings with the long hours that this House is in session.

We as the government members on the Public Accounts Committee certainly make a pledge right now; I as co-Chairman of that Committee will take part in as many meetings as is necessary to deal in depth with the reports of the Auditor General but not until after this House has adjourned, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a few comments on Labrador. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that Labrador power must be developed for the use of the people

DR. WINSOR:

of the Island of Newfoundland and the people of the mainland part of our Province in Labrador. The idea of a Port Labrador excites me, a relatively ice free deep water port, a center for industry, a particularly energy intensive industry utilizing the to be developed power of Labrador and also a transshipping center to service hydro-carbon development in the high arctic and also development off our Northern Coast of our Province, iron ore in its processed form.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: I wish to raise a matter of privilege and I wish to refer - I will do it very quickly because I realize the hon. gentleman's time has just about run out. It took me a little time to find the item in Erskine May and I shall do it very expeditiously. But I think it is an important issue, Mr. Speaker. If this House has not the confidence in me as Chairman of the Committee it should say so, of course. And the option is there, the government has a majority. They can get me off the Committee very quickly. But until they do that, Mr. Speaker, until they flick me off as Chairman of the Committee - they put me here, the government majority - until they do that I refer them to page 152 of Erskine May, reflections upon members. And to get quickly to the point, Mr. Speaker.

"As examples of speeches and writings which have been held to constitute breaches of privilege or contempts, may be mentioned." And I refer, Mr. Speaker, down to (4) or (5), reflections upon the conduct of the Chairman of a Standing Committee. Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot have it both ways. If the government is not happy with my performance, if the government feels I have stepped outside my role as Chairman, then there is a parliamentary way, Mr. Speaker, to get rid of me. There is a very parliamentary and a proper way to get rid of me. They are not stuck with me, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, while I am the Chairman of the Committee it is very unparliamentary, it is a distinct breach of privilege for a member in this House, whether he be the Vice-Chairman of the Committee

MR. SIMMONS:

or another member, it is a very distinct breach of privilege, Mr. Speaker, for a member to get up and reflect on the conduct of the Chairman of a Standing Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speakeer, the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir has me puzzled. I was listening very carefully to the very excellent speech of the hon. member for Mount Scio, well thought out, well documented, exceptional factual. And all he said

Mr. Hickman: was that he is determined, as I hope every other hon. member of the Committee is determined, to see that the Public Accounts Committee functions efficiently and very assiduously pays attention to the public accounts with or without the Chairman, with or without the Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is all.

MR. HICKMAN: Now what reflection is that on anyone other than he may be concerned that the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) remains in good health, so we will not have to go with or without. The hon. gentleman is a little bit too touchy. Methinks he doth protest too much.

MR. SIMMONS: He forget in particular to refer to the statement itself that I was objecting to, and that is that the Chairman of the Committee was using the Committee for his own political ends. That statement was made by the member in this House in the past ten minutes. And that is the issue to which I rise.

MR. W. ROWE: Very serious.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On this matter I refer hon. members to May, Page 152, the general heading says, "As examples of speeches and writings which have been held to constitute breaches of privilege or contempts may be mentioned." And then it has "reflections upon the conduct of the Chairman of a Standing Committee." It would appear to me that the reflection upon the conduct that the Chairman of a Standing Committee of the House is unparliamentary unless it is done in a way such as a substantive motion of which notice would be given; if there were a motion for concurrence or debate in the report of a Standing Committee then it would be a different matter. There I can see certain things to be said, and perhaps certain things would not be said. But I think it is an area in which a substantive motion of which notice is given, then obviously any hon. member may be subject to the severest criticism including the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, and others. But what I would here require is that the hon. gentleman withdraw or make clear to the House or withdraw whatever terminology he wishes to use

Mr. Speaker: that any reflections upon the Chairman of a Public Accounts Committee in the performance of his role in that particular office.

DR. R. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw, but also I will give notice that I am certainly considering introducing a motion into the House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the -

MR. SIMMONS: No, no, he has to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I understand that the hon. has withdrawn and then he went on to say that he planned to give notice of a motion, or to move a motion in the House. I will not ask him to withdraw that. It is, I suppose, a gratuitous remark. It is unfortunate, I think, on both sides of the House that when withdrawals have been required they have usually been followed by further remarks. In other words, hon. members in many cases, not in all cases, do not just get up and withdraw; they get up and withdraw and say something else which certainly reflects upon the withdrawal, but all I attempt to do is enforce the rules of the House. The rules of good manners and courtesy are matters which have to be applied, obviously, in a different context; the Chair cannot enforce them.

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. WINSOR: Getting back to Port Labrador, Mr. Speaker, as my remarks were interrupted when I was talking, I think, I ended up by saying that processed ore could be shipped through this transshipping port to world markets. Now also I feel strongly that if more transmission lines are put through Quebec for distribution of Labrador power, it gives Quebec a greater stranglehold on Labrador, also joint development of Labrador power concerns me. I am sure that the Government of Quebec which certainly encourage people of French origin to settle in Labrador if these projects go ahead, and I am rather leery of the future if in Labrador a movement for separation or for joining with Quebec arises without a greater input by our Newfoundland people, a greater settlement by our Newfoundland people



June 6, 1978

Tape 4038

PK - 3

Dr. Winsor: and again, I think, our government or any Government of Newfoundland should certainly encourage settlement of Newfoundlanders in Labrador to give it characteristic flavour moreso of the Province of Newfoundland, and not probably undermined by people coming in from another province and eventually that we may lose Labrador.

DR. R. WINSOR: In losing Labrador would be a tremendous tragedy not just for the on-land resources but the offshore gas and oil resources.

I certainly would encourage this government when money becomes available to certainly consider the building of the Trans-Labrador Highway off to the area of Port Labrador, also a road South and eventually a tunnel across the Straits so that we can have a physical link with that great part of our Province.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, just a short while ago, my hon. friend quoted I think from two or three or four words from a document and he was asked to table it, in fact, commanded to by the House. Now as one who collects original manuscripts, I am wondering if the hon. the Speaker would ask the hon. member who is now on Page 5 to table the document which he is now quoting from?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! In this instance I follow the precedents, and I do not have the page now but I did have it earlier in May, and that is when this matter has been brought up, the ruling of the Chair invariably has been that the hon. gentleman states that he is quoting from notes, copious or not copious or more copious or less copious, that the ruling of the Chair is that there is nothing to prohibit the hon. gentleman from referring to such notes.

The hon. gentleman.

DR. R. WINSOR: You have made your ruling, I assume.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

June 6, 1978

Tape 4039

EC - 2

DR. R. WINSOR: I just want to say obviously my time now has expired and I will certainly keep the rest of my extensive notes for the Speech in Reply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is 6:00 P.M. Perhaps we could all go and refresh ourselves copiously and hopefully wisely, and carry on the debate at 8:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman move the adjournment?

MR. ROBERTS: If hon. gentlemen wish to call it 6:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6:00 P.M., I leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 6, 1978

*This replaces #2 previously  
Compiled, dated March*

#2

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What plans do the Government have to supply prescription drugs to citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador who have no other income except Old Age Security?

ANSWER:

Drugs are supplied free of charge to residents of the Province who have been assessed by the Department of Social Services and certified as being unable to bear the cost of buying prescribed drugs. As previously indicated in the House, Government presently is considering the possibility of introducing a program to provide subsidized prescription drugs to citizens over age 65.

MAY 3, 1978

#2

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What plans do the Government have to supply prescription drugs to citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador who have no other income except Old Age Security?

ANSWER:

Drugs are supplied free of charge to residents of the Province who have been assessed by the Department of Social Services and certified as being unable to bear the cost of buying prescribed drugs. The requests of the Senior Citizens of the Province for some form of assistance is now receiving the very active consideration of the Government.

*James G. ...*

*June 6/78*

QUESTION #12

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Does the Government plan to have construction commence on all or any of the following hospital projects during the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1978:

- (a) new hospitals at Channel-Port aux Basques, Clarendville, Burin Peninsula;
- (b) new wing for the Dr. Charles A. Janeway Children's Hospital;
- (c) extension to Central Newfoundland Hospital at Grand Falls?

ANSWER

- (a) There is no provision in the 1978-79 Budget for new hospital construction for Channel-Port aux Basques, Clarendville or Burin Peninsula.
- (b) There is \$1,000,000 provided in the Budget for Dr. Charles A. Janeway Child Health Centre. This will allow for continued planning and commencement of construction to allow for (i) the separation of the post operative

recovery room and the intensive care unit and  
(ii) provide for additional service space.  
The total cost is estimated at \$2,000,000  
over 2 years.

- (c) There is no provision in the 1978-79 Budget  
for extension to the Central Newfoundland  
Hospital.

March 21, 1978



*Jan 6/78*

QUESTION #21

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. What action have the Government taken on the environment and occupational health hazards at the pellet plant and concentrating plant of the Iron Ore Company of Canada at Labrador City, the asbestos mine at Baie Verte, the Buchans mine and the phosphorus plant at Long Harbour, Placentia Bay?
2. Is monitoring of atmospheric dust levels carried on in these mines and plants on a continuing basis?

ANSWER:

Under the Mines (Safety of Workman) Regulations 1957, the Iron Ore Company of Canada is required to monitor dust levels at eighty(80) locations each week in the Pellet Plant and Concentrating Plant. A full time technician employed by the Department of Mines and Energy checks these results and does spot checks in these areas. The plant is visited every three months by the mines

Industrial hygienist, who checks all dust monitoring techniques and results of counts. Approximately 4000 dust samples are examined by the Company and 600 by the Department of Mines and Energy each year. The Department of Mines and Energy intend to introduce personal sampling by the gravimetric method in addition to area sampling in the near future on a continuing basis.

In Baie Verte the Company monitors dust levels in hazardous areas taking 4 - 6 samples per day - approximately 700 samples per year. The Department of Mines and Energy's Industrial hygiene service visits the operation four times a year for a period of one week and checks the company's findings and also carries out dust sampling for confirmation of these findings. A union representative also takes samples for dust counting in addition to the company at this operation.

In Buchans where there is very little dust hazard except in the area of the primary crusher, the Company takes the dust samples. The Department of Mines and Energy's Industrial hygiene service visits four times a year to check the counts and scrutinize techniques and findings of the Company.

At the Phosphorus Plant at Long Harbour monitoring for dust levels and phosphorus contamination is carried out by the Company and supervised by the medical department of the Company - urine examinations for phosphorus is carried out on all workers exposed on a regular basis. These findings are scrutinized by officials of the Occupational Division of the Department of Health. At the present time a health survey of all workers at the ERCO plant and children in the community is underway. This study is being conducted by the Canadian Public Health Association at the request of the Department of Health.

April 7, 1978

*June 1/78*

QUESTION #46

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House of Assembly the following information:

Does the College of Trades and Technology presently have a course for pharmacists? If so, would the Minister indicate how many students are presently enrolled in this course?

Is the certification of pharmacists in Newfoundland generally accepted by other Provinces of Canada.

ANSWER

The College of Trades and Technology offers a 3-year course in pharmacy.

Students presently enrolled are:-

1st. year	25
2nd. year	26
3rd. year	25

Certification of pharmacists from this course is not generally accepted by other Provinces. Each Province has its own licensing board and pharmacists wishing to practice in any province must meet the local requirements. Other provinces require university degree in B.Sc. (Pharmacy).

April 18, 1978

June 6/78

QUESTION #58

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Statement of reported cases of syphilis, gonorrhoea and other venereal diseases.

ANSWER

The question did not refer to any specific periods or year. The answer provides information for the past five years for reported cases.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Gonorrhoea No. of Cases</u>	<u>Syphilis No. of Cases</u>
1973	505	8
1974	575	10
1975	631	4
1976	792	13
1977	688	9

April 14, 1978

*June 6/78*

QUESTION #67

Mr. Heary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What are the names of those persons who are currently employed as Executive Assistants, Special Assistants, or Special Advisers to him?

On what date were they so employed and what title does each hold?

ANSWER:

The current position is that there are no persons employed as Executive Assistants, Special Assistants or Special Advisers.

~~April 27, 1978~~

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1978

June 6, 1978

Tape 4040 (Night)

EC - 1

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for the  
Straits of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I thank my few colleagues in the  
hope they thump as enthusiastically when I finish as when  
I start.

MR. SIMMONS: Send your cheque!

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Burgeo -  
Bay d'Espoir says to send the cheque. The trouble is  
he would probably wish to investigate it. We would have a  
public accounting on the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be forgiven,  
I would like to say a few words about the financial state  
of the Province where on an amendment to the Budget Speech,  
an amendment that stands in the name of my friend, the  
Leader of the Opposition - and let me begin by saying  
I think the amendment is a fair one and I shall with great  
pleasure vote for it. There is some fairly strong language  
in it - parliamentary language, but strong language - and  
that is reasonable because it deals with important issues,  
and I think, if anything, it is probably understated. So  
I shall support the amendment. I do not know if we will  
have a vote tonight. I understand that the House Leaders  
have been putting their heads together behind Your Honour's  
Chair and that we have an agreement, I believe, that at  
10:00 P.M. the Minister of Justice or the Minister of  
Finance or the Government House Leader, whichever one of  
the hats he is wearing, will speak to close the debate and



June 6, 1978

Tape 4040 (Night)

EC - 2

MR. ROBERTS: then I understand that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor will be in the House later on and will clear up the financial legislation.

MR. W. ROWE: - bail them out on that too.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, says we are going to bail out the government. I only wish that the government of this Province could be bailed out that simply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The problem, and I will touch upon it, is that I suspect the government of this Province may have got - I do not mind them getting themselves into the pickle - they have got all of us in this Province into a pickle where it is going to be very difficult to be bailed out.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go through the Budget Speech or the Budget, if you wish, in any detail. It has been somewhat exhaustively debated. I am not sure how much of the debate has dealt with the Budget - I think it has all been relevant to the debate on the Budget in the sense in which we use that term in this House - but there has been remarkably little said, at least in my hearing or to my knowledge, about the Budget itself or about the financial state of this Province. You know, we heard an excellent speech read by my friend from Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor), the gentleman who actually represents me or at least the district in which I live, in the House of Assembly.

MR. SIMMONS: Did he write it?

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir wants to know who the author is.

