

106
p

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1978

The House met at 3:30 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, on March 2nd, of this year I received a letter from the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) to the effect, and I will read the letter: "My dear Premier: It is with sincere regret that I must advise you of my intention to resign my position as Minister of Rural Development and Public Works with your Government.

"You have asked me to delay my intention for a few days for reasons which we have discussed. Out of respect for your request I advise that my decision will become effective Friday, March 10, 1973. You are clearly aware of my reasons. I cannot serve the Government with any pride or feeling of self worth as the Member for Grand Falls without some honourable realization of the public commitments which you and I made a year ago.

"My personal appreciation for the opportunity to associate and work with Government during the last two and a half years.

"Personal regrets for my decision."

Mr. Speaker, that was received on March 2nd, and as most hon. members are aware the member for Grand Falls went to the seal hunt on board The Lady Johnson and did not return until March 13th. Any delay in announcing was for the reason that I wanted personally to review the situation with the member for Grand Falls. I had hoped to be able to persuade him to see the government's point of view and Cabinet's point of view as to what has to be done in this Province. Because I feel very strongly, Sir, that Cabinet has the responsibility to act on behalf, as they see it,

PREMIER MOORES: of all the Province, as opposed to any one specific district or any one specific individual.

Since then the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) has met with his district party association and advised them what was allegedly in the Budget. I think, as most people realize on both sides of the House, and particular people who were in Cabinets before, it is a fundamental requirement of all parliaments and all Cabinet ministers that a budget, or anything that is in it, must be kept on a totally confidential basis.

I would like to say, Sir, before finishing my remarks, that John Lundrigan is a person whom I consider a personal friend. He is a person who basically is a very kind man. I think he cares very deeply about people. I think it was illustrated by his defense of the seal hunt and the people who prosecute that hunt. But unfortunately no matter how well meaning any individual may be, as long as the Cabinet system is such as it is, members of that body have no choice but to abide by the decision of Cabinet or resign their portfolio. And under those circumstances I very regretfully have had to, and have accepted, the resignation of the hon. member.

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

MR. W.N. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, before I make my short comment on what the Premier has just said, may I ask the Premier this question? Was the hon. Minister of Rural Development fired by the Premier or did he resign? I got the impression he gave a letter of resignation, The Premier now tries to give the impression apparently that because of a breach of Cabinet solidarity he has been asked to resign, in other words fired. Could the Premier clarify that?

PREMIER MOORES: It is very clear, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member resigned his position.

MR. W.N. HOWE: Thank you, Sir. This is not a very joyful

MR. H.C. ROWE: duty on my part. It is always sad when a public servant, an elected public servant like a Minister of the Crown, is forced to resign his portfolio on grounds of principle. I have nothing but praise for the minister himself since he has chosen to resign from his portfolio because he cannot live with, Mr. Speaker, he cannot live with a breach of public trust, a breach of commitment by the government which he belongs to.

Apparently, Sir, if the minister's reported words are correct, the public commitment made to the people of Central Newfoundland last year that there would be an expansion to a hospital in that area, that commitment, Sir, according to the minister, will not be lived up to in the forthcoming Budget, and therefore he must resign.

Mr. Speaker, we will be getting into debate as time goes on, and I will not get into debate on this very short and very brief statement that I am making now, but it is clear, Sir, to us on this side of the House, and to most of the people of the Province, that the present government is crumbling before our very eyes, mainly because, Sir,

MR. W. ROWE: it is a government which has made his own bed, it has made promises and commitments to the people of this Province, and now, Sir, finds that promises easily made are difficult to add up to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman having concluded his remarks, still I feel that I should continue - I was not aware when I interrupted that he was about to conclude - and that was with respect to Section 91, page 84, Beauchesne, "When the minister makes a statement on government policy it is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or the Chiefs of recognized groups," and in our practice spokesmen on their behalf, "are entitled to ask explanations and make a few remarks, but no debate is then allowed." Having said that, obviously the hon. gentleman has completed his remarks.

MR. W. ROWE: I was not, as it happens, Mr. Speaker, I was not finished. I sat down because Your Honour called order.

MR. SPEAKER: I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. Obviously I am not precluding him from continuing his remarks.

MR. W. ROWE: For the sake of clarity, Mr. Speaker, let me also ask the Premier if he happens to know, although a letter might be directed to Your Honour if it were the case, if he happens to know whether that hon. member intends or is resigning from the House as well, or is he staying on in the House of Assembly?

PREMIER MOORES: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that will be up to the hon. member himself.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, one further question, if I may? Has that hon. member being expelled from the P.C. Caucus by any chance, Mr. Speaker, or is he still a member of the P.C. Caucus?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: No, that has been only a habit of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling the next routine order I think I should point out that the prohibition of debate with respect to Statements By Ministers is operative toward hon. gentlemen to my left, and members making the statements as well.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - I rise to beg leave to present a petition on behalf of eighty-one parents of the communities of Middle Arm, Burlington, and Smith's Harbour in my district. And the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. I do not know if it is a good time to be asking for funds or not.

MR. W. ROWE: Better today than tomorrow.

MR. RIDEOUT: Better today than tomorrow. That funds be allocated to build a new school in the Middle Arm, Burlington, Smith's Harbour area. This petition, as I said, Mr. Speaker, is signed by eighty-one residents whose children presently attend the all-grade Pentecostal School at Middle Arm.

Now the school in question, Mr. Speaker, is a very old one. It is outdated, it is over-crowded, and in fact it is totally unsatisfactory. It is so much so, Sir, that the parents of those students are concerned not only about the educational impairment of their children but also about the physical health of the students who happen to be attending that old, dilapidated and run down building. The Pentecostal Assemblies School Board of Newfoundland is presently, and has been, I understand, for the last couple of years working on plans to build a new school in that area, be it at Middle Arm or in the centre of the area at Burlington, somewhere in that area. But so far, Sir, the issue has been finances.

Now in view of the urgent need, in view of the state of the building itself, and in view of the impairment of physical health of those students, I would ask the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, if he would take a special plea on behalf of those parents to the

Mr. Rideout: Denominational Education Committee, which I know shares out the money that this House appropriates for the building of schools every year. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not want the minister to get up and slough it off on the D.E.C. That is not the intent of the petition. We must remember that it is our money, the taxpayers' money of this Province that the D.E.C.'s are spending, and some priorities ought to be set up when we have buildings that are obviously dilapidated, obviously run down, obviously not fit for students to attend school in, then some leadership and some priority must be established. I would ask the minister to take that leadership, and to take a special plea to the D.E.C.'s and attempt to have money allocated this year for the building of a new Pentecostal School in Middle Arm area.

So, Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically and whole-heartedly support the prayer of the petition. I commend it to the House, ask that it be laid on the table and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my hon. friend and colleague to my right and in response to the - it is not the largest petition ever presented in this House of Assembly, eighty-one residents, I believe, signed it -

MR. RIDEOUT: Parents.

MR. NOLAN: - or eighty-one parents. But it is significant, all the more significant perhaps because eighty-one parents may not be the greatest political arm that have ever been waved in a public assembly in this Province, but what they are doing in fact is speaking on behalf of the students, and we have an obligation, particularly to students in this Province. We are going to - and I do not know what provision will be made in the current Budget, of course, for educational capital improvements and so on in the coming year since I am not privy to the contents of the Budget. But I do know that if, as we are informed, see fit for example to spend huge sums of public money on, say, the extension of this building, which we are informed is going to happen, and many other items that will see many other public dollars spent on in the next year or two, well then surely we must, if we have any kind of priority sense at all, look to the students who may very well be suffering in a manner that will retard their growth as human beings in this Province, not only now but well into their adult life unless we provide them with the proper educational facilities and the personnel to carry out the educational needs of these people.

The people in Middle Arm are appealing to us now as legislators, through their member, to see to it that in the Budget that is brought down by the Minister of Finance on Friday that provision will be there for this and so many other educational needs that are screaming to be handled by this administration. A look at any figure will tell you that during a by-election you can spend \$471,000 in one district in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Against the law.

MR. NOLAN: Against the law apparently. All we are asking now is to listen to the prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, and see that it is answered. Eight-one residents are now asking for our help. All they hear, unfortunately, sometimes through the public press, is the name calling that we hear in the House of Assembly. I suppose if I were to unleash a personal attack on the Minister of Education now I would no doubt make headlines tonight and perhaps tomorrow. This is some kind of an indication of the sign of our times, but what I am saying is that I hope that this petition will receive the attention and hopefully the funds that it deserves in the coming Budget on Friday and that our friend, the new Minister of Finance, who is noted for his kindness, generosity and public spirited awareness as has been demonstrated by his leadership and Justice in this Province - God help me! - will be shown up in the budget on Friday. So we certainly support this petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague. I can appreciate the concerns of the people on whose behalf he has presented the petition. Too many schools, Sir, in rural Newfoundland in particular are inadequate today in terms of modern day education, lacking the modern conveniences and the modern facilities that students

MR. LUSH: should have in 1970, lacking facilities that result in an inferior education. So I have no hesitation at all in wholeheartedly supporting this petition -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - knowing quite well that there are schools in my own district that suffer from the same inadequacies, in Eastport, Port Blandford and Musgravetown. And I would urge the minister rather than go to the DEC's, to go to Cabinet and ask if we cannot change the structure of the way that funds are allocated for capital expenditures for building of school buildings, I think a formula that goes up to 1980 without any increases at all, which means the money that education school boards are getting today to build schools have a dollar value of back to ten years ago. So I would ask the minister to go to his Cabinet and see if we cannot change that structure of financing education for school construction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy followed by the hon. member for Windsor - Euchans.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on record as fully supporting the petition just presented by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). I am pretty familiar with the communities of Middle Arm, Burlington and Smiths Harbour and can confirm that the prayer of the petition and the remarks by the hon. member are very, very valid. The present school structure in Middle Arm is antiquated, worn out, and there is a dire need for a new school building in that area - absolutely no question. I would even go so far as to say that of the many areas that I have visited around the Province in the last year or so perhaps the Middle Arm/Burlington/Smiths Harbour area is in more need of a school structure than some of the other areas that have been badgering their school boards and their politicians in government for such buildings. It is badly needed in that area. I would suggest to the hon. member that it be considered by the residents

MR. PECKFORD: of the area that the new school building go in Burlington rather than in Middle Arm, because Burlington is the community that is in the center of the three - there is Smiths Harbour to the North and then Burlington and then to the South, Middle Arm. That area, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps not as well known as many other areas of the Province. It is on the North Shore of Green Bay on part of the Baie Verte Peninsula and the road that leads from the Baie Verte highway goes down to just those three communities. And it is not near some of the larger centres like LaScie, and some of the smaller communities near LaScie get services because they are near larger centres and have a major fishing facility there.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of that area are very hardworking fishermen, a very vibrant logging and pulpwood operation is going ahead there at the present time, and the people there, I am sure, would be delighted to find out in the next year or so - the Pentecostal School Board with its headquarters in Windsor, in consultation with the DEC, with the sympathetic nagging by the Minister of Education - would be glad to see a new school building be committed to that area within the next year or so, and I fully support the prayer of the petition and the remarks made by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Suchans.

MR. FLICHE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague. And I rise in self-sympathy, Mr. Speaker. One of the first things that I did as a member of this hon. House was to present a petition to the present minister on behalf of the people of Badger, a town situated right on the Trans-Canada Highway, a town whose children are being bused to Grand Falls, a distance of seventeen miles. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I presented the petition, the prayer of the petition was to ask that the school busing system as they knew it be discontinued, be stopped, and that high schools be built in the town of Badger. And I expected that petition to be supported by some people, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that practically

MR. FLIGHT: everybody in the House of Assembly, as Your Honour will remember, supported that petition. The minister got up and waxed eloquent as to how he believed the schools should be built, that the Government of Newfoundland should use some of the \$250 million, the one-third of the provincial budget, they should have some say as to how the funds were allocated and spent. Mr. Speaker, that was two years ago. Shortly after, I drew to the minister's attention that the children of another community in Newfoundland, Buchans Junction, were being bused twenty-one miles - kindergarten children leaving home at eight o'clock in the morning, leaving home before light and arriving home after dark. And he got up and was surprised and committed himself to look into the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I should point out
to

MR. SPEAKER: the hon. gentlemen that a reference to an analogous situation in some other community for the point of view of comparism would certainly fall within, in my opinion, the ambit of the Standing Orders, but the hon. gentlemen will recall that after his first sentence he has really addressed himself to a petition of two years hence with respect to a different school in a different area. So I would ask the hon. gentlemen to confine his remarks to the material allegation of the petition.

Hon. member of Windsor - Buchan's.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Your Honor.

Well, Sir, I need not refer to the previous petitions, I would refer to the situation as it exists. This may appear to be tongue-in-cheek, it may appear to be facetious, but there is one department of government in this Province that I concede we could do without. In two and a half years as a member with all the problems that I have had presented to one with regard to a lack in the Department of Education I have not been able, not once been able to have gone to the Department of Education in this building and to have got a situation straightened out. I have been told time and time again it is either DEC's -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

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

Actually the Chair intervened and the hon. gentleman at the same time.

My understanding is that a point of order may be made at any time except during a division or when the Chair is giving a ruling. So having said 'Order' myself I think the rules would suggest that I make my ruling and then if the hon. gentleman's point is a different one obviously he may well go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: I will point out to the hon. gentleman to my right that he is now getting into really an area of debate on the policy of the Department of Education and this would not be permitted at this particular time. Hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Sir, I will simply end my remarks and my support by asking the minister if in dealing with the prayer of that petition, - because we all know that in order to deal with the prayer of that petition the structure of the Department of Education, as the hon. member for Terra Nova pointed out, has to be changed, - the minister has got to be given some authority as to how the funds in the Department of Education are spent? And so, Sir, I would suggest that the minister, unless he is prepared to tackle that basic problem, will not be able to assist or to answer the prayer of the petition. Sir, the petition clearly asks for a school in Middle Arm, and a school cannot be built in Middle Arm unless the minister is prepared to take on the DEC's and call the shots on how the money in the Department of Education is spent. At this point that they are not doing that. I whole-heartedly support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak a few words to the petition. The petition asks that the Minister of Education or the government allocate funds for a school in Middle Arm. I have explained this before, that we have a commitment to the Denominational Education Committee for a period of ten years, giving an amount of money, I believe in the past year it was something in the vicinity of \$14 million, it escalates a million dollars a year for the next couple of years and levels off and that carries on until about 1988.

