

VOL. 3

NO. 112

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

2:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to inform the hon. House that the Labrador Resources Advisory Council is now reporting to me as Minister of Rural Development. As you know, the role of my department is becoming increasingly important in developing the human and economic resources in Labrador. The Labrador Resources Advisory Council represents all areas of Labrador and its aims and objectives closely parallel the aspirations of my department. Their interests, for the information of hon. members, include communications with government reflecting the feelings of the people in the Labrador communities on all resource issues such as fishery, forestry, oil and gas, uranium developments and national parks; making communities aware of the use of resources and the effects that resource development may have on the people and the environment; developing policies on how the traditional resources, such as fishing, trapping and hunting may be improved; encouraging the development of new ideas in resource use which take into consideration the traditions and aspirations of Labradorians; and developing better communications between the various areas of Labrador.

Now although the council has only been in operation for a little over two years, they have been very active. They are involved, for instance, in the following: consulting with all the Labrador communities and interest groups to ascertain public reaction respecting the Province's Labrador proposal to DREE; conducting environmental studies such as FAMES, the Eastern Arctic Marine Environmental Study, which is a federally funded study to determine the impact of development on the marine resources of Labrador; dealing with resource issues by focusing on the needs of fisheries; possible interrelationship

November 21, 1978

Tape 5250

DM - 2

MR. GOUDIE: with offshore oil and gas and uranium mining; advising government on development programmes such as the shrimp fishery and the operation of northern fish plants. Other interests include national parks, wildlife and the traditional lifestyle of the people.

I am looking forward to continued co-operation between the council and my department. I will be meeting with the council representatives on the week

Mr. Goudie:

of November 27 in St. John's and we will be exploring with them all possible areas of development.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should first of all, because this is my first opportunity, I should first of all congratulate the new minister on his appointment to the post of Rural Development. I might also say that we on this side of the House have thought for a long time that the hon. gentleman should have been made a minister and perhaps of this department a long time ago, in 1975 rather than perhaps in 1978. So I congratulate the minister on his appointment.

And I simply want to make a few comments in response to the Ministerial Statement. And I am sure I speak for this side of the House when I say that we whole-heartedly endorse the role that the Labrador Resources Advisory Council has. Communications in Labrador has been a problem; communication with government in particular has been a problem for a long, long time. And we are happy to see that it has now come of age, and especially with the Labrador Resources Advisory Council and the work that they are doing there.

So once again, Mr. Speaker, I wish the new minister all the best and anything that can be done to improve the image of Labrador with government involvement we are all for it.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition received, I guess, yesterday—yes, late yesterday—from several communities in my district situated on New World Island.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

The communities are

Cobbs Arm, Pikes Arm, Too Good Arm, and Green Cove.

And the prayer of the petition, Sir, is as follows:

"This is to certify that we, the citizens of the foregoing communities, do hereby protest the condition of gravel roads leading into these communities as well as these roads within the communities. The roads are difficult to ride over at the best of times due to protruding bedrock, turns, narrowness of the roads and excessive dust. Dust is almost a continuous problem. Citizens who live near these roads have to forego a healthy standard of living by closing all doors and windows in order to escape the dust. Outdoor activities such as the drying of clothes, painting and drying of fish are all limited by the dust problem. Also on two or three occasions and because of the turns and narrowness of the roads, school buses have left the main roads and have ended up in the ditch." If Your Honour were familiar with the roads, as Your Honour probably is, he could see that happening quite easily in his mind's eye. "Fortunately, none of the students were injured, but further deterioration of the roads may result in more serious accidents. Furthermore, there is a lack of good turnarounds and guardrails. Generally there are no guardrails, especially in the more crucial areas, and the turnarounds leave much to be desired. Therefore, as citizens of the above mentioned communities, we petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to adequately upgrade and pave these roads. Only in this manner can we expect to enjoy a reasonable standard of health and safety for ourselves and our children." And they say, "Thank you," Mr. Speaker, and this petition is signed by the following voters of the area, and then 240 names of residents and citizens of the communities mentioned are signed on the petition.

November 21, 1978

Tape 5261

EC - 2

MR. WHITE:

Is Gerry Canning's name on it?

MR. W. N. ROWE:

I have not had an opportunity

to look through to see if Mr. Canning's name is on it, I hope it is. I look over the copy when I - Too Good Arm does not appear to have Mr. Canning's name on it, but it may be somewhere else. It does not appear to be there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No doubt he

supports it.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

I am sure he supports it,

Sir, since he made this a major part of his campaign

MR. W. ROWE:

around this time last year. Now, Sir, these communities and the roads to the communities are important, of course, for the people who live in the communities, but also, of course, it is important that the road be upgraded and paved as requested for people who live outside the communities as well, because as my hon. friend, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) district well knows the ferry to Change Islands leaves from Cobbs Arm and there is a considerable amount of traffic over that main road and down into Cobbs Arm and to the ferry terminal during the Summer months, not only residents of Change Islands but tourists as well use that road.

Somebody has already mentioned, and I have adverted to it as well, that Too Good Arm is the residence, the home community of a gentleman, a superb gentleman, who happened to have been my opponent in the by-election in Twillingate district, Yr. Canning. During the election the government, Sir, I believe as represented by the Premier, and if not the Premier then certainly a spokesman for the government, made a commitment to upgrade these roads and to pave the roads. I am sure that the commitment was not a political one. I cannot see bringing people's health standards and the condition of the road that they have to travel over on a day to day basis bringing that into a partisan politics. I can only assume that it was a well intentioned gesture on the part of the government, a commitment which the government intends to live up to. The fact that the people there in the district as a whole did not see fit to return the government member is purely academic and irrelevant, I would think. Surely we are not into political blackmail or bribery, whatever way you want to look at the situation, and surely the commitment made to the residents of those communities will be kept by the government in the upcoming construction season and hopefully, Sir, we will see these roads upgraded and paved during the coming Summer.

MR. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE:

I move, Sir, that the petition be received by the hon. House and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition coming from the residents of Cobb's Arm, Pikes Arm, and Too Good Arm, and I would not be surprised if there are a few names affixed there from the community of Change Islands, since the ferry from Change Islands lands at Cobbs Arm twice a day and a large number of people use the Cobbs Arm road to get back and forth to Change Islands.

I have been over the road a good many times and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, other than a few roads in St. John's I would say that this particular road should be known to the government, to ministers of the government more than any other road in Newfoundland since just about all the ministers lived in Twillingate district for three weeks last year about this time. So I would say that all the ministers should be aware of this road. I am sure the Premier is, since he did spend some time on the ferry in Cobbs Arm around this time last year talking to some people on the ferry there one evening or maybe two evenings. The road is in desperate need of repair and I hope something is done about it.

I would just like to add one point that was touched on briefly in the petition that many members may not be aware of. In this area last Summer we saw a great deal of squid drying. A lot of people got into that business. It was a very lucrative business with dried squid selling for about \$1.00 a pound and if you drove down over those roads last year you would see long clothes lines of squid hanging out to dry and I think it is a very significant development in the fishing industry and one that should be encouraged because

MR. WHITE: there was a great market for dried squid last year and a lot of people had difficulty with dust getting on the dried squid and if we are talking about quality product then certainly that is another reason we can add to the long list of paving.

I just want to add one point, with respect to Cobbs Arm being the terminal of facilities for Change Islands that is about to change. As a matter of fact, I received a letter this morning from the minister in Ottawa, the Minister of Public Works, saying that the \$1 million had been approved for the new ferry terminals and they say that as soon as the provincial government finishes the access roads they will get on with the construction.

MR. RIDEOUT: It would have been approved last year if we had to go to the Minister of Transportation.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of approximately fifty residents of Critch's Road, which is, for those not familiar with it,

Mr. Nolan: off Thorburn Road, not a big road as such, but a road that has been sadly neglected for a long, long while. The residents are petitioning for proper drainage, ditching, and, in fact, to have something substantial done with the road.

Now this petition, or the request, at least, contained is not a new one, Mr. Speaker. Residents have through any number of means over any number of years attempted to draw to the attention of those responsible their plight, and it is for this reason that we have this petition, and it is not the only one that was presented incidentally, of the people on Critch's Road. So in an attempt to bring to the attention of the members of the House of Assembly, the department concerned, and all citizens for that matter a very, very sad condition.

Here you have a number of families that are off a small road off a main paved road, and to the best of my knowledge there is not even a sign there at the moment, although I have talked to some people with the department attempting to get a sign put up so at least if you are delivering groceries or whatever at least you will know where it is. But here is a situation where you have people now who in some incidents that I know of from personal conversations and so on have really lost faith in the institutions that we are suppose to support, because they feel that in spite of their calls to officials on all levels that for some reason they do not have either the political clout, the economic clout, or whatever is required to draw to the attention of those concerned the very sad situation that they are in.

Here you have from residents, Mr. Speaker, who would, for example, be quite happy to co-operate with the Department of Transportation--I cannot speak for all of the residents, but some that I know of--to provide some of their land for widening of the road where it is necessary and to assist in any way that is humanly possible. But they are there, as I said, as a small group and they do feel that they have been left out of the mainstream of life.

Mr. Nolan: We heard bandied about in news conferences and so on about great grants, and millions of dollars to be spent on this highway and that highway. It is difficult for them to believe that since they are not asking for the world, why it is that they have been neglected? Why it is that they cannot get a little more done? They are not asking for any luxurious item. And, in fact, it is not too often you get requests from the residents there. What they are asking for now is, please, to honour the prayer of the petition. Where they can help in some instances they will provide some of their property for the widening of the road, where the department is concerned, if they would move in and do the ditching that is required and upgrading

MR. NOLAN: of the road and hopefully, in the not too distant future, to pave it. Because here you have a situation where it in some instances looks like a cow path, and it is a shame that this be permitted to continue.

So I do humbly ask, through this petition on behalf of the people, Mr. Speaker, that this merely not be simply another request. They have gone through every route that they know how, and now once again we try through petitioning in the House of Assembly to see if something cannot be done now, this year at least, in a preparatory way, I realize all the work could not be done, but please try to assist in this particular matter so that these people can feel that there are people who care about them, that they are not forgotten, that they are as important as any other road in this Province, as any other citizen in this Province. Right now I feel, and I say this not in an exaggerative sense, that they feel downtrodden. They feel neglected. They feel that though they have talked to everybody that they know of in the phone book when they can get him, who may be in authority, that they have not been able to get the preliminary work in the first instance, just to bring it up to half decent, sensible standards.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this petition to the House of Assembly and ask that you, through your servants, have the petition referred to the department to which it relates and I hope that the people will get the necessary results that are so sadly needed, just on the border of the city here.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I cannot see, Sir, how one can resist supporting the petition so ably and eloquently and dramatically presented by my colleague, the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). The hon. gentleman, Sir, should be congratulated

MR. NEARY: in doing such a fine job of presenting a grievance on behalf of his constituents who live on Critch's Road. And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that every member on both sides of the House, will rise in his place this afternoon and support that petition. The hon. gentleman made it sound as if it was as important as the landing of Normandy, and that is how concerned my hon. friend is about his constituents who live along this little piece of road which is a dead end I believe.

MR. NOLAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: It is a dead end. People in the Wintertime, Mr. Speaker, cannot get their oil in. The kids have to claw and scrape their way out through piles and piles and banks of snow to get out to the main road. And the people are prepared to co-operate - that is the significant thing - the people are prepared to co-operate by moving back their fences and giving up parts of their property.

Does the hon. gentleman think it is funny?

MR. W. ROWE: No. No. No.

PREMIER MOORES: The badge -

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not have one?

MR. SIMMONS: He does not drink coffee.

MR. NEARY: Look, the hon. gentleman has had such a bad couple of days I will give him mine for a gift and wherever you go with that badge the restaurants and hotels that are participating in the programmes, the Premier will get a free cup of coffee and that will be a very refreshing change for the gentleman, would it not?

MR. SIMMONS: "Not interested," says the Premier.

MR. NEARY: And I hope it is black, black coffee.

Mr. Speaker, I support that petition, Sir, so ably presented by my hon. colleague and I also support,

MR. NEARY: although I realize it is too late,
the petition presented by my hon. friend, the member for
Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) on behalf of the constituents in
Too Good Arm. I thought my friend was describing the road in
my own district of LaPoile, just on the outskirts of Channel -
Port aux Basques, the road to Grand Bay West.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right, I know it.

MR. NEARY: Because the conditions are precisely
the same.

MR. W. ROWE: Exactly the same.

MR. NEARY: And in the Wintertime,

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, without guard rails, with the potholes, that the school bus drivers that go down over the road to Grand Bay West tell me that it is a safety hazard, it is scandalous and there were times they were threatened to take the buses off altogether. And the people who have to get to work from Grand Bay West to get to get CN and to get down to the fish plant and so forth are continuously complaining. And this was another promise, Sir, all these things we are talking about were promises that were made in the last election. This was a promise that was made -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

As the hon. gentleman forewarned the House that he would be getting into an area that he was precluded from so doing, and that is a former petition which has now been tabled and which is no longer before the House for consideration;

I would ask the hon. gentleman to contain his remarks.

MR. S. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I got so carried away, Sir, with the Premier and I becoming kissing cousins and my presenting him with a little gift that I got carried away, Sir, and I apologize to the Chair. But I do want to support both petitions that have been so ably presented by my colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay de Esprit.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to rise in support of the petition presented by my colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). Both he and my colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) have said most of what needs to be said on the petition but perhaps it is a good time to once again, Mr. Speaker, it being so near to another Throne Speech time, it might be the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, to raise the question about the government's five year road programme and hope that this Critch's Road could be included in it.

MR. SIMONS: The road programme was committed on a number of occasions over the past three or four years in various Throne Speeches and we have yet to see the five year road programme and I would hope that perhaps in the Throne Speech or soon after the new Minister of Transportation and Communications might make the list available to us. One is led to believe that the list is long since in existence and now if we could only have a look at it I have no doubt that my colleague's concern will be taken care of, the fifty or so petitioners on Critch's Road will obviously be included -

MR. F. WHITE: Doody did not see the list.

MR. SIMONS: - in that list. I would certainly hope so. I would hope that this a clear case where the absolute need of the hour will override any partisan considerations and the fact that my colleague is a representative of the great Liberal Party will in no way adversely

MR. SIMMONS:

effect the chances of his constituents having their needs met.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

o o o

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burgeo Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have a petition which I would like to present, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition signed by seventy-seven petitioners in the community of McCallum in my district. The prayer of the petition is one that the House has heard about before because I believe that this is either the third or fourth petition that I will have presented from the people of this community on this subject in the past five years since I have been in the House of Assembly. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am sure friends in the House will be charmed, particularly my good friend from Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doody), to learn that on Sunday coming I am going to be celebrating an important anniversary, the fifth anniversary of my election into this Chamber, the anniversary of that famous by-election. I invite all members present to the party. There is going to be one or two on Sunday in Bay d'Espoir to celebrate the event.

MR. DOODY: A telephone booth will do.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is the minister who has rented a telephone booth for his meeting, like the one he had in Burgeo during the election in 1975.

MR. DOODY:

The hon. member should not complain about that meeting.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am not complaining about that meeting at all. I think Mr. Howard should have complained about the meeting, but I do not complain.

Mr. Speaker, I want to present a petition from seventy-seven petitioners in the community of McCallum. McCallum has a population of just over 200 men, women and children

MR. SIMMONS: so you will appreciate that the seventy-seven petitioners represent most of the adult population in that community. The prayer of the petition relates to the need for a water supply. Now I have not said a centralized water system. We are talking about a supply of safe drinking water. The need identified in the petition is a great one, indeed, it is an urgent one, Mr. Speaker. There is at the moment no safe water supply in the community of McCallum. In Summer

MR. SIMMONS: the 200 or so residents of Mc Callum depend on surface pools of water for their drinking water. In Winter they get their drinking water supply by getting aboard their small boats and going by powered boat out of the harbour for a couple of miles to a spring and bringing the drinking water back in barrels and then using hoops and buckets to get to get it from the waterfront up to the houses. That is how they get their drinking water in Winter.

This problem is not a new one to the House, it is not a new one to the government; indeed, the government made a commitment on this water supply in the Fall of 1973 when the minister of the day was Mr. Val Earle. Since then the matter has been raised with the former minister, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, and another former minister, the present Minister of Transportation and Communications, and on various occasions government have looked at it, have had engineering studies done. I say to the new minister, who, by the way, we would like to congratulate. When I was doing so the other day he was not in the House and I was able to pass on my best wishes to his seat mate, and I would like to do the same for the new Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and wish him well in his portfolio. I say to him, in case he is not familiar with this particular problem, that the departmental files are literally full of matters pertaining to this particular problem. The Premier and the then minister made a firm commitment on it in the Fall of 1973, indeed, at that time the Premier indicated it would be taken care of before Christmas of that year, 1973. It has not been taken care of, Mr. Speaker. Engineering studies have been done, I think at least two or three, and one in particular indicates that a water supply - and again, I stress, not a centralized

November 21, 1978

Tape 5268

EC - 2

MR. SIMMONS: water system but a water supply. a central well, for example, could be provided at a cost of \$25,000 to \$30,000. It would require some drilling.

Mr. Simmons: Frank Nolan Associates did the report to which I refer, and they put a cost on it and, of course, that cost is now two years old, so I am sure inflation has done something to the figure. But for a relatively small amount of money we could be providing a water supply to the people of McCallum.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that ought not to become a partisan matter. It is not a question of whether the request of the people can generate some votes for the government in power or for another party. That is not the issue. Here is a case of some basic human need which needs to be met and met fairly soon; indeed it should have been met. The fact is it has not been met. And I on behalf of the seventy-seven petitioners, and all of the people of McCallum indeed, Mr. Speaker, would make an urgent plea to the new minister and to the government as a whole to see that this need is met as soon as possible. There is still time indeed in this particular calendar year, we are talking basically about a drill rig going in there and doing the work that has to be done; it might take a few days. I am not an engineer, fortunately the present minister of the department is an engineer and perhaps he can give us some comment on that particular aspect of this. But that aside, Mr. Speaker, it is not an insurmountable problem. It is one that could be fairly easily attended to. All it requires is a decision in government to allocate the money for the purpose, and I understand that has not yet been done.

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in rising to support this petition. I too have visited McCallum on occasion, most notably during the 1973 by-election when my hon. friend was elected to the former district of Hermitage. And I remember well then the residents of the community telling me, telling us that a commitment had been made for a water system for the community of McCallum. What is that, five years ago now? My hon. friend is about to celebrate his anniversary.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, we remember it well.

MR. W. N. ROWE: We remember the by-election well. As a matter of fact, that is the same by-election where in the community of Seal Cove, a town which holds the name Hickman so high that people in fact call their children,

MR. W. N. ROWE: the first name, Hickman So -and- So - Hickman Lovelace, for example. And the hon. the Minister of Justice went down to campaign bearing that august name -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a Christian name.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right - bearing that name held in such high esteem on the South Coast, went down and campaigned and succeeded in reducing the vote to nine, I know, from what?

MR. SIMMONS: Fifty-nine.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Fifty-nine to nine as a result of his visit, nine for the P.C. Party from fifty-nine in the election a year or so before. So I would not say that he is a worthy carrier of that august and esteemed name of Hickman.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Or town council.

MR. NEARY: That was my speech in the L.O.L. Hall that did that.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right. Sir, a little bit of levity introduced into the support of the petition, but it is a serious matter for the 200 people of Mc Callum the fact that they do not in this day and age have a safe source of water for their families. It is an indictment Sir, of the government and perhaps this House, that a community in this day and age could be in such straits when it comes to something so basic as a safe and sound water system.

I support wholeheartedly, Sir, the prayer of the petition, and I do hope that this Fall a start can be made and perhaps a finish arrived at in

MR. W. N. ROWE: getting a safe central water system for the seventy-seven petitioners and the two hundred residents of the small community of MacCallum on the Southwest Coast.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to support the petition coming from the seventy-seven petitioners in the community of Mc Callum. And coming from the district that I come from and the area that I come from, I know so well how badly water is needed in some of the rural communities in Newfoundland.

This week, Mr. Speaker, when the government was looking for support on its loan bill of \$150 million, I thought then that if they came in with another loan bill for \$50 million to spend on water services in this Province, I would be the first one to jump up and support any piece of legislation, particularly since water is such a serious problem in some of the rural communities. I know some of the members opposite who do not represent rural seats just do not know how serious the problem is, but it is a serious one and something that we have to come to grips with. And I would like for the new minister to try to get the Department of Municipal Affairs in hand, to try to straighten out the water services division in particular that looks after so many of those small communities. I have never seen so much confusion in my life in a division of government as there is in the water services division, particularly over the past year. The rules have been changed in mid-stream three or four times, and I hope that the new minister now, Mr. Speaker, will set about to make the water services division of Municipal Affairs a workable one since I think it could be a very worthwhile vehicle

MR. WHITE: in remedying the serious water problems in some of the smaller unincorporated communities in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition because the problem that the people have in Mc Callum is very similar to the problems of a great many people, especially in Fogo district. And, Sir, there is nothing as essential as a good source of drinking water. And it is becoming very, very serious in many communities around the Province. The same conditions exist in many parts of Fogo district as exist in Mc Callum. People during the Summer months have to go from one community to the other to get water in trucks and sometimes in boats. And we have a system in one community where we have a water system in one part of the community and the other part of the community is without it, and that is at Musgrave Harbour, where the government have not seen fit to complete a water system which was started more than five or six years ago. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, one area of Musgrave Harbour is living in the twentieth century and the other part of the district is living back in the nineteenth century. And this is a shameful condition to have to live in in this day and age.

So, Sir, I can understand well the situation at Mc Callum. We have on Fogo Island not one water system, not a water system at all on Fogo Island. And it is difficult to get the government to understand the serious problems which lack of a good source of water presents.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: So, Mr. Speaker, some changes will have to be made in government's policy to provide a good source of drinking water. Because, Sir, I am afraid that if the systems continue as they are, that some day we are going to be faced with a very serious epidemic, maybe typhoid fever or what have you. But, Sir, unless something is done and done very soon this Province will be faced with a very serious epidemic. Now the government can avoid that by spending a few dollars in each community to provide artesian wells.

Mr. Speaker, I was flabbergasted sometime a while ago when I heard that a water system in Makkovik in Labrador would cost this Province \$50 million. \$50 million to get a system in one small community of Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: \$50,000 per connection.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with the thinking of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. FLIGHT: \$50,000 per household.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: \$55 million.

MR. FLIGHT: \$50,000 per connection, per household.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Sorry if I exaggerated a little. But even with the \$5 million -

MR. W. ROWE: The good old days are coming back.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: It is a shameful amount of money. It is a shameful amount of money to have to spend in such a small community as Makkovik.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support that petition and I hope the government will come up with some kind of programme to supply many of the badly needed areas of the communities and of this Province with a good source of drinking water.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot constrain myself from getting up when I hear a petition regarding roads or water or sewer when it is presented because I have presented dozens of petitions on the same topics from my own district. But before the minister gets up, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to have a word to say in support of this petition from the Seventy-Seven Sunset Strip.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, and it was only last night that I had two phones from two communities in my district about the same thing, artesian wells that were drilled three years ago that have not yet been connected up. Money was allocated last year and the year before but was never spent. There seems to be something awfully wrong in the Water Services Division of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I do not know what it is. I hope that the new minister will take a long hard look at the Water Services Division and see what can be done for unincorporated areas, especially unincorporated areas where you have pockets of families. nine, ten, fifteen families - and all they want - they do not want a \$1 million water and sewer system - all they want is a few thousand dollars, probably \$10,000, perhaps as high as \$20,000 to get an artesian well drilled and then of course the distribution lines for which they are quite happy to pay some of the cost. I have not met anybody yet who said the new restriction imposed last year, or this Spring, by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing was wrong, that each family was expected to pay \$100 towards the cost. Nobody that I have met, that I have talked to, has complained about that. They said, "Sure, it is only fair and it is only right that we should help ourselves. If the government is going

MR. CALLAN: to help us then we help ourselves by throwing in some of our own money."