June 6, 1978

Tape 4040 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. ROBERTS: The author cannot stand in this House because the author, I suspect, is not a member of the House. Be that as it may, it was an excellent speech.

MR. SIMMONS: What?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I - no, no. My friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is incredulous as only my friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir can be. He should not be incredulous - I think he should be grateful that the Speech was written and was read instead of simply being given. I think we should give credit where credit is due.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on now - my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) is going to launch a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, he was.

MR. SIMMONS: He is now allowed to be anybody's puppet now, remember.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, is my friend from Bonavista South willing to let me proceed? My friend from Bonavista South is ready to let me proceed? He is not going to demolish me with a point of order? Well, the hon. gentleman never says anything but he makes a lot of noise about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) touchy.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am not at all touchy.

I wish to say a few words on the financial state of the Province and I heard the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South in his stentorian tones say - sotto voce, I think, is the phrase that we would use -

June 6, 1978

Tape 4040 (Night)

EC - 4

MR. ROBERTS:                    heard him to say that he wanted to raise a point of order and I would be delighted. The hon. gentleman has been in this House for four to five years and it is time he raised a point of order. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) that whether or not it is a learned expression will depend, like beauty, on whether or not it is in the eye of the beholder. And for my friend from Grand Falls it is probably a learned expression and for my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) it probably is not.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk only about two topics in a little detail. I want to talk about the unemployment rate in this Province and I want to talk about the debt service picture or the debt service position. Both of them, I think, have been touched upon by other speakers, indeed, the learned gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) spoke at some length about the debt position of the Province. In a sense what I am going to say will touch upon the same subject as did he, but I think

MR. ROBERTS: I can take it beyond where he took it and perhaps put the matter in perspective. The labour force or the unemployment rate, which unfortunately is the significant fact about the labour force in this Province today, that so many of them are unemployed, so many of them are out of work, so many of them have never been given the opportunity to work, so many of them have lost any hope that they may ever get work, that figure, Sir, is one that while it comes up often in press releases, you know we have a charade each month. Statistics Canada send out their annual monthly reports on the number employed, the number unemployed, and the government make apologies. The government here and the government at Ottawa and the Opposition here and the Opposition at Ottawa, each attack the government, the government here and the government at Ottawa, and life goes on and the matter is never dealt with.

But I want to talk about these two topics, Sir, because to me they are probably the most significant indicators of the economic activity of this Province or the - if you wish, Sir, the state of our development as an economy, the state of our development as a Province.

The figures on unemployment I have them here for the last ten years. They are unadjusted for the benefit of statisticians and they are annual averages. And what it shows, Mr. Speaker, is that in the last ten or eleven years, beginning in 1966, our labour force, and these are Statistics Canada people, has grown from 131,000 people to 192,000 people in this Province and that is a very, very large increase. It is an increase of about a third, an increase of about 61,000 people. 61,000 men and women have come into the labour force in the last ten or eleven years, actually it is more than that because of course

This page is missing from the original copy.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4041

MF - 3

MR. ROBERTS: will remember it, as will my friend from Fogo (Captain E. Winsor), and my friend from Placentia West, or now Surin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning), about at the time the economic difficulties began for the government of this Province. It rose to 7.4 per cent. It stayed there for three years. In 1969 it was 7.3 per cent, in 1970 it was 7.2 per cent. In 1971, the last full year of the Liberal Administration, the Smallwood Administration, it rose again to 8.8 per cent. The first full year of the PC's it was 9.0 per cent, and then it rose from 9 per cent to 10 per cent, and then in 1974 it went from 10 per cent, which was the figure in 1973, to 13.4 per cent in 1974, 14.2 in 1975, 13.6

Mr. Roberts:

which dropped it back, in 1976 it dropped it back to below '75, but below '74, and then this most recent year 15.9 per cent. And, of course, Sir, it should be noted as well that these figures, these revelations, the information in these do not mention, although they fully reflect and take into account the fact that over this period the Government of Canada has become the employer of last resort. And there are, I suppose, would anybody care to take a guess? 15,000, 20,000 jobs created in this Province through the LIP, Canada Works, Young Canada Works programmes over the course of a year. There may not be 20,000 man-years at jobs, but it is not too far often. It might be 10,000 man-years, in other words, 10,000 people for one year each, 120,000 months of work.

MR. J. CARTER: How were the hon. member's figures arrived at? Translating from the unemployed people, drawing unemployment or -

MR. ROBERTS: Well my friend for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) asked how they are arrived at? I tell him quite candidly that I am not enough of a statistician to know. There are very serious questions about the methodology that Statistics Canada follow.

MR. J. CARTER: One very short suggestion is that -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. J. CARTER: - if the member would permit? Is that, if the LIP projects, and some of these other Canada projects give short temporary jobs then the people earn enough stamps to get on unemployment, and therefore they get reported as unemployed persons. I just want to be clear on that point.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I do not know enough about statistically sampling methods to tell my friend very much more, but I will say two things; first of all, I think these are the most accurate index we can get. And secondly, but more importantly for the point that I am trying to establish, they are consistent. There was a change made back in 1975 in the way in which the figures were compiled, but the figures which I have given are compiled on the same basis backward and

Mr. Roberts: and forward, and that was an exercise that was carried out by Statistics Canada, actually it is Bulletin 71-001, if hon. gentlemen, you know, want to refer to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well I mean I hear figures that go to any level at all, and if we want to talk about underemployment, you know, we may be up to 50 per cent. But what I am concerned about is the fact that since 1966 we have had a steady growth in unemployment in this Province, a steady growth, and quite a dramatic growth, 9 per cent does not sound like a lot, 6.1 to 15.9 and you could juggle the figures around and say, oh that is only 9.8 per cent, but it is an increase of two and a half times. And it is reflected in the labour force, the labour force is larger. There are far more people at work now. There are more people at work now than there were in the labour force in 1972, but the number who are unemployed has gone up dramatically, it is gone up from 8,000 to 30,000 and that is an increase of what? nearly 300 per cent. And what concerns me is there is no change in it. This is not an aberration, this is not simply the result of the failure to bring in this or that or to do this or the result of doing that or doing something else. To me, Sir, this shows very great structural weaknesses in the whole economy of this Province. It shows that we are not making progress. It shows that despite six years of planning and priorities we have not made any progress. The picture is getting steadily worse. And I have projected them back, or have them assembled back through the Smallwood Administration to show that, you know, the trend has gone on, but the dramatic increase came after 1971, and I am not saying it is simply the result of a change of administration, but I think the fact that this administration have completely failed to come to grips with it, completely failed even to appreciate there is a problem, that has contributed significantly to what I think is one of the most savage indictments of the way in which Province functions today.



MR. NEARY: Of course, you know what they will argue over there, they will say well unemployment is up everywhere, but it is not

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) makes a good point, sure the hon. gentlemen opposite will argue that unemployment is up everywhere. It is up nationally. But it is not up by two and one-half times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. ROBERTS: And we are falling behind. In 1956 there were 8,000 unemployed. And in 1967;8,000; and in 1968;10,000; and again in 1969 and 1970;10,000, 1971, 13,000 unemployed; 1972, 14,000 unemployed, 1973, 17,000, 23,000, 25,000, 30,000.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: What will it be next year? We are falling further and further behind. Our participation rate is going up, but by nothing like the national increases. We are still not 51 per cent, nationally it is up to 56 or 57 or 58. Our labour force is going up, but

MR. ROBERTS:

it is not going up as rapidly as it is across Canada. What is happening is we are not producing the jobs. Our economy is not producing the jobs. I am not going to say it is entirely the fault of the government of the Province. It is not. But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of the Province have done nothing about it. I will say that in six years in office they have not done one farthing's worth to develop the economy of this Province in any sense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The other day my friend, the gentleman from Green Bay, the Minister of Mines and Energy, made what is one of the better speeches I have heard him make in the House. It was a good speech. I have heard my friend make some good ones. I have also heard him make some absolutely atrocious ones, which he usually thinks are the good ones. But I heard him make quite a good speech in which he talked -

MR. SIMMONS: He writes worse than he talks.

MR. ROBERTS: He did not write that letter that went to that lady in Baie Verte.

MR. SIMMONS: He signed it.

MR. ROBERTS: No member of the House could possibly have had the gall -

MR. W. ROWE: Or the arrogance.

MR. ROBERTS: - or the arrogance or the weakness to write a letter such as was sent to the lady in Baie Verte. He signed it but I am sure he signed it in a bad moment, a moment of temporary weakness.

Mr. Speaker, the concern I have is that the government have not come to grips with it. I am not concerned simply with sitting here and flaying the government. We have had a lot of that in this session. The government have been well flayed. But is a little like taking candy from a child to attack this administration. They will self destruct like in Mission Impossible, the tape - was it

MR. ROBERTS: five seconds after the message had been delivered the tape self destructed? Well this administration is self destructing now. It began to self destruct about three or four years ago and all that we on this side need to do is stand aside and let them self destruct. They are on a disaster course. Anything they turn their hand to turns to dust and ashes in their hands. This year's budget was a disaster. Next year's budget will be worse for them. And the budget after that will be worse still. I am not so much concerned simply with that. They will be turfed out of office and they will deserve the royal order of the boot. But my concern, Sir, is broader than that. I am concerned with what is going to happen to this Province. I am concerned with the fact that over the last ten or eleven years, a period during which we have seen our debt increase astronomically, a period during which we have made massive public investments, you know we say we are a province that cannot raise money, well my friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) tipped them off the other night with \$110 million wasted, negligently wasted, if not deliberately wasted, down at the Straits of Belle Isle and on the Lower Churchill project, negligence, amounting almost to criminal negligence in my opinion, negligence or worse deliberate, \$110 million gone, \$250 million sunk in the Linerboard, sunk into Mr. John Crosbie's arrogant pride, \$160 million gone in the Upper Churchill and the questions which we raised back in 1972 or 1973, when this project was discussed in the House, are still not answered but are becoming more and more valid. We are no closer today to the development of the Lower Churchill than we were four or five years ago because of any efforts of this government. When the Lower Churchill is developed it will not be because of the fact that this government took \$160 million and purchased those shares from Brinco. That will not be the cause of development. That will not be the reason the development will go ahead.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4043

NR - 3

MR. ROBERTS:

So you know we can raise large sums of money and we have raised them and we have spent them. And it shows on the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk briefly for a moment about the debt service charges. And this is something that you know I think most members - I guess I have been guilty of this on occasion, maybe I will be again - most members sort of feel it is irrelevant, it is boring, there is no political moxy in it. It is not the sort of thing that any of us is particularly concerned about in his capacity as a district member, you know the debt. Well the debt is there. It is like taxes and debt, it has always been with us. Well I think, Sir, we can ignore the debt figures. We can ignore the message that is contained in them. But we do so at our peril. Because I think, Sir, that this Province financially is on a collision course with disaster. I think that unless we take some steps we are going to find that disaster may come fairly quickly. And so I would invite hon. gentlemen, Sir, to bear with me while I present a very brief analysis of two simple figures taken from our public accounts.

June 6, 1978

Tape 4044 (Night)

EC - 1

MR. ROBERTS: And the two simple figures, Sir, are in each year's Public Accounts. My figures come from the central statistical service of the government, one of the more useful of the swollen bureaucratic bodies with which we have been blessed these last few years. Our debt service charges - now you can quibble, you can quarrel - you know, as to what is in it and what is not in it - I have taken the same figures each year for the last two, four, six, eight, ten, eleven years beginning with the 1968 - 1969 fiscal year and ending with the current fiscal year ending 1978 - 1979, the year which is not yet finished, indeed, we are but two months and a bit into it. And I have taken in each case apples and apples, and if anybody really wants to refer, my source is the Public Accounts and Estimates of the Province and supplied by a gentleman in the central statistical services - I will not name him, but I mean, it is public information, the gentleman was kind enough to let me have them and send them up to me.

In 1968 - 1969 we spent - and in each case I will talk about the total expenditure of the Province on all headings - and this is a total expenditure figure, the budgetary expenditure, which will be capital and current; it would not necessarily include refinancing - the total budgetary expenditure was \$255 million. And in that year, Sir, we spent \$25.4 million on debt servicing - 10 per cent. Ten per cent of our Budget in 1968 - 1969 went to debt servicing - a large amount, but I would think most of us in private life spend at least that by the time you add up the mortgage and the payments on the car and bank loans and all of the other things which are

June 6, 1978

Tape 4044 (Night)

EC - 2

MR. ROBERTS: facts of life for MHAs who are perhaps well paid by some standards but impecunious by a lot of standards - 10 per cent in 1968 - 1969. By the time the Smallwood administration left office - and the last Budget which the Smallwood administration presented was for the 1971 - 1972 financial year - the debt charges had risen to \$42.5 million against a total expenditure in that year of \$367,200,000. So the percentage, Sir, had risen from 10 per cent to 11.6 when the Smallwood administration left office. We are now in the seventh year in respect of which the Tory administration have presented a Budget in respect of which they have managed - or mismanaged the financial affairs of this Province. The percentage of our total expenditure which has gone to service debt, Sir, has risen. The highest ever in the Smallwood years was 11.6 per cent. It has gone to 13 per cent - 14.1 - 13.1 - 13.2 - 14.5 - 14.9 and this year 15.7 per cent. Our total expenditure budgetary this year is estimated to be \$1,045,674,000. The debt charges are estimated to be \$163,778,000 - 15.7 per cent. Now, Sir, dry statistics, dull statistics, boring statistics, just numbers on a bit of paper, and as Lord Randolph Churchill once said, 'those damned dots.' But, Sir, they tell a story - they tell two stories. They tell us that the percentage of our income that we must shell out each year simply to service our debt - simply to service it, to provide some sinking funds - and not all of our debt is funded by any means, Mr. Speaker, the proportion of our debt that is not funded is rising dramatically and that should cause some concern; it causes me concern - but simply to service our debt, to provide some sinking funds and to pay the interest. This does not

June 6, 1978

Tape 4044 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. ROBERTS: take into account all those Deutsche marks that are going to have to be repaid, and very expensive Deutsche marks they will be and the revaluations that have worked against us, Sir. The drop in the Canadian dollar against the American dollar, I would estimate, has cost the Province what? - \$5 million a year in interest charges? Would the Minister of Finance care to hazard a guess? - \$5 million, \$10 million? because the American dollar has risen against the Canadian dollar? Our borrowings, many of them, have been in American dollars and we now have to pay back in American dollars and we need more Canadian dollars to repay a given number of American dollars than we needed at the time we borrowed it. Not only, Sir, are we spending a much higher proportion, but it is rising steadily. We are

Mr. Roberts: falling behind. Every single year the picture is getting worse. I do not say that with any glee, because the problem will be when the gentlemen who sits to Your Honour's right form an administration, and sits to Your Honour's left, they will have to live with these same figures, and they will have to come to grips with it. They will have to find a way to carry the debt load of this Province. And while the debt load is increasing, and to me these figures are far more significant than even in the increase in the debt. I do not care how much we owe, as much as I care how much we have to raise each year, and how much we have to take out of our income each year to service the debts that we owe. What matters is not our total liability. What matters is the percentage of our current income, the percentage of our available resources on an annual basis that is being used to service our debt and to meet our obligation, and that has gone up, Sir, by 60 per cent in the past eleven years. It is gone up from 10 per cent of our total expenditure to 15.7 per cent. Our expenditure has tripled, it has quadrupled, the debt charges have gone up by six times, a 60 per cent increase, Sir, and that cannot go on.