MR. HOUSE:

The Denominational Education

Committees then, of course, get this money on a per capita basis for the denominations represented and prioritize and determine where schools are going to built. Under the present legislation, and I guess under the acts that we came into Confederation with, it is pretty difficult to change that, if we want to change it, because they have their responsibility for building schools and we supply funds to them. So right now at the present time no government, whether it is this one or the past one, can allocate moneys for a school. The moneys are allocated through the Denominational Education Committee. Now in this particular case it happens to be the Pentecostal DEC. They have one board throughout the Province and they have a list of the schools that they have, a prioritized list, and I do not know exactly where the Middle Arm school stands. Certainly I will discuss it with the pertinent DEC.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member of Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to rise and give my support to the petition. I was not very sure whether the minister had supported the petition or not. He did not say so, and he probably should not be speaking in this instance, Mr. Speaker, if he is not speaking in support of a petition.

Mr. Speaker, just to clarify -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You do not understand the system.

MR. SIMMONS:

We understand, it is the minister we are concerned about, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify a point made by the Minister of Mines and Energy a moment ago, the bulk of students of this particular denomination are resident in Middle Arm rather than in Burlington, and the logical place to have the school is where they have it right now, in Middle Arm. But, of course, that is a decision for them to make. A number of the students in Burlington are of the integrated group and there

March 16, 1978

Tape 236

DM - 4

MR. SIMMONS: in the case of elementary school in Burlington-or in the case of high school,bused into Baie Verte.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the petition I would just like to appeal to the minister,

MR. SIMMONS: being the day before budget day, to ensure - as I am sure he already has done so - that there is an adequate capital amount in the Budget, the budgetary conditions as they relate to education, to take care of the increasing needs of the various school boards, to erect the schools and to affect the necessary renovations and improvements. Now he more than anybody else in this House, as a former superintendent of education who fought this cause long and hard, ought to be aware of the increasing capital requirements.

I have no dispute with the way the moneys are being allocated. That is not the problem the DEC's are having, Mr. Speaker. They have no dispute with the way the funds are being allocated; their problem is that they cannot get the funds to allocate. They cannot get the funds to allocate for this purpose and that is where the buck stops very much with the minister and I would hope he will reflect the concern he had in his former office as a superintendent of education and see that the increased amounts are embodied in the budget document tomorrow.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of fifty-six residents of the community of Hopedale. This is one of a series of petitions which I have received over the Winter concerning the service on the Labrador coast, the whole Labrador coast as far as transportation is concerned, with the Twin Otter service during the Summer which we had inaugurated last year for the first time.

Since I have a series of them and I could present them at other times, I will try to keep my anger for further petitions and at the moment try to present just as coolly as possible some of the facts

MR. STRACHAN: which face us in support of this petition. We are talking about aircraft at the moment which are giving a service to the Labrador coast, single engined Otter aircraft which can only fly under VFR rules, that is visual flying rules, not under instrument flying rules. These single engine aircraft, and I do not mean to defend Labrador Airways by any means at the moment, but these aircraft were stopped production of in the late 1950's. It is impossible to get any new aircraft ever since the late 1950's. Most of the aircraft used on the Labrador coast were built in 1949 to 1953. These aircraft are now old, inadequate, in many cases you could say falling apart, but virtually because there are no spare parts to be obtained anywhere - they are no longer being manufactured - the only way you can get spare parts is to take apart another aircraft and use it for spare parts. This is the kind of service that the people on the Labrador coast are subjected to and what they are petitioning for is a Twin Otter service which was tried last year.

And why we are going for Twin Otter is that the Twin Otter aircraft is the only aircraft which is of use in the Arctic or the North. It opened up the Northwest Territories. Since it can land in a very short space and it has a long wing span it can therefore withstand the conditions and the shocks of landing, certainly on the sea if on floats, or on the ice if on skis. So what we are asking for is an extension of a subsidy since the Twin Otter aircraft is an extremely expensive aircraft to operate. The population on the Labrador coast does not warrant some of the expenses and the costs incurred by that kind of aircraft.

You cannot fly Queen Airs into some of the communities, we do not have the airstrip

MR. STRACHAN: length, you need at least 3,000 feet, probably 3,500. On some of the airstrips already built we are looking at 2500 or 2,700 feet, 3,000 is the maximum. A Twin Otter is the only aircraft which can land on the airstrips, a Twin Otter is the only one which can be used during the Summer on floats. So what we are asking for here then is a continuation or a subsidy to assist the company, or whatever company, regardless of what company it is, to allow the Twin Otter aircraft, the only safe aircraft, to come back on the Labrador coast and provide a service.

As long as we are going to continue to use the single engine aircraft we are going to be freezing cold, suffering from air crashes. I can forecast we will have more and more. I myself have been down a number of times. I think almost everyone who has been on the coast and has travelled in those aircraft has been down, or stuck in places a number of times, and this will continue as long as we use these single engine aircraft.

I must commend the bush pilots of the North, the Joe Gibbonses, the Ian Masseys, and the Mike Burnses, the Bill Eatons, who have been flying under terrible, terrible conditions for years and years, subjected to much criticism which they do not warrant because they cannot upgrade nor change unless they get the new aircraft. I hope that the minister will respond to this in a favourable light and see that we get a Twin Otter service during this Summer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this and refer it to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment or so to add my support to the petition presented by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). I was one of the people on the inaugural flight last Summer of the Twin Otter when it was converted for float use on the coast. On that day we flew from Goose Bay to Makkovik to Cartwright to I think Charlottetown, Mary's Harbour and back to Goose Bay in a period of something like six hours, and that I think normally would take probably two or three days by the single Otter or single Beaver service. I have also flown that coast when it has been thirty and thirty-five degrees below zero in the cabin of the regular, the outdated Beaver aircraft.

I think that the Twin Otter service can provide an invaluable service to the coast in terms of moving of passengers, moving of freight, etc., and if it all we need is a subsidy or the extension of a subsidy to bring that type of service into operation while airstrips are being built at various communities along the coast then I think it should be done. I support the prayer of the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members have spoken, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) my colleague who presented the petition in the first place have already stated articulately and in a succinct fashion the need for this extension of a subsidy for the Twin Otter service on the coast of Labrador so I will very briefly merely add my voice of support to the petition.

I have not spent the time on the coast that the hon. member opposite has or my colleague the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) but I have spent some time flying up and down

MR. W. ROWE: the Labrador coast, Sir, and the demands of safety alone, Mr. Speaker, require that this subsidy be extended and that the Twin Otter service be renewed, put into effect year round for the service of people on that coast. Weather conditions alone, Sir, also demand it. My hon. friend the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was stranded in his home attempting to get to the House of Assembly for some eight to ten days because of weather conditions which are not unusual or unknown in the area of Nain.

I understand, Sir, without being an expert that if there had been a Twin Otter service in effect the delay would not have been nearly as long. I merely point to that fact not because I hold a brief for the hon. member and his desire to get back and forth but if this happens to him then it happens to residents on the coast on a regular basis. And, Sir, without going into any of the other reasons for having this extension of a subsidy to get a Twin Otter service on the coast of Labrador these two matters alone demand that this petition be given a sympathetic hearing by the Minister of Transportation and hopefully the Budget will bring down enough money to allow the Twin Otter service so that safety and weather conditions will no longer be the problem that they have been on the coast of Labrador as far as air transportation has been concerned, Mr. Speaker.

I take great pleasure, Sir, in supporting this petition and commending it to the hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, it is not too often I get up to support petitions but in this instance I think it is a petition that certainly warrants the support of this House. It should be given every consideration. We spoke yesterday about a resolution on Labrador, I mentioned to some great length the problems of transportation.

la

MR. ROUSSEAU: These single engine aircraft are not the best vehicle in the world for transportation and provide some of the hazards as mentioned by the previous speakers but I do wish to stand and fully support the petition. I hope that something can be done in the future to make the air service and transportation system along the coast of Labrador a much better one than it now is.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition presented by my hon. colleague the member for Eagle River (Mr. Stachan) on behalf of fifty-six of his constituents in the community of Hopedale. I understand from my hon. colleague that there will be other petitions following requesting improvements in the air service in Northern Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the prayer of the petition I want to pay tribute, Sir, to Bert Patey, Mr. Furey - What is Furey's first name?

AN HON. MEMBER: George.

MR. HEARY: Mr. Bert Patey and Mr. George Furey and the pilots and the ground crew that work for Labrador Airways. They are doing a fantastic job, Sir, a tremendous job under very difficult circumstances to supply the people in both Northern and Southern Labrador with air services, which is a matter of life and death as far as these people are concerned. It is the only way that you can get in and out of these communities, apart from the slow coastal boat service in the summertime. It is their highway, Mr. Speaker. They will never have a Trans-Canada Highway in Northern Labrador in our lifetime, and maybe in our children's lifetime. There is no way. So the people will have to depend on air service and the air service that is presently being provided by Labrador Airways, under very difficult circumstances, involved the use of single engine aircraft that are only being used, as I understand it at the present time, in Newfoundland. Nowhere else in Canada are single engine aircraft being used to transport passengers back and forth. They are considered in other parts of Canada to be unsafe, as my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, pointed out. And I think from this standpoint alone, Sir, the Minister of Transportation should approve this subsidy, which is not very much.

What are we talking about, Mr. Speaker, in the way of a subsidy? We are talking, I believe, about \$50,000 or \$60,000.

MR. DOODY: No.

MR. HEARY: No? More than that, are we talking about \$70,000?

MR. DOODY: More than that.

MR. HEARY: Are we talking about \$100,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: A bit more.

MR. HEARY: Less than that? More than that or less than that?

MR. SIMONS: Do I hear \$110,000?

MR. NEARY: Do I hear \$110,000?

MR. DOODY: Getting warm.

MR. NEARY: Are we talking about a subsidy of \$120,000?

AN UNK. MEMBER: One million dollars?

MR. NEARY: All right. Okay, Mr. Speaker, let us say - Mr. Speaker, how can you put value on human life? And if we are talking about a subsidy of \$120,000, Sir, \$115,000, \$120,000, \$125,000, then I believe that would be a very worthwhile investment on the part of this government to provide these people with an air service, because they will never have a road in our lifetime in Northern Labrador. And the people in Northern and Southern Labrador are now moving back and forth more so than they have ever done in their history. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my hon. friends realize it or not, but getting out of a Beaver aircraft, or a Cassna, and getting into a Twin Otter is like getting out of a Volkswagon into a Cadillac, or into the Premier's Lincoln Continental. And I believe, Sir, that -

MR. F. ROWE: Or your Rabbit.

MR. NEARY: It is like getting out of my Rabbit into the Premier's Lincoln Continental. But this is a very reasonable request, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that the new Minister of Transportation and Communications will give it favourable consideration. The deposed minister refused to carry on that service after the experimental stage. The people were very disappointed.

I had an occasion to go to Northern Labrador shortly after the service was discontinued. As a matter of fact I had the privilege of speaking at the first sit-down political banquet in Northern Labrador, held in the community of Nain, back in October. And one of the points that I stressed at that banquet, Sir, is that I would go back to St. John's and I would go on the floor of the

MR. NEARY: House of Assembly in the next sitting of the House and I would fight tooth and nail to try to get a Twin Otter service for the people in Northern and Southern Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD: I cannot let this moment pass without getting up and supporting the petition as presented by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). I spent a fair amount of time on the Labrador Coast and I am familiar with the problems with transportation and communication that are experienced by the residents and I am particularly familiar with the Southern Labrador Coast, just out of the Straits and the Mary's Harbour area, the Port Hope Simpson area, and also Charlottetown area. I have travelled that whole coastline in small boat myself on numerous occasions, as a matter of fact, and I know the kinds of transportation problems that the people there have and hence the prayer of this petition I fully support.

You know, there are a lot of people, especially in Southern Labrador, I guess it is also true of some areas still in Northern Labrador, where they have two homes and the transportation difficulties to move family and enough goods and services to keep them going from inland in the bay, in Mary's Harbour, out to Battle Harbour or Mattis Cove, or into Indian Harbour or out to Cape Charles from

MR. PECKFORD:

Lodge Bay, or out to Square Islands from Charlottetown, or out to Port Hope Simpson to Sandy Hook or William's Harbour or George's Cove are pretty immense. And, you know, any transportation improvement in the way of a Twin Otter is highly favourable to the people who live on that shore. They have many, many problems to contend with, and if one even looks at trying to put a road around some of the little harbours in those communities, that is a major, major undertaking because of the rock that a contractor or anybody else or council has to contend with it is almost impossible. Hence this improved service of a Twin Otter is highly favourable achievement, and I hope we can see fit, the government can see fit to improve the service there to ensure that when the new strips are built this whole Twin Otter service will be fully operational to give at least the residents of the Labrador Coast that swift and efficient system to make them feel that much more a part of the whole Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the petition. Last year the cost to the taxpayers of subsidizing the service, which is a very much needed service, in regards to transportation to the Coast of Labrador, the Northern Coast of Labrador, was in the vicinity of \$180,000 paid to the only licenced carrier on the coast, in this case Labrador Airways, issued licences by CTC in Ottawa. I understand now that a second carrier will be moving into the area in the very near future with a carrier service, only a chartered service, but the present service by Labrador Airways is a scheduled airfare service, which means that there could be over the next couple of years - and I say hopefully; competition is always good in my view - that there will be a third carrier apply for a licence on the Coast of Labrador. The fact is that it is the individual choice of the carrier, the licenced carrier on the coast as to what type of service he wants to implement. In this case Labrador Airways last year, on an experimental basis, brought in a Twin Otter aircraft, not subsidized by the Newfoundland taxpayers, on their own initiative, and a good move, to test out the service

Mr. Morgan: and to find out the satisfaction of the service to the residents concerned. Naturally and quite obviously the satisfaction was quite good, it was welcomed by the residents, a good service, and Labrador Airways is now asking for, I understand, a petition, a subsidization of that type of service. It is obvious that the residents will want an improved service. They have seen the Twin Otter.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. gentleman, Sir, would like to have his remarks go on the record of the House correct. And the hon. gentleman just made a statement that Labrador Airways were asking for this service. No, it is not Labrador Airways, Mr. Speaker, it is the people in Northern Labrador.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well there is a distinction. My hon. friend is not lobbying, he is not lobbying for Labrador Airways, My hon. friend is lobbying on behalf of his constituents, and -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - there is a great distinction, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is no point of order before the Chair.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is last year that the only carrier, in this case Labrador Airways, brought into service this kind of Twin Otter aircraft service and it was found to be satisfactory by the residents on the coast, and now the residents are asking for that type of service to be brought in by the same carrier. There is only one carrier licenced to do that kind of service on the coast, that is Labrador Airways. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we would welcome -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: The only carrier, Mr. Speaker, is Labrador Airways that can supply the kind of service. It is the only licenced carrier on the coast that can supply a scheduled aircraft service, a scheduled airfare service on the coast. The other one is a licence now issued to Gander Aviation to carry out a chartered service on the coast, a difference, a big difference.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, all of us on this side I am sure would agree that we would like to see an improved transportation service to the Coast of Labrador. The fact is that we are now paying out \$180,000 in subsidy to that one carrier, Labrador Airways. If a second or third carrier moves in it is obvious to me that they will want subsidization as well. There are a number of questions that remain unanswered but I am sure that my colleague, the Minister of Transportation, will agree in speaking on this petition, that we will make every attempt as a government to supply a satisfactory transportation service. But fortunately last year we were successful as a government in negotiating with the federal government a major airstrip development programme for Labrador. Now there is a contract awarded for two locations, in Wain and Makkovik. There will be at least ten others built on the Coast of Labrador. That is the efforts of this government over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: The situation is, Mr. Speaker, if the hob-nobs would keep quiet over there, Mr. Speaker, the situation is with the new airstrips and the efforts of both governments combined we look forward to an improved transportation service aircraft wise to the Coast of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, undisciplined as I am to public speaking, nevertheless after that glowing introduction by my very competent and capable predecessor I have to, in all honesty and modesty, say that we will do everything we possibly can to improve the air service on the Coast of Labrador. We realize how important it is. We also realize of course that there is a cost element involved. The competitive aspect that the Minister of Tourism has raised is certainly one that we have to keep in mind. Nevertheless we are fully aware of the problem. We know the advantages of the Otter as opposed to the Beaver. Those of us who have had the disadvantage

MR. DOODY: of travelling in boats to - Well we have known people, Sir, close friends of many of us here in this hon. House, who have been killed in DeLavilland 125's, so I do not really think that necessarily means that we are going to eliminate air accidents by changing the aircraft.