Nobody argues against that. But it is the slowness with which things get done. It drags on for two and three years. You know, it reminds me of trying to, it is similar to trying to get a piece of Crown land processed; it takes two and three years and you go and check on it and it has not moved off somebody else's desk. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the new minister will take a look at the Water Services Division, you know, and try to realign it and if extra staff is necessary add the extra staff so that if \$15,000 or \$5,000 is allocated to hook up an artesian well that was drilled prior to the election of '75 - which happened in Dildo, it is still there, not a thing hooked up to it and a school teacher from Dildo spent an hour on the phone yesterday afternoon talking to somebody in the Water Services Division. What a phone bill. One hour on a long distance call from Dildo to St. John's.

There is something terribly wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the new minister will take a look at it. It is happening all over the Province. I support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONSMR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the leader of the government, the Premier, concerning the upcoming signing of an agreement to form a corporation to develop or at least to deal with the problem of developing the Lower Churchill. A federal-provincial corporation consisting of, I would assume, roughly even representatives from both jurisdictions. Would the Premier indicate to the House - he does not have to go into any detail, I am not asking him at this point to divulge details of what the agreement may contain although perhaps he should before signing-but what I would like to know is, generally, what powers this corporation is intended to have? Are they powers to bind this government to sales contracts, perhaps, marketing arrangements, a financial deal, say, the raising of \$2.5 billion for example, will this corporation have the power to bind this Province with regard to that kind of a contract or that kind of agreement or is it a corporation being set up, as I understood it originally, to study the feasibility of developing the Lower Churchill, the options available as far as development is concerned, the various alternatives with regard to transmission, marketing, financial arrangements and so on?

Would the Premier at least explain to the House or at least give some information to the House on this dichotomy, either the power to bind this Province or merely to study or to enquire into the feasibility of the various matters which I mentioned?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, the signing of the agreement to form the Lower Churchill Development Corporation will be of major significance to the Province, there is no question about that whatsoever. With the federal and provincial involvement I think it would be very unfair for me to stand up when negotiations are still going on and the agreement likely to be signed within a few days, it would be very wrong for me to divulge the total content of that without having at

PREMIER MOORES: least advised our colleagues in Ottawa as to exactly, they also being part of it because they are obviously part of the corporation. But the one thing I can assure the House is that we will have an opportunity to have full debate hopefully when we open after the fourth on this particular subject. I would like to think as well - well I know that what is in that agreement with the federal government in order to establish a corporation is one that will absolutely look after the interests of this Province whether it be in the field of sales, whether it be in the field of local preference, whether it be in the field of what have you. The fact is that, yes, the Province's position and the Province's wellbeing was first and foremost all through the negotiations that we have had.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Perhaps I did not make myself too clear, Sir. At this point I am not asking the Premier to divulge details or even the terms of the agreement, What I am trying to zero in on is whether this corporation will have the power to bind this Province in perhaps an irrevocable fashion when it comes to financial arrangements, marketing arrangements and transmission arrangements on the Lower Churchill power, or whether we are getting into a position where it is going to have preliminary studies done or maybe even final studies done on various options or alternatives effecting or concerning these matters which I have mentioned but without this Province necessarily being finally or irrevocably bound to anything. Now by way of just an explanation of my question, the distinction between the two is all-important because there is no point in us here in this House debating terms of an agreement if in fact the powers have already been given and the corporation has the power to bind this Province in a way which may not necessarily accord with our ideas or the ideas of many members of this House, or in fact the general public as to

MR. W. ROWE: how the Labrador resources should be developed. Can the Premier give us an idea about that? Whether it is going to be studied or is there going to be a power to bind this Province in some kind of an irrevocable or final fashion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!"

MR. NEARY: A good question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the corporation obviously has to have an update of the development costs of the various projects in Labrador. They have to have an update of the study of what sales options today are available to the Province, that I think goes without saying, but the one thing that I can say is that the Province is fully protected. When you are asking are we bound by the agreement, the

Premier Moores:

agreement I think when it is divulged will show that the Province is the one entity in that agreement that is totally protected and has total flexibility within. Not quite as much as my good friend Mr. Jamieson said about Dree when he was asked originally, Mr. Speaker, it is not 'multi-dimensional with extreme flexibility' but it does have extreme flexibility as far as the Province is concerned.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question, Sir, is to the head of the administration, the hon. the Premier, and it has to do with the Newfoundland railway. The hon. gentleman knows, and members of the House know, there is a very great feeling of uneasiness and insecurity amongst railway workers and freight handlers in this Province. And I want to know now, because the government's position seems to be rather hazy on this subject, have the government done anything to save the Newfoundland railway other than to send a symbolic telegram to Mr. Lang, the Federal Minister of Transport?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have. And the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs can comment more fully on it at the moment. We had a meeting with Mr. Lang on this when we were in Ottawa last on the Constitutional Conference on this subject. Our position is not hazy at all. It is one of a very firm position regarding the railway. And even with that and with the undertaking by the federal government that they will support that position, the fact is they have cut back on some of the expenditures for maintenance and so on this year, which is not a happy situation at all. I do not mean to use this with any levity, but I know that after the First Ministers' Conference on the constitution they had a meeting of Intergovernmental Affairs heads and Ministers of Justice of which

Premier Moores: Mr. Lang asked that the thing he wanted to carry on his next meeting was a very quiet place that they could make sure that they could not be interrupted by the press and that they could really get down to the issues at hand in Canada, and where our Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs suggested that any CN station in the Province could possibly suit that particular location.

But the fact is no, it is not a dead issue with us, it is far from it. And if the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs would like to comment further on it because I know he has ongoing discussions on it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: I will put my supplementary to the Minister of Transportation and Communications and ask the minister what follow-up

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. NEARY: - or Intergovernmental Affairs. Transportation and Communications

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: No, oh I see.

Well what follow-up if anything have the government done to improve, to make recommendations to improve or modernize the Newfoundland railway. And have the government taken any steps to try and persuade the business community in this Province to shift some of its freight back on rail? And have the government taken any steps to protect the Trans-Canada Highway from these monsters, these tractor trailers that are coming down the highway, tearing up the highway and guzzling up the fuel in this energy-hungry world that we live in today?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, our position has been one that has not equivocated at all in this area. Our response to the Government of Canada, who are really the people who must take responsibility for this, and there has been an awful lot of hiding and hedging behind

Mr. Doody: CN, and these are the people who have been held responsible for the downgrading of the service in the Province and for all the various ailments and ills that have sprung from it in terms of the deterioration of the railway and in terms of the wear and tear on the Trans-Canada Highway.

It is really not a CN decision at all. The CN is a Crown corporation who are completely at the mercy and at the orders and at the will of the federal government and of the minister responsible. And a simple directive from the minister responsible should have the result of making CN abide by the decision of the people of Canada. However, that has not been the case.

At the press conference which my hon. friend attended down at Hotel Newfoundland, I think the minister responsible, the federal minister responsible at that time had a very serious, and it appeared to me a sincere statement of the policy and of the conviction of the Government of Canada that the service in Newfoundland, the CN service of Newfoundland would not be curtailed, it would not be downgraded; that there would not be layoffs, that the people involved would have at least as long as the second installment of the Sullivan Commission was published and made available before they could expect any deterioration in either their lifestyle or the service itself. Unfortunately that has not been the case. As the hon. member knows, there have been several hundred people affected really by a curtailment in train service, trains

MR. DOODY:

have been discontinued, service has been discontinued. The most recent news has been that the budget for CN's regular maintenance has been cut by at least a quarter, maybe as much as a half and it is difficult to get to the exact numbers. We have been continually and consistently sending telegrams, telexes and letters objecting to all of this. We keep getting replies back from the ministry responsible to the effect that at the earliest opportunity your complaints will be brought to the attentions of the minister and please feel assured that we are aware of the problems that you have in this particular regard. It is the most unfortunate situation, it is one that we have very little control over, it is one that we absolutely refuse to give up fighting for. We have absolutely no intention of trading the substance for the shadow. It happened a few years ago when regrettably a previous administration traded off the rail passenger service for what was purported to be a very adequate and reasonable road traffic service and we ended up with this rather disgusting, insulting, third class bus service that now purports to be Via Rail's answer to the transportation problems passenger-wise in the Province of Newfoundland.

I can assure you, Sir, and the people of this Province that this government has absolutely no intention of going along with that same sort of cheap trade off. This Province is entitled to a first class road service and a first class railroad service and we feel as representatives of the people of this Province that we can settle for nothing less.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY:

A quick supplementary to the minister, Sir. As an indication of the government's sincerity and the minister's sincerity in what he just said, would the minister send an official of his department to a public meeting in Port aux Basques in the Lion's

MR. S. NEARY: Den at 8:00 P.M. on November 27th. to attend a meeting in connection with setting up a committee to try to save the railway in this Province, and then another meeting on the 28th. in Corner Brook? Both meetings will be attended by the Executive Director of Transport 2000 which is a national body that are interested in saving the railway across Canada. Will the minister send an official of his department to attend both of these meetings?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no hesitation in saying that representatives of the various departments of government that are involved in this particular situation will be most willing, most anxious to make an appearance at any of these meetings that are set up, but I am afraid that the hon. member will have to make his schedule conform with the schedule of government rather than vice versa. I realize that the hon. member has more flexibility, he has more free time and perhaps it is easier for him to arrange a schedule than it is for me. Off the top of my head, I would find it very difficult to make a commitment on the exact date. As to the purpose and as to the intent, I think that this particular party and this particular government has been on record for quite a long while as regards to the future of CN and of the Marine Services and of the CN rail and of the road transportation system in the Province of Newfoundland. As a matter of actual fact it was not so long ago, Sir, that we signed a three year road agreement Trans-Canada road upgrading agreement with the Government of Canada through the courtesy of the hon. Otto Lang and in that particular agreement it was undertaken that with -

MR. S. NEARY: A point of order.

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

MR. S. NEARY: To my questions, the minister, Sir, is off the subject. My question was will the government send a representative to this meeting. A simple yes or no answer, that is all I want from the minister as an indication of the sincerity of the government.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On the point of order, obviously there is nothing on which the Chair can make a decision.

Hon. minister.

MR. DOOPY:

That was my point, Sir, I did not realize that there was a point. Obviously the officials of the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs and of Industrial Development are available at any time within the parameters of their duties. I cannot really commit a meeting in the Lion's Den, or whatever sort of dens the hon. gentleman frequents at any given particular time or place. I have some responsibilities to the people in the departments which I represent. I cannot send them into the Lion's Den at notice like this. But I am certainly only too happy to arrange all the meetings that are necessary to be arranged. As a matter of fact I have implored and have begged the Minister of Transport in Ottawa, Mr. Lang, to try to arrange a meeting with the unions involved. I have gone to them on their behalf and I have said, 'Mr. Lang, there are hundreds of people in the Province of Newfoundland who do not know where their jobs are coming from next year, Will you please take ten minutes out of your schedule to meet with them?' And he said, 'Why does not somebody bring that to my attention?' Now, great heavens here on earth, he is the Minister of Transport.

MR. DOODY: If the Minister of Transport in Canada does not realize the fact that the people in Newfoundland are concerned about the CN it is time for his colleagues to really have a chat with him, if indeed they can get through to him.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, and I would appreciate a short preamble. As the minister is aware and the House is aware, Badger the year before last went through a disastrous flooding situation. And Sir, it is a fact that responsible and knowledgeable people now in the Central Newfoundland area are aware and feel that conditions in that river right now, and I will point out the conditions in a second, are ripe for another flood in Badger. A very low river condition where Price (Nfld.) drained Red Indian Lake this Summer and now cannot get the water to maintain a decent water level, very low water conditions that with the kind of weather we are getting, you would get a very quick icing over of the river and possibly a freezing to the bottom because there is actually no water left in the river. And the risk is compounded further by the fact that Price (Nfld.) left approximately 20,000 cords of wood in Exploits River above Badger. The fear is that if we start getting an icing condition below Badger and that wood starts to move you could have another disastrous flood. And my question to the minister is that, to this point, and he has been informed of the danger out there, to this point has the minister had his officials or his department determined whether or not there is indeed a real concern that the conditions are there that could bring about a return of the kind of flooding we saw in Badger last year?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I checked on it this morning at eleven o'clock, Mr. Speaker, with one of the engineers in the Department of Mines and Energy, who was the person designated last year by me to look after that problem and to ensure that the gauges were in the right places and that the proper measurements were done and to do various studies on the ice flows and the amount of ice and all the rest of it, the amount of wood in the river, in consultation with the Department of the Environment, and I was speaking to him again this morning and we are going to ensure that that situation is monitored again this Winter.

He did not tell me though that they did not receive the same seriousness as the hon. member has just indicated in his preamble.

MR. FLIGHT: And the town council.

MR. PECKFORD: And the town council also in a letter to me just recently, And as a result of the letter from the town council, this is why I had the meeting this morning, I will as a result of the hon. member's further query in addition to that of the town council, go back to the gentleman tomorrow morning, further insist that he go out and take a look at it to see first hand.

We are hoping this year, because there are people in the Department of the Environment who are more knowledgeable than our petroleum geologists, for example, or ordinary geologists, into this matter to take this lead this year rather than the Department of Mines and Energy. But we intend to keep involved as well and to also involve Newfoundland Hydro into water flows and so on because they have some expertise there.

But I can assure the hon. member that all steps will be taken through the Department of Mines and Energy,

MR. PECKFORD: the Department of the Environment and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to protect and to do what we can to ensure that the kind of crisis that happened in Badger a couple of years ago does not recur.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the flooding in Badger two years ago there were recommendations made to Cabinet, to government, of things that could be done immediately following the floods that would protect or defend Badger against that kind of flooding. Now nothing has been done, Mr. Speaker, that may have been gauges - at least the people in Badger cannot perceive anything has been done, this includes the town council, that would have the effect of offsetting that kind of flooding.

So I would ask the minister that - And it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, whatever the engineers that the minister refers to, come up with, it is a fact that the ideal conditions exist in that river now to cause flooding. Now I want the minister to tell the House just what the government has determined, as a result of this past two years having had time to consider this situation, what they propose to do in the event we do start getting a build up of ice in Badger and in the event we start getting flooding? What have they got in place as a result of the lesson they learned two years ago?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member gets his information. I am trying to be reasonable on a very important matter. The letter that we received from the Town Council of Badger requested, as I remember, that we institute the same measures that we instituted in previous years.

Now obviously if they are asking to

November 12, 1978

Tape No. 5275

NM - 4

MR. PECKFORD: institute the same measures this year -

MR. FLIGHT: What measures?

MR. PECKFORD: - as we instituted last year, there must
be some measures -

MR. FLIGHT: What measures? What measures?

MR. PECKFORD: - that we instituted last year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: And for the hon. member to indicate
that he knows of nothing that we have done out in Badger just
shows his ignorance of the district.

MR. FLIGHT: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: This question, Mr. Speaker, is
on the same subject. I want to refer to the Minister of Forestry,
and I want

MR. FLIGHT: to ask the Minister of Forestry if he is prepared to tell the House why it is and how it is that a company like Price (Nfld.) can leave 20,000 upwards - I have heard figures of 40,000 but 20,000 is confirmed - in the Exploits River below Red Indian Lake. Now it is bad enough with thousands of cords of logs floating around Red Indian Lake, but this year, the first year yet, we have 20,000 cords of wood left in the river that will not be delivered to the mill, and that wood is causing a grave concern to the people of Badger in the event it would move and come down into an ice jam, something there was no way to deal with. How is it that the minister - number one, is the Department of Forestry aware that Price is doing that kind of thing, and how is it that they were prepared to go along with Price leaving 20,000 cords of wood in the Exploits River between Badger and Red Indian Lake?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Well, I see it did not take very long for the member to get after Price again. He is back on his usual track.

I am not aware why the Department of the Environment is allowing Price to leave wood in the Exploits River. I am also not aware of how much damage it is going to cause. I assume that he is talking again about the Badger situation, but I have no idea what damage it is going to cause with regard to Badger and any possible flooding. And there is no law that I am aware of that Price is breaking. I am sure if they are that the Department of the Environment will take appropriate action.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d-Esipoir (Mr. Simmons)

MR. SPEAKER: followed by the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

I make reference first of all to the provisions under Term 29 of the Terms of Union by which, after the recommendation of the Commission back in 1958, I believe, it was agreed by the federal government that there would be an annual deficiency payment of the order of \$8 million to help us to maintain a standard of services commensurate with those obtaining in the Atlantic Provinces without having to resort to more burdensome taxation measures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that figure was arrived at in 1958, and presumably in terms of 1958 dollars.

MR. SIMMONS: Inflation alone has meant that in terms of 1975 dollars we are not getting nearly the amount that was intended by the recommendation or by the government of that time, 1958. And I am wondering in the light of that if the government here, the provincial government, have sought to have negotiations reopened with the federal government on the point.

MR. HICKMAN: Budget Speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I say to the minister I am aware of his reference in the Budget Speech, but the reference includes no indication that this government have been talking to the federal government on the point. Indeed, the paragraph would indicate that such dialogue has not taken place. I am asking the minister now if there has been any request to the federal government to reopen negotiations on this point with a view to having the deficiency payment paid in terms of 1978 dollars, which I understand would be of the order of \$35 million to \$37 million in 1973 dollars?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the Budget Speech, on page twelve, I indicated that in going through the budgetary process, government had reflected on Term 29 and the award of \$3 million in perpetuity as a revenue deficiency payment, and pointed out in particular that at that time in 1958 when this was laid down, it constituted 15 per cent of our current account revenues.

The fact is that during the budgetary process, meetings were held in the nation's capital at the ministerial level and at the Prime Minister's and the Premier's level, when the Premier and the then Minister of Finance, now the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, set forth as strongly as we felt we could, our arguments, and our arguments were, I think, very well founded, namely, that the purpose behind Term 29

MR. HICKMAN: was to assist Newfoundland in maintaining services, public services, comparable to that of the Maritime Provinces, and because it was as impossible then as it is now to predict with any degree of certainty the escalation in costs, would they be prepared to reopen it? We talked of various avenues. One was various approaches and one was indexing and before the budget was brought down we were advised that that avenue was not open to us from the Government of Canada's point of view and there it now stands. I quite frankly do not believe that we will have any more success if during this year's budgetary process we decide to go back again to the Government of Canada and ask for further consideration. I cannot think of any approach that would be any stronger than the one we used before. It was, I repeat, at the First Ministers' level in either January or February of this year and the answer was a definitive no and we then had to come back and try to find other ways of facing the horrendous task of continuing with a balanced budget for this Province which is very essential.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the minister or for the Premier. The case here is very particular, it is not a case that any other province can mount, a very particular term of union applying to one Province and one only. It is clear, if one would read the provision in the term, that the intent of the term is no longer being met, and I believe that is the overriding argument, that the Government of Canada undertook to assist us financially to maintain a certain standard. I believe the nature of our taxation, the high taxes we have, is due quite largely I am sure to the failure of this term to do what it intended to do back in 1949 and certainly after 1958. My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is would the Premier undertake a further special initiative at the conference next week, the Economic Conference, on this very point and I am sure that if he needs a unanimous resolution I cannot speak for

MR. SIMONS: all the House but I think it is the kind of matter that we would speak with unanimity on-and I would be prepared to move such a resolution, as I am sure any member of this House would, to give the government whatever additional mandate it requires from this House to request, strongly urge the federal government to reopen the negotiations on this particular point. For me it is a very sore one and I do not believe the term is being met at all, the intent of the term is being met, and I would ask the Premier if he would be prepared to mount another special initiative next week at the Economic Conference of First Ministers with a view to having this term renegotiated and obviously with a view to returning more money to the Treasury to help us maintain that standard of service which the term intended we be able to do anyway in the first place?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. member's question, it is a subject that has been brought up on several occasions, not just once, on several occasions. It is not one that the federal government obviously wants to reopen. The revenue that is coming in now, I think it is fifteen per cent -

MR. DOODY: No, it was fifteen per cent.

PREMIER MOORES: It was fifteen per cent when it was done in 1958.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is now less than one.

PREMIER MOORES: Now it is less than one per cent, which is totally against the principle of why it was set up in the first place, and which is really irrelevant on the income of the Province now when one looks at the overall tax base and different sources of funds.

I had planned to bring it up at the Economic Conference anyway because I am introducing the paper at the Economic Conference on Regional Development and this is an example of how undertakings by a Central Government can sometimes be shelved and the obligation of the intent of that commitment not being lived up to. I think it is not only the commitments that are made at times

November 21, 1978

Tape No. 5278

AH-3

PREMIER MOORES:

like that that are important. It is also the spirit in which they are made and the priorities of the regional areas of Canada that have to be attacked.

Now in this Province as we know it is very costly to provide services, it is much more costly to provide them here than it is in the other

Premier Moores: Maritime Provinces even. That, I would suggest, was part of the reason why the federal government felt an extra reason, if you like, to develop Term 29, and to have that fund here until our own resources were developed. That situation has not happened. It is not because of lack of communication. It is one that the federal government do not have to, if they do not want to, they had commissioned the report that that was the figure, and I suppose theoretically they could stick with it. But certainly in the spirit of what was meant that Term 29 has not lived up with and I will be bringing it up at the Economic Conference.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 25, Bill No. 74, that is the adjourned debate on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it Order 25?

MR. HICKMAN: Order 25 right.

MR. SPEAKER: Or Motion 25?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no Order 25.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 25, the adjourned debate on Bill No. 74.

MR. NEARY: Could we have guidance from the Table on who adjourned the debate, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Right. If the Table will inform me, I will inform the members.

I am informed that the hon. member for LaPoile adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to continue very long with my few remarks, I just want to say, reiterate what I said before, that there are other facilities in Newfoundland that should get the same attention as the Summer Game facilities in St. John's and I am thinking primarily about the swimming pool in Channel-Port aux Basques, and the swimming pool in Stephenville, where my hon. friend represents the district of Stephenville, which has been closed down, I believe, for five or six years, four or five years, three years it is closed down. The Kinsmen in Channel-Port aux Basques have been

Mr. Neary: struggling with a swimming pool for that community for the Southwest corner of the Province now for four or five or six years, -

AN HON. MEMBER: And in Grand Bank too.

MR. NEARY: - and in Grand Bank you have the same thing. We are not objecting, Sir, to St. John's having these posh, luxurious facilities, and we wish them well. But we think, Sir, if there is going to be a policy, the policy should apply to the whole Province and not just to St. John's.

And the other complaint that I had, if you can call it a complaint at the time, Sir, was the fact that the City of St. John's will only be participating, I believe, to the tune of 25 per cent of the cost of operating the Aquarena, the hangover of the Summer Games. And, Mr. Speaker, while they are only contributing one-quarter of the cost they are down there squandering money right, left, and centre on parking garages. They are giving the Crosbies tax exemptions for the building they are going to rent to the government down there, Mr. John Crosbie, John Crosbie's companies getting a \$2 million a year tax exemption from the City of St. John's and asking the taxpayers of Newfoundland to support the Summer Games facilities. There is something not right about that, Mr. Speaker. They are having a big investigation into the parking garage. That will be another subject that we will bring up when the House goes back into session again.