Oh it can go on for a number of years yet. Sure it can. We have not as yet had a bond issue refused. Indeed the gentlemen who sell bonds are panting at the mouth, I am sure to have some of our paper to sell. Hydro have recently had a little trouble I understand pushing one of their issues. But all you do is you have to up the interest rate or lower the discount rate, you know, which just decreases our net take. That is all you have to do. We are paying a point above the average. We are paying a point and something above, and something is increasing. You know, we can go on, maybe for ten or fifteen years before, and it may never happen. The bond market will say, well we are sorry Newfoundland we cannot sell your paper. And it would not happen quickly, it would not happen dramatically, you know, it would happen the same way that individuals go bankrupt. You know, they first of all, they cannot get bank loans, and then they start financing them on, what? Chargex or Master Charge or, you know, that kind of charge account, and then they start borrowing never needlessly if, you know, the finance companies, and then they start the second



Mr. Roberts: mortgage, and the third mortgage, and one thing and another, and eventually, you know, you just run out of credit.

I think, Sir, the figures are something that we should pay some attention to. I think that the fact that our debt service used to take 10 per cent, and we heard then, I could be very political. I sat over there for a while as a member of the Cabinet, for a while before that as a backbencher, and I heard hon. gentlemen on this side, some of whom are now on the other side, you know, decried, they said, the Province is bankrupt and all of this. I do not think we are bankrupt. We were not bankrupt then. And we are not bankrupt now. I am not saying we will ever be bankrupt. But I will say that we are heading for trouble. And I will say that we are falling further and further behind, each year a larger proportion of our resources has got to go simply to pay back what we borrowed. And, of course, the other side of that coin as my friend for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) can testify with eloquence, is that, we are still not borrowing enough to create the social capital that we need to create. My friend left the Cabinet over that issue.

MR. NOLAN: So he said.

MR. ROBERTS: Well maybe he had additional reasons.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was requested to drop out.

MR. ROBERTS: No. I think, the Cabinet regret losing him. But, you know, my friend for Grand Falls whatever he did or did not do, or whatever reasons he may have had that certainly, I think, was the precipitate cause of his leaving the Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: .... ministerial pay.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know, ministerial pay is a pretty -

MR. NEARY: He bought a new Cadillac, he wants to get back in the Cabinet.

MR. ROBERTS: Ministerial pay is a pretty small mess of potage really when you come down to it, it is not one where, I think anybody who has ever been in the Cabinet or ever hoped to be there would say it is not worth very much. It is certainly not worth a twinge of somebody's conscience. You know, any man who would consider the issue of ministerial

Mr. Roberts: pay when he comes to consider whether he belongs in a Cabinet or whether he can support a Cabinet or not ought not to be in a Cabinet or ought not to be in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And I do not think that my friend for Grand Falls really worried for one second about the question of his ministerial salary when he debated whether he would stay or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) would worry though.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I do not know anything about the gentleman for Bonavista South, and I would just as soon not know anything about the gentleman for Bonavista South -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is just because he got patience.

MR. ROBERTS: And that is, you know, that is -

Mr. Speaker, I -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to underline the fact that I think it is something to which we should pay some concern. We are falling behind. We are raising vast sums of money in the market. We are paying back vast sums of money. Our tax take has gone up, I think, it is gone beyond the point of no return. I think it is gone beyond what we ought conceivably to be asked to bear, and we must bear it, there is no choice. We are the poorest Province in Canada by most measures, by financial or economic measures, and we pay the highest taxes.

MR. ROBERTS: You know the income tax in this Province is what, half as good again as it is in the Province of Alberta and that may say something about the Government of Canada but it may also say a great deal about the financial affairs of the government of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: It might say something about the Province of Alberta.

MR. ROBERTS: It says something about the province but we are as high- You know there is no province that is close to us. There are a number that are edging close to us. We have consistently and constantly kept our income tax higher. I do not mind paying income tax if it is the price we have to pay for living in Newfoundland we will do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Our total tax -

MR. ROBERTS: Our total tax, that is a meaningless phrase because that would be related to an income and our annual incomes, our mean income or our immediate income is well below the national average.

AN HON. MEMBER: We rank six in terms of total.

MR. ROBERTS: We may rank six in terms of total tax. We rank tenth in terms of immediate incomes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ninth.

MR. ROBERTS: Ninth is it? Ninth, no thanks to the present administration. We are paying more taxes from less and we have less public services and my concern is with the fact that we are borrowing more and more all the time and we have less and less apparently to show for it. Now I could go on at some length - You know a few years ago \$5 million would build a hospital and today I suppose \$5 million will not build an outpatients ward on a hospital. You know costs have risen but we have to bring it into perspective. We cannot go on on this mad past careering on. We just cannot go on. Sooner or later we will run into real trouble. And a sixty per cent rise from ten points of our total income to fifteen point seven points in the last ten or eleven years with a government that allegedly is talking restraint, allegedly is talking of priorities, allegedly is talking of planning and this rise in the percentage of our revenue that goes to service our debt this at the same time accompanied by a quadrupling of the unemployment in the Province

This page is missing from the original copy.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4046

JM - 3

MR. ROBERTS: cannot be that -

MR. NEARY: Garry Callahan was too busy writing the -

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance being left to carry all of the burden. Mr. Speaker, that just then underlines what I have been saying that this government have been too long here. They have no idea of what they are doing.

MR. ROBERTS:

They are not even administering well as a group of administrators including my friend with the inane smile, the member from - no the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) need not look, I am not speaking of him at this stage. I am speaking of the member from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn). They do not even administer well. They do not even have that saving grace. They have simply spun out of ideas. They have spun out of enthusiasm, energy, drive, hope. There is nothing in this budget to indicate that the corners can be turned. We have had promise after promise. But when the plans and priorities only come in things will be right. Now the best we are given is the hope, perhaps the certainty that there are hydro carbons off our shores and that they will be developed and brought ashore. Well good and let us all welcome it. But it is not answer to the immediate problems of this Province. It is five or ten or fifteen years away.

My friend from Grand Falls

(Mr. Lundrigan) I heard the other day make a very good point when he said, the fishery as important as it is cannot possibly provide enough jobs in this Province to meet the needs of our economy for jobs. It just cannot. With all the development, with all that we can possibly foresee the fishery cannot possibly do the job. It can do a lot. It will do a lot. It is doing a lot. More thanks to Ottawa than to the Province but that is the way the constitution provides. So I suppose we should be grateful for that.

That is what concerns me, Sir.

I think we are on a collision course with disaster. It is easy to attack this budget, you know, and my friends

MR. ROBERTS:

on the Opposition benches have had a great deal of fun. My friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) spoke for, what was it, fifteen hours? And he had lots of good stuff. And any one of us and this does not denigrate my friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir could have talked for fifteen times fifteen hours and flayed this administration. But that is child's play now. There is no sport in that. There is no meaning in that. There is no worth in that. Why attack a group of politically crippled people, poor dumb politically stupid men who have no hope, who are just staggering along like the three blind mice?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well I do not know, Sir. I do not know what that may be. So I will not say that. My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may be more familiar with that particular kind of animal than I am. But I have seen a group of men who politically do not know what they are doing, who politically are not only the blind leading the blind but the bland leading the bland. They have no idea of what they want to do except hold onto office. They are very fixed in that determination. And it is going to take dynamite and jack hammers to pry them loose.

Mr. Speaker, the job of the government of this Province is to lead and we have seen no indication in this Budget of any lead being given by this government. We have not seen anything in the Throne Speech. We have had six or seven years now. That is time for some priorities to have been set down. I defy anybody to point to a document that says, here are the priorities of the government of this Province. Time enough for planning. Where is the result of this planning, a few mealy mouthed pages attached on as an

MR. ROBERTS:

appendix, and an appendix, Sir, is a useless organ in man and it is just as useless in this Budget. It does not tell us anything. There are no real goals. There are no - where is the development strategy? We have not had a debate in this session about the fishery. The House may adjourn soon without a real debate about the fishery.

The Minister of Fisheries I believe has a great number of good ideas. I would like to hear them. I would like to spell them out in the House and then I would like to hear other hon. members take part in that debate, each bring his own contribution. We have not had a debate on Churchill Falls. We have lashed out all the money. We will never get our money back from Churchill Falls. We will never get in dividends from the Upper Churchill nearly enough to service the debt which we incurred in buying the shares from Brinco. There has been some fancy footwork in the balance sheets but if anybody takes them, Your Honour, and tears them apart and looks at them realistically, the balance sheets put out by Hydro and by the government confirm that fact, we will not take in enough each year to pay for the shares which we purchased. And that is not counting the \$110 million that was wasted at Yankee Point and at Pointe Amour and the preposterous pretense that this administration had the Lower Churchill project ready to go.

We have not had a debate, Sir, on development policy. You know it has been going on - we have been thirty years in Confederation now. The Smallwood administration whatever its failings, and I am not here tonight to defend the Smallwood administration, I suspect, Sir, that history will be far kinder to the



June 6, 1978

Tape 4047

IB-4

MR. ROBERTS:

Smallwood administration than to the Moores administration.  
And that when they write history -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - the contributions of Mr. Smallwood,  
the gentleman with whom I have had some differences of  
opinion on occasion, some of them public and others not,  
but when they write history, the history of this Province,  
the contributions made by Mr. Smallwood will rank far  
and beyond that made by his successor as Premier of this  
Province.

But, Sir, the Smallwood -  
the axe is about to fall,

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Sir, and I am grateful to Your Honour for giving me a little premature notice so I could move my head out from under the block just before it falls. But, Mr. Speaker, the Smallwood administration had a strategy, had a policy. It had weaknesses, it may not have been perfect; certainly, looking back with all the wisdom of hindsight we can see weaknesses. There were some which were apparent at the time but, Sir, it served Newfoundland well and it served Newfoundland and Labrador far better than anything this Administration has because there is no policy. There is no strategy. There is no aim. There is no hope. There is no thought for the future. There is simply a fervent desire to cling to office and we are standing idly by watching while unemployment goes up. It is not even debated anymore, it has become a fact of our political life. People do not even bother anymore that 30,000 Newfoundlanders are today unemployed; 30,000 was the average for last year, it is more than that today. We do not worry about the fact that sixteen per cent of our total budget this year is going to service our debt, and we are still crying out we do not have nearly the social capital we need. We do not pay any heed to the fact that these figures show dramatically that in the job of developing the economy of this Province which, Mr. Speaker, is the chief job of the Government of this Province, running the administration of the Province can be best left to the Public Service. They are far better at it than ministers, far better at it than politicians by and large; politicians must supervise, politicians must be responsible and must be responsible to this House, but not to run departments. Ministers do not run departments; deputy ministers are the heads of departments. That is what our law says and it is right that it should say so.

The job of the Government of this Province, Mr. Speaker, is to develop the economy of this Province, is to make it work, is to provide jobs, is to use it to generate the funds that we need to get the social services which we need and which we deserve.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Sir, by this standard, this Administration has failed completely and utterly, and if I have a complaint at all with the amendment put down by my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Rowe) it is that, if anything, too mild, too restrained. It is not nearly harsh enough. It is not nearly as harsh as the verdict the people of this Province are going to render on this Administration just as soon as they get the opportunity.

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debates and the speeches made in this debate both on the amendment and on the Budget Speech, I must say the last speaker made the most effective speech in my view, if not 'the' most, one of the most. At least he talked in a commonsense way and some points they were critical because he cannot refrain from being critical. But the hon. gentleman was far different in his speech from his other colleagues and I would say that in listening to the speech yesterday from the man who is aspiring to become Premier of the Province, the position the last speaker had until a short while ago and lost, I sometimes in listening to the speeches in this House often wish that the last speaker was still in the position of being leader of that party -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: - because he shows a sense of responsibility towards his Province and I fail to understand the connivings that went on in the last Leadership Convention of that party to get rid of that hon. gentleman. Maybe it is because he is too responsible and straightforward in his views and too positive in his views. Because the last number of days, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely astounding to have to sit in this House and listen

MR. MORGAN: to the negative approach taken by the Opposition speakers in this debate. If the hon. gentleman who aspires to become the Government Leader, if he could only realize and recognize the damage he has been doing over the past number of weeks in particular, to his province, to our province. Yesterday, and Hansard will prove what I am saying, the statements he made were simply unbelievable coming from a responsible position. The hon. Leader of the Opposition just cannot sit in the House and take any kind of criticism. He has to leave when someone from this side stands to speak, who he knows is going to condemn what he is saying he runs away. But the hon. gentleman stood in his place yesterday, was carried and quoted accurately in the media, as saying that this Province was bankrupt, it was financially bankrupt. It was on the rocks. This province is on the rocks. The bond companies have lost confidence. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine, I am sure his colleagues all can vividly imagine what this means to our Province, to have a leader, one of our leaders, standing up and talking about our province in such a negative way. The bond companies who are going to loan us money have no confidence in Newfoundland, not in no confidence in the Newfoundland Government, no confidence in our province.