We feel in all honesty that we have to examine the whole thing in the context of the funds that are available. The hon. member presenting the petition has indicated that he has several other petitions coming behind it. We will do everything that we possibly can within the limits of the financing ability of the Province to supply the best possible service we can for the people on the Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY SPECIAL AND STANDING COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I table special warrants for the past year which will be of great interest.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Is there a big increase in them?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh no! Will I have to resign?

MR. HEARN: There are quite a few more than last year.

MR. HICKMAN: No, No. There are seven copies in case hon. gentlemen thought there were seven files full.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. LOUSE: I wish to table departmental regulations, School Board Elections Regulations, School Board's Allocation of Monies, The Memorial University Canada Pension Plan Regulations, and The Local School Tax Amendment Regulations.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Thank you, Sir.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker. In order to clear up the confusion now existing in the public mind as a result of statements made by a certain former minister, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier now confirm or deny for the House reports of the former Minister of Rural Development that the extension to the Grand Falls hospital is not going ahead in this financial year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition well knows that with the Budget coming down tomorrow, that is a matter that is dealt with in the Budget and certainly there will be no confirmation from me one way or the other until that document has been tabled by the Minister of Finance in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I am well acquainted with the constitution, Mr. Speaker. It was the Premier's colleague, the Minister of Rural Development, who saw fit to give this information out publicly, and I wanted merely to clear up the confusion that exists in the public mind. This government is not unprecedented in giving out information before the Budget, by the way, Sir. Well, Sir, a supplementary on that question concerning extensions of buildings generally. Will the Premier indicate to the House whether there exists an Order-in-Council or a Minute of Council or any form of Cabinet approval as to the extension of this Confederation Building or the building of an entirely new Confederation Building?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all, Minutes of Councils are, as the hon. member once again well knows, confidential documents, but I will say that there is no agreement at this time for the expansion of this building. It is something that has been contemplated

PREMIER MOORES: by the government for a period of time and it still is. And when it is ready to be announced, if it is, it will be so done, but at the present time there is no undertaking, nor any commitment to build such a building.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South, a supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: In reference to the question addressed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier in the last session or the one before, in answer to a question, in fact, from me, as will be pointed out in the Hansard I asked if a committee of this House could be appointed to look into the need for additional space for civil servants. The Premier at that time his answer, and I am subject to correction, was that it seemed like a very good idea and that he would certainly consider it and look into the possibility of setting up a committee from all sides of this House to study the need for additional space for the Civil Service, the various boards and so on, so that you would not be into the kerfluffle that occurred before on the possible extension of this building. I am wondering what the Premier's current position is on that matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we had a full report done by a group in conjunction with the federal government and ourselves as to what office space was needed, which was the most economic way for it to be carried out. We are studying that particular document. I am still not opposed to the idea of a committee as such to sit down and look at the final ramifications of such a report. It is the sort of thing that, in my opinion, gets badly out of proportion sometimes politically, and if that would help the situation and make government more efficient we would be glad to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the matter of construction of the three hospitals that have been promised in the Province, the one at Clarendville, the one at Channel - Fort aux Basques and the one on the Burin Peninsula, and the extension to the hospital in Grand Falls, would the Premier indicate to the House if it is possible to renegotiate with the Government of Canada the agreements that were recently negotiated for Tourism and the government's supporting a golf course for Terra Nova? Is it possible to divert this money, to renegotiate these agreements with the Government of Canada to get this money to be used to construct and expand hospitals -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker - is it possible to rearrange their priorities so that the government of this Province can renegotiate with the Government of Canada to have this money, instead of being spent on billboards and tourist chalets and on golf courses, be used to construct hospitals and expand the hospital at Grand Falls?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Hear, hear! A good question!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member missed also the need for the expansion of the hospital at Placentia, I think, the one at Bonavista, the Janeway Hospital, which critically needs help, the Grace Hospital, which certainly needs help as well. You know, there is still a great need for acute bed hospitals, but regarding the question in federal -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

PREMIER MOORES: Are you answering the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: I am asking one. What is the Premier doing -

PREMIER MOORES: It is amazing to me, Mr. Speaker, he cannot even wait to ask this question, I mean, and well, anyway we will not comment on that. But the fact is that the federal government just last year went out of the cost sharing of hospital operation and capital so I hardly would expect that they would start opening up any arrangement

PREMIER MOORES: now for the construction of hospitals. The answer is we have talked to the federal government, we talked to them when they got out of cost sharing. They started the health programme, they started hospital cost sharing with the Province and once it was established they have decided that that is no longer the method they want to go. And as the hon. House knows, it is now in the form of block funding based on indexing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Premier aware that there is money in various departments in Ottawa, in DREE, and so forth, looking for programmes, and that in negotiating with the Government of Canada, for instance, for the Tourist Development Programme that seems to be an awful waste of taxpayers money, and the golf course and so forth, and the Government of Canada looking for job creation programmes, Mr. Speaker, and Premier Loughheed the other day stating publicly that this is the year to build hospitals; does the Premier not think that this government could convince the Government of Canada that instead of wasting their money on foolish projects, Canada Works and that sort of thing, that the money could be used to look after the health of our people by constructing new hospitals and expanding the hospitals that are now bursting at the seams?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member when he says a lot of the Canada Works monies are not a priority in the manner they are spent. I also agree with him when he says that such things as golf courses, which the federal government themselves took as part of their arrangement for parks, are not of the top priority either. But I do not agree with him in any way when he says there is DREE money lying around, waiting for application for spending. We have several agreements before DREE now. We have had them there for several months, and the fact is that they are based on resource development. They are based on the development of the Province with an economic background. And far from the sort of waste the hon. member refers to, to say that there is money available just for application is misleading this House in the worst manner, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in his answer to me, Sir, indicated there are a number of agreements now waiting to be signed by DREE and so forth. Now it is a matter of priorities, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Neary: Would the Premier indicate the kind of agreements that are waiting to be signed by DREE and various other government departments? Should they rate top priority over the health of our people? Should they get priority over, for instance, putting an extension on the children's hospital that is bursting at the seams? The Grand Falls Hospital where people have to be brought in and put in the corridors? Channel-Port aux Basques where you have a firetrap? Are these agreements the Premier is talking about, do they rank top priority or should the health of our people be put ahead of some of these things that are included in these agreements? And would the Government of Canada be receptive to a proposal from this Province that instead of wasting their money that they put it into hospital extension and expansion, and building new hospitals as the administration having been promising the people since 1972?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as I said the federal government have made it very clear that they are not getting involved in health expenditures in any province in this country. They feel it is a provincial responsibility, and they have made that very clear to all provinces.

The agreements that are presently before DREE, and there are several of them, but a few of the proposals, I should say, rather than agreements, is the polytechnical institute where training, particularly fisheries training, is going to be a very large factor in the future; there is one on rural development, for the development of rural Newfoundland in small business development particularly; there is one on the fisheries, which is, I would suggest, of very great magnitude and importance if we are going to get the economic development going in this Province. There is a huge one for Labrador. And I think even the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will agree that that is a necessity for the people of that very large area of the Province. So basically, Sir, there are lots of opportunity for the federal government to help in the development of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Premier. Last night in a television show which he appeared on, The Watson Report, is the item I want to refer to. As we know he went national last night, he did not do awfully well, but he went national anyway. In view of his startling admission, Mr. Speaker, that his heart and soul is not really in this seal hunt, that he himself could not participate, and that kind of thing, will he now tell the House which side he is on, Mr. Speaker? Is he on the side of the seal hunt campaign, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Or is the Premier, Mr. Speaker, really in bed with the people, the crowd -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: - is he really in bed with a crowd that want to put an end to the seal hunt?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. Premier answers, I should point out that questions which are argumentative are not permitted.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, even by someone with such expert knowledge of getting on the bandwagon late, it is too late for the hon. gentleman to suggest that now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier is awfully preoccupied with the bandwagon. It looks like he has missed a few bandwagons. If you can judge by his high cheeks he has missed a few bandwagons the last couple of days.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is in the (Inaudible) you are laughing at.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, whether bandwagons or perhaps wagons. I would recommend wagons to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, would the Premier clarify the remarks he made on the Watson Report last night. He did leave a lot of people wondering where he did stand - and my question was not all that facetious - it left a lot of wondering where he stands on the seal hunt and whether he is with us or against us on this one.

MR. SPEAKER:The The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that is worthy of an answer or not. The people of this Province know exactly where I stand as far as the seal hunt is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: As I said last night, I do not think the killing of any animal, when watched by people who are not normally exposed to it

PREMIER MOORES: it is an unpleasant sight, it is a gruesome sight, it is not something that -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about hunting?

PREMIER MOORES: I have been exposed to that and I enjoy it.

MR. FLIGHT: Sure! He enjoys it!

PREMIER MOORES: Sure! Of course I enjoy it.

I make no bones about saying that. But, of course, I enjoy fishing as well. The fact is, Sir, that I think it appeals to people's best emotions, people in urban settings who have been taught that cruelty in any form, as they visualize cruelty, is something that upsets them. A lot of these people have been giving huge sums of money to people who are basically rip-off artists, people who are in it for the funds they can raise.

I thought I said last night about the quality of life of our people, the traditions, the value of the hunt itself. Whether we look at it from the humane point of view, whether we look at it from the conservation of the herd point of view, whether we look at the economics of it itself, irrespective of which way we look at the seal hunt, Sir, the fact is that it is a way of life in this Province and anyone who would suggest otherwise, even by innuendo, I would say is running into real trouble in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOLAN: I wonder, on the same topic but hopefully in a slightly different vein, if I could address this question to the hon. the Premier. He will recall no doubt, as will the former Minister of Tourism, that I tabled in this House two years ago, I

MR. NOLAN: believe, a number of articles from The New York Daily News concerning this very matter, and expressed some concern about it. I now express the concern again. For example, the Minister of Tourism recently signed an agreement with the federal government on the new tourist agreement for this Province. I submit that as a result of Mr. Davies and his gang that he has succeeded to this extent, apart altogether from the killing of seal, Mr. Speaker, in making Newfoundlanders appear to be a bunch of barbarians and savages, and uncaring.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would call to the hon. gentleman's attention the stipulation of Standing Order 31(c) and express the hope that his question will be imminent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What I am asking is, to what extent in the Premier's opinion we are going to have to send off, in an nonpartisan sense, if you like, speakers across this land to speak on Newfoundland's history and so on. There has been so much attention publicly and nationally that is allegedly bad about this Province, it has to affect our tourist industry. How does the Premier visualize this particular problem? and I ask it in all seriousness.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all, obviously, there are people who have a very

PREMIER MOORES:

derogatory opinion of the people of this Province because a promise has been made by people such as Brian Davies and others. However I think because of what has happened there are a great many responsible newspapers, radio stations, television outlets who have in fact came out very strongly in favour of the people of this Province. So whilst there has been a negative aspect, I would suggest Newfoundland has not only become better known but there has been a tremendous amount of positive words written as well. So hopefully it will be beneficial.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the non-gentlemen for Port au Port and Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: I understand that the government, or the Premier and the ministers, met on the eight floor this morning, had a Cabinet meeting. Would the Premier indicate to the house if the matter of the increase in electricity rates came up at that meeting and if the government turned thumbs down on the increase as recommended by the Public Utilities Board?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as I did not get back from Ottawa until 1:30 P.M. today I can assure the hon. member that there is no official position gone forward from any Cabinet meeting that was held this morning.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Could the Government House Leader tell the House whether or not the matter came up for discussion this morning? If not, when will a decision be taken? Mr. Speaker, does the government intend to rubber stamp the recommendations of the Public Utilities Board or will the government be turning thumbs down on the recommendation for a fourteen per cent increase in electricity rates in this Province?

Mr. Speaker, is the Government House Leader going to answer the question?

MR. W. ROWE: Decisions made by Cabinet -

MR. CALLAN: The minister can announce anything at all.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House then, Sir, the Minister of Justice - the acting Premier, the Minister of Finance, Government House Leader, member for Grand Bank, future magistrate - would the hon. gentleman tell the house if a decision has been taken on the matter of increased electricity rates in this Province? Has a decision been taken? If not could the minister indicate when a decision will be taken and whether it will be against the increase in electricity because of all the examples of extravagance and waste that came out during the hearings, extravagance and waste on the part of Newfoundland Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the -

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman going to answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If an hon. gentleman does not get up then I have to call the next questioner.

MR. W. ROWE: Answer the question, 'Alec'

AN HON MEMBER: Not a word in his cheek.

MR. W. ROWE: Answer the question, 'Alec'

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications in his capacity as Chairman of the Board of Directors of Labrador Linerboard Limited.

The minister in a television interview yesterday said, I believe the words were that major construction of the Stephenville Linerboard mill while the mill is being converted will give a shot in the arm to the area and he also said that it would take six to eight months to install machinery there. Is the government planning to convert the mill itself or do they have a buyer for the mill?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. DOODY: Excuse me, Sir. I missed the last part of the

MR. DOODY: question.

MR. HODDER: I asked if the government were planning to convert the mill themselves or if they do indeed have a buyer for the mill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: The answer to the last part, and I am glad I asked for clarification, the government has no plans at this time to convert the mill itself. The exercise at the present time that is ongoing is the encouragement of private enterprise to take on the project and to invest some of their own capital money into a conversion of the mill to a product which will be profitable, reasonable, sensible and logical for that particular area and that particular operation. That does not certainly exclude some government participation somewhere along the line, but it is not the primary consideration of government at this point to invest the necessary funds for conversion.