AN HON. MEMBER: What has that got to do with John Crosbie?

MR. NEARY: What has it got to do with John Crosbie? John Crosbie is one of the owners of the companies I am talking about. That is what it has to do with him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you know that?

MR. NEARY: Do I know it? Does the hon. gentleman know it?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, these are the arguments that I have to put forward. Sir, if there is going to be a policy then it should be a policy for the whole Province, and not just single out St. John's and give St. John's the preferential treatment. And I hope, Sir, that the Aquarena will be a success. I have two young daughters who go over there in competitive swimming and synchronized swimming and they enjoy it and the facilities are wonderful, they are great, they are good, they are the best in the Province, probably the best in Eastern Canada, And they can get

MR. NEARY: get up and tell us we are unpatriotic and we do not go along with taking the Summer Games facilities. I could give the Minister of Justice and Finance a good argument on that but I will not. If we are going to do it, let us do it for the whole Province. Let us do it for Port aux Basques, let us do it for Stephenville and let us do it for Grand Bank and not just give St. John's the preferential treatment. And that is the main argument and bone of contention with this bill. We are not objecting to the Summer Games facilities opening up -

MR. W. N. ROWE: No, we are not.

MR. NEARY: - as long as the Aquarena and the Summer Games facilities benefit the ordinary people and not just the elite of this city. And I have talked to the people who are operating it over there, with whom I am rather impressed, because they seem to be thinking along the same lines, that the ordinary person must participate. And so far, I believe, there is a high degree of participation in the Aquarena, which is a good thing, but I am afraid, Sir - and we do not know what the deficit is going to be yet; the deficit is going to be substantial, I would think, anywhere from \$300,000 to \$500,000. If the Minister of Finance can get away with \$500,000 he will be lucky. But do not make it a facility for the well-to-do, for the snobs and the aristocrats and the elite of the city. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, that that can sometimes be done innocently, because, Sir, you take competitive swimming, synchronized swimming; it costs a small fortune to put a couple of kids in synchronized swimming. The ordinary person cannot afford it. You may have sons and daughters in families in this city who are drawing unemployment insurance, welfare, low income, medium income and sometimes upper income who cannot afford to put their daughters into these programmes because they cost too much.

MR. NEARY: And the travelling expenses are horrendous. And so, Sir, innocently, not deliberately, it suddenly becomes a facility for the elite.

Now, I do not know how to cope with that. I do not think the public Treasury can stand financing all these programmes. I know they are having a swimathon over there now and they are trying to raise some funds to be contributed towards the travelling and towards the expenses of people who have to go outside the Province and other parts of the Province.

But these are some of the points I raise, Sir. They are very valid points. And the one that I am more concerned about than anything else and the one that I would like to rivet home to the administration is the fact that by opening these facilities, by setting up this commission and by doing all the other things they are doing with the Summer Games facilities they are discriminating, whether they know it or not, against the other parts of Newfoundland. Buchans, where you have the mine closing -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - is being discriminated against; Port aux Basques, where you have the Kinsmen struggling for five or six years to get a swimming pool - not open yet, by the way, no indication of when it is going to open; Stephenville, shut down for three years - beautiful recreation facilities left behind, I believe, by the Americans, everything shut down, grinding to a halt; stadiums in the Province clinging on by their fingernails trying to keep going to provide hockey and skating and roller skating.

MR. J. CARTER: They do not pay, you know that.

MR. NEARY: Who do not pay?

MR. J. CARTER: Stadiums.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point I am making. The Aquarena is not going to pay. The Aquarena is going to be subsidized and we do not know how much yet, we have not been told, I would suspect to the tune of \$500,000 or more, plus the fact that this government that the hon. gentleman is supporting is going to wipe out the deficit from the Summer Games on top of that. And what I am saying is that the government is not doing the same as far as stadiums, recreation facilities, swimming pools in other parts of the Province are concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now is the hon. member going to sit there and support that kind of a government, who will make a policy for St. John's and discriminate against the rest of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. J. CARTER: Will the hon. member give way?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I will give way.
I have made my point, Sir.

MR. J. CARTER: You are finished?

MR. NEARY: No, I am just going to yield for the gentleman to ask a question. Sure. If the hon. gentleman wants to ask a question, sure, go ahead.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman realize that the stadiums outside of town have not taken advantage of a great many money saving

MR. J. CARTER: methods that are available to such large plants; For instance, and this is only one, I will only take the time of the House to illustrate one example: A stadium has a large freezing plant. It is not used all the year round, and this plant could be used to supply cold storage facilities at the same time as it provides an ice surface. A cold storage facility does not use a great deal of power once whatever is stored in it is safely salted down and this could provide an auxiliary use for such stadiums.

Another use that can be used stadiums is to promote certain public gatherings. I am told that some of these entertainers that come down here need such large facilities in order to make their visit worthwhile. And I understand that there is some difficulty in getting these facilities for these people.

I do not think you can possibly make a stadium pay just by having it for skating and for hockey, but by thinking of other uses for these buildings perhaps you can make them pay.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. gentleman's question, Sir, but I never heard such foolish nonsense in my life. I would like for the hon. gentleman to go out and become manager of one of these stadiums. It might be all right for the gentleman to operate a savoury patch, but it is a different thing operating a stadium and the gentleman knows nothing of what he is talking about, Sir. There are a couple of stadiums in Newfoundland that are paying their way, their operating costs. Springdale happens to be one, and I believe the Twin Rinks over here operate year-round, while it may not be paying, because I heard recently the gentleman who went out and raised the funds to build the Twin Rinks, and got all the honour and glory for it, is now looking for somebody else to pay for it. And that happens in a good many cases in Newfoundland. But the Twin Rinks is used on a

MR. NEARY: year-round basis. They have hockey schools going over there. But using them for refrigeration facilities, for what? For savoury? Cabbage, put cabbage in there, fish sticks or what? What is the hon. gentleman talking about?

I have no doubt, Sir, the hon.

gentleman -

MR. RIDEOUT: Cold storage space to rent.

MR. NEARY: Why not just take the stadiums and turn them into big warehouses, fill them up with fish, or vegetables -

MR. SIMMONS: What would he do in October?

MR. NEARY: And then in October shove them all out in the snow bank. I know the hon. gentleman meant well but it is so ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: What happens if you get a warm day in November?

MR. NEARY: But the hon. gentleman did make a point. The hon. gentleman, I think, feels in his heart that we should not just limit assistance from the Public Treasury. The money that goes into the Public Treasury comes from the taxpayers all over this Province, from Grand Falls, Labrador City, Port aux Basques, down in Baie Verte, St. John's, Corner Brook, Harbour Grace, Rose Blanche, Grand Bruit, LaPoile, all over the Province, the taxpayers put their money into the Public Treasury and then the government scoops it out and puts it in St. John's. It makes a policy for St. John's and discriminates against all these other places I just mentioned. Does that make sense to the hon. gentleman?

So I say, Sir, if you are going to have a policy and you are stuck with the Summer Games facilities, it is an embarrassment, it is an albatross around your neck, it is something that should have never happened but are stuck with it, do not let

MR. NEARY: it become a facility for the elite of St. John's. And if you are going to have a policy and you are going to pour money into recreation and sport and youth, well then let it apply to the whole Province. Do not discriminate against any particular part of Newfoundland. Give it to everybody.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I just rise to speak a few words on the bill. I think that if we are fortunate enough to have such fine facilities like the Aquarena and some other smaller facilities across our Province that our government should provide the necessary funds to provide an adequate and full programme for the benefit of our young and elderly people.

I do not think anybody will disagree that recreation and sport today play a very important part in our society and it will indeed help if it is programmed right to build a much healthier and better nation.

MR. W. McNEIL: One of the questions that maybe we should be asking ourselves when we have such a facility on our hands, should we proceed in the direction that Nova Scotia did in Halifax when they had such a fine facility after the Summer Games? They tried to conserve on the dollars and cents and as a result over a short number of years the facility declined to a great degree, and as a result the programme also declined, and years later the government and the municipal people involved realized that they moved in the wrong direction and they had to spend more money in trying to bring the facility up to a proper standard. So I think the steps that we have taken here in this Province is a good one in that we are going to make sure that if we run the facility it will be done in a professional manner. I will congratulate the minister for taking that step.

But I am disappointed in this government in not providing the same type of principle in relation to financing facilities to other areas across the Province and namely in my own district, Stephenville, we have a pool closed down for X number of years because there was not enough money in and around the area to run an adequate and decent programme. Now my hon. friend mentioned that the Americans left the pool there, No; the Americans did not leave the pool there. Actually it was a former MOT Building, it was a former air terminal, and it was converted the people in Stephenville. The people of Stephenville approached the government year after year to have a pool built in Stephenville and we were told to go and swim in the pool in Corner Brook which was sixty miles away. The people in the community formed a citizens' group, they raised X number of dollars, and with the help of the parish they committed themselves financially and they built and established a pool and it ran a very successful programme for years. One of the means they had as a part of fund raising, they got involved into running a lounge but in the community there was a lot of

MR. W. McNEIL: conflict in running a liquor establishment when you are also trying to run aquatic programmes to the children. So the Board of Directors at St. Stephen's, after many years trying to bring the facility up to standard-and it actually never did get to a standard where it was acceptable in the aquatic field because it was just a shell of a building, really all it was was an outdoor pool and year after year they put money into it to try to develop it into an indoor pool. They spent more money on capital than they did on programming. The amount of money generated within the facility itself was more than adequate to cover the programme itself. But when the Board of Directors, and I understand that they made this decision on a commitment from the government that they would get involved into the financing of the facility, they decided to get out of the liquor business. So as a result they phased out their bar, which was their only and best source of revenue, and just geared down the operation to just a bare pool, and then less than a year after the pool had to close because there was not enough money, not enough revenue coming in for just ordinary maintenance, and the thing stopped actually when the pool furnace - well the pool furnace actually broke down one winter, I think it was in February, and a few days after that the parish made a decision that they could not put more back into facility and the pool closed. And since then, year after year, month after month, there have been several people in the community approaching government for a commitment, and I must honestly say that in talking with the minister yesterday that he indicated that there is a commitment made to Stephenville and I would ask the minister to elaborate on that commitment when he stands up to speak in the Chamber.

But I must also point out that in Quebec where they have a lot of facilities - they have the Canada Games and actually the Olympics were held in Montreal - and the Quebec Government approached their problem in this manner and it is

MR. W. McNEIL:

in the Steel report and it is stressed that the provincial government by an act of legislation took up the capital costs, repairs, maintenance and utilities were carried separately from the programme budget of the facilities. So the Province was responsible for the maintenance,

MR. MCNEIL: capital costs and utilities, and the municipality that took over that particular facility was responsible for programming. In most cases there was enough money generated by the participants in the programme to carry the programme itself. So I think that maybe the minister's department should look in this direction. I realize that the government is going to have to make a tough decision if they are going to just support recreation in a lip-service fashion, or are they going to bite the bullet and support it in tough dollars and cents? I realize that the dollars and cents have to come from somewhere so that may mean some taxes. That is a decision that they are going to have to weigh at a later date.

But I cannot stress enough the importance of providing an adequate recreation programme. We are actually doing very well with facilities but we have facilities that are in place that do not have a good programme. Apart from the pool in Stephenville, I can also refer to the West Coast Training Centre which is a facility that was given to us by Uncle Sam when the American base closed. It is a West coast training centre; the government is moving in the right direction in trying to develop it as a provincial training centre, but they are not going far enough in providing programmes. The name of the game is programmes and getting the people involved, getting the people involved in recreation programmes, recreational sport.

For example, the facility is closed on the weekends. Most people work during the day-time. That is okay for the people who are on welfare; during the week they can go and enjoy the recreational facility, but if you are working from nine o'clock to five or six o'clock in the evening, and sometimes people work at night, the only time they have off is on the weekends

MR. MCNEIL: but when they come home to their community on the weekend the recreational facility is closed - that is the West Coast Training Centre.

So there should be a full programme. Again it is going to cost a little bit extra in dollars to the provincial government to provide a programme, but if you have the facilities in place put the programme there as well and I think there will be more returns coming back. Because it does help to build a better community and in turn we have a stronger nation.

I will not take any more time in the Chamber. I would support the bill and I would ask the minister when he stands to elaborate on his commitment that there would be a swimming pool for Stephenville, and if he would give some consideration to extending the programmes in such facilities as the West Coast Training Centre and, I am sure, in the Provincial Centre here in Torbay so that the majority of people in the community can take better advantage of the programmes that are available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): The hon. the Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to deal with a couple of points made by my hon. friends opposite. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made reference to Channel - Port aux Basques and I think it is necessary for me to point out to the House that the government provided \$200,000, which is the amount permitted under our policy, for swimming pools to Channel - Port aux Basques.

I am aware, as he is, that there are some problems. To go outside of that means an extension of what we are talking about in terms of the Aquarena, not to the same extent, mind you, but to the extent where we are either going to subsidize or revise the policy which is already costly and which we can ill afford at this particular point in time.

MR. HICKEY:

I think it is not fair to say that, to equate Channel - Port aux Basques or Stephenville or, for that matter, any other part of this Province with the Aquarena or the Summer Games facilities that we are talking about here. For the record, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure, I cannot recall definitively whether I said this in introducing the bill, but I want to say it and run the risk of repetition because it must be said, it must be said for the record; this government inherited the Summer Games facilities. It was not our design or architecture or priority or plan that brought them, we have never taken credit for them, they were brought to this Province through the lobbying, the enthusiasm and the efforts of the City of

MR. HICKEY: St. John's and a group of interested people. They were subsequently developed and run and the facilities built by the Society for the Canada Summer Games, who, we all know, is headed by Andrew Crosbie, Grant Chalker, people well-known by my hon. friends opposite, certainly closer to my friends opposite than indeed they are to people on this side of the House. I do not know, therefore, why my colleagues on the other side find it such a bad thing that those two gentlemen, and all the others connected with them in a voluntary effort, developed in terms of the Canada Summer Games and the necessary facilities which came with it.

The end result, Mr. Speaker, was that we had, after making a sizeable contribution to enable the games to take place, our Capital City having been chosen, surely goodness we were not to turn our back on the effort which had been already achieved in getting the Canada Summer Games here and surely any government would make a contribution, which we did, and a generous one at that.

There were no plans for this government to involve itself, nor any commitments to take over the facilities.

MR. MCNEIL: If the facilities—as you say, you know, you had no part of it—if the facilities, the Canada Summer Games, a site was chosen for Western Newfoundland or Labrador would you give the same type of treatment as paying twenty-five/ seventy-five? And if the answer is yes, why not do it on a smaller scale where there are less dollars involved? It is only a small pool not a total complex.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, you know if he is going to banter with me on recreation I had better do some research. He should be well aware of the fact that the Newfoundland Winter Games, the same formula was followed, the same procedure was followed, the precedent was followed. Indeed

MR. HICKEY: It was not patterned after the Canada Summer Games because we had not yet made the decision. But it was a policy which was conceived by this administration in our efforts to develop recreation, sports and fitness in the Province by putting money into facilities, necessary facilities, to improve those facilities, to raise them to a standard which could produce the excellence in our athletes in Grand Falls, in Gander and in Goose Bay, just last year.

MR. MCNEIL: But you cannot provide money to those facilities to run them the year after. Only in St. John's you have made that distinction.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, again my friend is wrong. We already provide money to run and operate those facilities.

MR. MCNEIL: On an annual basis.

MR. HICKEY: The fact that we do not pay the full shot should not be necessarily a condemnation of us, you know, because we go eighty per cent of the way or ninety per cent of the way if we do not go the hundred per cent of the way. You know, there are so many dollars to go around and that is all we can do and we must recognize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are living in a Province which is not blessed at this point in time with the kind of revenues that allows us to do the things that we want to do just as much as my hon. friend wants to do them. So he must recognize that. That is a fact of life and one of the things that have gotten us into so much trouble in the last thirty years of Confederation is the fact that governments before we came into office did not recognize that.

Now I do not want to get political because that was not the purpose for which I stood up. Let me simply say again for the record, Mr. Speaker, that this government I think acted handsomely in moving quickly to take over those facilities, to show an interest, a further and continuing

MR. HICKEY: interest now that the facilities were there, not to allow them to be closed up any longer. Indeed they were closed for too long as it was. We did not rush into anything. We got one of the best, if not the best, individuals in the Province to tell us in his expert way and with his professional experience just what we should do with them and how they should be run. And, Mr. Speaker, today we are following almost to the letter the recommendations of the Steele Report, which has been hailed by all the sports people and recreation people across the Province.

I can say with the great of assurance, having talked to people from outside this Province, that we have the best facility in the country and one of the best facilities in North America in terms of the Aquarena. That facility, Mr. Speaker, whatever kind of a noose it might appear to be around our necks in terms of operating expenses at this point in time, will allow our athletes to produce the excellence in terms of the potential that our young people have. to produce the

Mr. Hickey: excellence that is necessary in terms of an opportunity of our people and will continue the rise and improvement of our athletes across the nation as was so vividly demonstrated during the Canada Summer Games when they won the coveted cup or trophy as having shown the greatest level of improvement of any province or territory in the country. Surely goodness this is like motherhood, How can anyone possibly stand in their place and be against that? We are not boasting about the fact that we are going to have to pay some money.

MR. NEARY: There was never anybody against that.

MR. HICKEY: No, well. You know, what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is saying that this should happen across the Province.

MR. NEARY: Of course.

MR. HICKEY: And I will agree with him that it should, provided the money is there to do it.

MR. MCNEIL: Did you have the money for this Aquarena?

MR. HICKEY: No.

MR. MCNEIL: Well, I am glad you found it.

MR. HICKEY: We had to sit down and redo to our priorities, we did not have the money budgeted for the Aquarena we had to find it.

MR. MCNEIL: And it can be found.

MR. HICKEY: I can honestly say as Minister of Recreation, in my dying days as Minister of Recreation, and having gone across the width and length of this Province, that certainly not, we would not have assigned that kind of priority to the monies that we had to have, the amount of money that we have spent. But what does one do when a facility grows -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are being harassed by your colleague.

MR. HICKEY: - and it is there? You know, I mean we are locking the door, it is like locking the door when the horse is gone. So there it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Your colleague is harassing you.

MR. HICKEY: I just want to briefly touch on the swimming pool my hon. friend mentioned, and to say to him that this government's

Mr. Hickey: record is unquestionable, cannot be faulted, cannot be criticized as far as the swimming pool in Stephenville is concerned.

MR. RIDEOUT: You are getting on dangerous ground.

MR. HICKEY: I personally met with a number of people on, I believe, two occasions. I talked to a number of people on two or three other occasions; each and every time I talked to them I gave them the same answer, and I said simply that you activate that swimming pool, or show me a plan where you are going to, and we will make available the funds to do it. We cannot agree to build a new swimming pool in Stephenville when there is one lying idle. We cannot put money into a pool that is owned by the church. But if the Rotary Club wants to do it, as there was an indication on one occasion they were interested, we will do business with them. If the Town Council wants to do it, as some of the other town councils do in the Province, we will do business with them. We will make available the funds that are necessary to bring it up to the same standard of swimming pools across this Province. That can hardly be construed as not being interested or not being willing to do anything.

MR. MCNEIL: No. I am very pleased to hear that the minister said he will, because the last time he said that it would have to be only the Town Council involved. But he is willing to deal with any other body?

AN HON. MEMBER: Except the church.

MR. MCNEIL: Except the church.

MR. HICKEY: I believe the Town Council, Mr. Speaker, that is the people we usually do business with. But if the Town Council is not going to do it, in co-operation with the town and with the Town Council giving its blessing to the other organization, certainly there is no reason in the world. Why, some of our best facilities are operated and operated most efficiently by organizations such as the Kinsmen Club. So there is no reason in the world why we would not do something like that. And I would hope that in the not too distant future something can be done with that pool. We are not happy about

Mr. Hickey: the fact that it is idle any more than my hon. friend.

The only other point, Mr. Speaker, that should be made is that with regards to the schedule of the centre out there, I do not have the details. I can only say to him that I will pass on his concerns to my officials and to see what we can do. I do not know if we can in the present fiscal year extend the hours of operations, but certainly if not it is a recommendation which we will certainly like to look at in terms of the next fiscal year and do whatever we can.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of changes that I would like to have made in Committee stage, and before I sit down I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks as minister to the members of the Commission who have done a creditable job, a first-class job in taking a number of facilities and putting them into operation at very short notice. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but to develop a programme which is second to none.

MR. NEARY: What is the price tag?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, if I can carry on without being interrupted. I am not in the habit of trying to shout over somebody else.

MR. NEARY: What did it cost?

MR. HICKEY: If the hon. gentleman has a question when I recognize him he can get up and ask.

MR. NEARY: Well what is the cost?

MR. HICKEY: The Aquarena programme, Mr. Speaker, is one that all hon. members should read and they will get the answer in that programme,

MR. HICKEY: for in that programme the question raised by my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who says this should not be for the elite - every facet of the population can be involved in the Aquarena programme, the aged, the infirm, there is a special pool over there for people who require therapy; the kiddies, the beginners, the teenagers, the babies just walking. Holy goodness, you know, there is nobody in this Province who cannot take part in a programme that is available at that facility.

MR. NEARY: I am there every day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Leave room for the aged and infirm.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the fact that my friend from LaPoile did not stand in his place today and hail this as one of the best programmes in the Province, because it is the best in the country.

MR. NEARY: How much?

AN HON. MEMBER: He goes with the aged and infirm.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question if I have the responsibility for doing so, during Estimate time, and there will be no reason in the world why we will not give a blow-by-blow account of every dollar spent on the Aquarena, the Summer Games facilities, because in our view, Mr. Speaker, in the long run, it will be dollars well spent, because it will create the excellence in terms of the potential our people have and it will make good citizens. And let us face it, that is really what we are all here to do.

I would like again to thank the members of the Commission who have done such a wonderful job and I hope that they can continue. And I want to especially mention the name of Dr. Doug Eaton, who is chairman of the Commission, and unfortunately for personal reasons has to resign. I want to say a special thank you to him and to all other members of the Commission.

I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Administration Of Certain Facilities Constructed For The Canada Summer Games," Bill No. 74, read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now by leave.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Bill 74.

On motion clauses 1 and 2 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 3 carry?

MR. HICKMAN:

Clause 3, 3(a) strike three and insert five, five members.

On motion, amendment carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN:

If you want to lose a friend put him on that commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 3 as amended carry?

MR. NEARY:

No salary, no salary. It will not be (inaudible) Tory hacks.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

On motion clause 3 as amended, carried.

On motion clauses 4 through 22 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 23 carry?

MR. HICKMAN:

Clause 23, there is an amendment which reads, "This Act is deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of July, 1978.

On motion, clause 23 as amended, carried.

On motion, that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 74 with amendment, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed Bill 74 with amendment and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole report that it has considered the matters referred and has directed him to report Bill No. 74 with amendment.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion amendments read a first and second time.

On motion bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 3 Bill No. 49.
"An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957."
(Bill No. 49)

MR. NEAPY: I assume the minister will give us an explanation for these loans for Lasteel, Eastern Provincial Airways, Fogo Island, Sunshine Dairy, and Fishery Products.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The resolution relating to Bill 49.