Now these kind of statements are doing untold damage to our Province. It is doing untold damage to the Province. Maybe if a backbencher on our side said this, or a backbencher on the Opposition side said this, it would not have near the effect. It definitely would not, probably no effect. But coming from a man who is leading a fairly large opposition, who is pushing and pressing and will take any ends to get into power, any measures, but a man who is aspiring to become Premier to take this kind of an irresponsible attitude, is unforgiveable, because he is hurting all of our Province. He is not hurting the Minister of Tourism, or the Minister of Fisheries, or the

MR. MORGAN: Minister of Energy, the Minister of Social Services, or any of us here. He is hurting our Province in these kinds of statements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this gentleman who stood in this House in these debates and has gotten involved in the slanderous, innuendo, vicious, personal attacks that we have seen, it surprised me that he would do that. Because I earlier said I used to sit in the gallery and listen to the same hon. gentleman when I was then a citizen of the Province, and not a member of the House, I listened very attentively to some of his debates and what he had to say. I do not know what it is that is happening to the official Opposition, the Liberal Party, but it seems that what did happen was the fact that the leadership convention was not won from the people's votes, the unfortunate fact is that the hon. gentleman who is now leader was third in a row, he was third, and the other two gentlemen who are now the official leaders, are running that same gentleman. They are controlling him.

MR. SIMMONS: The member for LaPoile -

MR. MORGAN: The people's choice was not the hon. gentleman.

MR. SIMMONS: And you do not realize it.

MR. MORGAN: But the hon. gentleman from Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), and the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), these two hon. gentlemen, apparently have such an influence in making the now present leader, leader of that party, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition feels he has an obligation to do what they want to do. And these two hon. gentlemen are well noted over the past number of years for personal, slanderous attacks, personal, slanderous attacks on individuals.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4049

NM - 3

MR. SIMONS: On a point of order now, Mr. Speaker. I really did not want to interrupt the gentleman because he has given us such a good performance. I mean I wanted to have this. So often I have wished this leadership convention could be re-run and now he is re-running it for us, and I did not really want to interrupt him. But, Mr. Speaker, when he says that I, and I am rising on my own behalf, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can speak for himself, when he says that I am known over the years for personal attacks, I think he is outside

MR. SIMMONS: the parliamentary grounds now and I would suggest that we can clear this up very simply by his just withdrawing the remark. He knows it is unparliamentary to say that I have been known over the years for personal attacks. Indeed, if he wants to pursue it I challenge him to indicate one personal attack that I have made on anybody - personal attack - I have certainly documented some wrongdoing.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I think it is a point of order. Mr. Speaker may not think so, but that is for him to decide. But the allegation that I have been engaged over the years in personal attacks, I think, Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary and needs to be withdrawn.

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) might be well known for what the Minister of Tourism says he is well known for, but I suggest to you that he is also well known for bringing up very specious, unsubstantiated points of order and this just happens to be another in the long list for which he has been soundly defeated in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It would appear to me the allegation of one hon. member toward another that he, the other, is well known for personal, slanderous attacks is to go beyond the limits of difference of opinion and is a type of remark which is better deleted from the high level of parliamentary discourse to which the House is supposed to aspire, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that allegation.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am in your hands. I withdraw any unparliamentary statements and the statements I have made unparliamentary I now withdraw.

MR. MORGAN: In continuing my speech I will say the hon. gentleman, in my opinion, has been well known for casting innuendo.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: In my opinion, he is well known for casting innuendo and his hon. colleague - somebody gets upset in the Opposition - and his hon. colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), both hon. gentlemen are well known for casting innuendoes and attacking individuals outside the House, attacking individuals inside the House in their debates -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - in my opinion. And I am disillusioned over the fact that the man who is aspiring to become Premier of the Province is listening to these hon. gentlemen so much, because there are many good people in the Opposition. I have held discussions with them over the last two or three years as a minister and I have found them good to deal with, honest type, true Newfoundlanders who will push for their districts and work with the minister to get things for their districts, and I am at a total loss to understand why the present Leader has fallen into the trap whereby the Liberal Party today is known as a party which is involved in trying to dig up things, trying to find scandal, trying to cast innuendo at individuals, at families, at members of the House, instead of getting down to the basic issues and the basic problems we have in our Province. Wherever I travel in this Province, Mr. Speaker, the people known as Liberals, known as Liberal Party supporters have said to me in dozens over the past number of months, the past two months in particular, that the Opposition Leader unfortunately was placed in this position by two gentlemen -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)



MR. MORGAN: and the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), and he is being controlled by these two hon. gentlemen. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the main reason, I assume, for the kinds of debates and the kinds of comments we have heard from the last two or three speakers with regard to the position of our Province. Because if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition felt there was something that could be done about our problems why can he not put forward constructive criticisms, put forward constructive viewpoints, put forward suggestions? But instead of that he gets up and says we are financially bankrupt, we are on the rocks.

I think a statement picked up by the Canadian Press -

Mr. Speaker, if I could have protection from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman wishes to speak without interruption and I must require hon. members to abide by that.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe that is the reason for these damaging statements to our Province.

The kind of attack that I saw a few weeks ago was unbelievable. I was driving somewhere in Central Newfoundland. It was the morning that the Opposition members were expelled from the House - quite a few were named, had to leave the House - and I have confidence in one hon. gentleman from the Opposition whom I have dealt with - he is a good friend of mine and I know his constituents respect him and he does a good job. And coming to him that morning, I know he was caught

Mr. Morgan:

in a trap as well, I noticed he has not done it since, the hon. gentleman for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) stood that Friday morning and listened to the guidance from some of his colleagues in the gallery, but you were not able to sit in the House, got up and slandered a civil servant in the person of Mr. Ted Piercey, Director of Air Services. And I say, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it was slander because the headline story the next day was that that same hon. gentleman was carrying a tape recorder taping the conversations of ministers and shortly after that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It appears to me that the term 'slandered' is better avoided. There are obvious synonyms, but slander has the implication of, well, criminality.

MR. MORGAN: Okay, Mr. Speaker, the word 'slander' I again withdraw. Did a very serious injustice, a very serious injustice to the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: He can sit in his seat the same as I can.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wait until he comes.

MR. MORGAN: Did a very serious injustice, if I recall the innuendo in his questioning which he was being guided and coached from some members of the Opposition who were then outside of the House that -

AN HON. MEMBER: .... good friends.

MR. MORGAN: - the hon. gentleman - well I am stating the facts, and the facts speak for themselves. The hon. gentleman was caught in an innuendoing way asking questions of my colleague, the Minister of Transportation, Is it true that the Director of Air Services carries a tape recorder and tapes the conversations of all the ministers when he is talking to them in a very dectective likeway, taping all of the conversations? That was the questioning that was put forward

Mr. Morgan: in this House. It is unanswered to - we can all see it and proof is there. And the next day, of course, the press carried the story, and carried it adequately and accurately. And the headline was The Director Of Air Services Taping Conversations Of The Ministers, something along that line, I forget the exact headline.

And the hon. gentleman they were talking about was down somewhere on a vacation. Now I am using this as an example, how this hon. gentleman is a very honourable gentleman for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) who never gets involved in this kind of thing because his colleagues who normally do this kind of thing outside of the House he was coaching him outside of the House and he got involved, and got him caught in a trap. And I am using it as an example to say that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been caught in the same trap as well, and it is unfortunate. It is unfortunate. He is caught in a trap in getting involved in this kind of debate, this kind of casting of innuendo on members of the House and on civil servants, on individuals, even on families.

The hon. gentleman as he indicated this afternoon cannot take it. He can give it for eighteen hours, and there are many sections of Hansard I have clipped out and taken out which I have not time to go into because I only have forty-five minutes. We got involved in innuendo as well, casting innuendo. That is the whole problem, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Opposition feel they have every right to get up in the House and cast innuendo, and say there is a scandal here, and a scandal there, and a scandal somewhere else, and I want an inquiry, I want a police investigation. When it comes time that they pointed what they are doing is wrong, the heat in the kitchen gets too hot for them and they leave.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say it is unfortunate. I do not want to get involved in retaliating in this kind of a debate, but we have to defend and the defense is what I am putting forward, which I think is totally wrong, and should not be continued in the future. I am sure there are many of my good friends in the Opposition will agree

Mr. Morgan: with what I am saying, whether they will say so or not that is entirely up to themselves.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we are in challenging times in this country, not just in this Province. Back when we saw the spiralling inflation across the nation measures had to be taken by the federal government to control inflation, and these measures that were taken by the federal government has had a very serious effect on the Atlantic Region, not just Newfoundland, a very serious effect on the Atlantic Region of our country. And nobody is going to believe any politician who go out in any part of this country today and say that the unemployment is totally the problem of Frank Moores and his government. It is totally the responsibility of the Newfoundland Administration. They are not going to believe them. That is being done. But the fact is in 1975 the unemployment figure for all of Canada was around 620,000, if I recall that is the correct figure, around that in 1975, the early part of 1975, across the country of Canada. What do we

MR. MORGAN:

have today? A little over one million, the last figure, since 1975. A little more than one million the last figure, well give or take a few, but it is around the million mark but it was over one million no longer than a month and a half ago. Over one million people unemployed in the country of Canada. So nobody is going to believe that suddenly because the P.C. Government is in power in Newfoundland that unemployment is going to spiral upward because the Newfoundland Government is not taking the right direction, the right policy. It is because we are hurting, the economy is hurting all throughout North America, in fact, and we are definitely hurting here because we are bearing the brunt of something we did not cause, we did not cause inflation, there is no way the Atlantic Region caused inflation. We did not, we had no part of causing inflation. But because of the effect inflation was having in the country the Federal Government had no alternative but to take steps to halt and control inflation and these steps are hurting the economy of the region of the country we live in and the only way that we can recover the economy, of course is to do what we can from a public sector and to create the environment for private sector to invest the necessary funds required to stimulate industry, stimulate investment, and we have to create that kind of environment. We are not going to create that kind of environment by making comments saying the province is bankrupt and the bond companies have no confidence in the province. That is not going to attract industry, that is not going to attract investment. The hon. members in the Opposition are going to any end and any means to get in power and in this case, of course, they are blaming all the problems we have in the economy on the present government. We know there are problems in the economy, we know that, but let me ask the members of the House of Assembly a question. I have yet to see a petition come before this House any time for water and sewer, number one; for paving roads, number two, or for any other infrastructure

MR. MORGAN: need in this province. Basic services, if you want to call it that, what members of the Opposition got up and supported to the hilt, supported fully to the hilt. We demand this, we want this, we demand it be done. Who is going to do it? We are bankrupt. You want the taxes cut down on one end. I heard the Opposition a little while ago saying taxes be reduced, one was school taxes of course which was used in the last two elections.

HON. MEMBER: Abolish them.

MR. MORGAN: Cut down, abolish totally school taxes, reduce taxes. We want water and sewer, we want roads, we want this and we want that and the policy of the Liberal Government if they got in power would be spend, spend, spend, borrow, borrow, borrow. Yet they get up and say we are bankrupt, totally bankrupt. The former Opposition leader, I recall his speech made in the House before the convention where he got scuttled. He said, and I recall and Hansard could also prove this as well, "Spend, spend, spend. Give the people their services, go out and borrow, borrow but do not increase the taxes." Now is that a good financial planning scheme for this province? Is that a good financial scheme? Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is very deceptive on the part of the Opposition to be talking tongue and cheek of that matter. Who is going to supply the services unless it is going to be the taxpayers through their tax dollars being sent in. They have to pay for these services and only they will supply these services. So what is the aim of the Opposition in putting forward a debate. I listened carefully to the eighteen hour speech made by the hon. gentleman from Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), I sat in the House practically every hour through the speech and I listened. I heard a few suggestions on tourism, I must admit that, which were sensible or the suggestions with regard to crown land applications, minor things which were sensible and a few other things. I give credit where credit is due, he

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4052

CW - 3

MR. MORGAN: made a few good points on these matters but the remaining seventeen and one half hours that he spoke he said absolutely nothing. There was not one concrete suggestion came forward from him as the official financial spokesman in the Opposition.

HON. MEMBER: Your alternatives for financing -

MR. MORGAN: Any alternative to what problems we have, and we have problems here in Newfoundland, we have problems in Nova Scotia, we have problems in P.E.I., these governments will all tell you they are in the same strife as the Opposition leader.

MR. PECKFORD: Sure he almost put the Green Bay Integrated School Board bankrupt. So what does he know about plans?

MR. MORGAN: Oh Bay d'Espoir, oh yes we all know that, the teachers kicked them out.

HON. MEMBER: Another big charge through the door now.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman should sit in the House and listen to what is going on so he might be able to defend himself. So, Mr. Speaker, we have got a choice, and we had a choice and we have a choice now. The unfortunate thing in depending on the

MR. MORGAN: private sector. If we have to depend on the private sector the industry people to invest, I would say to invest in Newfoundland to invest in this region. We are going to have to do an awful lot of selling, we are going to have to be tremendous salesmen as individuals, as government, as politicians, members of the House because Canadians are not known to invest in their own country of Canada let alone this part of the country. But we have to create and show the leadership and create the environment for the private sector to invest. The bank people over the past number of months, by reducing the interest, have shown some kind of an incentive not sufficient to attract any major investment. Some expansions are taking place but not enough. The second is that we must as a province direct our financial resources we have towards the development of our primary resources, the fisheries, the sawmilling, tourism, energy. We just cannot go out as the Opposition is asking for, go out and keep on spending and supplying of services. I heard a couple of speeches being made in this session of the House and an Opposition member saying: "Well, create jobs, go out and create jobs, make some work programs, install water supply systems, pave more roads, build more buildings." I would rather, and I am sure the people of Bonavista South would rather as well, sacrifice a few years and wait for some paved roads or some water and sewer in some of their towns where they want water and sewer if they knew that the money was being diverted for the purpose of creating jobs in the future, permanent jobs. That is exactly what is being done but if the Opposition Party ever got into power, and if they carried on their present policy which has been made known in the House and hopefully one of these days we will have television coverage in this House and if only the people could see what the Opposition people are saying in the House. I am sure they are not saying it out in rural Newfoundland, they are not saying it to the business community. Only yesterday the Leader of the



MR. MORGAN: Opposition said: "Why, why help the corporations. They do not need any help in this province," carried in the media. Only yesterday, infact yesterday evening, I was talking to a number of prominent business men around the province who are attending the Atlantic Provinces Chamber of Commerce and numærous comment was made to me: "Is this what the Opposition is standing for, they are against business, they are against free enterprise, they do not want that?" That is the interpretation. Do not do anything to help the business community. Why? The Opposition Minister stood up and condemned the fact that we have reduced the taxes for the corporations. How are we going to get investment in this country if we do not show some kind of a favorable environment for the companies to come and invest. How are we going to do it?