The part of the question which related to the length of time which it would take to convert the mill from the present linerboard operation to bleached craft pulp or a newsprint mill varies from manufacturer to manufacturer or from company to company, so the time span that I gave was a rather large one and had to be because of the rather indefinite point at which discussions are in this particular point in time. The major object of the interview was to let the people in the area know that discussions were going on, that they were of a constructive nature, and that there is indeed a great deal of optimism and hope for the eventual conversion and reactivation of the plant at Stephenville.

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

MR. HODDER: Would the minister make public any negotiations that Woods Gordon had with prospective buyers? And will the minister inform the House what firms have shown interest in the mill?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware there has been Divestiture Committee appointed and has been in being for sometime. Represented on that group are representatives of the two unions directly involved in the prior operation, a member of the Harmon Corporation - I think it is the Harmon Corporation or of the Joint Town Councils, one of the groups active in the area - and these people are members of the Divestiture Committee. The other people on the Committee are members of various government departments, and of Woods Gordon, and they bring in outside expertise as they need it. But to that extent, Sir, the discussions and negotiations that have been taking place during the past months are public, but they are public only to the extent that they are a knowledge of the people whose names I have mentioned, or at least whose titles or definitions I have given. I certainly would not be in the interest of the ultimate objective of the people of the Province to make public the discussions that have been going on with the various companies. I do not think that there is any company would seriously consider following up the procedures if they were going to be discussed publicly the way that most of us in public life would like to see them discussed.

So I think we are going to have to wait a little while -

MR. HODDER: A supplementary.

MR. DOODY: - before we proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. HODDER: The minister in his television interview which I referred to earlier made very favourable comments about the mill's prospects. Now does this mean that the minister is telling the people of Bay St. George, hang on, do not sell your houses, do not take a job in Iran, hang on because things are going to be good? Or is he just trying to keep up optimism in case there is an election or something like

Mr. Hodder: that? In my estimation, you either have to tell the facts and let the facts come out or say nothing. What is the minister trying to do here?

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

MR. DOODY: What the minister is trying to do is something that perhaps the Opposition party is not familiar with—the minister is trying to tell the absolute and undiminished truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: What we are trying to do is trying to acquaint the people in the area with a situation -

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

MR. W. ROWE: What about the Twillingate by-election?

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege has now come up.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister has certainly cast aspersions on every member on this side of the House, but I rise on my own behalf that he intimated that we over here do not tell the truth. Now we make a deliberate effort to do so, Mr. Speaker; I do for my part and I think I speak for every colleague over here. And the minister has to retract that statement, that bit of innuendo, that somehow he has the monopoly on truth and we are incapable of telling the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: That is shameful, even from the minister.

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, in all humility, and all seriousness at no time did I intimate that hon. members opposite were not capable of telling the truth. What I intimated was that there were occasions in the past when they had told something less than the completely undiminished truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: Now if hon. members opposite want me to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh, oh'.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: If hon. members opposite want me to withdraw that, Sir, I will be most happy to do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. DOODY: If they feel they are not capable of telling the truth, that I misconstrued the thing, I will say, well I will take the whole thing back, I will start again from scratch. What I was trying to do -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has withdrawn?

MR. DOODY: Completely, irrevocably, and unequivocally.

What I am trying to do is answer the question of the hon. member opposite which was what was my intent in giving this interview to the press relative to the status of negotiations and the ongoing prospects of the mill in the Stephenville area. It had nothing to do with upcoming elections, as the hon. member suggested in his preamble. To the best of my knowledge there is no imminent election in that particular part of the Province, if there were I would certainly be very, very interested and very, very concerned, and I think the people out in that area would be very, very happy at the prospect.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: What I am saying, Sir, is that the Province, and the people responsible for the operation of the economy of the Province, are doing everything that they possibly can to reactive the mill and to try and provide some economic opportunities for the people who live in that area. That does not mean to suggest that anybody who is living in that part of the world who gets an opportunity for a job, and I think it was Iran the hon. member mentioned, should turn down the opportunity if they get a job in Iran. I think there are many people in the Province who are looking for jobs, not only in that part of Newfoundland but in many parts of Newfoundland, and I do not want to raise hopes or give out false expectations or to make people feel that there is a resurrection tomorrow that is going to solve all the problems in the Bay St. George area. What I simply gave was an unexaggerated and a very accurate summation of the situation as it stands to date, and I hope to be in a position to do that from time to time when called on. I

MR. DOODY: am not interested in raising false hopes or in giving false impressions.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that I will recognize the hon. gentleman for Terra Nova next.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower. In view of the recent layoffs of 350 men at Labrador City, with IOCC, I wonder if the minister can inform the House whether or not he took any initiatives or the government took any efforts to prevent this situation from happening?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: We certainly did. The figure is not 350, it is considerably less than that, and by the time the twelve weeks rolls around it will probably be considerably less than 300. The number is not now 350, although I do not have the official numbers yet. It would not be 350. We have held meetings with the company, we put it point blank to them and asked them not to lay off. Their position was simply this, that plants where they were selling in Europe, who were operating at 60 per cent capacity, they were selling half their product to and because environmental problems they have had, and start-up problems, they had plant that was operating at 2900-plus people - 2925 or 2950 - they felt that on a study they had done the number of people needed to operate that plant was around 2550 or 2600. We asked them not to go ahead with the layoff; they said they had to and proceeded with it.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: Can the minister assure us that there will be no further layoffs in Labrador City or in Wabush? I understand that the company at Wabush is contemplating similar moves.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all, I can only say what I feel. The evening I heard it, the next morning I had an opportunity to talk with a senior official of Wabush Mines. Wabush Mines is jointly owned, it is a conglomerate of seven companies. Two of the companies happen to be DELFASCO and STELCO, and with the Canadian pipeline going ahead, I would be very surprised if any layoffs ensued at Wabush Mines. Indeed, Wabush Mines

MR. ROUSSEAU: appears to be one of the better operating iron ore operations now in North America, probably, with the prospects of the pipeline, so they have not indicated to me the possibility of any layoffs.

What happens there, so that I am certain that everybody understands the situation; in December of every year the companies which are involved in the operation of Wabush mines, Pickands - Mather, the managing agent, and the other companies, including DELFASCO and STELCO, give in their requirements of iron ore for the year. They have an opportunity in March or April to reassess that and the Wabush Mines do not anticipate there will be any reassessment because of the fact that the pipeline is going ahead and because of the fact that there is a certain penalty clause -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Because of the fact there are certain costs incurred we are not doing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Am I answering it too much?

Am I?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: In view of the present situation in Labrador City, and I refer to the strike situation, and in view of the fact that one of the reasons given for the strike had to do with contracting out, and in view of the fact that the Bartlett Enquiry made some specific recommendations with respect to contracting out, I wonder if the minister would inform the House when the government intends to implement the major recommendations

MR. LUSH: of the Bartlett Enquiry?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Government is working on that right now, Mr. Speaker. I made an announcement the other day on - I hope very soon now because of the strike situation, the Iron Ore Company of Canada will be - The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) - somebody said, Thanks. If you do not want the answers gentlemen, I will not give them. It is a very important question and if people do not want the answers and make the suggestion that I am talking too long, I am sorry gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

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

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister, I know, would not intentionally accuse me of something I may not have been guilty of doing, but he is indicating that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans interrupted his answer and I would like to point out to the minister that it may not have been the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. ROUSSEAU: For the moment I thought it came from there. If it was not the member, I apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: In any case, there is no point of order before the Chair.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 23 to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the serious strikes ongoing at Baie Verte and Labrador City based on the issues -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - of safety and health conditions at those mining operations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Under the provision of the relevant Standing Order and, as hon. members are aware, the precedents of the House, a number of criteria are required, among them the urgency of debate now, and following and associated to that the reasonable expectation that there will be an opportunity for debate in the very near future.

With the Address in Reply on the Order Paper whereby in terms of relevance the matters referred to of the strikes in Baie Verte and Labrador City, and the health related issues could be debated, and it is my understanding that that order was to be called today, then the provision of reasonable expectation of an opportunity for debate very soon is met and the precedents would not allow me therefore to give the hon. gentleman leave.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment to the Address in Reply.

The hon. member for LaPoile,

MR. HEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is no trouble for a member to become swell headed with such enthusiastic colleagues.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege apparently has arisen.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, this point should have been raised on Tuesday; however, I had to research the appropriate citations and the point I am making is concerning the privileges of this House. We are being subjected, have been subjected and are about to be subjected again to an unending filibuster. No end in sight. The hon. gentleman's voice seems to be capable of carrying him through several more days. And the other members of this House, Mr. Speaker, our rights to speak are being seriously infringed.

The citations I cite are Standing Orders number 51(b), Beauchesne citation 119 subsection 2 on relevance and citation 108 on insolence. Notwithstanding Standing Order 49(a) and (b) of this House and Beauchesne citation 117 (1) and (2) and citation 119 (1) and (3) which safeguard a member's right to speak freely. Under certain circumstances and this is one of them a member may speak beyond his allotted time but nowhere is a member guaranteed unlimited time neither in Beauchesne nor in our Standing Orders. And when a member publicly proclaims his intention to speak for days on end as if to set some kind of a record, then I think it is time for this House to act, Mr. Speaker. His speech so far has been tedious and repetitious and that is against our Standing Orders, time consuming, mischievous and vexatious, in fact a rag-bag of ramblings, taking Your Honour's forbearance, I would suggest, to the limit.

So far no precedent has been set. We have put up with unlimited speeches before but there has never been a decision allowing unlimited speeches. People have been allowed to go beyond their allotted time but they have never been guaranteed unlimited speaking time. And our rules also presume good will, something notoriously

MR. J. CARTER: lacking in the hon. gentleman, I would suggest. I therefore invite -

MR. W.N. ROWE: A point of order?

MR. J. CARTER: No, a point of privilege of super -

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot hear a point of order while there is a point of privilege in process.

MR. W.N. ROWE: But is this a point of privilege?

MR. J. CARTER: Yes, a privilege of the House.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It would be great if the Speaker could make up his mind by now, Sir.

MR. J. CARTER: I am about to conclude, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is about to conclude, I understand.

MR. J. CARTER: I would seriously invite other members of this House to join in this particular point of privilege and comment on it because I suggest it will be their only opportunity to speak during this session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, Sir, I only rise, Sir, not to dignify that piece of buffoonery but in the hope that by some freakish aberration or lack thereof this does not in any way become a precedent of the House. First of all, Sir, there is no point of privilege raised. If in fact there was anything germane to be raised, it should have been raised by a point of order, perhaps. Second of all, Sir, the point of privilege, if it was a point of privilege, was not raised at the earliest possible opportunity; and **thirdly, Sir,** we do not know whether the hon. member is going to speak unlimited, until eternity arrives. So far, Sir, he has spoken for four hours. He may speak for an infinite length of time. We do not know that yet. We will not know until eternity in fact has arisen. So the point made by the hon. member for - What is he anyway?

MR. NEARY: St. John's North.

MR. W.N. ROWE: St. John's North. I hear so little from him, Mr. Speaker,

MR. W.N. ROWE: I do not even know what seat he sits in in the House. Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege involved but simply there may be a facetious point of order raised.

But I just stand for the record, Sir, to state that there is no point of privilege nor a point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile has spoken for four hours so far and I myself, Sir, found it most entertaining, as have all members of the House, I would submit, with the exception perhaps of the member over there who would not even allow, Sir, last year, one would recall, one of the great political institutions of this province to have a television report or recording of one of the great political institutions, Mr. Smallwood, in this House.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: And the likes of that hon. member to stand up and raise a point of privilege, Sir, is a disgusting spectacle.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The substance of the points brought up by the hon. gentleman is that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is filibustering and, presumably, should not continue. All I can point out is that of course our Standing Orders or precedents do not make any direct reference to filibustering as long as one brings oneself within the requirements of relevance, parliamentary language and other requirements. As I understand filibustering it is speaking merely to take up time, and one hears of incidents in the United States, for example, of people reading telephone books. That type of thing obviously would not be permitted, but I would point out that the Standing Orders on a motion of non-confidence make no limitation as to time. As was pointed out, whether it will be unlimited or not, it will take us all a long while to see. But there is no stated limit as to time, and as long as the hon. gentleman brings himself within the rules of relevance, of parliamentary language, then he obviously can continue. I would point out also of course that - I do not think the hon. gentleman made this submission but it may have been assumed in his use of the word filibuster. It may have been assumed. That would be a different case. I think there a person could easily put himself outside of relevance. Also, of course, the Government on four days of the week controls the order of business. Once the order of business is called then that is that, I think that also would be a guarantee if one understood filibuster in a different sense from the way I defined it which would have made it out of order on account of relevance. The hon. member is speaking as the introducer of an amendment which is of the nature of a non-confidence motion and the Standing Orders provide no time limit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of Order.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, during the scurrilous remarks by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) he accused my hon. colleague here of having bad will or - what were the terms used?

AN HON. MEMBER: No good will.

MR. W. ROWE: - lack of good will, Sir, which is the definite, unequivocal imputation of bad motives to a member of the House. As a colleague of this hon. gentleman, Sir, I ask the Chair to direct the hon. member to withdraw those scurrilous, slanderous remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member.

MR. J. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, if necessary I will produce the remark in Hansard but the hon. gentleman has gone on record as boasting about his ability to make a marathon of this particular speech and if that is not an admission of bad will, I do not know what is.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually, the rules with respect to parliamentary language apply, as I understand it, to what transpires in the House. There are extenuating circumstances of matters which transpire out of the House if they are brought up in this House, but if the hon. gentleman did allege bad faith or ill will then he will be required to withdraw that allegation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I am in your hands and if I have said anything unparliamentary I withdraw it unequivocally. However, I am very disappointed that the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) sees fit to take advantage of the rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think we should regard the matter as disposed of and the hon. gentleman should continue his speech.