The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this is the annual

MR. HICKMAN:

Loan and Guarantee Act which comes before this hon. House, requesting the House to ratify loans and guarantees made during the ensuing year. As the bill shows, loans were made to Easteel Industries Limited in the sum of \$800,000, Eastern Provincial Airways(1963) Limited \$6 million, Fogo Island Shipbuilding and Producers Co-op Society Limited \$140,000, Sunshine Dairy Limited \$250,000, Fishery Products (Harbour Breton) Limited, \$2,911,600. The Easteel guarantee, Mr. Chairman, is in support of a bank loan for \$800,000. The loan was to provide the company with bridge financing pending payment of substantial holdback receivables and settlements of the claim and to cover certain additional costs. The guarantee was issued on March 27, 1978 for a term of approximately fifteen months to expire June 30, 1979. As security the government holds a second mortgage on land and buildings and a first floating charge on the other assets of the company.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who holds the first mortgage?

MR. HICKMAN:

I am not sure. I do not know. Probably the bank. The company presently has an average of 150 employees and since March 1978 it has been making good progress on the collection of holdbacks and the settlements of claims and the accumulation of new business.

During the term of the guarantee, officials of the Department of Finance and the Department of Industrial Development will continue to monitor very closely the operations of the company. Easteel Industries, Mr. Chairman, is one of two companies in the Province engaged in the fabrication of structural steel and it is for this reason it was thought that the company was a significant element in the local economy and that we should assist them at that time. Eastern Provincial Airways (1963) Limited, this loan authorized the guarantee in support of a bank loan of \$6 million

MR. HICKMAN: to enable the company - they were in pretty difficult straits at that time - to obtain interim financing which was utilized to repay a loan of \$1½ million to Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation and for working capital purposes. The guarantee was issued December 2, 1977, for a term of approximately 18 months expiring June 30, 1978. The company, Mr. Chairman, gave adequate security to the Province and my understanding is that this year has not been - the company has worked its way out of the financial problems that it found itself in 1977. Like all other regional carriers, it has not enjoyed the same kind of business that Air Canada and Canadian Pacific Air, who have the major routes across Canada, are enjoying and hopefully as a result of some announced policies by the Government of Canada that this may rectify itself somewhat in the future.

The Fogo Island Shipbuilding and Producers' Co-op Society Limited - this was the issuance of a guarantee in support of a bank loan for \$140,000 to be obtained by that company for the purpose of enabling the co-operative to liquidate existing bank loans which were previously guaranteed by the Province. The guarantee was issued on October 18, 1977, for a term of seven years expiring October 18, 1984. The new guarantee has the effect of enabling the co-operative to obtain a more favourable repayment term for the \$140,000 bank loan. As security for the guarantee, Government has formed an advisory committee to monitor and control the operations of the co-op. Our records indicate and the advice we are getting is that since 1975 the co-op has continued to grow in its fishing operations and during the peak of the fishing season it employs several hundred people either in its plants or indirectly as fishermen.

The Sunshine Dairy loan - this again was an authorized guarantee in support of a bank loan for \$250,000 to be obtained by Sunshine Dairy Company Limited for the purpose of providing the company with additional working capital and to liquidate existing bank loans which were guaranteed by the Province. The guarantee was

MR. HICKMAN: issued February 21, 1978, for a term of approximately ten years expiring March 1, 1980. As security Government holds a first mortgage on land and buildings and chattel mortgage on specific equipment and the floating charge over all other assets. This company has achieved modest growth in the past years and Government monitors the operation by having a member on its Board of Directors.

The last loan guarantee on this one is with Fishery Products(Harbour Breton)Limited and that took place on July 6, 1977. The assets which were acquired by Fishery Products Limited were situated at Harbour Breton and were acquired from B.C. Packers Limited. There was also a satellite operation located at Change Islands in Herring Neck and this provides for the repayment at 9 per cent per annum in 17 equal semi-annual blended payment instalments commencing February 28, 1979. Fishery Products have given adequate security -

MR. NEARY: Who will pay the extra?

MR. DOODY: Too late for that now.

MR. HICKMAN: Too late now. And what it has done.

Mr. Chairman, it has allowed the plant at Harbour Breton, which was in difficult straits-and the production was down, as everyone who has been to Harbour Breton knows. The complaint of the union there in particular has been over the years that the landings were way below the plant's capacity and that work was sporadic. That plant lends itself to

MR. HICKMAN: side trawler operations and Fishery Products did have the side trawlers, fortunately, which they could provide for the operation of the Harbour Breton plant. It is my understanding that employment opportunity in the Harbour Breton area as a result thereof has improved considerably and is continuing to improve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, just one or two questions I want to put to the minister, Sir. First of all, I do not know why the government bailed out Easteel. The minister told us that there were 150 people employed, but is it the policy of government when an industry like that runs into trouble - I presume Easteel is into the Development Corporation and that is why probably the government had to bail them out, to protect the investment of the Newfoundland Development Corporation. Easteel, I remember their name turned up fairly regularly when I was doing some research on the Rural Development Authority, the loans they were lashing out, and the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation and the Federal Business Development Bank. But what is the policy? What does the government use for guide lines when they bail out an industry like this? And who are the people that had the holdbacks? I mean, did they perform? The minister expressed some concern that they were - well not concern, but they were gradually getting their holdbacks released. But who is holding back and why? Is it because of non-performance? Is it standard procedure to holdback so much on a contract that they may have had? Could the minister be a little more specific and give us some more details on it?

Now Eastern Provincial Airways (1963) Limited, there is \$6 million here. Where do we stand now with regard to Eastern Provincial Airways? Have they paid off all the previous loans that they had? Is this additional financing? I think the old loans amounted to around

MR. S. NEARY: \$12 million. Is this \$6 million to make it \$18 million or have they wiped out some of the old loans? The minister also again said that the policies of the Government of Canada may make it more practical now for Eastern Provincial to do a little better financially this year than they did last year.

While I am on my feet, Sir, I might say-and I do not know how hon. members of the House feel. I do not know what it is costing us-I was rather disappointed that the government allowed that training centre to go over in Halifax. I think that is one of the things for which this government will never be forgiven, and Eastern Provincial have managed to transfer a lot of their people to Halifax. Now they had a big opening recently of the maintenance depot out in Gander and I noticed all the Tories were trotted out in full regalia and the people who started Eastern Provincial Airways, the Liberal Government, the Smallwood administration, the Liberal Government of this Province that started up, as my hon. friend knows because my hon. friend was in the Cabinet at the time. Eastern Provincial Airways would not have been here today but for the Liberal Government, and not one Liberal member of this House, not even the Leader of the Opposition, was invited to the opening of that maintenance centre in Gander. It was turned into a partisan political deal to try to beef up the image of the administration and invite the Premier out to cut a ribbon for a centre that had been there -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the member for Gander.

MR. S. NEARY: - since the days of the Liberal administration. All they did was beef it up a little bit. And what it did, I presume, I hope it consolidated the maintenance operation in Gander. I hope that as a result of the opening of that centre that no more of the Eastern Provincial personnel will

MR. S. NEARY: be transferred to other provinces of Canada. Mr. Chairman, that is a Newfoundland airline and it was a mortal sin for this government to allow the Government of Nova Scotia to take the training centre and put it over in Halifax, over in Nova Scotia, It should have been built in Gander and all the crews and all the flight attendants, all the captains and first officers and all the maintenance people should be in this Province because it is our airline, It is paid for by the taxpayers of this Province, it is a Newfoundland airline. And I might say, Sir, that what started me off on that little trend of thought was the fact that every time I travel I am proud of that airline. I do not know what the people of Newfoundland and Labrador would do today

MR. NEARY: without Eastern Provincial Airways. Eastern Provincial Airways provide in my estimation, and I have not travelled all around the world but pretty close, an excellent service, second to none. Eastern Provincial Airways, I am always so proud of it and I do not know what the travelling public in Newfoundland would do without Eastern Provincial Airways. You can get aboard of your plane down here at the airport, I can and I represent a district right out on the other end of the Island, I can get on the plane in the morning and I can fly into Stephenville and I can go down and spend the day in Port Aux Basques and I can be back home again that night. You can do the same thing in Labrador City and Wabush. Absolutely fantastic, Sir! It is an excellent service and I have nothing but the greatest admiration for the crew. They can fly planes and land in Newfoundland airports and in the Atlantic Provinces; the captains and the first officers can put their planes down when Air Canada, with their great reputation, are hovering overhead making two or three swipes at the airport and then ending up in Gander or Halifax. It is a fantastic operation, Sir, and I am proud of it but perhaps the minister might, in the process of my heaping great praise on Eastern Provincial Airways, give us a little more on how much it is costing us and when the minister expects Eastern Provincial Airways to get into the black. I know they had a good year this year because of the Air Canada strikes and so forth, but what kind of policies is the minister talking about from the Government of Canada would help Eastern Provincial Airways to get into the black? Mr. Chairman, I tell you what I think should happen; I think, Sir, and I say this without fear of contradiction, that Eastern Provincial Airways should be the regional carrier in the four Atlantic Provinces and kick out Air Canada. Air Canada, Sir, like C.N., look down their nose at the Atlantic Provinces and

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland and all we are getting from Air Canada is a third-rate service in this province. They think they are doing you a favor by travelling Air Canada, I would rather travel Eastern Provincial Airways anytime myself and I think the time has come when whoever makes the decision, I do not know who it is or what body it is makes the decision, let Air Canada come in from Montreal to St. John's or Stephenville or wherever it is, Toronto, but kick them out of the Atlantic Provinces altogether and let Eastern Provincial Airways take it over. That is what I would do, because they are providing a good service, they have good aircraft, good crews and good flight attendants and they are a great crowd of people. But now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to dwell on that. We can save that for another time.

The Fisheries Products one again in Harbor Breton - perhaps I will read the newspaper while I am waiting for the hon. gentleman. What is this all about, this Fisheries Products one? I thought they had so much money they did not know what to do with it. Did they have the government across the barrel over the Harbor Breton fish plant. Fishery Products could have very easily went out and bought that plant themselves, Change Islands and Harbor Breton. Obviously the government was across a barrel and they were backed up in the corner and they had to fork over this \$2,911,000. But I believe all the other loans, perhaps the minister can tell me, with Fisheries Products had been consolidated and wiped out.

MR. DOODY: They are under one loan agreement.

MR. NEARY: All under one loan agreement but, in other words, we are still on the hook. I thought they went to a banker or some financial institution and got the government off the hook.

MR. DOODY: They are on the hook.

MR. NEARY:

In other words, we still own Fishery Products, let us face it, we own them body and soul, the people of this province own Fishery Products.

MR. DOODY:

As a representative of the people of this province I am too modest -

MR. NEARY:

A rose by any other name smells just as sweet, but it is nationalization and it is just as well for us to admit that we own it. Anyway, perhaps the minister could tell us a little more about it because -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! The officials are taking care of the interruption, I believe. The Hon. Premier.

PREMIER F.D. MOORES: (Inaudible) while I was in the House so I

could not be blamed for that interruption, Mr. Chairman,

Something that the hon. member mentioned I think is

MR. PREMIER:

worthwhile to bring to the attention of the House which is something that we have been familiar with for some weeks now and which until this minute I have not been able to release because of matters involving the Securities and Exchange Commission, and that is involving Eastern Provincial Airways. The official announcement is as follows, and I will elaborate briefly on it after, and I understand the airline themselves will be having a conference tomorrow confirming not what I am just saying but also to elaborate on what has happened to the airline. Eastern Provincial Airways Limited today announced that in a private transaction Mr. Harry Steele and Mr. Harold Wareham, both officers and directors of the airline, had acquired the interests of Mr. Andrew Crosbie and Mr. Keith Miller, both of whom are also officers and directors of the airline. At a board meeting following the transaction, Mr. Andrew Crosbie submitted his resignation as Chairman of the Board of Directors but will remain as a director. Concurrent with Mr. Crosbie's resignation, Mr. Keith Miller submitted his resignation as President and Chief Executive Officer. The Board of Directors has voted to appoint Mr. Miller as Chairman and Mr. Steele as President and Chief Executive Officer of the airline with Mr. Lewington continuing as Deputy Chairman. In making this release, the airline reaffirmed that there will be a continuity of management since Mr. Steele has been a Vice-President and a director of the company for a number of years. I might also say at this time, Mr. Chairman, although I think Mr. Steele would be the appropriate one to say it tomorrow when he advises me he wishes to do it, that there will be a statement very much reaffirming of Gander as a central and developing point for the airline.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer the questions raised by the hon. gentleman for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) and I may assure the hon. gentleman that this was not orchestrated, but the timing could not have been better. I am sure that everyone will agree that these changes assure Gander as the central point of operation and managerial decisions and policy decisions for Eastern Provincial Airways.

The hon. gentleman talks, and I should not reminisce, about the start of Eastern Provincial Airways.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Ches Crosbie started Eastern Provincial Airways.

MR. HICKMAN: No, Eastern Provincial Airways was started by a gentleman named Eric Blackwood, and I as a very young lawyer in 1949 went out to Gander and appeared before the Air Transport Board representing Eric Blackwood who was applying to get a couple of licences to operate in Newfoundland - operate this little company called EPA in Newfoundland. He was opposed by Maritime Central Airways through their subsidiary Newfoundland Airways, and we fought a great fight before the Board. They came down right after Confederation sort of to show the flag. Mr. Baldwin was the Chairman. At the end of it all, Eric Blackwood, who was a magnificent witness, an absolutely magnificent witness and very knowledgeable - a great missionary, I might add, insofar as air transport in Newfoundland was concerned and serving the remote parts of this Province. All of the applications Eastern Provincial Airways were granted marked the demise of MCA in Newfoundland, and from that very small beginning started EPA. Then Mr. Blackwood made a terrible mistake, an unforgiveable mistake in these times. In 1951 he had the audacity to announce that he was going to be the Progressive Conservative candidate in Labrador - Eric Blackwood - and that was not looked upon with much favour, let me tell you. In any event, two things happened: Number one was the election was held in the fall. The election was held in the fall, but for some strange reason it was thought that the weather conditions, being so bad at that time, that the election in Labrador, as it was then one district, should be postponed until the spring so that the democratic process could work effectively

MR. HICKMAN: and fairly and equitably throughout that great region. In the meantime, during that winter, EPA's business continued to decline and Mr. Blackwood found himself in a state of financial embarrassment. And then along came some businessmen led by Mr. Chesley A. Crosbie and with the help of the late Chesley A. Crosbie and with the help of the government of the day, lo and behold, EPA fell into their hands and started anew. By the time the election was called,

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Blackwood, who could not wait around looking for a job, had been hired as a bush pilot in some remote part of Northern Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You are not quite so subtle today.

MR. HICKMAN: Over and above this though, to answer the question put by the hon. the member for LaPoile, we do have, as well, preferred shares in EPA upon which we have first call and we also have control over the voting of the common shares by that trust agreement that has been in force for many, many years so that the Province is secured.

I share the concern expressed by the member for LaPoile over the corporate decision that was taken two or three years ago to go to Halifax with that training programme. We did fight it. There were two applications went into DREE, one from the Government of Newfoundland and one from the Government of Nova Scotia, and the Government of Nova Scotia succeeded in getting the DREE programme, in getting DREE funding. For the maintenance workshops out there, we had to put all provincial monies to keep the maintenance programme and the maintenance facilities and modernize them in Gander. But I believe that E.P.A. is now on its way.

MR. NEARY: A good airline.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957." (Bill No. 49).

On motion clauses 1 and 2, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 2, Bill No. 48.

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957, to provide for the guarantee of the repayment of loans made to, and the advance of loans to certain Local Authorities.

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957." (Bill No. 48).

On motion, clauses 1 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 1, Bill No. 33.

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st. day of March, 1978, the sum of nine million, six hundred and forty-eight thousand, seven hundred dollars (\$9,648,700).

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Does the resolution carry?

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I do not wish to delay the House of this particular matter. I had the Lieutenant-Governor's warrants in front of me, but I have so many affidavits on my desk these days I cannot find the warrants, Sir.

MR. DOODY:

You have so many warrants on your desk you cannot find the affidavits.

MR. NEARY:

No, Sir, with so many warrants out for the hon. gentleman's arrest.

MR. DOODY:

I know.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I went through them and I do not see anything of any significance in there

MR. NEARY: except the fact that you cannot help but think how certain ministers and certain departments of government underestimated and could not foresee certain things that were going to happen.

 There was one item in there that intrigued me in connection with the Pippy Park and that raises the whole matter again of what is happening over there at the Pippy Park Commission. Was that to buy private land and property? And if so, would the minister be so good as to tell us how much property the government purchased, how many houses have been torn down in the last - who took my warrants? -

MR. DOODY: There are plenty of warrants out, do not worry about them.

MR. NEARY: - tell us how many houses have been torn down, if people are repairing their houses in the Pippy Park now, or was that just for upgrading and improvement in putting in the facilities for the Summer Games and

MR. NEARY: additional cost on the taxpayers for the Summer Games, building these trails and so forth that are over there and the trailer parks and that sort of thing. Maybe that is what it was for.

So let the minister take a few moments and just run through the Lieutenant-Governor's warrants and if we see anything in there we want to ask questions about my colleagues may feel free to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Does the hon. gentleman want me to work backwards and deal with the Pippy Park first?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. HICKMAN: Alright. The Pippy Park, that is under Public Works and the total warrant was for \$277,400. One was C. A. Pippy Park grant-in-aid \$9,000. That was to purchase some office furnishings and \$4,000 to replace a 1974 car.

MR. NEARY: A car for whom?

MR. HICKMAN: The van that the Pippy Park had. They had to buy a new one - \$9,000 all told.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I thought you were talking about Social - it is the Pippy Park.

MR. HICKMAN: We are on the Pippy Park.

MR. NEARY: Okay.

MR. HICKMAN: The other part, the \$268,400 - \$183,400 was spent on the preparation and completion of the travel trailer campsite, as the hon. gentleman mentioned. This has had very wide acceptance, I understand.

MR. NEARY: It was never used -

AN HON. MEMBER: I think they had six or seven people -

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right. They were never used, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: - who got lost. It was very foggy one night.

MR. HICKMAN: My understanding is that they have been used this year.

MR. NEARY: Well, they have been used this year because now the tourists are using them -

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, that is what I mean.

MR. NEARY: - but they were not used during the Summer Games.

MR. HICKMAN: And \$85,000 was a very modest amount to be used for land purchases.

MR. NEARY: That was a terrible blunder to waste that much money.

MR. HICKMAN: A lot of these, for instance, the monies shown here under the warrant - one was Legislative, \$59,900, that is primarily salaries; Finance \$980,900 - most of that was spent in the increase in the amount of monies to be paid by way of interest as a result of the foreign exchange rates determined by market conditions.

MR. NEARY: That opens up a can of worms.

MR. HICKMAN: That does. It opens up - well, not a can of worms. A can of worms is hardly the word, I would suggest. But loans that had been entered into over the last twenty to twenty-five years; many of them were in the U.S. markets and with U.S. dollars, and as the Canadian dollars started to decline vis-a-vis the U.S. dollar and vis-a-vis the West German Deutsche mark and vis-a-vis the Swiss franc, obviously then it is difficult to estimate and most of the Finance warrant was for that amount: Labour and Manpower was for salaries, \$49,000; General Administration, \$10,200; Engineering and Technical, \$23,900; Labour Standards salaries, \$14,900; Justice salaries; Social Services which the hon. gentleman asked about, additional funds were required in the amount of \$535,000 due mainly to the almost impossibility of estimating with absolute certainty what the unemployment situation is going

MR. HICKMAN: to be at any particular time and that money was used in that area; in Tourism there was a capital grant, a library to the town of Pouch Cove and the other funds were really a transfer -

MR. NEARY: Tourism? How did that get under Tourism?

MR. HICKMAN: Because cultural affairs comes under Tourism.

MR. NEARY: Because the minister happens to be the member for that district, is that right?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, no! It has been for years and years and years. It was taken out of the Department of Education quite some time ago.

MR. NEARY: I did not realize that that minister was responsible for cultural affairs. You could have fooled me.

MR. HICKMAN: Anyway, that was \$30,000. The other which was \$309,500 I understand was a payment out as a bookkeeping entry and most, if not all of it, came -

MR. NEARY: When did they decide they were going to build a library in Pouch Cove?

MR. HICKMAN: - came back in -

MR. PECKFORD: A long time ago.

MR. HICKMAN: That is decided by the library committee -

AN HON. MEMBER: Libraries board.

MR. HICKMAN: - libraries board - and that was to cover the acquisition of Stagg Lake from Bowaters (Nfld.) Limited. I think that about covers them all. It is all I can remember.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman, Sir, in summarizing the Lieutenant-Governor's warrants brought up a very interesting point. And I do not know if the hon. gentleman has the information at his fingertips

MR. NEARY:

but I am sure there is somebody out in the common room listening, probably, from the Finance Department. If the information is not immediately available, perhaps the minister will undertake to get it for me before this day is over because I think it is a very significant matter, Sir, and that is the question of the amount of additional revenue, the amount of additional money that is needed in this Province, required to meet the interest payments on our loans as a result of the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, it must be a staggering amount. I am not talking about the amount of interest. I am talking about the additional interest that has to be paid, the additional amount that has to be paid.

MR. DOODY: Not interest really, the currency fluctuation.

MR. NEARY: That is right, as a result of the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. Can the minister give the House that information?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: I already gave that.

MR. NEARY: No, you only gave them to me for last year. I want the total. That was over and above what we budgeted for. I want the total amount.

MR. PECKFORD: You were not here the other day.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I was waiting for the minister to say something about the tremendous overrun in spending in the Department of Transportation and Communications. The highest supplementary supply required for any department was T and C, over \$3.5 million. Looking at their projected budget for this year, it is about 5 per cent or 6 per cent overrun by that particular department and I think the minister, Mr. Chairman, owes it to the House to tell us what happened in the Department of Transportation and Communications to cause such a serious overrun. We can see overruns on Winter maintenance and things of that nature, but certainly nowhere in the vicinity of \$3.5 million. I would call that a very serious overrun, a lot of money

MR. RIDEOUT:

to have to ask for for one particular department under supplementary supply. So I want to know why that happened. What happened in the fiscal year ending last March? What did the department do that it had not properly budgeted for in the budget that we passed here last year? So I would like for the minister to give us some details on that and let us know where the money was spent, why it was spent and how come there was such an overrun?

MR. HICKMAN: I am sorry. I was reading from notes here and I missed the page. Transportation and Communications -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

There are two hon. members on their feet.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Go ahead.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, if anything I say is incorrect the hon. gentleman will correct me. Additional funds were required because of the staff complement which was higher than anticipated and staff reductions were not realized as quickly as projected due to the higher than normal level of services being maintained during the Winter operations, the snowclearing. Additional funds of \$2 million were required for a subdivision (transportation development - DREE - capital) as a result of one. A number of new projects were added to this vote as a result of an amendment signed in July to the 1976-1977 Canada-Newfoundland Subsidiary Agreement on Highways, i.e., additional funding for the Burgeo Road, the Bonavista North Loop Road and the Northern Peninsula Highway.

It would be imprudent, indeed we cannot put in our budget for T and C, we cannot anticipate that the Government of Canada is going to accept any new DREE projects and these negotiations go on and there is a subsidiary agreement signed each year.

MR. NEARY: But you get your money back?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no. It is still either seventy-five/twenty-five or fifty-fifty but there is provincial funding goes in. We get some of it back, yes, a great deal of it, but we cannot show it in the

MR. HICKMAN:

budgetary process unless the agreement is signed, sealed and delivered at the time and in this case - pardon?