HON. MEMBER: Federal make work program.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation that we find ourselves in and its very challenging times and challenging times I have always found when times would get hard and times get difficult you get more spirit of cooperation among each other. When I grew up around the bay in a little fishing community, when times were hard everybody chipped in and helped out. Not in this case, Mr. Speaker, because when times get hard throughout the country and times get hard in this province the Opposition feels it is the oppertune time to jump and stamp on the government because they are to blame, it is not the policy of the federal government. The fact that the Opposition leader and the Opposition Party has so much doom and gloom for our province, fortunately and I say sincerely very fortunately, is

MR. MORGAN:

not being shared by the Federal Liberal Party and the Federal Liberal Party is now in power. Because just last year, in 1977 despite the doom and gloom, despite the no future for our Province put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, despite the fact that we are on the rocks, despite the fact that we are bankrupt financially, despite all these things, DREE a department which is recognizing the regional disparities of our country of Canada last year in 1977 approved forty-one applications for DREE assistance and business incentives in this Province, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador - not in the Atlantic region but in this Province. That is Federal Liberal policy completely different from the Provincial Liberal policy. There is no future for the Province in their eyes but this was equal to a sixty-four per cent increase. Mr. Speaker, listen to this, DREE in 1977 increased the assistance to the business community in this Province by sixty-four per cent in 1977 over 1976. They approved forty-one applications. They only approved twenty-five in 1976. Now that is not lack of confidence. That is not a negative attitude. I would say it is the very opposite. A confident in our Province, a confident in this government and a positive attitude toward the future because they are assisting in the business sector of our community and that is the kind of thing that has to be done in the future. Federal Government Policies recognizing the needs of certain regions of our country and in this case they are recognizing the needs of Newfoundland. Despite all this propaganda which is being spread by the Liberal Opposition Party across the Province, despite all this negative attitude the fact is that only yesterday the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council which is a fairly important body in the Atlantic region publically said that tourism was one of the best potential economy developers in the Atlantic region and primarily in Newfoundland. Now that is the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council in a statement to all the media.

When the hon. gentleman finds his picture in the paper there now maybe I can get on with my speech.

MR. DOODY:

I was looking for yours.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that is the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council consisting of four provinces. Two of them the same stripe as the Opposition party and yet I listened today when the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) stood up in the House and said "Abolish the Department of Tourism." That is what he said, abolish the Department of Tourism, make it a division of the Department of Transportation and give everybody who comes across the Gulf, when he gets across the ferry and lands on the wharf at the terminal in Port aux Basques, give them a little cash donation and say, "Welcome to the Province." Give them a cash donation from the Newfoundland government. How idiotic. That is the kind of policies if the Liberal party ever got in power, that is the kind of policies we are talking about because they are talking about policies they would implement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Over there handing out cheques.

MR. MORGAN: Hand out cheques when he crosses the Gulf. Give him some money and let him have a good time. Let him go to a tavern and buy a few rounds of beer. My good Lord what a policy! And at the same time this is being said here is the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council saying the only bright star in the future of the economy in the Atlantic regions is tourism and the biggest potential was in Newfoundland. But the Opposition party wants the department abolished. It is a waste of money and a waste of time and there should be no policy direction by having a Department of Tourism.

Well I will leave it at that because I think it is so idiotic to talk about these things because the fact is the Liberal party has got no policies, they have no ideas, they have no positive ideas. Everything is negative, negative, tear down, destroy, attack, attack, irrespective of what damage it does to individuals or to the individuals in government or outside of government, tear down, tear down, attack. The last

MR. MORGAN: speaker said that we were, I think he mentioned something we would do anything to stay in power. We were a poor, dumb, stupid bunch of men.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. MORGAN: The hon. member for the Straits of Bell Isle (Mr. Roberts) said we are poor, we are dumb, and we are stupid, and we will do anything to stay in office.

MR. DOODY: He is right about the first part of it.

MR. MORGAN: We are all poor. I do not dare face my bank manager these days. And we would do anything to stay in office. He does not mention the fact that his colleague, and two or three of his colleagues, LaPoile M.H.A. (Mr. Neary), Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir M.H.A. (Mr. Simmons), and the Leader of the Opposition, these three in particular, they have given a clear indication to the public of this Province they will stop at nothing to get in power. That is the impression left by the Liberals, all the Liberals, the workers and supporters and the troops, the Liberal Party throughout the Province. There are many of them in my district, and throughout other districts I have talked to. These three gentlemen will do anything to get in power. Anything. Stop at no end.

You know, I talked to a gentleman a few days ago and he said, "You know, the hon. Leader of the Opposition went to Paris to speak French, and he came back from Paris and nobody has heard him speak a word of French since he came back."

AN HON. MEMBER: I did. Yes.

MR. MORGAN: And I understand he can say, "Comme c'est va," and a few phrases like that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take it easy now.

MR. MORGAN: A few of these things.

AN HON. MEMBER: You lost me long ago.

MR. MORGAN: I learned more French in two weeks in Montreal than he learned in a full year in Paris. He went to Paris to learn French. Maybe it is to have a good image, to come back to Newfoundland a great saviour and he sails along the Coast of Newfoundland in his great white yacht and he comes in the great saviour, here to save the people of all their problems.

MR. PECKFORD: Right from the Eiffel Tower.

MR. MORGAN: Right from the Eiffel Tower. But he gets waylaid and he is waylaid by the fact that he did not win the leadership in the proper way without the support of two of his colleagues and now he is destroying his own party. He is not destroying this government. I would say the only way that he could destroy this government, and if I was sitting in his position, and I am surprised because his hon. - well I should not say hon. brother, but his hon. friend who is his brother, the hon. member for Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe).

MR. DOODY: His hon. brother who is his friend.

MR. MORGAN: I have listened to his speeches and he has always had some good suggestions and positive ideas, that is the reason why I have not lumped him into these three, always good speeches and good ideas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: The only thing is he is the official -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - spokesman for fisheries in the Opposition and the fisheries I would say is a major, major aspect of the economy of this Province. It has a bright future as well as I mentioned tourism. And my hon. colleague who sits behind me said to me yesterday, he says, "You know all of these questions about the air services and water bombers and about Mr. Ted Piercey and about somebody else and about the budworm and everything else," he says, "there is never a question asked about fisheries."

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4055

NM - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Never a question about fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

No interest in fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

No interest in fisheries. I think the hon. member for Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) spoke for - well he did speak for eighteen hours, if he said five sentences about the fisheries I can speak all night, and I know I cannot speak all night.

MR. W. CARTER:

I am going to have to - on this side 'Jim'.

MR. MORGAN:

My hon. colleague said, "Well maybe get some of our backbenchers to ask me a few questions about what is going on in the fisheries, the Opposition Party do not care what is happening to the fisheries. Do not bother to ask. They do not care."

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is no good to ask.

MR. MORGAN:

One hon. member in the Opposition, from St. George's (Mrs. McIssac), the hon. member spoke about the fishery problems in the district, the only one so far. I am counting on listening to the hon. member from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) because he is knowledgeable on the fisheries, because I am sure that he can put forward some points on the fisheries. He is involved in the fisheries.

But all we have heard, and I spoke a few days ago to a group of people somewhere in the Province and I mentioned that one gentleman had spoken for eighteen hours in the House in the Budget Debate and they said, "What did he say?" I said, "Well, did you read the press? Did you listen to the media? What did he say?"

MR. MORGAN: "I do not know what he said." I do not know what he said! Eighteen hours! At the same time I am sure there are some good points we brought forward by members in the Opposition, the backbenchers, in fact, about fisheries, and farming, and agriculture or forestry, sawmilling etc., they have not had a chance really.

AN HON. MEMBER: Terrible.

MR. MORGAN: They have not had a chance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not tourism.

MR. MORGAN: They have not had a chance to do it.

And that is unfortunate because all we have heard is the kind of attacks we have been seeing over the past two or three days. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that despite the attitude of the Opposition Party that we are not going to be fell swooped by this kind of attack on us trying to find scandal where scandal does not exist, casting dirty innuendo, whether it be about the use of helicopters, which was brought up once again to me, which was totally untrue, and other things. These kind of things are not going to cause the fall of this government, because we believe that we have the right policies for this Province, and its policies will be sold to the people. And unless the Liberal Party can sell their policies, and it has no policy, they have none.

AN HON. MEMBER: Says who?

MR. MORGAN: What is the policy in Rural Development?

I mentioned this in an earlier speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Zero.

MR. MORGAN: Do you believe in rural development or resettlement? What is the policy?

AN HON. MEMBER: Zero.

MR. DOODY: Burn your barges!

MR. MORGAN: Do you believe in saving the forest of our Province? Or do you believe in having them destroyed by the budworm?

AN HON. MEMBER: Zero.

MR. MORGAN: What is the policy there? What is the policy in the offshore resources? The hon. Leader of the Opposition stood up and

MR. MORGAN: said, "Oh if only the government negotiate with Ottawa." Why does he not say, "If only Ottawa could negotiate with us about the offshore resources".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Or does he - of course, naturally he would want us to go up and bend to Mr. Trudeau and his ministers and say, "Yes, Mr. Minister, yes, Mr. Prime Minister, whatever you want from Newfoundland we will give you. And we will bend to the companies in their wishes in regards to regulations." What are the policies? These are the questions I am not going to ask the next election. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, they are going to be asked by electorates of this Province. And there are no answers. And there are no answers now.

The only answer that will be put forward is their attempt to destroy this government by attempting to create scandal where scandal does not exist. Now I have nothing against bringing out things which in regards to wrong spending. If the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can find some wrong spending or you can use a term in this, I think, this resolution 'misuse' I will agree with him totally.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many -

MR. MORGAN: If he can find any misuse, but do not cast any innuendo or make charges unless he can prove the charge that he is making. And the unfortunate thing is that these charges are made in the House and they have not got to be backed up because we are all immune to any kind of a court case, or anything of that nature, any action against us all as individuals, and we can say what we want. But if statements can be made -

MR. NEARY: What about A. B. Walsh?

MR. MORGAN: Well I am not going to comment on that. All I know is that the hon. gentleman referred to owns a company, I understand there is a court case. That is all I am going to say. And if there is any wrongdoing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



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

MR. MORGAN: Now I have five minutes left, so let me finish my speech without interruption.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MORGAN: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget Speech we talked about the financial matters of the Province. I listened very carefully to what my colleague for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) had to say, I think, it was very important. He follows and scrutinizes the financial affairs of the Province. I was hoping to hear the same thing from the official spokesman who spoke for eighteen hours. I did not hear it. I heard some good concrete statements from the member for the Straits (Mr. Roberts) and I admit he made some good points. I listened attentively to his speech. And I would say that irrespective of our party affiliation irrespective of what we are that we should not destroy our Province for the sake of our party, what we believe in our party. We should not destroy our Province because we want to get into power or we want to stay in power. If I felt that is was following a policy of government which was detrimental to this Province I would not want to stay in power. Why would we want to remain as a Cabinet minister and part of a government that was taking policies which were detrimental to the Province? Why would I? Why should I? I would not. I would not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: And what I am saying is, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the statements being made by the Opposition not statements because they are put forward as policy viewpoints when they are coming from a man who is the head of that party, is indeed doing damage, and I will close out tonight by saying it has done severe damage over the past few days to this Province, because the fact is we are not bankrupt. We are not bankrupt in ideas, we are not bankrupt regards to policies to put forward to develop this Province, we are not bankrupt financially.

Mr. Morgan: Now if the hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and said, Look the government is bankrupt in ideas, and they are bankrupt in views, they are bankrupt in policy, they are bankrupt in suggestions. We did not say that. Attack us the party, but not the Province. And it is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition did, he hurt the Province by saying, "The Province is on the rocks. She is smasked to smithereens.

MR MORGAN: The bond companies will have no more confidence in this Province." He was not attacking the Premier and the Premier's government, he was attacking his own Province, he was doing severe damage to this Province. Suppose tomorrow or next year if the same hon. gentleman got into power, a year and a half from now an election were called and he happened to become the Premier, and he went out on a bond market to borrow money for a special purpose - it could be to put in water and sewer and build roads which he says he is going to do, pave all the roads and put in all the water and sewer: I do not know who is going to pay for it - he says he is going to do it, abolish school taxes and all these kinds of things - and he could not raise money in a bond market. I would say. Mr. Speaker, one main reason why he would not be able to do it would be because his policies and his views now being put forward would come back to haunt him and he would realize then instead of doing damage to us to try to get into power that what he has done is damaged this Province. And that is unfortunate, because we are determined. I firmly believe in the future of this Province, a great future, a bright future. We have the potential and we are going to develop as a Province, and one of these proud years, Mr. Speaker, we are going to stand proud, and I say 'stand proud' - that is my attitude - stand proud in this great Confederation of Canada.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) The hon. the member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, in the three years I have been in this House I have on almost all occasions gone in for serious debate. I have done my share of putting forward good points, positive ideas, argued, debated with

MR. STRACHAN: the Minister of Mines and Energy. I have enjoyed it very much sometimes. Only recently, a few weeks ago, I spent two and one-half days debating the Mineral Impost bill for which we got very little media coverage, but regardless of that we debated it. But somehow or other just because the government members opposite wish us to be good boys we must always come forward with positive ideas and be good, nice, clean gentlemen - stand up and debate with good points and then leave this House - that we should follow that course.

I feel that within this House, around the precincts of this House, there are two different sets of ideas. There is a set of ideas espoused politically within this House, and what I find is a great deal of political hypocrisy is that outside of the House the very members who are standing debating and defending a certain position outside of the House, acknowledge to us that they do not agree with it. There is a fiasco that is disgusting. It is terrible. That Dobbin affair was terrible, disgusting. Yet they can stand in their seats opposite and vote to kick us out of the House at the same time as they stand in here talking that way and outside telling us it is disgusting, it is terrible.