MR. NEARY: Sir, let me make a reference to what the hon. gentleman just said before the hon. gentleman took his seat. Your Honour knows full well that I have not broken any rules of this hon. House and I want to congratulate Your Honour, as a matter of fact, and I want to congratulate the Deputy Speaker of this House for doing such an excellent job under very trying circumstances in this session of the House when we have had so many personal attacks made on members on this side, Sir, and Your Honour has ruled every time that the remarks had to be withdrawn and the members had

MR. NEARY: to apologize. We saw another example in this House this afternoon, Sir. That is the only way, Mr. Speaker, we can maintain the decorum of this House. It is the only way we can maintain law and order in this House. I have to compliment Your Honour for doing such a fine job, Sir, in this regard. It is absolutely amazing and it is very impressive especially to me, Sir, who has had to ask so often

MR. NEARY: for the protection of the Chair. You see, Mr. Speaker, hon. ministers sometimes misinterpret an attack on their department and on their position. They take it personal and they retaliate, Sir, with a scurrilous, personal attack on the member on this side who happens to be doing that, who happens to be zeroing in on that particular minister or department. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour would check Hansard and check the records, there have been no personal remarks made from this side of the House in this session of the House so far. All my colleagues have managed to restrain themselves.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody has spoken.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is exactly the point, Sir. My hon. friend has said nobody has spoken. Well, Sir, my hon. friend and his colleagues go outside of this House and say the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is the one who gets personal, is the one who attacks people's character, and I have been five days now on my feet and there has not been one personal attack, there has not been one sour note. If there is any character assassination, if there is it is coming from the other side of the House. And I hope, Sir, that the people in the gallery, the press people will take note of the fact that my colleagues - none of my colleagues, and I have been speaking now for four or five days, have said anything about character, have attacked a minister personally. If you say a minister is incompetent that is not a personal attack, Mr. Speaker, you are attacking the position.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there was no boasting; I have not outside of this House made one reference so far to any of the speeches or the length of time that I intend to speak in this House, no reference at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: You just finished saying that.

MR. NEARY: I did not just finish saying it, Mr. Speaker. To be perfectly honest with members of the House, I would have finished my few remarks on Friday had it not been but for interruptions

MR. NEARY: from members on the opposite side of the House. And let me say this, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter); even, Sir, if I took my seat now in this hon. House we would not hear a peep, not a sound out of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has spoken on two or three occasions in this House to give his own administration a kind of a backhanded flick, that is all. The hon. gentleman has done nothing for his district, nothing for the Province, just taken a little swipe, needling, needling his own colleagues or tearing somebody else apart. And so, Mr. Speaker, I intend, Sir, to finish my few remarks, I intend to finish them in my own time, in my own style and I am not going to be provoked by any hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that every hon. member of this House before this sitting is over will have a chance to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I was given the major responsibility of leading off the Throne Speech by my colleagues. That is a major responsibility, that was a heavy responsibility that was placed on my shoulders. And in so doing my colleagues understood that I would be either carrying on until my speech was finished or I would be moving a vote of non-confidence in the government. And my colleagues know full well that unless the government shuts the House down after we get rid of the seventy-five hours that we have on the estimates, unless the government shuts the House down as they apparently intended to do, shut her down as quickly as they can - they have shut down all the industries or a lot of the industries in this Province and now they are going to shut down the only bulwark of democracy that is left, shut down the House as fast as you can.

My colleagues on this side understand that they can now make two speeches as a result of the motion that I moved. They can speak on the amendment, on the vote of non-confidence, and they can speak on the Address in Reply. And not only that, Sir, not only that but each one of my colleagues, if they want to, up to

March 16, 1978

Tape No. 250

AH-3

MR. NEARY: a certain point can move a vote of non-confidence which would allow them to speak for an indefinite period of time. And in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, each one of my colleagues when the Budget is brought down and the Budget Debate starts can

MR. NEARY: speak at least once, if not twice in the Budget debate.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleagues are not impatient. My hon. colleagues are waiting until I finish and then the Minister of Fisheries will follow me - the Minister of Fisheries, if he is in his seat and the hon. gentleman is not there now - in a few minutes if the member for St. John's North would just stop interrupting me and the member for - the deposed Minister of Transportation and Communications, if the minister -

MR. DOODY: I did not say a word, Sir.

MR. NEARY: If the minister would just restrain himself. Then just give me a few more minutes. Give me a few minutes to wind up my few remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: He always says that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there you go now, look. See that is another two or three minutes wasted. If the ministers, Sir, if the ministers would just control themselves, not go berserk, restrain themselves then in a few minutes, Sir, I will hopefully conclude my remarks and then the Minister of Fisheries can get up on his feet and if the hon. gentleman so desires he can tear the hide off us.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that I now first of all, Sir, would like to deal with the resignation of the hon. member for Grand Falls as Minister of Rural Development. Mr. Speaker, last week in this hon. House, if hon. gentleman will just recall the events, the comments that I made in my speech - and I would like to welcome the hon. member for St. John's South, the hon. member back to his seat. The hon. gentleman has been away for -

MR. R. WELLS: Kilbride.

MR. NEARY: Kilbride rather. The hon. gentleman has been away. The hon. gentleman now has an opportunity, by the way, in case the hon. gentleman did not hear the news, now has an opportunity to get into the Cabinet and I would, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly recommend -

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, there must be something about relevance -

MR. NEARY: I would recommend that, Sir, to the hon. the Premier,

MR. MEARY: Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman be invited into the Cabinet. The hon. Minister of Finance, who is also Minister of Justice, would not let go the Justice Department so the hon. gentleman could slide in. But now there is a vacancy and I could think of no better candidate, Sir, than the hon. member for Kilbride who is in great shape these days, getting in great shape and I am sure physically and mentally. And I am sure the hon. gentleman would make a good minister, Sir.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to know now is how many more resignations does the hon. Premier have in his pocket postdated from ministers who have resigned? How many more does he have in his pocket? The hon. gentleman has been carrying this resignation around since March 10th in the hon. gentleman's pocket and I referred to it last week in my few remarks here in this hon. House when I talked about the virious row that had taken place between the hon. the Premier and the member for Grand Falls. And hon. members might remember that I suggested that the next main bout would not be between Mohammed Ali and Spinks, it would be between the Colgate Kid and the Swiler. Does not Your Honour the Speaker remember that? We knew, Mr. Speaker, we knew on this side of the House that there was trouble in the Cabinet. We knew she was getting ready to go bottom up. We knew, Sir, that the ship was sinking and we know there are other problems, that there are other ministers, Sir, who are on the verge of either getting the flick or quitting. We happen to know that too, Sir, and we happen to know that there are a few backbenchers who are very disillusioned with the performance of the administration. They are cheessed off, Sir, they are browed off with the number of breaches of commitments that have been violated by the administration, false promises that have been made especially during by-elections and the deceitfulness, Sir, especially, as I say, when by-elections are held in this province

MR. NEARY: . . . and during election time. So, Mr. Speaker, we can understand the frustration of some of the ministers. I do not know how I feel about the Minister of Rural Development resigning. I have mixed feelings. I am sorry. I hate to see a Minister resign, to be forced to resign. Then, on the other hand, I admire a man who will stand on his principles. I admire a man who will renounce his colleagues for not keeping their promise to the people who live in his constituency, in this particular instance, Grand Falls. I admire a man for that, Sir, and I am sure my hon. friend has nothing but respect and would tip his hat to the hon. member for Grand Falls for having the courage to stand up for his convictions. Not too many ministers would have the courage to do that. The last time it happened I think it was Mr. Cheesman who resigned. Mr. Cheesman resigned basically for the same reason, non-performance.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think it was Marshall.

MR. NEARY: Yes. The hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) resigned from the Cabinet. I think the hon. gentleman should have resigned from the House, or crossed the House, or come over and sat down with my friend from Bay Roberts, because the hon. gentleman resigned on the grounds that a certain buddy of the hon. the Premier was going to get an office building over here at Wedgewood Park without calling public tenders. We hear now that the same thing is happening again but I do not hear a sound out of my hon. friend, not a sound.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman will be heard when and if the situation arises, which I do not believe it will.

MR. NEARY: In other words, Mr. Speaker, do I understand the hon. gentleman as saying, and the hon. gentleman can correct me if he wants to, that if a certain close friend of the hon. the Premier has an Order-in-Council in his pocket or has an assurance of the contract to put an extension on Confederation Building, that my hon. friend will take a stand? But what kind of a stand? Will my hon. friend still continue to support that administration? That is the key question.

MR. MARSHALL: I said you shall wait with bated breath.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have waited before with bated breath and I must say I was rather disappointed with my hon. friend. But we saw my hon. friend resign from the Cabinet for a different reason than the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Cheesman. The reasons were different in this way, Sir, that both of these gentleman resigned because of the breach of promise on the part of the Government. My hon. friend resigned for what appeared to be a bit of political skulduggery. So that was a different reason. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am happy or sad about the resignation of my hon. friend. It is always, Sir, a bit of a shocker to this House and to the people of the Province when they hear of ministers who are forced to resign. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the frustration, the turmoil, the chaos inside of that Cabinet? It must be devastating, and it is having a very serious effect on the Province as a whole. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot get anything done. There is no leadership, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that resignations sometimes have a tendency to bring people a little closer together because I was once a member of a cabinet myself, and I have been in the House long enough to know the strategy that will be implemented now. One minister after the other will be told by the head of the Administration, by the Premier, 'Now, boys, we have to stick together. This is our time to stick together', and the ministers will fall for it, Sir. Some ministers will fall for it. Some will not. Some backbenchers will fall for it. Some will not. From now on we will see in this House for the remainder of the session a sort of an expression of solidarity. One minister after the other will get up on his

MR. NEARY:

pins and say, "Boy, this is a great government. I am all for it," even though down deep in the pit of his stomach he may feel like going outside the door and throwing up after having said it. I know, Mr. Speaker, I know what the strategy will be. The orders will go out, "Now, boys, stick together. We have lost one; two will destroy us". Because for the longest time, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if Your Honour has heard any rumours or not, we have been hearing them for months and months and I mentioned it in this House since I started to speak on the Throne Speech, rumours about the dissension in the Cabinet, dissension in the ranks. You cannot run a Province that way, Sir; you have to have Cabinet solidarity, you have to have everybody behind you. Times are difficult enough as they are. But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot support nothing, there is the problem. If you have no leadership, if you have no policy and no platform, well what do you do? Do you stand up in the House and say, "We are all together. We will rise or fall together!" They will probably fall together, Sir, like a house of cards. They have nothing to fight for, nothing to crusade for, the life is gone out of them. They are over there, Sir, like a beaten bunch of men, and, Mr. Speaker, it is beginning to show all over the Province. This problem is not being dealt with, they cannot cope with this, they cannot do anything about this situation, they cannot do anything about that situation, they are making contradictory statements. You hear a statement one day in this House about the policy on the Lower Churchill and the Upper Churchill and the Minister of Mines and Energy the next day will contradict the Premier and then the next day the Premier will contradict the Minister of Mines and Energy, and then the next day the Minister of Justice will contradict the two of them. It is Mumbo Jumbo and we are all confused.

AN HON. MEMBER: They cannot get their act together.

MR. NEARY: That is right. My hon. friend says they cannot

MR. NEARY: get their act together.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope, Sir, I do hope that my hon. friend, the gentleman who resigned today, the hon. Minister of Rural Development, I do hope the hon. gentleman will stay in the House. I hope the hon. gentleman will not resign from the House.

Mr. Speaker, I say that with one stipulation, I say that with a certain qualification, Sir. I would like to see the hon. gentleman stay in the House because I believe in my heart that the hon. gentleman has a contribution to make to this Province, to the people of this Province. Now I so happen to believe also, Sir, that the hon. gentleman cannot make that contribution sitting to your left, to Your Honour's left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I am not inviting the hon. gentleman to come over, It is not my place, Sir, to invite the hon. gentleman to come over and sit with the Opposition, that is not my place, I am not doing that, Sir. But there is another spot in this hon. House in which that particular gentleman can sit, I have had the privilege and the honour, Sir, of occupying that position for two and one half years, right down here, Your Honour, where my dear friend and colleague from Bay Roberts (Mr. Dawe) sits. The hon. gentleman could sit as an Independent PC or the hon. gentleman could sit as an Independent, period. If the hon. gentleman is a strong PC and I doubt that very much because before the hon. gentleman ran for the riding of Gander - Twillingate, before the hon. gentleman who is now the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) ran in that riding the hon. gentleman was a card carrying Liberal. So I cannot see the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) being such a staunch Tory; as a matter of fact I cannot see the hon. gentleman being a Tory at all. So I would say that the hon. gentleman has no real strong feelings about the Tories, about the PC party, has no loyalties to the Tory party. The gentleman I would think, Sir, is probably more of a Liberal than he is a Tory.

Mr. Neary: The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and I can only speak personally, I cannot speak for the party, but I would say personally speaking that I would like to have the hon. gentleman as a colleague, and that is only my own personal feelings, Sir. I am not speaking for my colleagues or for the party. We have a president and we have a leader who can do that. But personally speaking, Sir, I would be very happy to sit in this hon. House with the former Minister of Rural Development, especially with his experience that he gained while a member of Parliament, Sir, very outspoken, the very outspoken gentleman sat with my friend, the Minister of Fisheries, in the Parliament of Canada, made a magnificent contribution to the debates, most colourful when the hon. gentleman sat in Parliament, very colourful indeed, did a magnificent job. Time ran out for the hon. gentleman; he got defeated, then came back to the Province and ran as a P.C. That is the only thing I have against the hon. gentleman; apart from that, Sir, I would be very happy, very happy indeed to have the hon. gentleman sit beside me here to help us to fight the good fight, to help us, to give us, Sir, the benefit of his experience and his ability, to try to fight the major problems, to solve the problems that are facing the people of this Province.

The hon. gentleman had told us so often he is just an ordinary little fellow from Upper Island Cove. And I think I have told the House on many an occasion that I worked and lived with 200 or 300 people from Upper Island Cove for a good many years when they worked on Bell Island. And I will say one thing for the men from Upper Island Cove - they always had guts, Mr. Speaker, I saw the men from Upper Island Cove walk from Bell Island when the ice was in and the ferries could not get across and they wanted to get home to the North shore of Conception Bay on the weekend; they would take their bags on their back, they would get out on the ice and they would walk twelve miles to Upper Island Cove to get home for the weekend to see their families. And, Mr. Speaker, they had the courage, and they had the guts. And I would say my hon. friend has the guts.

But my hon. friend, in order to prove his sincerity, in order to show, Sir, that he is typical of what the Upper Island Covers

Mr. Neary: are made of, has to now disassociate himself altogether with the administration. The hon. gentleman cannot sit in this House and support that administration any longer. The hon. gentleman, if he were to take my advice, should now move, move away from the administration. I would be glad to have him, But the hon. gentleman does not have to come over and sit with us, Sir, here just to satisfy me, the hon. gentleman has a recourse of going down and sitting as an Independent P.C. or an Independent, period.

Mr. Speaker, could you not see the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) over here with his gift of the gab, with his Upper Island Cove sense of humour, blasting away, Sir, at the government? Could you not see it, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: How sweet it is!

MR. NEARY: How sweet it would be! How sweet it would be, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sweet it will be!

MR. NEARY: - to see the hon. gentleman sit on this side of the House with both guns blazing.