MR. RIDEOUT: You did it on the Trans-Canada Highway.

MR. HICKMAN: Ah, but we had it signed before the budget came down.

MR. RIDEOUT: Is that true?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. When I say signed, we certainly had letters of commitment.

MR. RIDEOUT: Had it initialed or something?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: We had a conflict going on between two minister at the time, did we not?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. The other reason for it was that again there were extremely good Fall weather conditions in October and November of that year and this enabled contractors to achieve the departmental expectations on the length of time that they could work. That is where all of the money went.

On the other question by the hon. gentleman,

MR. HICKMAN: I did answer it here in Committee this week. I have not got anybody outside right now, but it -

MR. NEARY: Do you remember what the amount is?

MR. HICKMAN: No, I do not.

MR. NEARY: Can you get it for me before the day is over?

MR. HICKMAN: I will try.

MR. NEARY: As long as the hon. gentleman gives me his undertaking he will get it for me, okay, we will let her go.

MR. HICKMAN: There is a question here, now, this is a couple of months old, 'exchange losses on interest of \$15 million and loss of redemption of \$9 million - that would be \$26 million - will be offset by a \$6 million gain expected in Euro - which was realized in the Euro-U.S. issue'. So, we are going to lose - there is no question about it - we are going to lose somewhere between ten and twenty million dollars -

MR. NEARY: A year?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, in redemption and interest this year unless the Canadian dollar fluctuates, or improves, but you cannot just tell because there is no way of knowing what it is going to be for instance when a Swiss loan

MR. NEARY: Does that mean we are going to have a deficit this year?

MR. HICKMAN: No, it does not. Nor did we have a deficit last year. I am pleased to announce, if the hon. gentleman were to recall, that last year toward the end of the fiscal year -

MR. NEARY: You mean despite the fact that we are going to have to pay out an extra \$10 million because of the devaluation on the Canadian dollar, we are going to have a surplus?

MR. HICKMAN: I would hope.

MR. NEARY: You would hope, but the Minister is not sure at this stage.

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot be. Let me remind this Committee as to how things operate. Last January there was an indication based on the best advice one could get at that

MR. HICKMAN: time that because the Government of Canada had changed some of the equalization payments, which reduced ours by about \$15 million or thereabouts, that we anticipated a deficit on current account of about \$2 million. In fact, the hon. gentleman criticized me for it -

MR. NEARY: Well, if we show a deficit this year, Standard and Poor and Moody's are going to be on the Minister's back, I can you that.

MR. HICKMAN: - and called for my resignation, I think.

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. HICKMAN: I had only been in there one day!

MR. NEARY: And if you have a deficit two years running, you are in serious trouble. The Minister knows that.

MR. HICKMAN: But may I, I am sure to the delight of every hon. gentleman in this Committee, advise the Committee there was no deficit last year when we finally closed the books, the accounts of the Province -

MR. NEARY: Where did you get the extra money?

MR. HICKMAN: - because between January and the end of the year sales in this Province picked up and income picked up -

MR. NEARY: Well, how are we doing this year?

MR. HICKMAN: - and we have got very careful - so far this year we seem to be alright.

MR. HICKMAN: 'We seem to be' do not use wishy-washy words. Are we alright or are we not?

MR. HICKMAN: We are alright now. We are alright now!

MR. NEARY: We are in the black right now?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes. No problem at all right now.

MR. NEARY: And are we going to have a surplus or a deficit at the end of the year?

MR. HICKMAN: I would be very disappointed if we did not have a surplus, but I am not going to - there is no way that I can predict, Mr. Chairman, any more than anyone else today in Canada can predict as to what January, February and March of next year holds in store.

MR. NEARY: Okay, so if we have a bad January, February and March, we are likely to have a deficit and that is going to be devastating on the credit of the Province.

MR. HICKMAN: I would strongly urge the hon. member for Lapoile not to get his hopes up. He may be disappointed again next year. We may again have a surplus.

MR. NEARY: But we did not have a surplus last year.

MR. HICKMAN: But we did have a surplus last year.

MR. NEARY: We had a deficit last year -

MR. HICKMAN: No, sir.

MR. NEARY: - and we cannot afford to have a deficit two years running.

MR. HICKMAN: We did not have a deficit last year. This Province had a surplus, I repeat, a surplus at the end of the fiscal year.

MR. NEARY: Well, then you must be juggling the books if you did.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no juggling the books.

MR. NEARY: We will see, we will see.

MR. HICKMAN: There are certain things -

MR. NEARY: We will see. Does the hon. gentleman want to lay a bet on the table?

MR. HICKMAN: No, I will give you one bit of advice, that in the first six months of this year the retail sales in Newfoundland were further ahead of the Canadian average than any other Canadian province.

MR. NEARY: Thanks to Ottawa. Thanks to the money coming in here from Ottawa.

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. DOODY: Otto Lang came down and made a purchase down at the Rotary Club.

On motion resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-First Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-Eight and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."
(Bill 33)

On motion, clauses 1 and 2, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution without amendment, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report it has adopted certain resolutions and bills consequent thereto and recommend that said bills be introduced to give effect to the same, all without amendment.

On motion the following bills were read a first, second and third time ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper.

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957." (Bill No. 49).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957." (Bill No. 48).

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Eight And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service." (Bill No. 33).

MR. HICKMAN: We will start to work backwards. Order 47, Bill No. 94.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Brinco Limited (Labrador Agreement) Act, 1974." (Bill No. 94).

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, here is the explanation as given to me by the Department of Justice for Bill No. 94, "An Act To Amend The Brinco Limited Act." It has to deal with Brinco not being able to pay itself some money on its shares. Under Newfoundland law a company cannot buy its own shares. The above act, or the act here before us now - is that right?

MR. HICKMAN: You had better read it.

MR. PECKFORD: The act created an obligation on Brinco to buy its shares from those shareholders who wanted to get out of Brinco consequent upon the sale to government of CFLCo. Therefore, the above act conferred a right on the company

MR. PECKFORD:

to buy its own shares but omitted to state what would happen to the dividends or benefits flowing from these shares. When Brinco declares a dividend on all its shares, some of the dividends go to the declarer, that is, Brinco. Thus monies are hanging in limbo because there is no way by which these monies can get out to the shareholders who are members of the public. The purpose of this bill is to create the shares so purchased as a separate class of shares as long as they are held by Brinco, and that from the date of the original Act, the holder of these Class A shares would not get any dividends or benefits. Thus the door is open to enable Brinco to declare dividends or benefits to its common shareholders without giving to itself these benefits. And that is the purpose of the amendment before us presently.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) and I have several things in common; one of them was just demonstrated then, that we both totally do not understand the ramifications of this piece of legislation.

I wonder now that we have gone through the mechanics of having the minister open the debate so he can close it, would the Minister of Justice get up and answer a few of the questions that the minister raised? In his initial statement, almost his first or second sentence, he made some reference to Newfoundland law and its restriction on companies purchasing their own shares, I think, was the term he used. Now why a company would want to purchase its own shares I do not know, but again that is part of my lack of understanding of the subject. But I wonder would the Minister of Justice just take us

MR. SIMMONS: through in somewhat elementary fashion for us laymen the explanation of why this is necessary. Now we have listened with interest to what the minister has read, but as he, himself has admitted, he read it, and I gather it is a fairly complicated thing, but would the Minister of Justice just indicate to us, first of all, What is the spirit behind the initial legislation which this is getting around, the legislation that debar a company from participating in this way, buying and selling shares and so on, and then why this particular piece of legislation is necessary now to get around it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, under the Newfoundland Companies Act - and this is peculiar to Newfoundland - a company is not allowed to buy its own shares. Most other Canadian provinces make this provision, and in the White Paper that was made public by me here some months ago, that course of action for the New Companies Act is recommended. The Canadian Companies Act contains this provision as well.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) White Paper proposing that we align ourselves with the practice elsewhere in Canada?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, that is right.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay.

MR. HICKMAN: But when the Brinco Act went through it was felt that there were a lot of small shareholders throughout Canada who had bought shares in Brinco simply because they owned Churchill Falls, CFLCo, that was their big asset.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. HICKMAN: So they said, 'These people may no longer want to continue on as shareholders. So there was a commitment given by Brinco that they would offer to buy the shares of any of their shareholders themselves - in other words, they were buying their own shares.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. HICKMAN:

And the Act provided for it.

Many shareholders availed of it, but a lot did not and that was their prerogative. I have forgotten what the price was but I think it was considerably above the market price that they offered, but a lot held on. And this came to our attention only about a week ago. Brinco has on hand some capital surplus which, if they distributed it in accordance with normal company practice and under the provisions of the existing Act, at some time in the future - but they may never want to do it - they would be beneficiaries themselves and this would attract a tax under the Canadian corporation tax. And the Canadian Corporation Tax Act has been repealed to become effective on December 31st this year, and if this is not through now - which will prohibit Brinco from taking advantage of it - then also any benefit which accrues to the other shareholders will be taxable. And this is done to protect the outside people.

MR. HICKMAN:

not to protect Brinco. The wording of this particular bill was worked out as a result of negotiations between the federal and provincial Deputy Ministers of Finance and Stype and Elliot who are supposed to be Canada's leading tax lawyers. But what it is prepared to do, what it is aiming to do and what it must do if these people who still hung onto shares in Brinco, the man in the street, if they are not to be taxed unnecessarily this has to be through before the end of the year. To do that you have got to prohibit Brinco, and all the wording and the jargon that is the hallmark of tax lawyers ends up accomplishing that very desirable little end.

MR. NEARY: Look at the Minister of Mines and Energy making a fool of himself.

MR. DOODY: They are not allowed to pay dividends on the shares they receive.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Brinco Limited (Labrador Agreements) Act, 1974," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 94)

MR. HICKMAN: Order 46, Bill No. 93.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act." (Bill No. 93)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple provision which will provide a public utility shall not proceed with the construction, purchase or lease of improvements or addition to its property worth in excess of \$50,000 without the approval of the board. The only difference between the law now and then is to add the word 'lease' to it.

Now I can see an hon. gentleman opposite getting up and saying, why did they not put in lease instead of writing it all out again but anyway that is the way it is done.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it then the Newfoundland Telephone Company, for example, would have to seek approval of the board and does under existing legislation for its new exchange in a given community. The board regularly has to sit on the matter and give its approval. Is that what the act says?

The matter which I want to raise may - I will have to pursue it another way, really. Under the provision of 3 as it would be amended, construction, purchase or lease of improvements or additions to its property, would property - could the minister help me on this one - would property of the utility be construed as to include transmission lines, for example?

MR. HICKMAN: I am sure that would be a work within the definition of the act.

MR. SIMMONS: This may not be the appropriate place but I will unload my concerns very quickly and if this is not the appropriate place we can do it in the appropriate place - if somebody will tell me where it is. The utilities, to wit the electrical and telephone companies, have, it seems to me, too much license in the matter of locating transmission lines. I know they get an easement signed the owner. The easement has got a fair amount of flexibility in it as to the actual location on the property of the transmission line and it creates a lot of problems for the individual property owner, the private citizen, if you like, but also for organizations. And the one I think of right now, and I use it as an example because I am sure other members have similar examples in their own districts, in the community of Milltown the Anglican Church has acquired a piece of property across which there is a transmission line. The easement had been agreed to by the previous owner. Now the Anglican Church is putting up a very beautiful building. Indeed the roof trusses were stuck a week ago and it is obviously going to be quite an attractive facility except for one thing;

MR. SIMMONS: There are about 25,000 lines, as it were, running right across the front profile of the building, within five or six feet of the building. The church has gone to Hydro and said, "Would you move it?" And Hydro has said, "Sure, we will move it for a price." And the price is somewhere around \$5,000 or \$6,000. And while the congregation would like to have the lines moved they cannot be so concerned with aesthetics as to lay out \$5,000 or \$6,000.

Now, you check the easement and the question comes up, who gave Hydro the authority to put the transmission line in that particular place? When you check the easement you find that Hydro had a fairly blank authority under the easement to put the line just about anywhere across that property, and chose to put it in that particular place, actually about 200 feet from the centre of the highway, which would be the Bay d'Espoir Highway. Anybody in his right mind, had he in mind any concern about the future use of the property, would have realized that a point 200 feet from the centre of the centre of the road would just be about at the front of any building that might go on the property, if you follow me. What I am saying, in effect, is that if the line had been put another 100 feet back it would wind up at the rear of any property fronting on the highway. Instead of that somebody in his wisdom or otherwise, in Hydro, elected to have the power line put down within about 150 or 200 feet from the centre of the road and it is going to obstruct the view somewhat, certainly subtract from the aesthetics of not only the church property, but any other business that locates along that highway.

As I say, this is probably not the place to raise it, but I would hope that there would be some more restriction on these utilities. They have covered themselves in law. They have all the legalities

MR. SIMMONS: down pat. One of the problems with the easement is that it is too open to loopholes and the company, the utility, tends to take advantage of it.

Again, to be fair, the utilities have a particular interest in mind, namely, to install these transmission lines at the lowest possible cost. But I would hope that there would be a constraint on them, perhaps it is the board that could exercise this restraint, and perhaps you would need new legislation for it, I do not know, but the board ought to be able to exercise a constraint on these utilities which place these transmission lines without any thought as to possible interference with the location of future assets and buildings of property owners.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. HICKMAN: This bill does not deal with the issue raised by the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. As I understand it, in this particular case the Anglican Church purchased this land after the easement had been signed. Well, you know, I think that Hydro and the Newfoundland Light and Power go out and negotiate with a property owner. There is a right under our Expropriation Act, I think, that if you are building a transmission line, say, 100 miles, one person could not hold it up.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, no, and no argument.

MR. HICKMAN: But the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, their responsibility is simply to satisfy themselves that the expenditure of building a new transmission line from Milltown to St. Alban's is warranted. They do not have jurisdiction over the route of that, that is done by negotiation, preferably, and in this particular case, I guess the old doctrine of caveat emptor prevails.

MR. SIMMONS: Who is she?

MR. HICKMAN: Buyer beware!

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. HICKMAN: I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act," (Bill No. 93), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 45, Bill No. 91.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment - it is important for the students of the university - but it is an amendment to allow for the appointment of two students to the Board of Regents of the University. This came, pretty well, at the request of the students last year. 1, gives the permission to appoint and then, of course, 2 and 3 set out the regulations governing the positions in which a student can act on the Board of Regents.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. gentleman, Sir, for introducing this piece of legislation to make provision for two students on the Board of Regents at Memorial University.

MR. SIMMONS:

The first bit of leadership he has shown.

MR. NEARY:

Well, it is. As I have said so often in this House, when we see something that we think that is worthwhile and good legislation, then we are the first to compliment and commend the ministers or the government, especially the minister who brings in a good measure.

In this particular instance, Sir, we think this is a worthwhile and a valuable and a good piece of legislation and we are all for it. We have no hesitation at all in voting in favour of this piece of legislation and we congratulate the minister, Sir, for acting swiftly on the recommendation of the Student Union to put two students on the Board of Regents at Memorial University. Now, Sir, having said that I hope that the students who will be selected to go on the Board of Regents are the kind of Newfoundlanders who believe in reform, and that they will see to it, Sir, these students, about the only hope we have left - not even members of this House, not even Your Honour, the ministers, the Premier, can get the university to publish its budget so that the people of this Province can scrutinize the budget of the university to see how our \$35 million or \$36 million is being spent over there at Memorial. Is it being squandered and wasted? Is it being invested properly? It is a huge amount of money, Sir, that we are putting every year into that university and we cannot, except for generalizations, we cannot find out how the univeristy spends that money and our only hope now is these two students. If there is one message I can get through in endorsing this bill, it is that these two students would believe in reform and believe in eliminating extravagance and waste and open up the university, open her up, let a breath of fresh air blow into it so that people

MR. NEARY: can have a look at it, tell us all about the medical school and tell us about the Health Sciences Complex, and tell us about all the trips and all the jetting around that professors and associate professors do and all the other foolish things that they do over there to waste the taxpayers' money. These two students, I hope the Student Union will have some input into who these two students are going to be and when they get in there that they will shake her up, that they will take these old cronies and these old codgers that have been put on that Board of Regents, political appointees down through the years, shake her up, put some life in the university.

MR. DOODY: You are asking a lot of two students.

MR. NEARY: I know I am asking a lot of two students, but I have great faith in the students, Sir, and I am sure that our students can do it if they have a chance.

MR. RIDEOUT: There is something you forgot to mention 'Steve', the Premier's buddies over there.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, I know that in the selection of the students that the minister would not dare allow politics to enter into it. I hope that if there is indeed, and I doubt if it survived, a P.C. Party on campus at the university, I doubt if it survived over the last three or four years, but I hope that these appointments will be wide open, no favouritism, the Student Union will have input and that we will get two Newfoundlanders, two young Newfoundlanders attending the university who will rock her, who will go in and make Doctor Fred look like -

MR. DOODY: What is wrong with poor Doctor Fred?

MR. NEARY: Dr. Fred! Just imagine, Doctor! Doctor! The capitalistic - it would almost make

MR. NEARY: you puke on the floor,
Sir, when you think of it. Doctor! Doctor, oh doctor,
or dear Doctor John, ripping the people off with cars
in this Province right, left and centre, getting the
tug contract down at Come by Chance through the back
door.

MR. DOODY: Typical of -

MR. NEARY: I debated with that gentleman
on television and if anybody should get a doctorate, it
should be me. I should get the honorary degree for
exposing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - for exposing the price
fixing. That was the gentleman - what was it? - high-
grading. He did not know what high-grading was. Now,
all of a sudden he gets his honorary degree, he
is a doctor. Well, I hope that we get two students in
there who will make him earn his doctorate. Let him earn
it and get two students in there who will shake her up a
bit, put a bit of life in her, get the university back
on the rails because it has gotten off the rails, get
the right things taught at that university, keep our
young graduates of the medical school in Newfoundland and
in Canada, not

MR. S. NEARY: export them down into the United States. That is the sort of thing the Board of Regents should be doing, not just rubber stamping everything. And I am sure my hon. friend - why does not my hon. friend get up and join with me -

MR. DOODY: I do not need (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: No, neither the hon. gentleman nor myself will ever get an honorary degree at that university because we have criticised it too much. I do not know about my hon. friend. I am sure if my hon. friend was not a minister and was sitting over here -

MR. DOODY: Then I would be (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: - that the hon. gentleman would be up on his feet decrying the fact that this university will not even allow the House of Assembly to have its budget to go over it with a fine-toothed comb. Feeble excuses! And so this is a good move and I really am glad of it. I feel jubilant today, Sir, over the fact that we are going to have two students appointed to the Board of Regents that may bring a breath of fresh air into that university. At least I hope so, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Just a word or two, Mr. Speaker, I did not get from my colleague's remarks whether or not the PC organization had survived at the university or not.

MR. S. NEARY: I do not think so.

MR. SIMMONS: There is some question in his mind there.

MR. HOUSE: There are two.

MR. SIMMONS: Two organizations? That is like in most districts of this Province where there is one Tory organization there are two, one trying to replace the other, except in Deer Lake, I say to the minister, there is neither. His organization is - I hope the one at the university is more healthy than the one in Deer Lake. Over there during the by-election they were falling like ten pins.

MR. WHITE: We fixed that one.

MR. SIMMONS: They were coming all the time talking to me wanting to be part of the Liberal camp, including his manager in the last election, as a matter of fact, and including his workers out in Cormack. That is another story Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bit of legislation here: First of all I too would like to congratulate the minister for showing this bit of a brilliant stroke of leadership and he is kind of showing his true ability in the education business. He has been kind of hamstrung these past few years because he has had to be concerned about political considerations, but when he behaves as an educator he does a good job. And he has done a good job here to a degree. Now, Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Bill 93 is good and it is that we congratulate him on or Bill 91, I believe. The spirit of the legislation is good. There is a couple things wrong with it, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the detail and I will mention it here. It has to do with a particular clause but I believe it relates to the principle of the bill nevertheless. You see, Mr. Speaker, we should keep in mind that any university by its very nature is a very undemocratic sort of structure. It has a highly centralized administration. The real decisions that are made at the university depend on the style and the bent and the whim, sometimes, of the chief administrator, the president of that university. And these comments are particularly true of our own university, Memorial University, again because of the highly centralized nature of the administration which has been established under the current president. Indeed in some respects Memorial, while being the school from which I graduated some years ago and one which I have some fond things to say about, is at the same time perhaps one of the worst examples of inbreeding that one could imagine and more could be said about that at the appropriate time. But the point I want to make on this bill now is in relation to the method of appointment of these two students.

November 21, 1978

Tape 5301

DW - 3

MR. SIMMONS:

The provision in the bill is they would be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, by government upon the joint recommendation of the student's union, the CSU, and the officer at the university designated as being responsible for student affairs.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now what that provision says in effect is that there has to be concurrence, there has to be agreement by the C.S.U. on one hand and an officer of the university on the other hand. So one could raise the question, what if there is not agreement? To put it another way, can the two choices of the C.S.U. ever be appointed to this Board of Regents if the officer representing the university objects? And the answer is no. If the officer of the university has an instruction from the president of the university as to whom he does not want on that board, that student does not get on the board; it is that simple. The provision of two students on the Board of Regents is a good provision, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is being totally undermined by the method of appointment and the students who will go on that board will not be as such the choice of the C.S.U. so much as they will be the compromise choice of the C.S.U. If you are sitting on the C.S.U. at the university, you will have to keep in mind the criteria for selection of the two students to go on the board. They have to take into account his acceptability to the administration, and that is the key indictment in this particular provision. These students will have to be considered to be acceptable to the administration. I would hope that a C.S.U. representing the student body of the university, elected by the student body, a group of young adult Newfoundlanders, could be trusted by the government in this day and age to choose wisely. That obviously is not the case. They have built in a veto power for the president, they have built into this provision, Mr. Speaker, a veto power for an officer who, of course, will act on the instructions of the president of the university and if the president does not like these

MR. SIMMONS: students. I do not mean does not like, I strike that - if the president does not find these students acceptable or does not feel they will reflect on the board the administration's point of view, he has the clear option to pass the word to the officer of the university, who is liaising with the C.S.U., to pass the word that certain candidates or would-be candidates for these positions would not be acceptable to him, as president, or to the administration of the university. Now, Mr. Speaker, we support the principle of this, we support the spirit of it, but I find it passing strange that there is built into the bill a veto power for the president as to who could be appointed under this provision.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member speaks now he closes the debate. The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen of the Opposition, for their positive remarks. As set out in Section 23 it states that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will appoint two full-time students and of course in (3) it states that they will make regulations and presumably make regulations governing what the qualifications of the students should be academically and I think the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) will recall that even back in the days when he was going to university, even to be a member of the council there were certain qualifications, you had to keep up an academic standing, and I think this is one of the reasons why -

MR. SIMMONS: But they did not have to be approved by the president.