MR. NEARY: Kick us out without an investigation.

MR. STRACHAN: It is political hypocrisy.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Of the worst order.

MR. STRACHAN: When we see people talking about various situations, when we see ministers and members opposite, for instance, defending today like monkeys or seals, clapping and defending a director of Air Services who did tell us outside of this House in the precincts that he has for years been short-circuiting them, that he has gone past then, that he cannot be fired, that when his car was taken away from him once it was given back to him

June 6, 1978

Tape 4057 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. STRACHAN: again by short-circuiting the minister and the department.

MR. NEARY: Now!

MR. W. N. ROWE: How about that?

MR. STRACHAN: When we see the same kind of situation -

MR. NEARY: He was fired once was he not?

MR. STRACHAN: - when he was fired once by his department, by his divisional head, short-circuited the department and through political pressure was appointed again -

MRS. McISAAC: Yes?

MR. STRACHAN: - and we are told that we are wrong to be criticizing this kind of behaviour, that to me, Sir, is political hypocrisy -

AN HON. MEMBER: True.

MR. STRACHAN: - when we find good friends of mine who know him well, good friends. EPA pilots who know full well he has been dictating for years, that he has no page boy, when his own staff tell us that he has never been on call - never been on call-

MR. W. N. ROWE: Do you hear that? Never.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4058(Night)

AH-1

MR. STRACHAN: and we hear this kind of a weak defence.

MR. ROUSSEAU: He is always on call.

MR. STRACHAN: He has never been on call. In the last four years he has not been on call and we know.

MR. MORGAN: He was on call the two years I was a minister, three or four years.

MR. DOODY: He was not.

MR. STRACHAN: And we see the same man flying a helicopter for another company belonging to a friend of the Premiers. And we see a relationship between that man as Director of Air Services giving hours or allocating extra hours or overruns as in the past. Degrading himself by flying a helicopter belonging to a friend of the Premier and also involved in a company who is dealing with government. We are wrong then in bringing up that in this House?

MR. NEARY: No we are not allowed to do that.

MR. STRACHAN: That our credibility is wrong, like the member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) said today. Our credibility is wrong for bringing up questions like that. When we see a Canso water bomber deal in which we believe and we hope to have proof but in dealing with the people we have been talking to we feel absolutely that we have proof that a half million dollars has been ripped off. When we stand up and ask that question here in this House then it is our credibility that is questioned.

CAPT. WINSOR: Decorum and dignity of the House.

MR. STRACHAN: Because a company was jammed in the middle the minister today, the Minister of Forestry states quite clearly that the government found two Canso water bombers. Who found the Canso water bombers? Was it government? Was it at government expense? If the government found them why did the government not buy them for \$110,000? Austin Airways, the company who owned them, and the other one, Felician Airways could have sold them to us for that price instead of \$535,000 with Field Aviation jammed in the middle.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. W. ROWE:

For no purpose.

MR. STRACHAN:

For no purpose whatsoever. And it is our credibility because we are asking questions like that? When we witnessed the terrible scene that night which decided me that I was going to finish on some of the lines that I have been taking, the terrible scene of a friend of the Premiers outside of this House trying to intimidate member inside this House.

MR. W. ROWE:

Dictating to the Premier.

MR. STRACHAN:

And we had to listen to the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who resigned from Cabinet because of a suggested building that is not there in Wedgewood Park, who quit over building rental in Wedgewood Park and then stands up and tells us that we are totally wrong because the agreement is only in principle, it is only a signature in principle, that we are totally wrong, and says the opposite outside of the House. That to me is political hypocrisy. There cannot be two sides to us. We must surely have some principles in which what we say here is what we believe in. We cannot always be propped up because that is what we are told to be as a party line. If we cannot say anything, if it is against our principles, it is better to shut up. If one wants to be silent - and I do not even agree with this, this business of being silent in situations like that. And we are attacked, we are attacked for questioning about a fire on Signal Hill. I do not know the family involved at all. I have not a clue. I have never met them. I do not know anything about the St. John's circuit whatsoever. I live the furthest away from St. John's. But to me there is a relationship when an affidavit is filed here and a few hours later there is a fire in the department of the Minister of Industrial Development, a minister of this government. He is a very likable man, I like him a great deal but he is still a minister of government. We must separate the man and his personality and a wonderful personality he has. I could be very great friends with him but he is still the minister of the government and we therefore have the right and should have the right to keep questioning. Question the Minister of Justice.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4058 (Night)

AH-3

MR. W. ROWE:

We have an obligation.

MR. STRACHAN:

Absolutely. We have an obligation to keep questioning and we feel that we have an obligation to keep questioning and we feel that in many cases, many cases that much of what we bring out or what has been brought out or what has happened, we feel that whether it is correct or not, whether our feeling is correct or not, we feel that much of it is hidden. We feel that. We do not feel that these charges will ever come out or that the air will ever be cleared and the only way to clear all this is to clear the air publically as quickly as possible, quickly. Not to drag it out and hope that the House will close and somewhere in the middle of the Summer holidays this will all be lost in the wind. What we are asking is that a situation like that should be investigated with haste because of the importance of the situation.

MR. NEARY:

And the reports not controlled.

MR. STRACHAN:

Given quickly so that we know exactly what is happening. When we see a member of our caucus has a search warrant against him, signed against him with the charge being that \$5,000 has been extorted from government and the minister in the House -

MR. NEARY:

You are not the boss.

MR. STRACHAN:

- the Minister of Transportation  
and



MR. STRACHAN: I would not like to have my house searched, or my office searched and papers taken from me, and two, three, four years down the road, not have the papers returned to me, but never charged either. Charge me or give me back my belongings.

MR. FLIGHT: Persecution.

MR. STRACHAN: And we believe, we believe absolutely, that it is wrong. And we believe we have to and we have an obligation to, to expose these kind of things.

I do not like it. I would much prefer to deal with the Mineral Impost Bill, hydro situations, oil and gas policies. We have great problems in Labrador, great problems in Labrador I would much prefer to deal with. I am not naturally a nasty person who likes to go into these kind of things but when we sit and watch the situations arise we have no choice but to question, when we see members opposite in small affairs and the government buildings, the \$20 million possible rip off there, it is a small affair but it is a very great deal of money, but when we see that kind of attitude that someone can defend that, defend that, then we wonder what is going to happen in the bigger issues of the Province when it comes to things like Brinco takeover, in which many members opposite believe it was a wrong deal, when the Gull Island situation in the last election was a fiasco. These are all words used by members opposite to me outside the Chamber. And yet when they come into the Chamber it is the very opposite they say.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two faces.

MR. STRACHAN: We cannot continue to have in politics two faces. Surely we must come into the Chamber and believe in what we are saying and believe in what we are doing. Otherwise we do not belong in here.

I believe that over the last few days, that the government have taken a great deal of beating from us on this kind of situation. In fact it reminds me in a lighter vein

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4059

NM - 3

MR. STRACHAN: of being in Labrador where goose hunting in the Fall and by the ponds, when the geese come in the black ducks come later. But because of the quick darkness one very seldom gets black ducks. And they are very good eating, better than geese. So what we do is we kill them in the Spring, which is illegal, according to this Province, I have done it, often a time, and we kill them illegally in the Spring. But the amazing thing about black ducks is it is like the government, they are like black ducks, because when the boat arrives and you drive your boat and you see the ducks in the water, they scurry ashore on the beach and up into the low willows and bushes and they squat down and you can virtually stand in them before they ever move. They never lift a head. Because the first one it knows, lifts its head is dead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: In the last few days the government is reminding me of black ducks in the bushes. And now all of a sudden, tonight and today, some of them have

MR. STRACHAN:

started to lift their heads, lift their heads a little bit. And the trouble with lifting your heads is if you get a 22 in the head.

MR. W. N. ROWE: 'Ray Winsor' found that out.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a right and I hope for the sake of this House and for the sake of this Province and the sake of political parties involved that answers to many of the questions raised here can be done quickly. Get the investigations over.

We were thrown out of this House because of the so-called Dobbin affair because the government opposite split hairs, it was in an agreement in principle, the building is not there. So if the building is not there what are you arguing about? Now if the building was there then you would have a case, but the building is not there so you have no case, and we were thrown out of the House.

MR. NEARY: Without an investigation.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Agreements signed by the Premier.

MR. STRACHAN: But there was no investigation into it, and it will hang over your heads.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Forever.

MR. STRACHAN: Your defeat is in the House. That is understandable.

MR. NEARY: Brute force.

MR. STRACHAN: But it will hang over your heads. The question mark will always be there. The question marks will always be there because it was never the committee which we asked for to investigate it, to clear the air one way or the other was never set up.

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

MR. STRACHAN: And it will hang over your heads.

The as another situation, and the situations with the fires will also hang over your heads unless the situation is cleared quickly. The relationship between an affidavit and a few hours later

Mr. Strachan: a fire in a minister's apartment, and a few hours later another fire of number four on a list for being awarded contracts in Public Works, the relationship is too quick, too soon and too close. There should have been an immediate investigation. A quick one. And let the chips fall where they will, but clear it, finish it. I believe that all you are doing by continuing a stonewall or becoming like black ducks, and not lift your heads, and hope that it will all go away, all you will do is leave it, it will remain over your heads, hang over your heads and that is no way surely that this House can continue to function or a government can continue to function. And we will keep digging, and we will keep pushing, and keep going until we can clear that air. It is our duty, our duty to continue doing that, and we will do it.

I would much rather spend my time reading about offshore oil and gas. I would much more spend my time than looking at Canso water bombers and finding out the companies they came from and discussing it with some pilots and finding out the situation, and finding out that the engines are only twenty hours left in them, and forty hours left in another one, and eighty hours at the most, and the government is going to have to spend on top of the \$1.2 million already spent another \$35,000 for engines because the planes are finished.

AN HON. MEMBER: How old are they?

MR. STRACHAN: For planes twenty-six years old. Twenty-six year old planes, \$1.2 million.

MR. NEARY: No, no, they are older than that. 1942.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Gee, thirty-six years old.

MR. STRACHAN: Thirty-six years old.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty-six years.

MR. STRACHAN: Thirty-six year old planes, \$1.2 million.

MR. F. ROWE: That is almost as old as -

MRS. MCISAAC: Why did the government buy them?

MR. STRACHAN: And you are saying we are wrong to investigate that? I cannot understand it, why our credibility should be questioned.

MR. F. ROWE: It is almost as old as the Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: I would not want to be the pilot to take one of them up I will tell you.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that what we have done in recent weeks, I have not particularly enjoyed.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is not the way I heard it.

MR. STRACHAN: I do not believe that some of the members in our caucus here have enjoyed it. I know many members it is not their cup of tea. It is not the kind of thing that they want to be involved in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: But it has to be done.

MR. STRACHAN: But it has to be done. Because as long as we got a Canso there the surgery must be carried out.

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

MR. STRACHAN: And we believe that there are somethings wrong here, some major faults wrong here, and we also believe in these ones of which we can see, and very few we can see, these ones we can see, that if we believe there are coverups or if they are sitting on things or if there is political double talk on these kind of things, there are excuses, then we wonder how the greater things of the Province is being run.

And it is our duty, our duty as members as an Opposition, sometimes not to be good boys,

MR. NEARY: It is an awesome task sometimes.

MR. STRACHAN: Sometimes we have to decide that we are going to dug into some situations.

MR. SIMMONS: Even if we are slandered by the member for Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor) for personal abuse or slander.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: A smear artist.

June 6, 1978

Tape 4060 (Night)

PK - 4

MR. STRACHAN: I was surprised by the member for Mount Scio, but he has his job to do over there as government, but I was amazed that he would defend -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Stoop that low -

MR. STRACHAN: - some of the situations.

MR. NEARY: Lower the dignity and decorum of the House. How is he going to explain that in caucus. I thought it was -

MR. STRACHAN: Especially the credibility. I can understand that if he is very good friends with a family, that he could see that we are questioning that family, or we are questioning the relations of that group of people. But that does not mean to say that because a fire has occurred after another fire, with some kind of relationship with it, that we cannot question that as a member of the Opposition. It is our duty. We have to.

MR. SIMONS: He did not refer to the family. He just referred to -

MR. STRACHAN: We have to. To me it is very bad taste to question the Minister of Industrial Development because I like the gentleman. I think he is a wonderful gentleman. But I have to separate his function as a wonderful gentleman, and a good friend, he could be a very good friend. I could enjoy going out at night and have a few drinks with the gentleman and sit and talk, very easily. But he is also a minister of government and I must therefore attack him as a minister of government. It is like being brought up by, he was brought up playing a great deal of rugby and you went in on the field and you kicked hell out of the people opposite and then when you are all finished with your bruises you went and had a pint of beer.

In many cases that is the way it is here, that I can attack the Minister of Industrial Development, or the Minister of this, or the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who I think let himself down badly in his defence of Mr. Dobbin, when he resigned in 1975 for the same reasons, for less reason, less reason of what you are defending. And so I believe that we have a duty, hopefully as quickly as possible it will all be over, that somehow

MR. STRACHAN: the situation will fall in place, the enquiries will put it in place. Charges will be laid or no charges will be laid. Investigations will be carried out. And we believe it is our duty as an opposition. It is our duty as an Opposition -

MR. NEARY: That they will all take the lie detector test.

MR. STRACHAN: - to bring up these kind of situations.

MR. NEARY: Take the lie detector test, the Premier, the Minister of Industrial Development, the same as all the other people are doing.

MR. STRACHAN: My colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) the other day tabled some tapes and some discussions on a conversation which was given to him. It was not tapped. It was not third hand. It was direct. And they meant very little. They were innocuous documents really. They meant very little, except it makes you wonder when a member of government, whom one can respect, thinks that the Brinco deal was totally wrong, the biggest mistake ever made in Newfoundland, how a member, if he has got any principle at all, and he has, he indicates that, how he can continue to sit on the same side, on a government, carrying out a deal which has cost this Province millions upon millions of dollars for nothing. It cannot even service it. And has probably delayed Gull Island because had it not occurred, a high possibility of Gull Island, with a company, an international corporation set up like that, reputable, experienced, could have possibly had the thing on the go and in the pipeline right now, wiped out.