AN HON. MEMBER: He knows the skulduggery!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, what a contribution, what a service the hon. gentleman could provide for the people of this Province. What a service, Sir, knowing the chaos, knowing the strategy, knowing what is going on in the Cabinet, maintaining his silence as a Cabinet minister, but putting forward counter arguments, and counter proposals, and in a subtle way letting the people of this Province know how they are being let down and sold out.

MR. WELLS: I believe the hon. gentleman is completely recovered from his flu.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) for helping me get my voice back as much as I have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, without dwelling, Sir, any longer on my hon. friend, I look forward, Sir, with great interest to the next move

March 16, 1978

Tape 254

PK - 3

Mr. Neary: the next move of my hon. friend. My hon. friend, so
the hon. Premier told us, went down to Grand Falls

MR. NEARY: and consulted with the committee, the district association, the hospital committee, and said, "Here I am. I am in your hands. Did I do the right thing by resigning?" And they said, "Yes, yes you did. God bless you." There are too many people, Sir, sitting on the opposite side of the House who like the salary, who like the soft, cushy job they have, who like the glamour and the travelling and the privileges that they have to give it up as my hon. friend did. My hon. friend is not a lawyer or a doctor. My hon. friend has given up today, Sir, what - What is the salary of a Cabinet Minister now? \$25,000.

MR. MORGAN: The same as the hon. gentleman's.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it is not the same as the hon. gentleman's.

MR. MORGAN: There is very little difference.

MR. NEARY: There is a big difference, Sir. When the increases came through a couple of years ago a Cabinet Minister's salary I think was doubled. Doubled or it may be a little more than doubled. A Cabinet Minister today is making \$22,000 or \$24,000.

MR. MORGAN: Over and above his -

MR. NEARY: Over and above - No, Mr. Speaker, a Cabinet Minister today is earning - A Cabinet Minister, I would think, is earning about \$32,000 to \$35,000 a year in this province today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Plus what -

MR. NEARY: How much?

AN HON. MEMBER: \$13,700.

MR. NEARY: Plus the House. Well put it all together and what is the total? Plus travelling allowances of \$3,000 or \$4,000, -

AN HON. MEMBER: What you are making.

MR. NEARY: I am not talking about me. I am talking about the minister who just resigned. Well, all right, let us say - All right, forget the argument, let us say that the hon. gentleman was only getting \$13,000 as a Cabinet Minister, would that be a fair sum?

MR. WELLS: Fair enough.

MR. NEARY: All right. The member for Kilbride who is very seldom wrong says that is fair enough. Well the hon. gentleman is not a doctor

MR. NEARY: and he is not a lawyer. He is not, I would say, according to today's standards not an academic although the hon. gentleman was a teacher at one time. He may have some difficulty with the problems the teachers are having to be able to go back to the teaching profession unless he upgraded himself. So the hon. gentleman has given up \$13,000 plus because there are fringe benefits. He is giving up adding to his pension rights. He has given up his travelling allowance. He has given up being able to go down to the motor pool and get a free car once in a while. He has given up the odd little trip with the Premier down in LaPoile Bay or down on Brunette Island. He has given up trips on Lundrigan's aircraft to bring back partridge and moose and all that sort of thing. The hon. gentleman has given all that up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose aircraft?

MR. NEARY: Lundrigan's aircraft, so I am told. I am talking about the hon. member for Grand Falls what he gave up today. He gave up free hunting licences. He gave up little trips, hunting trips with the hon. the Premier in LaPoile Bay and in Brunette Island and other places, down in Bay d'Espoir. He gave up trips on Lundrigan's aircraft bringing back moose and partridge and all that sort of thing. But these are all little fringe benefits.

The hon. gentleman, I am making a point, is not an academic and he is not a doctor or a lawyer, so he has made a big sacrifice. He can no longer go off on these safaris with the hon. the Premier to London and Paris and he can no longer - I do not think the hon. gentleman ever took up golfing. I do not believe the hon. gentleman ever went to California but nevertheless, Sir, it is a big decision. And I am sure that the hon. member for Grand Falls must have spent many a restless night pondering his future.

AN HON. MEMBER: - the ice.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman had resigned when he went to the ice. No, the hon. gentleman had passed in his resignation before he went to the ice.

MR. NEARY: The Premier said that he waited for him to come back so he could discuss it with him. In the meantime, the hon. gentleman was out in Grand Falls with his constituents where the hon. gentleman should have been. Rightly so, he took the advice of his constituents and threw in the towel. Now, Mr. Speaker, having done that, having given up \$13,000 a year, and the hon. gentleman has a young family and nothing to turn to except to be a member of this House and draw just an ordinary backbenchers pay, how in all conscience, Sir, can the hon. gentleman now sit as my hon. friend, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) did after condemning the Government, after bailing out, after tearing the hide off the Premier of the Government - I am talking about the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) now - how could the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) follow the example that was set by that gentleman?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to interrupt for a few moments.

As it is Thursday and at 5:30 P.M. it shall be deemed that motion to adjourn the House will be before the Chair and the so-called 'late show' will be on, I have to inform the members of the subjects to be debated.

The first subject will be debated by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the hon. Minister of Justice concerning a police commission.

The second subject by the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) and the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications regarding ferry services.

The third by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the hon. the Premier regarding the Hinds Lake project.

Hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will be anxiously looking forward to seeing what move the hon. gentleman is going to make. The hon. gentleman has obviously left the sinking ship. Now the question is, Sir, will other

MR. NEARY: ministers follow his good example or will they be manoeuvred into a position where they will express Cabinet solidarity, where they will, because of instructions from the head of the Administration, the hon. the Premier, and because they will be afraid if they do not come out and say, "Bless me, father, for I have sinned but I have no intention of leaving the Administration, I am going to stick with you Premier, good or bad, right or wrong I am going to stick with you, sink or swim"? Is this the kind of a position now that the other disgruntled ministers will be put in or will they have the courage as my hon. friend from Grand Falls did? Will they have the courage, in the best interests of the people of this Province, to say, "I am sorry, Mr. Premier, but I do not believe in your fiscal policy, I do not believe in awarding contracts without calling public tenders, I do not believe in the policy you followed with Affiliated & Marine Metals, I do not believe in your policy of favouritism in political patronage".

To give an example, Mr. Speaker: Yesterday in the Daily News, I think it was, March 15, there was a picture of the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, nice looking fellow, takes a nice photograph, and there was a caption up over the picture. It said, 'Cheque for \$200,000'. The hon. the Premier must be proud of his colleague, he takes such a nice photograph. \$200,000. Now let me read the caption, Sir: 'First instalment of \$200,000 of a half million dollar grant to the Y.M.C.A. to aid in the construction of their new home in St. John's was passed over Tuesday night by Recreation and Rehabilitation Minister T.V. Hickey to President Mary Andrews at the annual meeting at City Hall' Nothing wrong with that. A noble gesture on the part of the Administration. My hon. friend was commendable. The hon. gentleman will probably be down getting ready for the Boston Marathon when it is built. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, 'At the meeting award of the contract for the structure on New Cove Road near the present facilities was announced. It goes to

MR. NEARY:

N-O-R-D-I-C, Nordic

Construction Company of St. John's in the amount of \$1,335,000, the lowest of eight bids. The lowest of eight bids. That is the crucial point, the lowest of eight bids.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know the government will argue, Well, this is a private organization, that we have no control over this organization, that is it a volunteer group. And, Mr. Speaker, let it be said in this hon. House, Sir, that I am all for the 'Y' and I support their cause, and I respect the 'Y' and admire the volunteers, and I admire the work they do. That is not the point at all, Sir. They are going to be passed over a half million dollars of public money, of money from the treasury of this Province, from the hard-pressed taxpayers of this Province and we see this statement, "Construction company of St, John's in the amount of \$1,335,000 the lowest of eight bids."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question that I am raising here is did the minister and will the minister pass over this \$500,000 without any strings attached? Will the minister pass over this \$500,000, for instance, without a reference to the preference policy that we heard expounded by the minister who resigned on March 10? Are there any strings attached to this \$500,000, this half million dollars? Because I want to say before the hon. the Premier leaves this hon. House that the contract did not go to the lowest bidder. The lowest bidder did not get the contract. There were eight bids on that contract, eight bids. And it is stated here, Sir, with the minister - and I wish the minister was in his seat so the hon. gentleman could tell me if it is correct or not. Well, I know, I know it to be a fact, Sir, that the bids were opened in public,

MR. NEARY: public tenders were called, eight firms, eight companies tendered and the statement is made - I do not know who made it, whether the 'Y' made it or whether the minister made it - that the contract went to the lowest bidder. Sir, that is not true! The contract did not go to the lowest bidder. And what does my hon. friend the Archangel think of that kind of policy? Should we pass out funds right, left and centre to organizations, extensions to fish plants, new buildings and that sort of thing without insisting that the government public tendering procedure be used when public money is involved? Is that a fair and reasonable request? I ask my hon. friend from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), is that a fair request or is it not?

MR. WELLS: It may be a fair and reasonable request, but having gone this far and saying they were not the lowest tender, can you say what the lowest tender was?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, the lowest tender was approximately - well, the difference was only about \$1300

MR. NEARY: and the lowest bidder was a company, called Bata?

AN HON. MEMBER: Bata.

MR. NEARY: Bata. Now does that answer my hon. friend's question?

MR. WELLS: Does the hon. member know, I mean, often there is a reason why a company does not get the job.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. gentleman with his legalistic training is saying there are reasons why -

MR. WELLS: I have no -

MR. NEARY: No, hold on! No, no, I am not criticizing the hon. gentleman. I just want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to what is stated in the paper. It is stated here, and I can read and this is beyond doubt 'the lowest of eight bids! It is not the lowest of eight bids. That is the point I am making.

Now the hon. gentleman may say there is justifiable reasons for -

MR. WELLS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, of course not.

MR. WELLS: The paper is not necessarily accurate ...

MR. NEARY: Or whoever made the statement. Maybe the paper is just quoting somebody.

Mr. Speaker, look, there is a picture here, Sir, of the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, and let me see who the lady is here, a Mrs. Andrews, and it is the annual meeting at City Hall, and the minister is passing over a cheque; and I am asking the minister if there are any strings attached to that cheque? I mean it is public money, Sir, it is public money. Did the minister insist that the local contractors be given preference, as the minister who just resigned told us they were going to get? Did the minister indicate that the "Y" must follow the government's public tendering procedure if they are going to spend a half a million dollars of public money? I do not know. Maybe I am wrong. Perhaps the member can tell me if we can insist on that. I mean, we are in the driver's seat, are we not?

MR. WELLS: I do not know, really. Would the hon. member yield for a question?

MR. NEARY: Yield for a question? Yes, Sir.

MR. WELLS: I did not obviously intend to get into this, and I do not know anything about the internal workings of the "Y", but as I understand it from a person reading the papers about their building, and a person who may, like a great many others citizens, make his contribution, you know, of a few dollars, whatever it was to the building, that they estimated that it was going to cost something in excess of \$1 million. Now it is a private organization, and they make their own deal with whoever they want, I suppose, to build it. The Government of Newfoundland, as I understand it, said, all right we will contribute a half million dollars something less than half of the cost. However you cut the cake or whoever gets the contract it is still substantially less than half the cost. Well surely now the government if it is going to make that grant for \$1.3 or \$1.5 project would make the grant and that would be it. I cannot see the government having the power or even the need to go and make sure that they gave it to a bidder who - or the lowest bidder or any bidder because the government is after all contributing less than half the cost, the rest of it is public subscription.

Now was the hon. member at the meetings to hear if there was any explanation for this? In fairness to these, you know, they do a lot of good work, as the hon. member said. And I do not think it is right for this House to give the impression that there is something not right going on, unless there is not something right.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend, you know, the hon. gentleman as usual always manages to put his finger right on the key point; is there something wrong?

MR. WELLS: Right.

MR. NEARY: Is there?

MR. WELLS: Now if there is then, fine, expose it, but if there is

Mr. Wells: not, it is not right to imply that there is , and that is -

MR. NEARY: There is nothing wrong with the "Y", Sir, there is nothing wrong with the "Y" in my opinion. A great organization. A fantastic organization. And I hope that they can correct this, you know, that there will be no bad taste left in anybody's mouth, Let us hope that it is just an error on the part of the news reporter. I hope that is correct. But I do know for a fact that this particular company, I believe - I do not know who owns the company, Sir - but I believe if we did a little research maybe down in the company, if my hon. friend has access to the Registry of Companies -

MR. WELLS: I never heard of it.

MR. NEARY: Well I have. I heard of it. Well I have heard of it. And if the hon. gentleman happens to be in the Registry office tomorrow it would be worth the hon. gentleman's while to take a look at it to see who is the owner of this company, and maybe that is what gives me such a dirty mind, you know. But I hope, Sir, the "Y" can make a statement.

MR. WELLS: May I interrupt again or would the hon. gentleman yield for a moment?

MR. NEARY: Of course, Mr. Speaker, to such a thorough gentleman, Sir, Then I will carry on with my address.

MR. WELLS: Do you realize, you know, what the hon. gentleman has done here this afternoon? I do not know, apparently he does not know whether there was anything wrong with the letting of the "Y" contract, if there was any skulduggery or anything. These people are like anybody else; I presume they are innocent until proven guilty. But just look at what the hon. gentleman has done this afternoon, If the press report what he has said, everybody in Newfoundland is going to say, Well, my God now, there is the "Y" now are they up to something wrong? Did you

MR. WELLS:

see what the hon. gentleman - I will give him the benefit of the doubt that he is speaking truthfully and as he sees it - but, you know, here is an organization comprised of people who are doing a lot of good work, a lot of people all over this Province giving so that they can have these facilities. I ask the hon. gentleman, without being able or without nailing down wrongdoing, is it right, is it really right to infer that everything is not according to Hoyle? And I am not being funny now or being specious, I am asking the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously trying to put words in the mouth of the press, Sir.

MR. WELLS: No. He is not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have been very, very careful in my choice of words and let no hon. member of this House misinterpret or twist or distort what I am saying. I have already said that I have the greatest regard for the "Y", they are an outstanding organization, fantastic, unbelievable, there is nothing too good I can say about them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why are you attacking them?

MR. NEARY: I am not attacking them, Sir; all I am doing is asking a question: Should this House vote funds to any organization without insisting that preference be given to local contractors and that the government's tendering procedure be used? If we can do it - If we cannot do it, fine, that is it, we cannot do it. But we are spending a half million dollars of taxpayers' money. And the statement that appeared in The Daily News is incorrect.

Now maybe tomorrow, Sir, somebody will correct it or say, "Well, it is just a typographical error, or it is an error on the part of the reporter," I am hoping that will happen, Sir. But I believe as a member of this House that I have a right to draw to the attention, not only a right, Sir, it is my duty to draw to the attention of the House that the contract did not go to the lowest bidder.