MR. HOUSE: Well it was the academic standing. Right now this would be presumably the Dean of Man who would be the student advisor in this particular case and I think we

MR. HOUSE: are reading a lot into it when we say that the president will have a veto power. I think the legislation is good; two students will be recommended by the student union and, of course I would presume that the university designated officer would be looking to see if they make the qualifications with regard to academic standing and so on. I could not see that as being an inhibiting factor, I believe that the students at Memorial

MR. HOUSE: University on Student Council and Student Centre are going to recommend we will do a good job. I do not see that they have to be reformers, but we hope that they will have a good input into the university. I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 44, Bill No. 81.
Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, this is strictly a housekeeping bill. The first amendment simply removes any specific reference to the term 'common-law union' and the second amendment will see that the act will come into effect. The Social Assistance Act, 1977 will be deemed effective May 1977 rather than July 1977. That second amendment, really, is to protect the cost-sharing arrangement with the federal government.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Would the hon. House Leader, perhaps, Sir, in the absence of the Premier, indicate why the former minister is speaking to this? We have no objection but just as a matter of enlightenment is there some restructuring required or is he up just as the sponsor of the change? Is there any particular reason why my good buddy from Gander is not speaking to this matter? Do you need some legislation to put into effect the changes announced by the Premier?

MR. PECKFORD: His name is on the bill.

MR. SIMMONS: Just because his name is on the bill. It is as simple as that, is it?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay. We were just worried. I did not want the minister to lose any of his jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is just for the record.

MR. SIMMONS: He will lost them soon enough, the people of Gander tell me. I always look after his interests when I am not ducking.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister, and I do not know if he did this deliberately or not, attempted to gloss over a very dangerous amendment to the Social Assistance Act in this Province. At the moment the present law reads, and common-law union is defined. The minister is attempting to take that common-law union definition out of the act altogether and leave the definition of a family unit to the discretion of a social worker. Well, the Minister of Justice is shaking his head. "Family means a group of two or more persons residing together in which a parent or guardian is recognized by an officer of the department as being responsible for the care and custody of the children, if any." So the discretion of a common-law union is now left to the hands of the social worker.

MR. BRETT: It always was.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, it was not always so. Before it was in the act. The relevant provisions it said read, In this Act common-law union meant such and such a thing.

MR. HICKMAN: May I ask the hon. gentleman what is a common-law union?

MR. RIDEOUT: It was defined in the act before but now it is taken out and left to the complete

MR. RIDEOUT: discretion of a social worker.

MR. HICKMAN: The words are -

MR. RIDEOUT: Let me finish. What I am worried about is this, I have seen instances in my district, and other members may well have seen the same circumstances, where social workers have been rather reluctant to grant social assistance to people living in a common-law situation. They have been reluctant to do so, there is no doubt about that, I have seen it.

MR. FLIGHT: They denied it.

MR. RIDEOUT: They totally denied it in some cases. Now before the law was there, they had to do it. There may have been some questions that had to be answered, and I am not arguing against that, but now under this particular provision the definition is no longer there and whether those people are living together in a common-law union or not, if the social worker does not agree, it is up to his discretion to deny social assistance to those people. Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment is dangerous. I think there ought to be some more specific terms, in terms of legislation, nailed down in this provision.

We have in all professions, Mr. Speaker, those people, I do not know what the correct term is, but there are bad apples in every group, let me put it that way, there are bad apples in the law profession, in the teaching profession, in all professions and sometimes that is reflected in the

MR. RIDEOUT: discretionary decisions that those people make. Now, here we are providing some of those people with a very dangerous weapon to be used, or could be used, against people in this Province who decide for their own reasons, whatever they are, and I am not about to question them, that they want to live together in a common-law situation. I would like to hear more on it from the minister and I will tell him now that unless I am satisfied with what he has to say, even though when he rises again he will be closing the debate, I am prepared to raise this again in Committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question this particular part of the act was included about two years ago. Prior to that there was no specific reference to common-law union as such. You would look at a group of two or more and if there was a breadwinner or somebody, then they were considered a family. We found that having this in the act really, you know, there was really no need of it. And the criteria to assist a group or family - what we are saying now is, we do not have to say that they are living common-law, that is not important, it does not matter. If there is a group of two or more, say a man and woman and children, then we will look on them as a family. Why say they are living common-law or whatever? And whether or not they are assisted will have no bearing on whether they are living common-law. If there is a group and the head of that family is earning, has some income, that is what the decision will be based on, not whether or not they are living common-law. So, it does not change the criteria for giving a group or a family social assistance, it has no bearing at all. It is just that there is no need of it in the act, we do not need it there, we do not need it, the department does not need it to establish criteria for

MR. BRETT: assisting a family.

AN HON. MEMBER: It just puts a label there
that is not -

MR. BRETT: Well, there is a stigma
attached to it too and social workers found themselves
in an awful position when trying to prove whether or not
there is a common-law union. And I do not have to tell
the hon. member some of the embarrassing experiences
both by the social workers and whatever groups might be
involved. So really, it is purely housekeeping and will have
no bearing on whether somebody gets help or not. Mr.
Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act
To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977," read a second
time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House
presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 43, Bill No. 72.
Motion, second reading of a
bill, "An Act To Revise The Newfoundland Architects Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will not delay
the House on this. This simply replaces the existing
Architects Act and I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act
To Revise The Newfoundland Architects Act," read a second
time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House
presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 42, Bill No. 88.
Motion, second reading of a
bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro
Act, 1975, The Electrical Power Control Act, The Newfoundland
And Labrador Hydro (Loan And Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975,
The Newfoundland And Labrador Rural Electricity Act, And The
British Newfoundland Corporation Limited (Lower Churchill
River Lease) Act, 1966.67." (Bill No. 88).

MR. NEARY: Some fancy footwork there.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it give me great pleasure to introduce -

MR. NEARY: The Hinds Lake project.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, right, partly.
- to introduce this bill No.

88 which, as Your Honour has just read, involves amendments to the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act, 1975, The Electrical Power Control Act, the Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro (Loan And Guarantee Limitation) Act, the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Electricity Act, and the British Newfoundland Corporation Limited (Lower Churchill River Lease) Act so this bill does at least six things by way of amendment to six different acts already passed by this hon. House.

So I will go through them, Mr. Speaker, as they appear in the act and try to give as clear an explanation on each of the amendments as I can, and then undoubtedly there will be questions concerning it.

AN HON. MEMBER: I hope the minister will do better than he did on the Brinco amendments.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes. I am not a lawyer nor am I a financier and, therefore, for that I make no apologies.

The first major amendment here, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the request by the Hydro Corporation to ask its customers for forecasts of its power supply over a given period of time.

MR. PECKFORD:

In other words, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro in trying to determine what the demand load will be at any given time in the future could ask some of its major customers for their forecasts. For example, hopefully in a little while now Labrador Linerboard complex will be starting again. It is a fairly major industrial enterprise in the Province. It will be very important for Hydro to know, since it is going to be the supplier of the power, just what the projected amount of power that industrial complex will use over a given period of time; and, of course, the rates to be established will be the going rates of the day. It will not be any ERCO's or whatever involved here, you can be sure of that. So, many of the major industries, large consuming industries of power, will be now under this amendment - the first one here - and will be asked for some twenty-year forecasts, up to twenty years. That is extremely necessary because when you are into a project planning situation, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has to know what kind of forecast, what kind of demand load it is looking at for in '82 or in '83, because it has to now give project release to a Hind's Lake or next year to an Upper Salmon on the basis of what it thinks will be the demand load in 1983 and '84. And if they are wrong, of course, there will be a fairly large outcry that we expended thirty million or forty million or fifty million or whatever dollars to bring on a project a lot earlier than we needed to and therefore tied up the credit of the Province unnecessarily in that given fiscal year. So, it is extremely important, and I think makes a lot of good sense in allowing for that to happen. That is the first major amendment in the Bill 88,

Mr. Speaker.

The second one is one that, I suppose, we could debate a long while and it is the loan limitation situation with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, that this House will give authorization to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, authorization or authority to borrow so much money to carry out its capital projects. In 1975 this House passed a bill - a loan limitation bill - giving Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. PECKFORD: Hydro the authority to borrow up to \$200 million in 1975 - \$200 million. We are fast approaching our maximum under that loan act and now we need to go ahead and borrow for Hind's Lake and to borrow additional money to complete the Holyrood extension and other borrowings over the next eight or ten months to allow the corporation to function, capital projects under PDD and so on, which will have to be.

MR. NEARY: Why can not the Legislature do it?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lapoile will have his opportunity to speak in this debate. I now have my opportunity and I would ask for the protection of the Chair for this hon. gentleman to be quiet while I complete my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I understand the hon. minister is exercising his right to be heard in silence.

Hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are asking here for the same provisions as we asked in 1975 for the ceiling to be \$200 million for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, for a new ceiling of \$200 million because it has almost reached the \$200 million that we have already given authority for - to use a very poor grammatical sentence. Now, Mr. Speaker, since the \$200 million authority was given in 1975, here is what has happened. In 1975 Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro floated a bond of \$25 million at 10.75 per cent in Europe in Swiss francs. In 1975 floated a bond of \$28 million at eight per cent in Swiss francs in Europe. In 1976, floated a bond of \$25 million at 9.75 per cent in U.S. dollars but in the European market. In 1976 it floated a \$30 million at 10.25 per cent Canadian. In 1977 \$30 million at 10 per cent Canadian. In 1977 \$35 million at 10 per cent in 1977 that is Canadian. And in 1978 it floated two bonds,

MR. PECKFORD:

one of \$35 million and one of \$40 million. The one of \$35 million was for ten and a quarter and the one of \$40 million was for ten. These are both Canadian issues in 1978. If you add those up it gives you a total -

MR. NEARY: If you follow that line of reasoning, could the government not go out and do the same thing, borrow money for the next ten years?

MR. PECKFORD: That gives you a total of around \$248 million but some of the borrowing was refinancing which is not included in the \$200 million, which leaves you with around \$163 million borrowed of the \$200 million authority that was given in 1975 leaving a difference of \$37 million left for Newfoundland Hydro under authority of this House to borrow.

As you can notice by the issues that I have just given you, the normal practice now in 1978 for issues for Newfoundland Hydro are \$40 million, \$35 million to \$40 million. It is felt that there is absolutely no need to go for less than that at any time. Usually we are going to need the full \$40 million. We need to have some flexibility and some ceiling so that they can go to the market at the right time. You just cannot call the House at a moment's notice when you think the market is proper and then call them together in order to put through an authority of \$40 million for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. They have to be able to read the market and to decide upon when is the best time to go to the market. That is usually the reason for the ceiling.

We need now, Mr. Speaker, around \$75 million for Hinds Lake and about \$30 million for Holyrood, which gives you over \$100 million already that is needed additional for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to carry out its mandate of bringing on new energy supplies to allow us to have some stability in relation to the demand into the 1980-1981 period. So therefore the second major amendment deals with a new authority for \$200 million for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro because it only has \$37 million of its original \$200 million authority left and it needs the additional money for Hinds

MR. PECKFORD:

Lake and Holyrood and some that is still left there for flexibility to go to the market when it believes with the Department of Finance, and always in consultation with the Department of Finance, when it sees fit and when the market seems to be in good shape for the corporation and the government to go. So that is the second major amendment to the bill, to one of the acts that are mentioned in the reading of the bill.

A third major amendment, Mr. Speaker, has to deal with interim increases when Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro was going to the Public Utilities Board. Presently Newfoundland Light and Power and other utilities that come under the Public Utilities Board have the right to make increases to the consumer before the board actually rules on whether those increases are legitimate or not. So that if Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is contemplating increasing to its customers 5 per cent, say, and it makes an application to the Public Utilities Board, under this amendment they want the right to go ahead and pass through that 5 per cent in the interim. When the Public Utilities Board rules on it, if there is any reduction ruled by Public Utilities Board less than 5 per cent then the corporation has to refund. Now Newfoundland Light already has that power under the Public Utilities Act and we are asking here in this amendment to give Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro the same rights as it goes before the Public Utilities Board as the private utility, Newfoundland Light, now enjoys. So it is just bringing into line under the Public Utilities Act the same kind of privileges and rights that the private utilities have, which is a normal one. If the increase sought by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro turns out to be less after the Board looks at it, and they have passed through five and the Public Utilities Board only allows three, then the 2 per cent has to be refunded to the customers and the refundability provision is a part of the this act and mentioned in this act.

So nobody loses anything by it but it does allow some streamlining and some efficient administration to Newfoundland and

MR. PECKFORD:

Labrador Hydro in line with what is now available to the private utilities.

We also need, of course, because we are going after a new \$200 million limit, the repeal of the old Loan Bill which would have to be affected as well and so in the same breath, if you will, or in the same bill, that we are asking for a new \$200 million limit we are asking for the repeal of the old act which gave the old authority of \$200 million. So that is just a housekeeping proposition because if the House -

MR. NEARY: That is some housekeeping, \$200 million!

MR. PECKFORD: If the House approves a new \$200 million limit, then the old act approving the original \$200 million.

MR. PECKFORD: is no longer necessary.

Another major provision in this Bill is a very important one dealing with the Lower Churchill Basin. Under one of the old acts mentioned in the British Newfoundland Corporation Limited (Lower Churchill River Lease) Act, 1966:67, under that bill it gave authority for the government to enter in to, Mr. Speaker, gave authority for the government to enter into a lease on the Lower Churchill Basin with Brinco. Fortunately, that authority was never exercised, there was never any lease signed between the government and Brinco for the Lower Churchill Basin but the authority there still exists for the government of Newfoundland to sign such a lease with Brinco under that act. Now that we are considering a different arrangement for the development of the Lower Churchill Basin than was envisaged in this act, namely an agreement between Brinco and the government of Newfoundland, to a new corporation soon to be established to look at the Lower Churchill Basin and develop it, it is necessary therefore to clear up and to leave no ambiguity as to title and as to authority and as this old Brinco act deals with authority given to the government to sign a lease on the Lower Churchill Basin with Brinco, it is no longer needed and just a needless -

MR. NEARY: It is not a commitment.

MR. PECKFORD: No, no, it is just an irrelevant and needless piece of legislation left on the books which should be eliminated to totally clear in everybody's mind any question as to title on the Lower Churchill Basin and it is just done as a, in one sense a housekeeping measure because no agreement was signed with Brinco and the government and the government, number one, but, number two, to just clear the way in any case so there is no ambiguity, no confusion,

MR. PECKFORD:

no question as to any power that the government now has in signing a lease on the Lower Churchill Basin with Brinco, as was the authority given under that Brinco Act. So we want to clear up any confusion as to title on the Lower Churchill Basin which will therefore allow tidely, if you will, clearly for the new corporation soon to be formed to exercise some jurisdiction, if you will, and power to sign with the government leases as it relates to and development of the Lower Churchill Basin. So that amendment is there to completely clear title as it relates to the Lower Churchill Basin because if we do not eliminate that act, therefore there is some confusion.

That is five of the major amendments, Mr. Speaker, There is one other one that is fairly major and it is the repeal of the R.E.A. Act, Rural Electricity Authority Act, because it is no longer needed. Up until now, when the government approves subsidies on the diesel generation areas of the province, because they are not viable in their own right, and government then provides money through the Department of Mines and Energy to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro for these subsidies to come into effect, it is done through the mechanism of R.E.A., the Rural Electricity Authority, and the R.E.A. is no longer a necessary vehicle for government to pass over the money. The question then can be asked, "Oh, why is that so, when it was always necessary?" We can pass it strictly straight through to the power distribution district now. Years ago there several power distribution districts in the province and, therefore, instead of trying to pass out individual subsidies to the various power distribution districts it was decided to do it through another agency called the Rural Electricity Authority. Since that time all those power distribution districts have

MR. PECKFORD: amalgamated into one called the Power Distribution District of Newfoundland under Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and so therefore we can now pass the subsidy directly over to one P.D.D. which distributes retails electricity to rural parts of the province through the diesel system. So R.E.A. is an incumbrance, an unnecessary vehicle which should be eliminated now to make it more streamlined and more efficient. There is absolutely no need for government now

MR. PECKFORD: in providing the subsidy on the retailing of power to remote parts of the Island to do it through R.E.A. We can do it directly to one P.D.D., because that is all that is there now, there are not many P.D.Ds. So the R.E.A. was only a vehicle as long as there was a multiplicity of P.D.Ds. Now that there is one P.D.D., the R.E.A. vehicle is no longer necessary. And that is the final major amendment to the bill.

Let me just review, Mr. Speaker, for the edification of hon. members: Number one, the bill is requesting the power of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro - MR. NEARY: Do you understand what you are trying to do? You are trying to bypass the Legislature. So sit down and be quiet!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. minister has requested silence.

MR. PECKFORD: Number one, we are asking for approval to give Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro approval to request forecasts from its customers; number two, we are asking for a new loan bill with a ceiling of \$200 million, which is exactly the same ceiling as this Legislature gave Hydro in 1975; we are asking that interim increases can be passed through or interim increases can be given by Newfoundland Hydro pending a decision by the Public Utilities Board on that increase; we are asking for repeal of the former loan bill now that we are requesting a new one; we are asking for repeal of the Brinco Act which involves the authority of the government, giving the government authority to sign a lease on the Lower Churchill Basin with Brinco which is unnecessary now - the authority was never exercised - and to clear title we repeal that Act; and last but not least, to repeal the R.E.A. Act because it is unnecessary now in the whole question of providing a subsidy to P.D.D. for the maintenance and operation

MR. PECKFORD: of electricity in the remote parts of the Province. These are the six major amendments that are requested in this bill and affect five or six other Acts in the bargain.

I move second reading.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

The hon. the member for

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to address myself to one aspect of the bill, Mr. Speaker, and that is the 'around \$75 million.' I would like to hear the minister indicate what he means by 'around'. We have heard \$80 million to \$100 million and now he says \$75 million.

MR. PECKFORD:

It was \$80 million and \$5 million has gone and now there is \$75 million left.

MR. FLIGHT:

Oh, I see. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the few words I am going to have I want to point out to this House how this administration uses Hydro when it is to their advantage, manipulates them when it is to their advantage -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. FLIGHT:

- and then uses them as a scapegoat when it is further to their advantage.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Exactly.

MR. FLIGHT:

Very quickly, Mr. Speaker, I am going to outline the position Buchans finds itself in - three months, basically, of an economy left.

This administration almost four years ago, Sir, sponsored a task force and the main purpose of that task force was to indicate to the government of the day what could be done to guarantee Buchans a viable future, what it was possible to develop that would guarantee that if and when the mines closed that the people of Buchans

MR. FLIGHT: could survive, could make a living. The task force did that, Sir, and the major recommendation of that particular report was the building of a Buchans-Howley road, which the government rejected on the basis that it would have been too expensive. We were moving into a period of retrenchment, of tight money, and the people of Buchans by and large accepted that fate and said, 'We will not get the Buchans-Howley road.' And then, lo and behold, the Hinds Lake project was conceived - \$80 million of public money to be spent within six to fifteen miles of the town.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I met with the top officials of Newfoundland Hydro when this concept of Hinds Lake was announced and in conversation with them - I was not concerned about the jobs that the Buchans workers would get on Hinds Lake, I saw Hinds Lake as being, since it was smack in the middle of Howley and Buchans, as being the means of the Buchans-Howley road. The access roads into the construction site would follow by and large the proposed route of the Buchans-Howley road. And I suggested to Hydro that this was indeed what would happen. The benefit - how lucky are we! - that this project would come just when we need the Buchans-Howley road and that the access roads coming in would provide by and large two-thirds of the Buchans-Howley highroad. And they nodded around the table, agreed that that would be one of the benefits.

The minister of the day, Sir, on two or three occasions in making statements pertaining to Buchans, tied the Hinds Lake development in favourably with the town of Buchans. And anybody in his right mind, any fair-minded person

MR. FLIGHT: would have to believe that a project that was going to cost \$80 million, a three-year project, would be so designed, not specifically designed, but so designed within reason, to have whatever economic benefit, spin-off benefit, that could possibly accrue to the town of Buchans under the circumstances, that that is the way that that project would be designed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to admit that Hinds Lake today is the biggest industrial activity that is going on in this Province. And we should see to it that when Hydro spends \$80-\$100 million that they would spend that money and do that project in a way that certainly it would have some influence on the economic and social scene in the area that they are working. And Hydro intended that to happen. Mr. Speaker, as time went on and we started to get reports of the engineering, we became aware that Hinds Lake was going to be serviced from the West coast. We had no problem with that. We were quite prepared to see roads come in from Howley and contractors move in if they wanted to move from Howley, but we could not believe and nobody could believe that the project was being deliberately engineered and designed to deliberately deny with aforethought, deliberately deny the Buchans area any economic spin-off, any benefit at all from the Hinds Lake project.

Newfoundland Hydro came into Buchans and held a meeting and they tried to justify - they could not do it but they tried to justify - the orders that they had received from Cabinet that Buchans could not be the service centre for Hinds Lake. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three or four ministers on that side of the House - I do not know what happens in Cabinet - but at least three or four ministers have come to me time and time again and said, "Keep on the pressure for Buchans. It makes sense to have the Hinds Lake project developed in such a way that it would benefit the town of Buchans. Keep the pressure on. There are only one or two ministers who are withholding support, who are stopping it, and you keep enough pressure on and they will have to give in."

MR. FLIGHT:

Ministers recognize it, came to me behind the curtain, met privately with me and said, "Look, keep it up because it has got to come. It is foolhardy for the Government to try to develop the Hinds Lake project and do it in a way that would deny the Buchans economy any spin-off whatsoever". However, up to this time we have not been successful, Mr. Speaker, We are looking at three months from now Buchans losing its mine. It is going to close down and 500 men are going to go unemployed.

There is a possibility we may get some work on the Hinds Lake project, but the important thing for Buchans was the economic spin-off, the eight or ten or fifteen or twenty million dollars that would have accrued to Buchans had the contractors gone in from Buchans, had we made it possible for any contractor landing a contract on the Hinds Lake project to have come in through Badger in through Buchans and serviced that project. Some of the construction sites are less - there are all less than twenty miles - some of them are within six miles of the town of Buchans, Mr. Speaker, and the Cabinet, the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy have deliberately refused to let the Hinds Lake project to this point in time have any economic benefit to the town of Buchans at all. Now, how can an administration retain any credibility in anyone's eyes when they put together a task force and say, "Look, we want Buchans to have a viable future. We want to take advantage of anything that is in the Buchans area to guarantee that people will be able to continue and live there and work there." They say that in one breath and in the next breath they deliberately deny a town any benefit whatsoever from a \$80-million dollar publicly funded project. How can they have any credibility? Mr. Speaker, there are towns in this Province that survive on the construction industry. That is the basis of their economy. Their people go away for six months, work on a construction job, come back and go again next spring.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Minister just referred to the Salmon. You know, the next three years could be crucial to the Buchans economy. The Minister is always talking about the greater mineralization area there, the possibility of mining in the future. Price (Nfld.) is dancing to his tune when they are announcing million-dollar exploration projects, programs over the next year, talking about a barite development. Well, if the Minister believes all this is going to happen, why does he not make it possible to keep Buchans off the welfare rolls over the next two or three years? All we are asking for is two or three years of a reprieve until the dust settles in Buchans and we see if we have a mining activity.

He mentioned the Salmon

River. The Upper Salmon when it is developed has got to be developed through Badger - up through Badger, Buchans Junction, Millertown and on in. Let us assume out of the 300 people that are employed on Hinds Lake, let us assume only 100 - we do not care if 600 or 700 people from the west coast work there. All we are asking for is a fair shake and we have not got it. We have been deliberately denied a fair shake on that Hinds Lake project,

MR. G. FLIGHT: very, very deliberately denied it and, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation and Communications and this Cabinet have misled the people of Buchans and the Central Newfoundland area. The minister announced publicly that he was meeting with the Minister of Mines and Energy over a year ago to talk to him about the possibility of a joint venture of Hydro building the access roads into the Hinds Lake construction sites.