So it makes me wonder continuously, I am only new at politics, three years, not exactly naive but new at it, learning the game as you say, and it makes me wonder how someone can stand up and defend a position which you do not believe in, which as soon as you step out the door you can laugh about and say, "I had to do it. I had to do it. That is the Party policy. It is Cabinet policy. It is caucus policy."



June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4061

NM - 3

MR. STRACHAN: Cabinet solidarity I can see on major issues, I can see that it has to happen. But how can you stand up in these situations and defend some of the situations and then step out and say, "I disagree with that. I think it was terrible what happened. Shocking what happened, disgusting, a fiasco." Surely there is something wrong with this if this is what we have got to become to be a politician. Because surely that is not what we have got to become. Surely we must stand in our place and state, if it is a caucus decision on the spruce budworm, then that is how it is. My disagreements will be heard in the caucus room and I will come in and support the position. But basically I will not argue it. If it is philosophically against my right I will not stand in debate.

June 6, 1978

Tape No. 4062

NM - 1

MR. STRACHAN: It is a Cabinet decision, or a caucus decision, but how someone can come in here, like the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), which really disappointed me, come in here after quitting from government, quitting as a minister over a rental by Mr. Dobbin for a Wedgewood Park deal, something which never came about, and then defend the very argument, defend the government and accuse us all here of being way off target because the building is not there. It is not erected. The money was not made. The deal was not consummated. It was there already to be but it was not consummated and so you are wrong.

We also believe, we believe very clearly that there was a case, and there is a case, and we will try to prove it, it is our duty to try and prove it, the Sealand Helicopter business. We believe there is a relationship there which is an incorrect relationship. If it is not illegal, it is certainly immoral. A tender called six months before, which is highly unusual, never occurred before. When we see the company who are spraying the spruce budworm, the companies applying on the tender being disqualified for not having sufficient planes. That is one of the reasons for disqualification of one of the companies. They had insufficient planes to carry out the job, and yet we another helicopter company being bought with a couple of helicopters only, and a tender call being given six months before, and being awarded it so they can get then put into place, their helicopters. Then it is something wrong with it. Perhaps there is something wrong. They do not jibe, the two situations.

MRS. MCISSAC: Did they buy the helicopters?

MR. STRACHAN: When we see a Cadillac helicopter service, 206B's and Long Rangers instead of the normal Hughes 500 or Jet Rangers, a Cadillac system, we think there is something wrong. I do not think you need long rangers in this Province, I do not think you need 206B's in this Province, not for that kind of service.

And so when we see all these kinds of relationships, and we question them, we are wrong? It is our credibility that is at stake? It is not our credibility that is at stake. So, Mr. Speaker, I stand here explaining why in the last few weeks - I have assisted my colleagues and others to look at situations, especially the water bombers and helicopters because I believe fundamentally that there is something far wrong with it. And I believe that it is our duty in this case here to question it. I believe it is our duty in this House on the Dobbin affair, which was debated here, to question that. It is our right. Mr. Dobbin himself tabled in the House the very morning that he had spent considerable sums of money, and I have heard between \$400,000 and \$500,000 on architect plans and engineering plans from an engineering company which we know in Toronto.

MR. NEARY:      We can even tell them who did it.

MR. STRACHAN:      He has spent that amount of money, \$400,000 \$500,000 committed, a half a million dollars committed and the government's defence is an agreement in principle, and we are thrown out of the House. What a hypocrisy!

MR. NEARY:      The plans were done in Toronto by a Mr.

MR. STRACHAN:      To me, political double talk. I cannot believe it, and it is our credibility that is questioned.

MRS. MCISSAC:      The Premier said he had no money to spend on plans.

MR. NEARY:      Oh, no.

MR. STRACHAN:      I understand that many members over there are also questioning, asking questions and being told to hold on, it will all go away, just hold on, keep low like black ducks and hunters will leave and then we can come back out and go into the pond again.

MR. NEARY:      They are still waiting for the plans to come back.

MR. STRACHAN:      Well until some of the questions are answered, I think it is our right and our duty and our obligation, and we will

Mr. Strachan.

continue to do so to keep probing, to keep asking questions.

MR. NEAPY: And we will get to the bottom of the Saunders' affair, too, before we are finished.

MR. STRACHAN: I think it is a terrible waste of time sometimes, but it is our duty, and it has to be done, because we are involving millions upon millions, upon millions of dollars. I listened to the Premier - I was in Goose Bay the weekend and the Premier was in Labrador West - and I listened on CFLN,

MR. STRACHAN:

which is the Happy Valley - Goose Bay station, linked to CFLW and Wabush - Labrador City, and the Premier comes on saying that there are no inroads being made by Quebec into Labrador City and Wabush, announced on Happy Valley - Goose Bay radio by a French Canadian announcer who following up called the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Rowe, and the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Roger Simmons, of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and the member 'Steve Neary' of Lapoilee, on -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN:

Goose Bay - Happy Valley

radio at 11:30 last Saturday night.

MR. NEARY:

There is no French influence down there.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

That is unbelievable.

MR. STRACHAN:

When I listened to the same broadcast, in fact they mentioned the three names in reference to the member for Grand Falls who had had a little diatribe put out over the weekend that the Liberals were undermining the parliamentary process.

MR. NEARY:

Protecting the public treasury.

MR. STRACHAN:

When he attends the House. The last time he was in here his point of order took one hour and fifteen minutes.

MR. SIMMONS:

He has not been back since.

MR. STRACHAN:

Undermining the parliamentary process.

MR. NEARY:

The Deputy Speaker is waiting for him to come.

MR. SIMMONS:

We have to wait a week to make a ruling.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. SIMMONS:

And we cannot do anything in the House.

MR. STRACHAN: sleuths or detectives looking for information that is, surely, if we can prove there is sufficient evidence, or it looks like a situation -

MR. NEARY: A prima facie case.

MR. STRACHAN: - then form an enquiry, put it together, give the investigation, clear the air.

MR. NEARY: Right! Right!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Ask for a secret vote.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Mifflin Report?

MR. STRACHAN: What about the what?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Mifflin Report?

MR. STRACHAN: I do not have a clue about what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: Only for the poor old widows and the workers we would never agree to it. The poor widows, the civil servants and the -

MR. STRACHAN: So, Mr. Speaker, in concluding this brief thirty minutes I have -

MR. NEARY: You are lucky. Thank your lucky stars.

MR. STRACHAN: - I should like to say that the members opposite should think seriously, should think very seriously about what they say in the House compared to what they say outside in the corridors, or outside in public, or at home. They should start questioning, questioning very seriously one of these situations which we have brought up. A lot of them are unfortunate, very unfortunate. A lot of them I do not like one little bit at all. I would much prefer to enjoy people, have a good sense of humour, laugh with them than I would take people's noses off.

But I think in these situations here we have no choice and we are going to continue to do it. It is a shame in many, many ways, as I have said, that we have to allow, at ten o'clock tonight, this budget to go through, this amount of money to go through, especially in the capital expenditures for Sealand helicopters and many other deals, the Canso water bombers and various other things which we do not agree with. And we must get to the bottom of it.

MR. SIMMONS: We cannot trust them with the money, that is the problem.

MR. STRACHAN: And to tell us that we must put hard, cold facts in evidence on the table of the House, we are not detectives. All we can get, as we see it, are sufficient links and sufficient evidence. We want enquiries. We want the police to be directed to it, if we think there is evidence there. It is not for us to continue being

MR. STRACHAN: No, Mr, Speaker -

MR. NEARY: No, he did not.

MR. STRACHAN: - we agreed on this side of the House that the Budget would go through at ten o'clock tonight. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I personally object to allowing anything else but the current operating money to go through. I can tell you many members on this side had a long, long argument and debate over allowing the budget to go through.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: We were prepared to say, Let the current go through, the operating so that people can get paid, but on capital expenditure in this Province, with the history of this administration we felt like digging our heels in and saying, No, not one penny until we can get the air cleared on some of these situations.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: Kill them, get them finished, over and finished with and then when that is done the capital expenditures will be allowed. But we came to the agreement because we had to consider many people, old age pensioners, social assistance, the cheques and so we allowed this to go through. But I can tell you that all these things that we have been discussing and debating in the last few weeks will continue to be discussed and debated and we will continue to dig and push and get to the bottom of. We will continue to do that because it is our duty, as we see it at the moment, it is our duty to get to the bottom of these situations.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Clear them up once and for all, finished with, out of the way and then get on with the serious business of the Province. It breaks my heart to see you get one penny of capital money, one penny of capital money.



MR. STRACHAN: I live in a part of this Province in which we were not even linked to you by radio, so I have not a clue as to what you are talking about. I was not here so I had nothing to do with it. I am just talking about the last three years that I have been here and the last few months in the House.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Call for a secret vote.

MR. STRACHAN: I should indicate to the member talking that if he thinks Gull Island a fiasco, so do I.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is our duty, and we will continue to do so, to get to the bottom of some of these affairs and let the chips fall where they may. And we will continue to do it regardless of whether members opposite think we should be good boys, behave ourselves and be nice fellows and come in here and leave with a smile on our faces every day -

MR. NEARY: And do not criticize them.

MR. STRACHAN: And do not criticize them and talk positively, we will not. I lay that here now. That is how we feel and that is what we are going to do in the next few weeks left to us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question on the amendment? Those is favour "aye", contrary "nay". In my opinion the "nays" have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the amendment please stand:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hodder, Mrs. McIssac, Mr. Strachan,

June 6, 1978, Tape 4064, Page 2 -- apb

Mr. Fred Rowe, Mr. Neary, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White,  
Mr. Roberts, Mr. Flight, Mr. Canning, Capt Winsor,  
Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Jack Winsor, Mr. R. Moores.

MR. SPEAKER:                      Those opposed to the  
amendment please stand:

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Justice, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, Dr. Winsor, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Young, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Wells, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Neil Windsor, Mr. Cross, Mr. Patterson, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Power.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion defeated, twenty-five to sixteen.

Is the House ready for the question on the motion?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKMAN: Do I get some injury time, Mr. Speaker, for that great applause?

Mr. Speaker, there are a few things that I would like to refer to with respect to points made by hon. gentlemen opposite and hon. members on the government side of the House.

Before I deal with the matters that are directly related to the budget, I want to comment very briefly on the theme advanced just a few minutes ago by the last hon. member to speak, the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). Let me assure the hon. member for Eagle River that the ministry in this government has no

MR. HICKMAN: objections to questions, we welcome questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: What I do ask of any hon. gentleman, and it is up to the gentlemen opposite when they are asking to decide on the questions, the nature of the questions, the form of the questions, that is their prerogative, their responsibility, their duty, what I do ask, Mr. Speaker, is that insinuations or conclusions not be reached except where there are facts and not by innuendo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: And that is all that any hon. member of this House can ask and that is what any hon. member has the right to expect.

Mr. Speaker, there were comments made, again by the hon. member for Eagle River, on various matters, some that are before the courts and some that are not and consequently I am rather constrained and restrained and very much restricted in what I can say. But let me assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that since I have occupied the portfolio of Attorney General of this Province, which has not been continuous but for about ten years since 1966, I have never nor will I ever interfere with an investigation nor will I ever order a charge withdrawn or not laid. That will never happen during my tenure of office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Now will I ever commit what would be a very pleasant thing at times, politically - maybe not pleasant but advantageous - to indicate publicly matters that come to me in that capacity. Because if we ever reach that stage, Mr. Speaker, where an Attorney General of this Province, or indeed, any of his prosecutorial staff or solicitors, start making public the results of

MR. HICKMAN: matters that come to them in the course of their responsibility as Crown law officers, then this will be a very unhappy place to live and certainly it will do nothing for the administration of justice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I deal with some points raised by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall)? This evening the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) raised certain questions and brought to the attention of this House concerns that were also raised by the hon. member for St. John's East, and in particular, the public debt of this Province. As Bismarck says, One can take statistics and play with statistics, twist them and turn them and use them to one's advantage and always be telling the truth but always coming up with different conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, the credit of the Province of Newfoundland at this time stands very high indeed. In looking at the credit of the Province-

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from  
St. John's East -

MR. HICKMAN: No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: No, I did not, I said the  
hon. gentleman and to his credit and to the credit of  
the hon. member for St. John's East, neither suggested  
that, they both drew to the attention of the House the  
obligation which I hope government is discharging of  
maintaining the kind of debt sector, debt service ratio  
that we must maintain if this Province is going to be able  
to borrow the necessary funds to meet the demands of  
Canadians who live in this Province. And these demands  
are growing. The appetite is insatiable. The people of  
Newfoundland very properly say water and sewer, or paved  
highways, hospitals. These are no longer luxuries in  
North America. But regrettably, Mr. Speaker, the ability  
of the Province to pay for these services must be the  
guiding factor in whether or not we can provide them.  
And the ability to provide these services will depend to  
a large extent upon our credit rating, upon our stability  
within the bond market, namely our ability to borrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I too  
may refer to some statistics, of facts, factual figures,  
it is relevant to note that the total public service debt -  
public sector debt rather for the Province of Newfoundland  
on a per capita basis, this is the per capita debt, was  
\$2,203 in 1973. The total per capita personal income for  
1973 was \$2,445. That means that personal income as a  
percentage of the total public service debt was 111 per cent  
and that is a very important yardstick when you are going  
into the bond market.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1978 the  
total public sector debt will be \$4,275. The total  
per capita personal income \$4,915 for an improvement,  
insofar as the personal income as a percentage of total

MR. HICKMAN: public sector debt is concerned, of 115 per cent. So, Mr. Speaker, it would not be correct to say that our position in the eyes of the financiers, of the lenders and the bond markets of the free world, in Europe and in North America, has deteriorated, indeed, it has slightly improved.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you have the figures for 1965?

MR. HICKMAN: No. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the year 1972?

MR. HICKMAN: No, from 1973 and then in 1974 we were up to 117 per cent, in 1975 116, in 1976 115, 1977 115 and 1978 115.

MR. ROBERTS: You do not have the figures for earlier on?