MR. MORGAN: Says who?

MR. NEARY: Says me.

MR. MORGAN: Says you.

MR. NEARY: Says me.

MR. MORGAN: - Show your proof.

MR. NEARY: Show my proof?

MR. MORGAN: Yes. Show your proof.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman always wants proof for things,
always wants proof.

MR. MORGAN: Stop making innuendoes until charges are proved.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman if he wants proof, the hon. gentleman can do the same thing that I did, make a few enquiries. Because every time I see something like this in the paper I look at it and I check it out and I just say to myself, that is fine. Great. The "Y" is going to get a new building. My kids will be able to go down and enjoy these new facilities and so forth. But I do not want another Summer Games type of situation on our hands where they have not paid all their bills yet, where they owe all kinds of money, that that booze that was consumed during the Summer Games could have paid some of these bills. I do not want that kind of a situation to arise. So I hope, Sir, that the minister - I think it is the duty of the minister really, not the "Y" because the "Y" are just the innocent people in this whole thing, it is the minister that I am getting after, it is the \$500,000 of public money. It is the House voting this money. It is the ministry passing this money over. And I am asking should there be strings attached to it? Should we insist it go to the lowest bidder? That is all I am asking. Is that fair enough? No slur on the part of the organization. So what am I doing? What am I doing? Would the member tell me what am I doing?

MR. WELLS: Unfortunately that may not be the way it comes out.

MR. NEARY: Well I cannot control the press. I cannot. I cannot tell the press what to print and what to say. But I would say to them now this is not a criticism of the "Y". Is that fair enough?

MR. WELLS: - before the facts are ascertained.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no control over what the news media report and what they do not report.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are news reporters.

MR. NEARY: That is a matter of fact. They have already reported it. I am merely saying it is not correct. Now somebody may come back and say that I am wrong, but I am saying, Sir, that the statement

MR. MEARY: that the tender contract was awarded to the lowest of eight bids. I am saying that to my knowledge, and I may be one hundred per cent wrong, but to my knowledge that is not a correct statement and I hope it will be corrected and an explanation given, the matter clarified and then that is it. It is over and done with. Okay. Fair enough. That is fine, Sir. It took me a little while to dispose of that because I know it is a very delicate matter. And I want to repeat again, Sir, that this is not a criticism of the "Y". I have nothing but the greatest of admiration and praise for the "Y". Fair enough. And if I pick up a paper tomorrow - if I pick up a newspaper or I turn on the radio or television tonight, honest to God, Mr. Speaker, - But well. Look, I have to say this, Sir, yesterday, yes, yesterday's Evening Telegram - I have to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, I have to congratulate the gentleman of the Evening Telegram who covered this House of Assembly yesterday. I think he did an absolutely magnificent job on reporting what I said the day before about a couple of his colleagues, as a matter of fact, and about other matters that I raised during the Throne Speech. I thought it was superb, Sir, and the kind of reporting that we should have in this Hon. House. The kind of reporting we should have. It was the best reporting that I have seen so far this session. I am sorry to say that I cannot say the same for the public owned media and I do not want to get off on that kick again because if I do - I remember a few years ago I made a statement that almost got me flung out of the Cabinet but anyway I will come back to that later.

So let it be known, Sir, let members, unless there is somebody who is thickheaded, unless there is somebody who deliberately wants to distort what I said, I am merely saying that this is an incorrect statement and I am asking the House - I am in the House's hands - Will the House tell me if we should be passing out money without any strings attached, without insisting that the government's public tendering procedure be followed and that the contract go to the lowest bidder? That is all I am asking, and if I can get an explanation for that I will be satisfied. And also I would like

MR. HEARN: to know if the same principle should apply to extensions to fish plants in this province that are being extended - being extended, the work being done, Mr. Speaker, by companies outside of this province, by companies from Nova Scotia in the main. When Nickersons want to expand their fish plant in this province, do they call public tenders? No. Are they using public money? I do not know.

I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries if money is being used, borrowed from the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation and used to expand fish plants in this province, contractors brought in from outside the province and no public tenders called. The same question arises, for the benefit of my hon. friend, the same question - the ministry argues we have no control over the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation, they are like a bank. Baidordash, Sir, No, wash, that is not true. It is taxpayers' money. Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation answers to the Minister of Industrial Development who answers to this House and because the money was gotten from the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation indirectly the companies that get it do not have to call public tenders. They can bring in their buddies. They can go over on the Mainland and form companies if they want to and come in and do the work as principals of construction companies, of contracting firms

MR. NEARY: as well as our owing the fish plants. Does the hon. member think that is right? I am asking the hon. gentleman. Who am I smearing now? Am I smearing anybody?

MR. WELLS: Supposing you buy a house tomorrow and you get a loan from Central Mortgage and Housing, would you expect Central Mortgage and Housing because that is public money to make you put your house up on tender and give it to the lowest bidder or would you be free to arrange your own contractor? After all, you are going to pay it back.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, somebody already put that argument to me today before, by the way, so the hon. gentleman must be on the same frequency with somebody else.

It is a completely different situation. It is public money. The Newfoundland Development and Loan Corporation is not a bank. The hon. Minister of Fisheries can argue all he likes about it being a bank, it is not a bank. It is a means whereby the Administration can pork-barrel. That is all it is. It is giving out, to the best of my knowledge and I am subject to be corrected on this, loaning money to fish plants who do not call public tenders, who bring in contractors and construction firms from the Mainland, And we hear all about the preference policy of this Administration, to do the work. Now, is that right? When we give these loans - we, the House; it is the House that does it. We give them the authority. They are operating under a law of this House - should we not insist when they take these loans, when they come for these loans and grants, that they follow the public tendering procedure of the Government of this Province, should they not? And should they also not award the contract to the lowest bidder and should they not give preference to local contractors? Is there anything wrong with that?

MR. WELLS: The person involved or the company involved has a right to say if it is a genuine loan: "I am going to pay this back. You are not giving me anything; you are lending me something and I am going to pay you back, Government. I am going to pay you back interest. I am going

MR. WELLS: to run my own business." That is what you or I or anybody would say if we were in business just as you would say if you were borrowing money from Central Mortgage and Housing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: What did the Bartlett Commission say about the Iron Ore Company of Canada? What did they say? Do we have to have a commission for everything that goes on in this Province? Do we have to have a commission to look into this to get the answer?

The hon. member can throw obstructions, can create red herrings, can use legalistic arguments, but my hon. friend knows, and I know my hon. friend is acting the devil's advocate probably right now.

Mr. Speaker, let me again repeat what I said.

Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation -

MR. HICKMAN: You have another problem now.

MR. NEARY: What is the other problem?

MR. HICKMAN: Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation is funded primarily by the Federal, under the Department of DREE. Under their DREE terms of reference they will not tolerate what they call provincialism, that it has to be open to all Canadians.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation is down there in that building, renting a building, sitting in a building rented, no public tenders called. They are over there because we put them there, this House! This House put Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation over there.

MR. HICKMAN: Are you talking about (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is what I am talking about.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, that is primarily -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Frank Nolan is now the President.

MR. NEARY: That is there, Sir, by an act of this Legislature.

MR. HICKMAN: No. We passed complementary legislation but most of the money, a very high percentage of the money, 75/25 is Federal.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning that at all. A lot of the money comes from the Ottawa, Sir. What I am asking - while I am thinking out loud - Mr. Speaker, that Corporation is there at the mercy of this House. My hon. friend can shake his head all he wants.

MR. HICKMAN: Both Houses.

MR. NEARY: More so, this House and the Parliament of Canada.

MR. HICKMAN: They have the majority of directors, the Government of Canada, and they put in seventy-five per cent of the money.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation is responsible to the Minister of Industrial Development who is responsible to this House.

I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: A motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the Chair. The first matter for debate - I should point out that there were more matters submitted than time will allow - they are given in the order in which I received them. The first matter, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Justice concerning the appointment of a police commissioner.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: In my opinion the time is long overdue for this House to make a number of decisions concerning the future of one of the most respected and tradition-rich institutions in this Province, the Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. NEARY: As the Force is at present, Mr. Speaker, it is Newfoundland and Provincial in name only, it is Newfoundland and Provincial in one sense only: It is paid for by the taxpayers all over the Province, but, Mr. Speaker, it functions as a St. John's municipal law enforcement agency. Mr. Speaker, this House must decide at once whether the Newfoundland Constabulary's future is to be as a truly provincial police force or to continue, Sir, as it really is at present, a St. John's municipal service.

Mr. Speaker, while Government is trying to make up its mind on that matter, there is no reason why we cannot deal with the present state of chaos

MR. NEARY: within the Newfoundland Constabulary because of the traditional autocratic structure of the constabulary, Sir, which is outdated today except maybe for emergency situations. This House should really debate seriously the removing of the present morale eroding situation which only breeds confrontation between a fine police chief, Sir, and perhaps the best one we have ever had, and an equally fine force. The answer, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion to this is to incorporate the practice which is uniform throughout the whole of North America: Set up a police commission, preferably, Mr. Speaker, of outstanding citizens functioning as dollar-a-year men and motivated not by meeting attendance fees or sinecure salaries but by an honest desire, Mr. Speaker, to assist the chief and his force to function at their maximum potential of service to the citizens of this city.

The composition of the police commission will depend on the legislation brought into this House. If the constabulary is to continue as a municipal force, Mr. Speaker, the commission could comprise of perhaps only citizens of St. John's. If the constabulary is to become a regional or metropolitan body similar to the practice in Metropolitan Toronto, for example, the commission could comprise of representation from both the city and the region. And of course, Mr. Speaker, if the services of the Newfoundland Constabulary are ever extended and expanded then other people could be brought into the commission merely by amending the legislation that is brought into this House. If, for instance, Sir, the constabulary is to become a truly provincial force then the commission should include membership to reflect the force's provincial status.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to members on both sides of this House to make every effort, Sir, to clear up during this session the all too obvious problems connected with the Newfoundland Constabulary, to decide on its real status as municipal, regional or provincial, and to remove it, Sir, from the handicap of the present ultimate political control by appointing a police commission comprising well intentioned, highly

MR. MERRY: respected citizens equally endowed with both dedication, the spirit of public service, Sir, and common sense.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the matter raised by the hon. gentleman from LaPoile is an interesting one. There has been a lot of loose talk about police commissions. Obviously people do not quite understand why a police commission was first created and set up throughout North America. It was not set up primarily to direct the operation of the forces. A police commission was set up in the beginning and it still has as its prime function in most places as a protection for the citizen. That if a citizen feels that he or she has been unduly harassed or harassed by a police officer that person has a right to make an application or file a complaint with the police commission whose powers are all supreme, totally supreme, all supreme, everything falls by the board if they decide that there has indeed been a case made.

Now with respect to the Newfoundland Constabulary which has a police chief today who knows no peer in Canada, bar none, who has a force today that has never been more efficient, whose law enforcement programme has the support of the people they serve - right now namely the citizens of St. John's like they have never had it before. I am sure that the most popular, the most highly respected man in the City of St. John's today is Chief of Police John Brown and he has done a magnificent job since he assumed that office. I am very proud of the force, proud of the work that they are doing. They asked me, back last fall when they were about to sign a collective agreement, the Brotherhood did, whether or not I would be prepared, because they knew we were looking at the concept of a commission and some amendments to the act, to give them an opportunity to file a brief and I told them in writing that I would welcome it. Because of their expertise in the law enforcement area I would like to hear their views, which naturally are not binding on government, but their views as to what they would like to see in the act.

MR. HICKMAN: and I also said that save in an emergency, I would not bring any amendments before the legislature, any massive amendments or major amendments to the act until I had their brief.

They have assured me that the brief will be ready in the fall. In the meantime there are certain regulatory provisions that are totally within the provisions and scope of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to deal with. As an indication, Mr. Speaker, I found in this file here today a commitment that the present government has to the Newfoundland Constabulary.

May I

MR. HICKMAN: remind this House that in 1972 the total amount of money spent on the Newfoundland Constabulary was \$1,813,500. Five years later we spent \$5,374,300 in the process of giving that fine force the first headquarters ever and I am confident that the morale of that force has never been stronger and better than it is today. And let me assure this House that the Chief of Police has never had the kind of support that he has received today with respect to the idea of a provincial police force really policing the City of St. John's which is peculiar to Newfoundland.

If they were in Halifax it would be the City of Halifax paying. We would have a much smaller force, I suggest a much less efficient force. I subscribe to the view that the responsibility for law enforcement under the Criminal Code of Canada vests with the Attorney General of the Province.

In some provinces the Attorney General delegates that to municipalities with results that leave a great deal to be desired. In this Province that responsibility is discharged in the City of St. John's by the provincial police force, namely, the Newfoundland Constabulary, and outside by another fine force, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I would seriously doubt if this Province will ever be in the position financially where we can expand the Newfoundland Constabulary to the extent that the OPP or the Quebec Provincial Police Force, the only other provinces, have done where they have a provincial police force.

As far as political control is concerned, I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say there should not be because obviously, under the code, under the laws the final responsibility for law enforcement lies with the Attorney General and

MR. HICKMAN: under our system of government the Attorney General is a politician and must be a politician so that there has to be political control in the sense that it is this House and no one else, not a commission or anyone else that decides how much money is going to be voted this year for the policing of this Province and that is the kind of control that we must have and that is political control.

As far as what happens in the force, I have no hesitation in saying that the Chief of Police of the Newfoundland Constabulary, this Chief and his two predecessors in office who have been there in my day, have never been subjected to the slightest bit of control. I regard them as the experts in their field, I take their advice, I accept it unequivocally and I have never been prouder than I am right now of the work that the Newfoundland Constabulary are doing in the City of St. John's. I am also secure in the knowledge that if an emergency did arise in some other part of the Province that because they are a provincial police force I have the right to direct that they respond to that emergency, something that I probably would not have if they were a city police force, and if they were a city police force in the City of St. John's, watch the diminishing of their numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I am on my favourite topic and I would love to go on for a long time but Your Honour is indicating the time has come for me to sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The second matter of ferry services.

The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just sat down I am sure spent five minutes and he never

MR. WHITE: mentioned the police commission once. I hope that I get a better answer to my question than I got a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, reference, the Change Islands ferry service and all the ferry services on the Northeast coast of Newfoundland, and I hope that he has more information and knows more about the subject now than he did then. Because then he did not seem to know very much about the controversy that has been going on with respect to the ferry services on the Northeast coast, particularly, Mr. Speaker, the one at Change Islands.

I suppose to be truthful I would have to say that it is probably the saddest story that I have come across since I have been a member of this House. The problem has been going on ever since I have been elected, September 1975. That is almost three years, Mr. Speaker. The people of Change Islands have no, and I say no, ferry terminals whatsoever. On the Cobb's Arm side, Cobbs Arm being in Twillingate district, there is an old pile of rocks that the ferry lands to when it comes over from Change Islands and the people get off by walking on a plank to the shore.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Left over from a mine quarry.