The Minister of Transportation indicated that he was having meetings with the Minister of Mines and Energy to work out an arrangement whereby government funding could go into the building those roads. Now that is a public statement by the then Minister of Transportation. What happened to that meeting? What were the results? Did the minister say, "No. No go. We are not going to spend the money." There was a 14 mile road built for \$750,000, an all-weather gravel road already built on that project for \$750,000. There will be less than 10 miles of road to be completed in order to have the first stage of good gravel roads from Buchans to Howley on the Hinds Lake project.

And, Mr. Speaker, in view of that, in view of the fact that the miners in the town of Buchans are facing ruin - the mines will close, 500 men will be laid off, the livelihoods of 3,000 to 4,000 people will be affected. A whole town, a total town! It is a unique situation and this government denies that town and that area any socio-economic benefit at all from that kind of a project. It is enough, Mr. Speaker, to bring on civil disobedience. I do not know what the mood in that town is going to be next Spring if 400 or 500 men are walking around without jobs and six and seven and eight or nine miles away 700 or 800 men are working from all over Newfoundland. They have never made any demands on any government of this Province up until this time. We never asked for any special considerations on the Bay

MR. FLIGHT: d' Espoir projects or the Churchill Falls projects or the Labrador City projects. We never asked for any special jobs, we could not care less how many people go to work from Deer Lake or from Howley or from Corner Brook. All we are saying is that we have the right to compete for jobs, we have that right. That million dollars will be wasted because when that project is finished those access roads will be allowed to wash out, probably \$1 million or \$1.5 million spent in access roads that could have been the basis of the Buchans - Howley highroad. It is madness, it is economic madness. The road was recommended not only by people from Buchans. It was recommended by the Premier's own advisors that if Buchans was to remain a viable community it had to be tied to transportation. And in spite of that, Mr. Speaker, in spite of action committees, in spite of task force reports, in spite of private letters to the Premier, nothing! He sits back, Sir, so unconcerned. He does not even know what is happening in Buchans and could not care less.

MR. J. NOLAN: Callous.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Callous? That is his approach to a whole town. What does the Minister of Public Works think of it? What does the Minister of Education, the member for Deer Lake (Mr. House), the member for Howley think of that? Why do not the Minister for Education tell this House how the people of Howley have put the pressure on him and said, "Go into the Cabinet and demand that the Buchans - Howley road be built because any spin-off, any economic activity that we get as a result of Hinds Lake will only last for two years but in order to survive and in order to have a decent economy after the Hinds Lake project is finished, the road to Buchans will be more valuable to us. We prefer to have the road to Buchans than the Hinds Lake project itself." Let the Minister of Education tell the House.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, we talk about pork barrelling. It is too important an issue for me to get political on but, I mean, the minister rightly or wrongly has been accused of being the champion pork barreller in the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, while he has the gall to stand up and tell the people of Buchans, "We cannot spend \$700,000 to give you a basis of life, to give the town another year or two of economic survival," he goes down, Mr. Speaker, and spends this past year millions of dollars on jobs that were necessary, maybe, but not necessary in the same sense that the Buchans - Howley road would be. And, Mr. Speaker, that is pork barrelling and the Hinds Lake project is an example of indirect pork barrelling.

MR. FLIGHT:

The three districts to benefit most from the Hinds Lake project are going to be the Premier's district, the Minister of Education's district and the member for Corner Brook West, who is not here, the recent Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. NEARY: Humber Valley, Humber East and Humber West.

MR. FLIGHT: And they sat down, Sir, it seems to us—and if I am wrong the Premier will get up and say I am wrong, or the minister—they sat down and apparently contrived and apparently decided that this is the way the Hinds Lake project is going to be pursued. To hell with Buchans! To hell with the livelihood of the people there! We will deny them, deliberately deny them any benefit from the Hinds Lake project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Buchans Task Force Report had dozens of recommendations. The Minister of Energy a few days ago was on radio saying that he believed that any possible way for Buchans to survive would have to be based on the development of small resource based industries. The minute I heard it it sounded like 1972 all over again, the mandate that put this crowd in office, Mr. Speaker, this hon. crowd. That was the election promise, the economy of Newfoundland would be based on small resource based industries.

Three months before we go down the pipe economically, the minister gets on radio and says that the future of Buchans will have to be based on the development of small resource based industries. I agree with him, the task force agreed with him, that Action Committee agrees with him, everybody in Buchans agrees with him—but they also say that in order to survive on small resource based industries we need the infrastructure, we need the roads to get our goods and to support these basic industries to the West Coast. And he had the chance to put the Buchans Howley Road in place, gravel road, Buchans—Howley, and he refused.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote against this bill. The Province needs the power. The economy needs the jobs on Hinds

MR. FLIGHT:

Lake, but I am going to use it every chance I get to ridicule this government, to show them up for the callousness that they are capable of. I hear there is a possibility that the minister will be going into Buchans to a public meeting -

MR. NEARY: Oh, oh! That will be a hot time in Buchans then.

MR. FLIGHT: - in the near future. It is going to be interesting to hear the minister explain. The Premier should go. It is going to be interesting to hear him explain how they have left this past three and a half years, the most important - four years now - slip by without lifting a finger to relieve the fears of the people of Buchans, to give them some insight into whether or not there is any security left in the town, how he has let the four years go by and now he is proposing - he has denied them any benefit whatsoever from the one major project that is going on that they could have taken advantage of. It is going to be interesting to hear him explain, in view of his past performance, how small resource based industries are going to maintain a viable economy in Buchans if he is not prepared to let them have the roads, the transportation they need in order to develop those small resource based industries.

The tourist potential, he said; the forestry potential, he said - and while he is saying this he knows that two or three days ago he made sure that Buchans would not get the Buchans - Howley Road, would not get the road we would need on which to base these small resource based industries. And the minister sits there. Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be a laughing concern for some of the ministers on the other side of the House but it is not a laughing concern for the people of Buchans.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have the floor.

MR. FLIGHT: I am good until nine o'clock on this. It is not a laughing concern for the people in Buchans whose jobs, whose livelihoods depend on government involvement in that town and who are going to see their jobs go down the drain come March.

MR. FLIGHT:

So when the minister stands up to speak, I want to hear him - he will get up and castigate me for being political or what have you - but I want to hear him justify spending \$80 million within six minimum, maximum twenty miles of Buchans and refuse the work force of that town the right and the ability to reap any benefit whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, this government, the Hinds Lake project and the way that they have treated the town of Buchans over this past three and a half years

MR. FLIGHT: is going to cost this administration, it is going to cost them in areas far removed from Buchans. And Mr. Speaker, I will do whatever I can do, as I say, out of a sense of responsibility. I could very well take the attitude of filibustering when we come to the second reading of this bill, but Newfoundland needs the power, we need the economic involvement, but there is no justification for the way that this administration, the Premier and his Cabinet, have treated Buchans with regard to the development of Hinds Lake, and their actions will come back to haunt them.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will never be forgiven.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before my hon. friend answers the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), Sir, who made some excellent points and who has been making these points now for the past couple of years on behalf of his constituents in Buchans, I want to say this, Sir, that what I am against in this bill is the principle of giving Newfoundland Hydro too much power. We are creating another monster. They are becoming an empire unto themselves, a law unto themselves, Newfoundland Hydro, and it is time, Sir, that we pulled the reins tight on them. And I am against giving Newfoundland Hydro a blank cheque to go out and borrow a couple of hundred million dollars.

We are not going to finish this bill before 6:00 P.M., Mr. Speaker, so why not rise the House and we will have a few minutes at it when we come back?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that we call it

6:00 P.M.?

As it is agreed that we call it 6:00 P.M., I leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Lapoile adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I know that we have a lot of work to do in the next three hours between now and eleven o'clock or twelve or one or three or four whenever we get around to it, but nevertheless, Sir, there are a number of important pieces of legislation on the Order Paper that you cannot just let go by without making some comment and this happens to be one of the pieces of legislation.

The Minister of Mines and Energy got up today and laid out his case as if this was just something that was of a housekeeping nature, a very trivial, very trivial matter, only asking the House to authorize the borrowing of Newfoundland Hydro, a monster that has been created by this hon. crowd on the other side of the House, authorization to borrow another \$200 million without coming to this legislature, without the authority of this House, something that my hon. friend the member for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) was advocating for years that we should not do - take the power - remove the authority from the legislature. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has done it in a cute kind of way because he has tossed in four or five things into this bill and you will be damned if you do and double damned if you do not. You have got to vote for Hinds Lake if you believe in that development, but nevertheless you still have to vote to give all this power to the Hydro Corporation. How can you separate them? They should have been all separate bills. The hon. the Premier knows what I am talking about.

MR. F. ROWE:

Look how seriously he is taking it?

MR. NEARY:

My colleague does. Well, I tell you I am going to suggest to my colleagues - I know I am going to vote against this bill. I am going to vote against it because it gives the Hydro

MR. NEARY: authority too much power, it puts too much power in the hands of a crowd of hacks that have been appointed by this administration. I have no intention of going along with it, Sir. Nevertheless, I agree with the development of the Hinds Lake. I agree with that but I cannot separate it. There is no way I can do it. I cannot vote for one part of the bill and vote against another part. I am against it in principle, Sir, in giving more authority to the

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland Hydro; as a matter of fact I am for reducing their authority, not giving them more power to borrow or anything else. Down there we have created a monster, Now that they have bought their own building they are gone hog wild, Sir, they are spending money like drunken sailors; there are no limits on them, they are a law, they are an authority unto themselves. Now also in the bill they are asking also to increase their rates, to increase electricity rates and then submit the application to the Public Utilities Board and then if the Public Utilities Board say, 'Well, no, you should not have increased them that much,' then they will reduce them again by whatever amount the order of the Utility Board calls for. They are using the argument that the other utility, the private utility, can do this. Mr. Speaker, who are that crowd trying to cod? The people who decide whether or not electricity rates are going to be increased in this province are the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is the Premier and the Cabinet. Let us level with the people, let us be honest about it, let us not try to be sneaky about this: what does not seem to have sunk in yet, Sir, to the media in this Province is that group, the people, the body, the authority who decides whether or not Newfoundland Hydro are going to have an increase in electricity rates is the Premier, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman), the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) and all their colleagues on that side of the House. Because, Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour will remember when that piece of legislation went through the House, the recommendation of the Public Utilities Board is subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which is the Cabinet, and so when the Public Utilities Board recommend an increase the Cabinet has the power to reduce it or abolish it. But they

MR. NEARY:

keep pawning it off and say:

"Oh, no, you can have a hearing." Who can have a hearing against Newfoundland Hydro with the resources that they have? They got the computer experts down there, the young hot-shots that come out of the commerce department, Rollie Martin's buddies that came out of the commerce department down there and they would spend millions, they would spend the whole public treasury to fight the consumer, to bring in consultants and lawyers. How can you put ordinary people up against that monster that we have created down there, The Newfoundland Power Corporation? Before the hon. the Premier leaves the House there is something I want to put to that hon. gentleman in connection with the supply - he is gone out now to meet with his press agent again, the old image must be in bad shape again, bad supper tonight. I guarantee you, Sir, if there is a man in this province that earns his keep, that earns his salary, it is the Premier's press agent trying to beef up his image. The poor fellow should get triple what he is being paid. He had one fellow resign, could not take it any more, could not do anything with it.

MR. SIMMONS:

He saw the writing on the wall, you mean.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, there are a lot of them

like that sir. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the development of electricity, of power on the Island of Newfoundland and in Labrador and I want to put a question to the premier when he comes back, something that my antenna picked up recently in my travels and I do not know if the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) knows anything about this because the premier seems to be the one to go off to Hotel Champlain and meet with Ataka officials and then when you ask about it in the House, he never heard of them. This is probably another one of these deals where he is off in Hotel Champlain discussing various

MR. NEARY:

things and now if I put the question to him he might not remember anything about it but if I produce the documentation and the evidence and put it up in neon lights then he might admit, he might say: 'Well, if they say, if they say so then it must be true.' I want to ask the premier this, we have the Hinds Lake development going and we have this expensive expansion to the thermo generator plant up there in Holyrood and that involves quite a large, I would say expenditure of money over the next few years for Bunker C, I would say over the next five or six or seven years you are probably talking about

MR. NEARY:

\$500 million or \$600 million which would be a pretty fair contract if somebody could only get their hands on it but I do not want to ask the Premier about that. I will deal with that one in due course. I want to ask the Premier this. In his negotiations with Brinco or Churchill Falls, I think maybe Brinco and the Development of the Lower Churchill and so forth, did Brinco ever make this Province an offer? I am being distracted, Sir, by the hon. gentleman. Did Brinco ever make an offer to this Province to build a nuclear power plant here on the Island of Newfoundland and sell the power to the consumers and to the people here on the Island, the users of the power, sell the power at the same price, same cost as power delivered from the Upper Churchill?

PREMIER MOORES: No.

MR. NEARY: Did they make an offer to put a nuclear power plant on the Island of Newfoundland?

PREMIER MOORES: Would you allow me the floor for a moment?

MR. NEARY: I certainly will.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, not only did Brinco not mention it, the only people who have ever suggested that is the federal government and when they found out that we could not absorb a nuclear power plant in this Province, on the Island part of the Province -

MR. HICKMAN: In the system.

PREMIER MOORES: - they realized - in the system because the system could not stand it. When they had done their homework they realized that it could not be done either. But they were the only ones who ever suggested it to my knowledge.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my antenna is not too bad after all, fairly good. There was an offer to put a nuclear power plant on the Island of Newfoundland, deliver the power at the same price -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at the same price as the power costs from the Upper Churchill.

MR. DOODY: No.

MR. NEARY: In return, of course, for some rights in connection with the Lower Churchill.

MR. DOODY: The same sort of a sellout that you had in the Upper Churchill.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about a sell out. Sir, we are on the brink in this Province - and the hon. gentleman knows it full well - of the dirtiest, lowest, foulest sell out of hydro power in Labrador that we have ever seen. I am talking about the Lower Churchill and the rotten deal that is in the process at the moment. My antenna also picked that one up.

MR. DOODY: Where does your line go?

PREMIER MOORES: To the federal Liberal Leader.

MR. NEARY: We heard this afternoon, Sir, about the federal-provincial Crown Corporation.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are not serious.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I am serious. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman parades Mr. Roosevelt across the lobby of Confederation Building, bosom pals. What for? What were they talking about? The weather?

AN HON. MEMBER: World War II.

MR. NEARY: World War II. What about Ted Sorenson? Were you talking to him about World War II?

PREMIER MOORES: No, about the Kennedy administration.

MR. NEARY: Ah, and Mr. Hiatt and Mr. Kraft also talked about the Kennedy administration.

PREMIER MOORES: I never met Mr. Hiatt.

MR. NEARY: Never met Mr. Hiatt. Well, Mr. Hiatt knows all about the hon. gentleman. And Mr. Miller met the hon. gentleman. Mr. Miller was wine and dined by the hon. gentleman down at the Starboard Quarter.

PREMIER MOORES: I am sure he is a fine gentleman.

MR. NEARY: He certainly is. He is a fine, decent, successful, United States of America businessman, a fine gentleman. And if I was the hon. the Premier I would pay very strict attention to what

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Miller said in his affidavit that I tabled in this House yesterday and I am sure the hon. gentleman will.

But anyway, Sir, getting back to hydro development, Mr. Speaker, there is a number of things in this bill, Sir, that I do not approve of, that I have no intention of voting for and the main thing being that I am deadly opposed to putting any more power or any more authority in the hands of the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation. What we are doing is we are giving them authority to borrow \$400 million really, \$400 million without the approval of this legislature. We are giving them a blank check and I do not intend to tolerate it myself, Sir.

Now I was talking about that federal provincial Crown corporation that the Premier mentioned this afternoon. My impression of the Premier's answers to the questions put to him by the Leader of the Opposition is that the hon. gentleman unless I misunderstood, misinterpreted what the hon. Premier said this afternoon, that once that agreement is signed with the federal government and the one that the Minister of Mines and Energy said a year ago his administration would have nothing to do with,

MR. NEARY: told the federal government to go jump in the lake, that they did not want to have anything to do with them. And the hon. the Premier screws up his face. The hon. the Premier will remember me coming into this House and saying that the federal government did not want any equity, they did not want any profits from the Lower Churchill. And the Minister of Justice screwed up his face at the time, rolled his eyes and gazed heavenward, and the Minister of Mines and Energy said, 'No, go straight out and jump in the lake!' And now a year later, one year's delay, now they are finally going to come around and sign an agreement in a few days with the Government of Canada to set up this joint federal/provincial corporation. And what does it do? What does a Crown corporation do? Well, Mr. Speaker, from the answers I heard the Premier give the House this afternoon, it takes away the authority from the Legislature. This federal/provincial Crown corporation is going to be all-powerful. They are going to make the decisions on what is going to happen to the power of the Lower Churchill. They are going to decide where they are going to get the markets, whether Quebec will buy it, whether it will be sold in New York, whether it will be delivered in the Atlantic Provinces. They will decide, not the elected representatives of the people, not the Legislature of this Province, but this federal/provincial Crown corporation. And they will decide whether they are going to go out and borrow \$2.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. That is just making a shambles, Sir, out of this Legislature, out of this House of Assembly. Why, we may as well abolish the House, do away with the elected representatives of the people and let the

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland Hydro run the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: They are running it now.

MR. NEARY: They are running it now, my hon. friend says. Well, they are pretty close.

MR. F. ROWE: Between the Action Group and a few more.

MR. FLIGHT: And the Atlantic Council.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in Canada - in Newfoundland, I know, you have two or three governments, you have this administration, Newfoundland Hydro, C.B.C. and Memorial University -

MR. FLIGHT: The advisory group that they put together a few days ago.

MR. NEARY: - and the Action Group. You have five governments.

As I described Hydro last year, Sir, to the House, it is the Newfoundland Senate. It is where you put people who have failed in everything else, put them on the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation, the Newfoundland Senate.

MR. DOODY: What is wrong with the Senate?

MR. NEARY: The Senate, the Newfoundland Senate I am talking about. We have our own Senate. They are trying to abolish the Senate in Ottawa. Well, the Newfoundland Senate, which is Newfoundland Hydro, has just as many parasites as the one up in Ottawa.

MR. DOODY: I am sorry about that. I did not mean to bring you down.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is bound to happen on both sides.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: I just thought I would bring it up.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is all

I have to say about this bill, except to reinforce what my hon. friend said this afternoon about Buchans.

This government should be ashamed of themselves and should get their rear ends kicked for the way they have treated

Buchans in this Hinds Lake development. They set up a task force that cost the taxpayers of this Province

\$200,000 -

MR. FLIGHT: Plus.

MR. NEARY: - plus. And here is a development

going on right on their doorstep and they will not build

eight or ten miles of road to give the people of Buchans

where a mine is going to be closed, 500 people are going

to be economically marooned in three months time and they

will not build eight or ten miles of road to give the people

access to the jobs on that project.

MR. FLIGHT: It is madness, boy! Madness!

MR. NEARY: But they will give Craig Dobbin

a \$4 million or \$5 million contract to fly helicopters

around so Charlie Pride can be taken aloft with a portable

bar.

MR. FLIGHT: What is this telephone bill

for \$3,800 now?

MR. DOODY: Keeping it all.

MR. FLIGHT: That is plus the telephone bill.

We have to get that figure.

MR. NEARY: Is that so? My hon. friend

might be interested that I went back after that and got

re-elected twice. That is more than my hon. friend can

boast about.

MR. SIMMONS: He was elected twice.

MR. FLIGHT: It will be the last time.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not

going to get involved in that sort of thing.

MR. SIMMONS: He did not get a majority the last time.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right, did not get a majority. That is right, Sir.

MR. FLIGHT: A minority government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Hinds Lake development should be made accessible to the people of Buchans, no question about that. Why waste all this money on a task force? Why make promises to the people of Buchans? How cruel can an administration be? These people are going to be economically marooned. In three months from now they will be out of jobs, and

MR. NEARY: all they will have facing them, Sir, is unemployment insurance and then later on welfare. Not that this Government - this administration has not lifted one finger to help these people. Here is their chance with this Hinds Lake Development and they have neglected to do it - they have ignored the task force that was set up and the Minister is over there staring me down and I am getting nervous, and I am going to take my seat now, Sir, and

MR. SIMMONS: There are a few more of us yet to have a go at it.

MR. NEARY: Okay, fair enough, few more of them up to have a go at it yet.

And so, Mr. Speaker, if I had my way I am going to vote against this bill although there are one or two items in there that I would probably vote for if the bill was separated, if they were separate items.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you. I thank my colleagues on the other side.

What I noticed about the Minister was not that he was saucy, I say to my colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout), but that the Premier came up with a new arrangement. First he will have him barred in by the Minister of Forestry. He could not contain him alone so you get the Minister of Forestry on one side of him now and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs on the other side, and somehow they have managed to restrain him at least temporarily, and since then he has been relatively restrained, you notice these last three or four days.

The omnibus nature of this bill, the umbrella form it takes where it proposes amendments to four or five different pieces of legislation, raises certain suspicions, because the pattern in this House, with very few exceptions, has been to introduce the amendments to the several pieces of legislation individually. And for some reason in this case, the Government has decided to bring

MR. SIMMONS: in the omnibus bill to make all the amendments in one bill, and it seems to me the reason is quite obvious. There are a couple of fairly unpalatable matters in this that the Government is hoping we might vote for because it is tied to a couple of other items that are not nearly as unpalatable. Perhaps we will have to do it in Committee, Mr. Speaker; perhaps we will have to take care of them clause by clause in Committee, because as my colleague from Lapoile has said there are a couple of objectionable things in this bill such that it is difficult for us to vote for the bill as a whole unless it were separated into its various parts.

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot hear him?

MR. SIMMONS: No, it is not that I cannot hear, but I was just waiting for the Minister of Mines to finish so that I could get his ear for a minute. I meant finish his discussion with his coach in the back row there.

Now, will the Minister at some point, perhaps in closing debate, tell us why the - I said coach, I never said able coach. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister in closing debate would address himself to this business of the power distribution district. I know there is only one. I have never really understood why it is we need it even as it operates as a subsidiary of Hydro as I understand, but why the necessity of it other than the fact that it churns out some additional stationery and the customer gets his bill in the name of that entity rather than Newfoundland Hydro, but why the need for a separate bit of nomenclature there anymore. Is there a need now that all the PDD's have been consolidated into one?

Mr. Speaker, the part about the bill that I find most objectionable is that item, Clause 1(2) which would allow the corporation, the Hydro Corporation, to borrow up to \$200 million, this, of course, quite in addition to what it has borrowed up until now since the 1975 bill. The Minister in closing debate might want to tell us how much we are on the hook for now as a result of Newfoundland Hydro. There was a bill which passed this House in June, 1975, which

November 21, 1978

Tape 5317

GH-3

MR. SIMONS:

authorized aggregate borrowing up to \$200 million, and we have been told by the Minister this afternoon that that amount has just about been exhausted, I think all but about \$30 million.

MR. SIMMONS:

So since 1975 we know the Hydro Corporation has borrowed about \$170 million. This will give Hydro authority to borrow an additional \$200 million. Now the question is, what were we on the hook for prior to 1975 that has not yet been paid off? What liabilities, what debts do Hydro still have, what capital debts do Hydro still have which were incurred before that new authority was given in June, 1975? Then, Mr. Speaker, if you follow me we are talking about three separate figures. We are talking about whatever Hydro has now prior to the authority given in June, 1975 plus the \$170 million or so that accrued since June, 1975, plus the additional borrowing capacity it will have now of another \$200 million.