MR. HICKMAN: No, I do not, not in front of me.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: I will attempt to get them for the hon. gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I draw to the attention of this House that this improvement in the debt ratio, in the coverage, as it is known in the market, the debt coverage, and the stability that has been imposed during the past three years has taken place at a time when the economy of this Province, when the economy of this nation has been in a state of decline. It has taken place, I submit, as a result of some pretty necessary but stringent and not always popular restraints imposed by government in the last several budgets that have been brought down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another fact that has been referred to in debate here, brought to our attention as a matter for concern and so it should be, is the - and I give these facts with respect to the summary of the debt service and the debt service ratio. In 1973 it was 17.8 per cent

MR. HICKMAN: That included the sinking fund payment and in 1974 it was 17%, in 1975 16.4%, in 1976 15.9%, in 1977 17% and for this year, 1978, it would be the same as it was in 1973 17.8%. That is the debt service and debt service ratio. Now, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making with respect to this is that as one hon. member today speaking here tonight pointed out and again the member for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) that as of now we are continuing and I think I can say with confidence that this government, my colleagues in the government, the hon. the Premier, the hon. members on this side of the House, and I would hope hon. members opposite, are committed to maintaining that stability within our debt service ratio. We have to do it. There is nothing wrong with borrowing money so long as we act upon good sound fiscal advice and show good fiscal responsibility. It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, and we can all do it, we have all done it, to say we can go out and borrow 'x' number of dollars and build a new school or a new hospital or some other new institution; and we will get political kudos for doing it. But, Mr. Speaker, we do have an obligation to make certain that having done that, having created thereby very substantial increases in current account commitments and expenditures, that the Province in the future is going to be able to meet these additional current account expenditures. And that is what it is all about, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe - it is easy and it is always great politics and it is the kind of approach that people on both sides of the House, if they are discharging their responsibility to their parties, will take of accusing each other of making promises at times of certain electoral contests. And I believe that has been done. But Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that when these promises are made that when any hon. member on either side



MR. HICKMAN: of this House indicates his or her ambitions for their particular district during an election campaign and what they want to do and would like to do and, in many instances, what they say they will do if the people in their constituency sees fit to return them to office or to elect them to this House, is more a hope that has to be tempered with the facts of life when it comes to the ability of 500,000 people in this Province to pay. Now, Mr. Speaker, another figure that I would like to leave with hon. gentlemen; and we are feeling at this time some of the difficulties and problems that are arising out of the decline in value of the Canadian dollar vis-a-vis certain other currencies. We have got - this Province owes some monies that have to be repaid and that we are meeting on schedule on account of Labrador Linerboard. The time of the take-over which this House approved in 1972 we owe - there was then owing approximately \$90,938,000 with, I believe, a small U.S. loan over and above that. These monies which had been borrowed prior to this administration assuming office, but which was part of the legislation that was passed in this House, and I cannot recall a dissenting vote on that bill, in fact I would say that there was not at the time that the bill went through - the Labrador Linerboard -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: No, the hon. gentleman from the Strait (Mr. E. Roberts) confirms that this had the unanimous approval of both sides of the House. We assumed this responsibility to repay these loans.

MR. HICKMAN: This has got nothing to do with the monies that had to be spent afterwards to complete and operate: this is what we had to assume, and here is what happened since. There was a Deutschemark loan the equivalent of \$51 million and a sterling loan of \$39 million. We have repaid a fair amount of that loan; the Deutschemark loan will be totally repaid as it must in 1983 and the sterling loan in 1982. But because of the exchange problems and the present position of the Canadian dollar, it is anticipated that it is going to cost us an extra \$11 million. You cannot blame the Moores' administration for that.

MR. KITCHEN: What about all the American dollars borrowed within the last five or -

MR. HICKMAN: The American dollar borrowings too, and I have not got that figure - I thought I had it in front of me -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, but there has been an increase obviously - it stands to reason in the monies that have to be paid on account of our American borrowings as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this, may I give one more bit of information which I know, no matter how partisan, any hon. member in this House should be delighted to hear. In May of this year this Province went into the European market for the purpose of borrowing \$50 million U.S., and on May 9 a \$50 million loan was priced at 9-1/4% at a par plus 1/2% to yield 8.9%. Now, simplification -

MR. NEARY: What were the London Inter-bank rates?

MR. HICKMAN: I do not know. The issue went on the European market at - you could buy a \$100 bond but you would have to pay \$100.50 which would pay 9-1/4 which had an effective yield of 8.98%. Now, Mr. Speaker, the report that we got even today - some representatives of the Province's

MR. HICKMAN: fiscal agents were in my office this morning - that the trading of the Province of Newfoundland bonds in the secondary market has been most remarkable in light of a, and I am quoting them, in light of conditions in the world market. Now, Mr. Speaker, so that we do not leave this debate and we do not leave this chamber feeling that the Province of Newfoundland has a credit rating or that in the eyes of the Europeans that compared to other jurisdictions in Canada it is something less than satisfactory. May I point out to this House that this year in that same market there have been at least two other issues from Canada - Ontario Hydro and the Canadair issue which is guaranteed by the federal government and both of these have fallen in value by over three points from the issue price and Newfoundland bonds are still trading at the issue price today. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I suggest to this House and my suggestion is not based on wishful thinking - it is based upon the advice of the European bankers and the Canadian fiscal agents we have and American. The Government of Newfoundland in the eyes of the investors in Europe and they are only concerned with facts not fiction - they have come to the conclusion, and I think with a great deal of justification, that the debt management policy that the careful way in which the Ministry of Finance is operated in this Province is one, Mr. Speaker, which gives them a great deal of confidence in the future of this Province and makes them very anxious to do business with us and to do it in the best interests of this Province.

MR. NEARY: The Minister made a fool of himself over in Europe - (inaudible) - the oil refinery - made a fool of himself.

PREMIER MOORES: He was not there on the oil refinery (inaudible) -

MR. NEARY: He was there.

June 6, 1978

Tape 4068

GH-3

PREMIER MOORES: Do not be so foolish, boy.

MR. NEARY: I am not being foolish.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, you are.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier knows that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, order!

PREMIER MOORES: Not at all.

MR. NEARY: It is true -

PREMIER MOORES: No, it is not true.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, you know, the hon.

gentleman, I know from where he gets his instructions. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, I think it was, from Burgeo, it was from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. R. Simmons) in his non-budgetary address did make this statement when he was referring to the blueprint document and I quote, he said, "They are admitting in the budget document, the budget blueprint, that there is going to be a net loss in effective income, in effective earnings, real earnings, a net loss of over the next five years, if you are to believe the projections, in the budget document the budget supplement". Now, obviously the hon. gentleman did not read that very carefully

MR. HICKMAN: because here is what the blueprint says that it is our determination "to increase annual per capita income from \$5,000 to \$6,000 in constant 1977 dollars". Now, Mr. Speaker, do you know what that means. Do you know what that means in real dollars? Do you know what that means in the eyes of the bankers, the eyes of the fiscal people? It means that there will be an increase in real terms during that period per annum of a minimum of 5% - not a decrease, because either the hon. gentleman conveniently or did not look at in real dollars and neglected the constant 1977 dollars. So, Mr. Speaker, never let it be said that this blueprint for development is one that conceives or is based on the premise that there is going to be a net loss to Newfoundlanders, not only a net loss in jobs but a net loss in income. Mr. Speaker, I consider that blueprint for development that is an appendix to this budget and I believe that it was the first of its kind that we have seen come in. We have been asked year after year - I have heard the cry - I have heard it ever since I have been in here. The Minister of Finance comes in with a budget speech, reviews the financial position of the Province, tries to set forward what will happen for the fiscal year and I cannot remember a year since 1966 when opposition critics, particularly the financial critic, will get up and say "Where are the long-term plans for the government?" Any fool can come in with a budget that takes care of the immediate needs for one fiscal year. Now, Mr. Speaker, this for the first time in Newfoundland's history does contain a blueprint for the development of this Province. We have the confidence that it can be kept - we know it can be kept - and, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be kept. Now, Mr. Speaker, I -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: I should not be diverted - I should not be digressed - I should ignore, but I cannot - how can I ignore it. How can I ignore it when in 1977 - forget DREX

MR. HICKMAN: for a minute - out of the provincial funds we spent \$25.8 million on highways - I thought that was reasonably good - \$34.6 in 1976 - and in that election year - that terrible election year of 1975 we only spent \$23 million and that is an oversight that I would hope the Premier will never see happen again, but it was done. And in 1974 it was \$19 million and in 1973 \$19 million. We have spent in the last five years of provincial funds and we had a great deal of help with federal funds under DREE for highways too - \$122 million. There has been a fair amount of money spent on highways and on other public services in this Province, but I hope they have been spent realistically. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to refer to two other non-budgetary items that were referred to by the financial critic for the Opposition, but I am going to have to leave that for another day. Neither of them had anything to do with the budget but there were comments on the Public Accounts Committee - there was one with respect to certain entries of the sum of \$200 million which I have read very carefully the Hansard and I think it needs some explanation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: I know it has nothing to do with the budget debate. That is why I could not understand why the hon. gentleman raised it. But, Mr. Speaker, I always - I make a mistake, Mr. Speaker, I should not be taking notes. When an hon. member is a financial critic I write down what he says, you know, and I should not be doing that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by, I will conclude -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: I am doing my very best - I have made a commitment - I made a commitment to my colleague opposite that I will complete my few remarks within two minutes and this I shall do, but if the hon. gentleman would exercise his leadership and his authority and hush, hush -

June 6, 1978

Tape 4069

GH-3

MR. HICKMAN: hush, hush - hush, hush the financial critic, because the hon. gentleman says "I am going to be a minister of finance if ever there is a change of government" -

PREMIER MOORES: Gift-wrapped.

MR. HICKMAN: and Newfoundland deserves better than that, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER MOORES: White-gift Sunday.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the last forty-five seconds at my disposal may I deal with the suggestion by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that Newfoundland should open an embassy in Ottawa. I say tommyrot! We are not going to open an embassy in Ottawa, we are not going to open an office in Ottawa. There is only one Province of Canada that has opened an office in Ottawa and that was the Province of Alberta, probably the only province that does not need anything from Ottawa anyway.

Mr. Speaker, during the Address in Reply debate I would like to bring to, and I will bring to the attention of this House the tremendous change in attitude and policy on the part of the Government of Canada towards the Government of this Province in the last two or three years, the very satisfactory results that we have reached as being the first Canadian Province to negotiate a general development agreement and the massive sums of money that we have been able to negotiate with the Government of Canada because they know as we know that in this Province we have and they have a very responsible administration that spends their money prudently and well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Good speech! Good speech!

On motion, the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means.

On motion, the Committee of Ways and Means rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.



MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Dated May 8, to the hon.

the Minister of Finance;

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the public service of the Province for the year ending 31st. day of March 1879, by way of further supply and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

Sgd. Gordon A. Winter  
Lieutenant-Governor."

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young):

Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the total contained in the estimates be carried.

MR. NEARY:

Are you reading your lines?

MR. HICKMAN:

So far so good.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

All those in favour of the motion "aye", contrary minded "nay". In my opinion the motion is carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of  
Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of  
Supply reports having passed the amount of \$1,063,129,356  
contained in the estimates of Supply and ask leave to sit  
again.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman reports  
that they have considered the matters to them referred and  
have passed expenditures as indicated by him and ask leave  
to sit again.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the  
report of the Committee of Supply with respect to the  
estimates of 1978-79, together with a resolution and a  
bill attached thereto be referred to a Committee of Ways  
and Means.

On motion that the House  
resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and means on  
said resolution, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): Order, please!

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

RESOLUTION: That is is  
expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting  
to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the public  
service for the financial year ending the thrity-first day  
of March,1979, the sum of \$897,279,356.

On motion, resolution carried.

On motion, schedule carried.

Motion, a bill, "An Act

For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For  
Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The  
Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March 1979  
And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means reports having passed a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted bill ordered read a first time now, by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March 1979 And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first, second third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. HICKMAN: Now we get back to normal.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS Mr. Speaker, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Admit His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, and of Her faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a bill for the appropriation of Supply granted in the present Session.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Finacial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March 1979 And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service."

HON. GORDON A. WINTER(Lieutenant-Governor): In Her Majesty's name,I thank Her loyal subjects; I accept their benevolence and I assent to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present Session passed certain bills,to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly,I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act To Empower The St. John's Municipal Council To Raise A Loan For Municipal Purposes By The Issue Of Bonds."

A bill, "An Act To Authorize An Impost Upon Certain Mineral Holdings In The Province."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Industrial Standards Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act."

A bill, "An Act To Repeal The Government - Pyramid Mobile Homes (1959) Limited (Confirmation Of Agreement) Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting Unfair And Unconscionable Trade Practices."

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The St. John's Housing Corporation Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting  
The Rehabilitation Of Disabled Persons."

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Statute Law In Respect Of Annuities Payable Under Life  
Insurance Contracts."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973."

A bill, "An Act To Regulate  
The Discounting Of Income Tax Refunds."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Welfare Institutions Licensing Act To Ensure Greater  
Emphasis On The Inspection Of Welfare Institutions In The  
Future."

A bill, "An Act Respecting  
Occupational Health And Safety In The Province."

A bill, "An Act To Further  
The Government - British Newfoundland Exploration Limited  
Authorization Of Agreement Act, 1957."

A bill, "An Act To Authorize  
The Lieutenant-Governor In Council To Enter Into An  
Agreement With British Newfoundland Corporation Limited And  
N.M.Rothschild And Sons, Supplemental To The Agreement  
Dated The Twenty-First Day Of May, 1953, As Heretofore  
Amended."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Motorized Snow Vehicles And All-Terrain Vehicles Act, 1973."

A bill, "An Act To Convey  
Certain Trusts And Properties In The Province To The Royal  
Trust Corporation Of Canada."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Dog Act, 1976."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Social Assistance Act, 1977."

June 6, 1978, Tape 4072, Page 3 -- apb

A bill, An Act To Amend The  
Consumer Reporting Agencies Act."

A bill, An Act To Amend The  
Mineral Act, 1976."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Department Of Municipal Affairs And Housing Act, 1973."

A bill, "An Act To Enable The  
Golden Eagle Canada Limited To Become A Federal Corporation."

HON. GORDON A, WINTER(Lieutenant-Governor): In Her  
Majesty's name, I assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 1978, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, June 7, 1978, at 3:00 p.m.