MR. WHITE: That is right, left over from a limestone quarry that was there a few years ago and, I might say, owned by the Province, owned by the

MR. WHITE: Department of Transportation and Communications and by now something should have been done to fix that up. On the Change Islands side, Mr. Speaker, there is an old boat that is overturned and filled with rocks and that is the ferry terminal at Change Islands. Now 650 people on Change Islands, which is probably one of the most economically stable communities in Newfoundland, I do not know of a single welfare case on Change Islands. The women all work in the fish plant, the men all fish and they are all employed year round and yet they have to put up with this kind of inconvenience, Mr. Speaker, month after month after month, year after year. And to make matters worse in December during the by-election, the Premier went down, went on board the ferry and told the crew members, and I have four witnesses, that he did not realize the situation was so bad as he saw then and would do something about it right away. Well like most of the Premier's promises, nothing has been done about it and I doubt that he has even remembered the incident since then.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the last couple of years the federal government has been trying to reach agreement with the Province with respect to the ferry services on the Northeast Coast. Part of the reason they could not get agreement, I would say, Mr. Speaker, is because of the attitude of the previous member, and we all know that that situation has now been resolved and the Premier has taken the proper action with respect to that. From what I understand, and I met recently with Department of Transport people in Ottawa, their intention is to cut off the federal subsidy to all ferry services along the Northeast Coast at the end of March - now that is my understanding - this year, that they have told the Province they are going to do it this year, and they want a response. Now what I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is why it takes two years for this government to come to an agreement on five or six small ferry operations in this Province, why it takes two and a half to three years to reach agreement on a matter such as that. And knowing that, Mr. Speaker, I can well understand why this Province cannot get agreement with

MR. WHITE: Ottawa on very many things, including the Trans-Canada Highway, I might say. And I do not know if it is the plan of the Province to tie the Trans-Canada Highway agreement in with the five ferry services or not, but that is the kind of answer I want from the minister when he answers my question.

Mr. Speaker, what are the people of Change Islands supposed to do? They wanted a road around the community there a couple of years ago. The Minister of Mines and Energy knows this; he went down when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs and gave the commitment for the road to go ahead but only after the schools there had been closed for four weeks was that commitment honoured, Mr. Speaker, after the schools had been closed for four weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: It was honoured, Mr. Speaker, after the schools had been closed for four weeks. Now the people after three years, the next thing we can expect is that the people down there will have to take some kind of radical action, and all I am asking is that this government prevent that kind of thing from happening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously is very rightly concerned on behalf of his constituents in Change Islands and I certainly agree with him. The ferry situation, the terminal situation in Change Islands is one that is deplorable. I do not pretend to have as much knowledge as the hon. member himself does, nor do I apologize for that. Obviously he has far more opportunity to visit that area than I do.

The ferry situation in the Province of Newfoundland generally is certainly one which I do claim a great deal of knowledge of, and I particularly refer now of course to the Bell Island situation which

MR. DOODY: is one of the major problems in arriving at an agreement with the Government of Canada, and has been over the past, as the hon. member has mentioned, over two years. The Federal government would like very much to have us tie all ferry services together in one neat package and then have the provincial government take responsibility for all of them.

The sum total of the cost of these ferries to the Federal government, as I understand it, during the past year was about \$1.6 million. Of that amount almost \$1 million was accounted for by the Bell Island ferry. The Bell Island contract does not run out until 1985. In order to get an agreement with the Province as quickly as possible on the whole ferry package, the Government of Canada has indicated that they will terminate the Northern ferry services, the six Northern services, including the Change Island one, by March 31st. coming, of this month.

MR. DOODY:

This is an unfortunate situation obviously and one that the Province certainly is not prepared to accept.

I have had recent discussions with the officials of the Department of Transportation in Canada and they have agreed to give us another six month extension under certain conditions which I have not had an opportunity to discuss with my colleagues but which I feel reasonably certain will be acceptable to the Province, because it is quite obvious that we do not want to, nor can we, deprive the people in these areas of a ferry service no matter how terrible and substandard it is. Another reason why the agreement with the Government of Canada has taken so long to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion is the fact that there is some \$5 million to \$6 million dollars in capital improvements that have to be made, and not the least among these is the ferry terminals which were so eloquently described by my friend from Lewisporte. The situation up there is indeed a despicable and deplorable one and one which we feel that the Government of Canada should take some hand in correcting before the Province of Newfoundland accepts, under any circumstances, the responsibility for operating that service. I honestly feel, since the Government of Canada has had the responsibility and has accepted the responsibility for operating the service, it is quite unfair to ask the Province of Newfoundland to pick up the cost of renovating or bringing up to a reasonable standard the operation which these people are now anxious to leave and to pass over to us. We had a similar sort of situation in the Province of British Columbia, and I say similar when one compares Newfoundland and Newfoundland's economics and Newfoundland's conditions generally with those

MR. DODDY: of British Columbia one has to take that as a relative statement. Many of the ferries as I understand in British Columbia are indeed luxury liners and many of the terminal facilities are quite elaborate and quite elegant. The Government of Canada had entered into an agreement with the Province of British Columbia some years ago whereby they undertook to operate the ferries at a given point in time. A little while ago, hon. members will remember, the Government of Canada decided that they would cut off that agreement and cease. There was a considerable turmoil in Ottawa and subsequently an agreement, an arrangement was reached with the Province of British Columbia. In the meantime, unfortunately, the ferry service was tied up in British Columbia. I certainly have no intention of bringing things to that point in the Province of Newfoundland and I have every assurance from the minister responsible in Ottawa, Mr. Lang, that he shares that concern and has every desire and every hope and ambition of reaching an agreement in the very near future, to that extent, as I have said, he has indicated that under certain conditions which I hope are acceptable he will be happy to extend that March 31st. deadline.

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

SOME HON. MEMBER: By leave! By leave!.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave? By leave.

MR. DODDY: Let me take another minute or so, Your Honour, thank-you. I hope to be in a position shortly to discuss this in more detail with the federal government. I would not want to let the hon. House have the misconception that all will be rosy when we meet because that Capital Improvement Program, that \$5 million to \$6 million dollar capital work thing that has to be done on the ferry terminals, has got to be

MR. DOODY: one of major importance to us, and also of course the Bell Island complication in which we as a Province are very reluctant to pick up the tab for that service at this point with the 1985 agreement involved it is certainly a complication but I have no doubt at all about the good intentions, the intent of the Department of Transportation in Ottawa. I feel reasonably certain that during the next month to two months we should come up with an agreement that is satisfactory to both the Province and the Government of Canada. I hope that I have answered to some degree of satisfaction the question of the hon. gentleman, I certainly, as I said, had no intention to do otherwise when he asked his question originally. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The final matter for debate concerns the priority for Buchans, residents of the Hinds Lake project. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, in the short time that is available, the five minutes, I want to try to put into perspective for this House the Buchans situation as it relates to the Hinds Lake project. Now, Mr. Speaker, every member of this hon. House is very familiar with the Buchans situation. The town of Buchans today is facing one year and it will have to accept total and absolute collapse of its economy. As a matter of fact, it may come quicker. If the market for base metals deteriorates any more the shut-down may come before then. That is public knowledge stated by management and acknowledged by government officials and anybody else concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this government instituted or sponsored four years ago an industrial inquiry, the only result of which we have seen is the Buchans Task Force. One of the recommendations was that a task force be set up to advise government as to what could be done in Buchans to guarantee some life expectancy, some future, some viability to the town after the mine closed. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the main recommendations of that task force was a road to Howley, and that, of course, is based on the fact that if Buchans had a chance to survive it had to be tied to transportation. We had to have a way in and out of Buchans, access to the West Coast. Anything else would be incidental. First we had to have a transportation system.

When I first came into this House, Mr. Speaker, I went to the Minister of Highways at the time, or Minister of Transportation. I met with the officials of the Department of Transport and they pointed out that due to the fact that we were into a tight economic situation - that funds were tight - that the money was not available to build the Buchans - Howley road. And, Mr. Speaker, I went back to Buchans and I took the responsible attitude and I told the people, "Look, we cannot expect - under the economic situation that exists in this Province it is not realistic and it is not responsible." I can produce evidence that I did that, Mr. Speaker, I played the game.

MR. FLIGHT: But lo and behold, a year ago, Mr. Speaker, this government announced a \$100 million hydro project within eight to ten miles of Buchans - \$100 million public funds.

MR. PECKFORD: Department of Finance.

MR. FLIGHT: Newfoundland Hydro would spend \$100 million of this Province's money, Mr. Speaker. We stand behind every dollar Newfoundland Hydro spends in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting with Hydro and no commitment was made, but the indication was there that the Hinds Lake project is coming at an opportune time; it may be the shot in the arm that Buchans needs. It is a three year project; there is \$100 million to be spent; the project will be so designed so as to have some economic spinoff for Buchans.

Now, it is a known fact also, Mr. Speaker, that the mines may close now, but they may re-open. There is all sorts of exploration going on. But that is beside the point, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to run out of time here so I am coming right to the point. I want to hear this government justify to this House how they can hope to retain any credibility by saying that they want Buchans to remain as a viable community, that they recognize the financial contribution to this Province over the years that that town has made, they recognize the rights of the people of Buchans--and there are four generations of Buchaneers now - the rights to stay there and make a way of life there, if they at the same time deny them access to the construction sites on that project within eight to ten miles of Buchans. Two-thirds of the Buchans - Howley road will be built when that project is finished, Mr. Speaker. Every person in this House can recognize what a \$15 million spinoff to Buchans from that project would mean. Now, how in God's name can this government retain any credibility? How can the Premier say and the minister say that they are concerned? They spent \$200,000, Mr. Speaker, there was

MR. FLIGHT: just an access road finished, fourteen miles all weather access, from Grand Lake to Howley - all weather, fourteen miles for \$750,000, and what this government is saying by denying us access into the construction sites is that 'We are not prepared to spend \$750,000 of a \$100 million project to guarantee you people some future, some way of making a living after that mine closes.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have run out of time, I have to stop. I will bring it up again, but the point I want the minister to address himself to, and the Premier, is to tell this House how they can defend not spending - not giving Buchans access into those construction sites. It is their resource, they have earned the right to make a living in there, they have indicated the desire to stay and make a living, and I say, Sir, that they are entitled to their share of that project - \$100 million - and we want our share of it, and only our share. We are not demanding any special status.

I appeal to the various members whose districts will also be affected, the hon. member for Deer Lake (Mr. House), the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow).

We are not asking any special consideration. We are asking for a fair share of that project, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. minister of Mines and Energy starts, if he is going to speak his full five minutes then we shall be somewhat after 6:00 P.M., so is it agreed that we will call it 6:00 P.M. until the five minutes is expired?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been fairly familiar with the whole Hinds Lake project since its beginning,

March 16, 1978

Tape 266

EC - 4

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, and have discussed the whole matter of not only the Hinds Lake development but the various access roads and other spinoff benefits that could possibly accrue to neighbouring areas with my colleagues in Cabinet and with the

MR. PECKFORD:

Premier and with people in Newfoundland Hydro and we have been over the thing quite a few times, even with the people from Buchans just recently. Some of the committee members from Buchans were in to meet with a number of minister including the new Minister of Transportation and Communications, the Minister of Industrial Development and others.

The situation is simply that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) simplifies the situation. He knows as well as I know, as well as everybody in this Province knows, and every hon. member knows that we have to build - and first of all the whole project is project financed. It is not money out of consolidated revenue; it is borrowing that Hydro will undertake and which will be paid off through revenues generated from the sale of the power when it comes on to the grid so that therefore it is not money, dollars today, that the government has to find. So we are not suddenly doing a major project out of revenue coming in from the taxpayers of the Province right now.

Everybody knows in the Province that the people of Buchans wish to have a road to Howley -

MR. FLIGHT:

They need it.

MR. PECKFORD:

that there is some confusion - now, it seems to have cleared up - in the minds of engineers that the best future for Buchans, from a transportation link point of view, is a road from Buchans to South West Brook to join in with the road that goes on down to Burgeo and that meets out on the West coast as a second Trans-Canada, that this is the planning that is going ahead in the Department of Transportation and Communications, that is the planning that DREE, through its ongoing roads commitment to the Province, is interested

MR. PECKFORD: in pursuing, and that this is the road to go, if you will.

To put a permanent road for the next three years into the Hinds Lake site would cost a fair sum of money, millions of dollars to put it in. The route is not as easy as the route from Howley to Hinds Lake, it is not as easy topography-wise or any other wise and the hon. member knows that, that it is going to cost a lot. Now, Mr. Speaker, we shall not have the first mile of that road, which has got to be a permanent gravel road, built to, say, the Hinds Lake project, or wherever the work is going to be commenced, before there will be a demand by government to finish the road to Howley and that is going to cost \$5 million or \$6 million. No sooner will we have the second mile built to the hydro site than the people of Buchans, and rightfully so - if I were a resident of Buchans I would say the same thing, that we not only want an all-weather road to go to Howley, we cannot have our gas tanks beaten up, we cannot have our mufflers beaten up, that we need a paved road to Howley, and that we are talking about five to ten to twelve million dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two ways that this can be financed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: You do not like to hear the truth.

MR. SIMMONS: You are making a fool of yourself.

MR. PECKFORD: You do not like to hear the truth.

Mr. Speaker, there are two

MR. PECKFORD: ways it can be financed; out of the hydro project so the electrical rates of the Province will go up higher, so that then the members on the other side can accuse the government of having too high electrical rates in the Province, of wasting money so that now the consumers of electricity all over the Province have to pay more because we are adding additions to the hydro site or secondly, out of the Transportation and Communications budget. Two ways it can be done. On the second way you are asking government to spend three-quarters or more of its capital budget in one year to build an access road or a gravel road from Buchans to Howley.

The government just does not have the money to do it. And another point, Mr. Speaker, it has to be ascertained just how many people in Buchans will be willing to leave their present jobs at the mine and work on the Hinds Lake project. How many skills -

MR. FLIGHT: Present jobs? That mine is going.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, but there will be work before it goes. How many skills? There will be 400 people working on the Hinds Lake project this year so we have not identified how many that will be. There will be people from all over the Province going to Hinds Lake, from further away than Buchans to get jobs at the Hinds Lake project, through Howley. There will be people from the Avalon Peninsula, from the West Coast, from Labrador who will have to go long distances to get work.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister's five minutes has transpired.

March 16, 1978, Tape 267, Page 4 -- apb

MR. PECKFORD:

Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, the House at
its rising adjourned until tomorrow Friday, March 17, 1978
at 3:00 p.m.