We know that these three figures add up to at least \$370 million, the \$170 million and the \$200 million. The question is, how much more than the \$370 million are we on the hook for or will we be on the hook for potentially. To what extent then will the amendment here enable Newfoundland Hydro to effectively worsen our debt position as a Province? Because after all it becomes part of the indirect debt of the Province. We are now giving to a group if we were to pass this amendment, giving to a group of people who are not answerable to the House of Assembly or to the electorate of the Province authority to worsen our debt position as a Province by an additional \$200 million. I think it is uncalled for. I do not know what the way around it is except that the kinds of developments that the Hydro Corporation is getting into are specific and one at a time, sometimes they follow in close sequence but one at a time. They are matters that the minister himself and his department are closely involved in obviously and I would like to see more of the borrowing authority stay with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and alternately with this House of course. With the Lieutenant Governor in Council it is once removed from the House. This method here has it twice removed from the House.

And a related question: How often do you see this wording come before the House? We had it in 1975. This is three years and

MR. SIMMONS:

three or four months since and we have it again. Can we predict that in eighteen months we will have another amendment providing for a further \$200 million? How far do you go in giving a group such as Hydro -

MR. J. CARTER: Would the hon. gentleman permit me?

MR. SIMMONS: Of course.

MR. J. CARTER: Does the hon. member not realize that all power production or something like over 90 per cent of all power production is done on borrowed money? This is the way power is produced. Power facilities are developed on borrowed money and that money is frequently rolled over when it comes due. Some people may regard this as unfortunate but this is the way all power production is done all over the world.

MR. NEARY: But it was wrong for Joey to do that but it was all right for you crowd to do it.

MR. J. CARTER: He did not care about bringing it back.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see.

MR. SIMMONS: That is all right 'Steve'. He wanted his day in court; he just had it. It is important that certain fellows get into the record or else their posterity will never be able to prove that they are in the House. We should take attendance here, Mr. Speaker, because then members like the member for St. John's North would not have to ask that kind of a question he just asked because the record would show he was here. But in lieu of that he has got to get up and get physically into the record by his yapping little interjections from time to time. And when he realizes that even the man who manipulates the mikes upstairs is ignoring him and his little red light never comes on, then he has got to get up. Yes he is reading the right book all right. He is reading the right book, the Book of Insults. Now if he only understood them, Mr. Speaker. If he only understood them.

The answer to his question, the question he put to me - he is ready for it - the answer is yes, I do realize. I also realize, Mr.

MR. SIMMONS:

Speaker, that his question has absolutely nothing to do with the concern that we are expressing here, that we are being asked now to give people down in Vic Young's fiefdom

MR. R. SIMMONS: some additional borrowing capability without any reference to this House. Now the hue and cry from the Tories when they were in Opposition was that this House had lost control over the big financial decisions that this Province had to make, that is was being made in Cabinet or behind closed doors and by Crown corporations and so on. Well, this bill symbolizes a new advance in that respect in that not only behind the closed door of Cabinet, but the closed door of a private-not a private, but a corporation that is not answerable to the public in the electoral sense of the term. They do not have to answer to any constituency. It is clear that from their immediate masters, the Cabinet, they have a blank cheque. They can do what they want, they can do no wrong and we on this side have tried to expose some of the inefficiencies of Hydro, some of the waste-fulness that goes on there and still it goes and nobody is taking any steps in government to do anything about it.

But our chief concern, Mr. Speaker, is about this large amount of money that a corporation which does not answer to this House directly is allowed to borrow and no effectively worsen the debt position of this Province by what looks like \$400 million to \$600 million, over \$500 million potentially. And then the minister, Mr. Speaker, has the gall in introducing this bill to tell the House it is a housekeeping bill, these were his words, 'A housekeeping bill,' the minister said, 'A housekeeping bill.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of housekeeping that has made this government a house of ill repute. Housekeeping bill! Housekeeping bill! This government in the name of housekeeping has literally prostituted itself before Crown corporations, almost Esau fashion sold its birthright, its responsibility to govern to non-electoral agencies such as Newfoundland Hydro. I think it is time it stopped and that is why we will be voting against the bill or certainly clause 1 (2) of it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in the time that is available on this bill. First of all the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has indicated that this is a borrowing in this House, authorization of borrowing without reference to the House, which is not really strictly correct because the House - it is now being referred to the House in this bill itself the fact that the government wishes to authorize Newfoundland Hydro to borrow \$200 million. Now prior to changes in policy and prior to changes in legislation that came before the House, there would not even have to be this bill for the purpose of the borrowing, prior to the policy adopted by the government and prior to the financial -

MR. NEARY: You are living in the past.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I realized one is forced by one's constituents when one is elected to listen to people and to feign respect for certain individuals but I do have the right, Mr. Speaker, to speak without interruption. I intend to ask for that right now.

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

The hon. member has requested that his right to speak without interruption be observed, and that is how it must be.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Before I get to what I want to say on this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like for it to be clearly understood that in no means am I agreeing or siding with what the Opposition said, and particularly the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), because it is well known that the individual concerned, and some of the individuals that were speaking, while they were in government were for the delegation of complete borrowing power and now they are against it when they are in Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition was -

MR. S. NEARY: Do you want to know why we are against it. The Minister of Justice (inaudible)

MR. W. MARSHALL:

was for the switching on of the power and now wishes to switch it off. Like the Opposition now is not for the sale of power outside of the Province of Newfoundland but sold away a large part of our birthright in the Upper Churchill. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I do point out that I have concerns about this particular bill
concern

MR. MARSHALL: and I would emphasize that I do not share the concerns of the Opposition. I have concerns about this bill -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member should not be interrupted. It is incumbent upon this Chair to enforce that. I would point out that in the past few days we have had hon. members speaking without interruptions from either side. It would appear to me, and indeed it is my consensus from hon. members on both sides, that they find that a much more conducive manner in which to debate issues and difference of opinion will be expressed, and hon. members will have an opportunity to debate but without interruptions one from the other. I do think that that is satisfactory for all of us on both sides.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to the \$200 million that has been borrowed, we are told that \$75 million of this is for the Hinds Lake development and \$45 million is for the Holyrood generation station - no, \$35 million. If these figures are correct, this leaves a cushion of about \$90 million. Now, it is incorrect for the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to indicate that the Board of Directors of Newfoundland Hydro can themselves borrow without reference to Cabinet, because I believe the act requires them to go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to get approval for any amount that they are borrowing. But I do draw issue, Mr. Speaker, with the cushion of \$90 million. I think it is very essential that the legislature not lose any control whatsoever of the amounts that are being borrowed when you consider the amounts of the borrowing in this Province from time to time. The last bill that was put through in 1975, as I recall, was for \$200 million and, if my memory serves me correct, at that period of time a fair amount of that was contemplated to have to be dedicated towards the development of the Lower Churchill as it was envisaged at that particular time. And the Government

FR. MARSHALL: addressed itself to that particular borrowing and these borrowings requirements, and as a result of that explanation that was given, \$200 million was voted to allow them to borrow. We now have the situation where \$200 million has been asked for, \$110 million is specifically accounted for, one, as I say, for the Hinds Lake development, \$75 million of it, and \$35 million for the Holyrood generating station. Now, I have a certain amount, as I say, of misgivings with respect to this legislature authorizing the borrowing, be it by a crown corporation or be it by the Cabinet, of an amount in excess, an amount for which there is no specific reason given for the borrowing other than, as I understand it, this is to be used for a cushion and it is to be used for future needs of Hydro. Now, I have no doubt that the Hydro needs that. It will not be - you know, I have no doubt that it will not be spent unless for very good reasons, but that is not the point. I think that the public debt is mounting to such a degree in this Province that it does not get the serious consideration that it ought to receive. We have had views expressed in this House with which I draw issue, particularly with the member for St. John's West (Dr. H. Kitchen), the hon. member for St. John's West, who is not now present in the Opposition who talks about \$150 million and he says "What is that? That is not much. It is only \$300 for every person in Newfoundland - for every man, woman and child in Newfoundland." But the fact of the matter is the public debt is now at the stage of probably \$7,000 to \$8,000 for every man, woman and child and it is that particular psychology that results in the debt being mounted.

So, to borrow money without their being any specific objective in mind - as I say, I had no doubt it will be borrowed wisely. Unlike the members of the Opposition, I have a good deal of confidence in the Board of Directors of Newfoundland Hydro, and particularly in the present Chairman, and if there is any minister that I have confidence in I certainly have a great measure of confidence in the Minister of Mines and Energy and know

MR. MARSHALL:

that he will be quite sure that the cushion, as I refer to it, the \$90 million when it is borrowed is borrowed only if it is needed.

MR. SIMMONS: The remaining cushion is identified, another \$30 million cushion that the minister has admitted is unborrowed from the first \$200 million, the \$75 million -

MR. MARSHALL: That is not my interpretation. My interpretation of the bill is that there is \$200 million now and whatever was authorized to be borrowed before has now been cut off. We start off now with \$200 million and of that \$200 million - I beg your pardon?

MR. DOODY: I think most people have grasped that.

MR. MARSHALL: Well it is here in 35 (1) of the bill. So you know you have a \$90 million cushion.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is the same as the Loan Bill, the same principle.

MR. MARSHALL: And as I was saying and you know, I mean this, if there is any minister of the government whom I would, you know, feel safe in entrusting the borrowing of this \$90 million and ensure that it is spent wisely and that it is justified, I would repose confidence in the Minister of Mines and Energy. But that really is not the point. The point of the matter is that there should not be any monies that are borrowed by this government or by any Crown corporation or by any agency of the government unless the same is justified by the government, is justified before the Legislature. And the question comes as to what justification is necessary. What is the type of justification? When you come in and you say, I need \$75 million for the Hinds Lake Development, the Hinds Lake development has been announced and the nature of the Hinds Lake development the public is fully cognizant of it and aware of it, then and in that event perhaps there is enough information available with respect to that amount.

MR. MARSHALL:

When you come to the \$35 million for the addition to the Holyrood generating station, that is another reason and another valid reason as well. But to say \$90 million of a cushion that you are going to give to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, maybe the minister when he gets up to close the debate can give more and fuller details as to why this \$90 million is required. But if it is just general, for the purpose of allowing normal expansion as determined by this Crown corporation from time to time I wonder whether or not, you know, this affords sufficient justification. It is tied in, my whole comments are tied in to my concern with respect to the authority of this legislature or any authority or checks and balances, as it were, on all Crown corporations of this Province, that are owned by this Province.

We seem to have very little control over the expenditure of money. To a large extent the Legislature as it operates as a mode of investigating the expenditure of money in the estimates themselves seems to be somewhat very, very irrelevant and not of too much utility or benefit to the general public. But even more so is the device of the Crown corporation which seemingly is allowed to go on its own way from time to time with even less justification than is afforded to the expenditures of government which are directly made from time to time.

MR. NEARY: The Labrador Linerboard would be a good example of that.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I am not talking about the Labrador Linerboard. I will draw issue with the hon. member on the Labrador Linerboard and the hon. member's desire with his affidavits and what have you in due course and the facts that the hon. member continually springs up for reasons that are only inherent in the hon. member. I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to debate with the hon. member at this time or at any time, to enter into a direct debate with him. I am talking about another subject on which I have been consistent as opposed to the hon. member when he was on this side of the House.

MR. MARSHALL:

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as I say, and I would ask the minister what safeguards are available with respect to this \$90 million. What references will be made to the Cabinet before this \$90 million is allowed to be expended? What references will be made to the Legislature with respect to this \$90 million rather than the ex post facto references that may be made through the filing of the public accounts? Because I think it is

Mr. Marshall: extremely essential that government get control of the operation and management of crown corporations and I do not quite frankly see that giving it a cushion, as it were, of \$90 million is going to result in this control being established in the manner that it ought to be. It is a matter of concern because when we look at the loan bill, for instance, with respect to the government itself, we have a loan bill that was passed authorizing the borrowing -

MR. SIMMONS: Do you have any control of your backbenchers?

MR. MARSHALL: The control of the backbenchers is exhibited but not to the same and subservient degree as it was about eight years and before that. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter, as I say, to me of very real concern, how we are supposed to be able to control the crown corporations and that, as I indicated, when the loan bill was passed, it went through yesterday, there was \$150 million that was authorized to be borrowed and if you look at that in relation to the authorized expenditures of the government, government expenditures of \$145 million were necessary. Therefore, the government gave itself a \$5 million cushion, which was reasonable. Now in this particular case, and maybe I am referring to it wrong, maybe the minister, when he gets up to close the debate and give greater and more specific details with respect to that \$90 million, but at the present time it would appear that whereas we are giving a \$5 million cushion to the Executive Council of the Cabinet, which is a reasonable cushion, we now appear to be giving a \$90 million cushion to the Newfoundland Hydro. As I say I will be interested in the comments the minister makes in closing the debate but would reiterate I have a great deal of reservation in giving to any crown corporation a cushion of this magnitude and size without further and better details and without, in fact, the necessity of the expenditure being debated in much greater

MR. MARSHALL: detail and with much more rationale than we can in the time available to us in the House at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly to state that I for one will vote against this bill and I vote against this bill not because I want in any way to jeopardize any legitimate means for the provision of power or employment to the people of this province, but I vote against it because it is quite obvious that this administration attempts and has in the past, and I am afraid will in the future as long as they are there, attempt to use crown corporations and the like where they can pawn people off when it is convenient for them to say "Well, it is not in our hands, they are an independent group," and so on, which is absolute nonsense. This is what I was referring to in the House the other day when I said that I felt that every crown corporation, every group that is presently getting monies from the government should be thoroughly investigated to see how much wastage and bureaucratic build up there is. I do not look upon anything as holy writ with Crown corporations because it was set up ten, fifteen, twenty years ago or whenever, does not mean that it is functioning the way it should. And we are all aware of bureaucratic build up.

Now the other thing, bearing in mind the fact that the government uses often times Crown corporations for their own benefit, and in view of what the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has stated that there very well could be a \$90 million cushion in there, and in spite of the fact that I have no particular doubts or

MR. NOLAN: to cast any aspersions upon the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, what I am saying is we are dealing with the government that went, for example, a year past into Twillingate and made all kinds of promises to the people there, all kinds of them. This is not supposition on my part, it is a matter of record. And yet no member opposite stood up to mention that, misleading, dishonest arrogance. It is absolutely shocking.

So you expect me to then on the one hand have this group who deceived, misled innocent people in the district of Twillingate a year ago, and now you expect me as a member of this House to forget all and allow them through one of their Crown corporations to have a \$90 million cushion? You would have to be out of your skull, Mr. Speaker!

MR. NOLAN: Now I ask members of this House to think very carefully about this. All of a sudden people would apparently be concerned about Hinds Lake, employment, the people of Buchans and so on. Where was that concern three or four years ago? They were just as concerned, just as depressed then as they are now. I warn members of this House that what we are seeing here now and what we will continue to see in the next session is one of the greatest slush funds ever built up in this Province for the coming election.

MR. FLIGHT: It is starting now.

MR. NEARY: Retaliation.

MR. NOLAN: Never mind! The minister knows what I am talking about. And I am telling the members here in this House now, Mr. Speaker, that what we are seeing is an effort to buy the people again with their own money, such as the Fisheries Conference. I want the Minister of Fisheries to assure the members of this House and the people of this Province that the video tapes and shots used at that conference will not be used for any political purposes in the next election of the P.C. Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: I want the Minister of Fisheries to now state clearly where the money came from to pay for such video taping and PR efforts as he attempted to use in a most scandalous fashion.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: All for the benefit of the fishermen?

MR. FLIGHT: No.

MR. NOLAN: I am really surprised. As a matter of fact, I do not believe the Minister of Fisheries was responsible for it, I will go so far as to say that. I cannot believe that he was directly responsible.

MR. RIDEOUT: Who is using whom?

MR. F. ROWE: What are you pointing at me for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) has difficulty continuing his remarks.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
We are now seeing the beginning of plans to finance projects building up to the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: It is not concern for the people at Hinds Lake or out in Buchans. No way! It is not concern for the people of Twillingate who were promised so much largess only a year ago and there are members on the opposite side of the House who say, 'Oh, well, I do not know anything about that.' Well, what party do they belong to? The fact is you are going to see funds spent in the next year. Even if the Linerboard mill is given away, what difference does it make when people in Stephenville are desperate to save their homes, to get jobs for their families? What is the motivation? The motivation is for a desperate crew to try to hang on to the Ship of State which they have almost broken in two in the last seven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: We have witnessed one of the most scandalous administrations this Province has seen since the fishing admirals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: And the Minister of Industrial Development grins and smirks his way through the whole effort.

AN HON. MEMBER: What have you got against 'Admiral Peckford'?

MR. NOLAN: 'Admiral Peckford' is alright as an individual.

MR. SIMMONS: It is the company he keeps that is the problem.

MR. NOLAN: If anybody thinks for one minute that the Linerboard mill and the Come By Chance refinery are going to all come onstream in this particular year principally because of the skill and economic knowledge of those opposite, they are out of their minds. This is coming about now, including the fisheries programme, to try to fit in with the grand and glorious scheme to convince the people of Newfoundland that this crowd have a heart. Well, they are going to have some convincing to do.

MR. RIDEOUT: They did not have a heart in November, 1975.

MR. NOLAN: The people who have been shafted since the last election remember what we had in 1975 - blasting on both sides of the Straits; Petro-Chemicals were going to go into Come By Chance, that was in 1975 during the election. Now after that we hear blaming of the federal government, blaming of the Arabs, blaming of John C. Doyle, blaming of John Shaheen, the blaming of everyone under the sun. When anything goes wrong this crowd are over there washing their hands. But when everything is right, even if it comes from the federal government or

Mr. Nolan: even if it came from the Holy Ghost they would try to take credit. It is a scandalous display that we have seen, a heartless, vicious administration that I have ever seen in the last seven years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: - playing with the emotions and the real needs of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: And now you would like for me as an individual to vote \$200 million. Let us get to the Newfoundland Hydro: here you have a situation now in Newfoundland Hydro - I would love very, very much, and I have not always been kind to the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, I would love for the officials of Newfoundland Light and Power to be able to tell the real story of the wholesale blackmail that they must be exposed to because they are the retailer, they are the ones that have to come in and increase rates and so on. But who is the producer of power? Who is the wholesaler? It is Newfoundland Hydro. And if Newfoundland Light and Power, the shareholders for that matter and the management, do not keep in line they are going to have their economic throats cut; it is as simple as that. Newfoundland Hydro is the one that is playing the tune on the instructions of this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: And let us stop clowning around with the whole deal. I will not vote for this bill. There is no way in God's world anybody could.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: Because I believe it is a corporation that is being used and used very, very badly against the people and the best needs of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. minister now speaks he closes the debate.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. gentlemen opposite and gentlemen on this side of the House who have spoken on the amendments contained in this bill. I thank them for their advice and their suggestions. First of all, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) just let me mention and respond to a number of concerns that the hon. member had. The hon. member seems to think that I and a number of my colleagues, but I particularly am against trying to help the people of Buchans. Not only am I against trying to help the people of Buchans I had deliberately gone out of my way, and the hon. gentleman used the word 'deliberate', gone out of my way to ensure that the people of Buchans are scraped from any opportunity or any possibility to get jobs in Hinds Lakes or to get jobs anywhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I as one individual, as one citizen of this Province, take except to those kind of comments. I am just as concerned about the people of Buchans as I am about the people anywhere else in the Province, in that anything I can do to enhance their opportunities for employment, for advancement, for progression, for social welfare then I will do it. I will go to any parts of the Province to do it. That is a different thing, Mr. Speaker, than saying that we must expend millions of dollars additional on the power project in order to provide an access to that project for the people of Buchans. It is a different thing altogether, because there are so many things in this world today and in government today you are damned if you do and you are damned if you do not. So you try to bring on power at the cheapest possible rate because the consumers are shouting out that the electricity is costing too much, at the same time then you must try to protect your flanks, and those people who say that they must have first call on employment opportunities and first call on all access to any work that is to be done on that project. So it is a very difficult road to walk down. It is a very difficult path to follow. On the one hand to keep the price of

Peckford: electricity down, and on the other hand expend additional sums over and above what is necessary in order to provide a preference for a certain segment of the population. It is a difficult road and I appreciate the hon. member's comments. I understand the frustration that he has. I understand that from the point of view of being on the opposite side of the House he can then make statements which if he were on this side of the House he would not be able to make, in my view. I understand that. That is part of his job to oppose. That is part of his job to try to prove to the people of Buchans that he is out there on the front lines with all hands going to try to help alleviate some of the problems that they have. That is his job and I appreciate it. But I see it in that context, and not simply in the context that we must just go open the floodgates and go out of our way for any one part particular part of the Province.

The Bay d'Espoir area, as the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) knows, has got a pretty, pretty serious unemployment problem, really serious. And add to that when it comes to Bay d'Espoir as opposed to Buchans a very highly qualified group of men who have worked on power projects over the last decade, as a matter of fact right now at Hinds Lake there are over twenty people from Bay d'Espoir working at Hinds Lake because of their expertise. Now, you know, the hard crunch comes then if you take a person from a depressed area called Bay d'Espoir or do you take a person from a depressed area, Buchans, and where is the saw off there when nine times out of ten the guy from Bay d'Espoir is going to be able to prove to you that, you know, I have more experience on power projects than the gentleman from Buchans? I mean these are the hard facts that employers have to contend with that

MR. PECKFORD:

Canada Manpower has to contend with. We negotiated for quite some time with Canada Manpower in order to get the Grand Falls office accomodating requests from the Central Newfoundland area so that we could reflect in the hiring practices altogether some Central Newfoundland bias there as well as having the Western Newfoundland. It is a funny thing, Mr. Speaker; the most phone calls that I got or my department got or Newfoundland Hydro got or McNamara got came from the West Coast because they were saying there is no preference. "You told us a lie when you were out here for three public meeting, you are telling a lie, you are not hiring people from the West Coast. You are hiring them from Central Newfoundland and other parts of the Province and you have told us a lie, you are being untrue, those things in the tender documents meant nothing" And so we had to go out of our way to prove that forty-four people were now working from Howley on Hinds Lake and seventy-seven people from the Hampden, Jackson's Arm and around fifty to eighty people from Deer Lake and twenty to thirty people from Bay d'Espoir and so on to prove to the people of the West Coast - that is not to say to anybody from Bay of Islands of any consequence no great numbers are on yet until it builds up to the 800. So it is a big problem and it is not an easy one to deal with and that is all I will say as it relates to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchan's (Mr. Flight) concern as it relates to Hinds Lake. I understand them, appreciate them but I would like for him to know and would like for it to go into the record that I am just as concerned about the plight of the people of Buchans as any other member of this House.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in his usual style said very little but spoke for a long while and there is really nothing new in what the hon. member had to say from what he said in the House over the last three or four years as it relates to amendments to bills for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

MR. PECKFORD:

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir

(Mr. Simmons) brought up a number of points of interest I thought which are worthy of comment. One has to deal with the need for PDD and on that score we are now looking at changing that because the hon. member is correct. All the PDDs are together and we no longer need a vehicle through REA to put the money in there and we are looking at now just making it as a part of Hydro. But the whole key to it now is that the people who are in PDD, as the hon. member knows, are the retailers of power as opposed to the wholesalers of power in the rest of Newfoundland Hydro where they are more project orientated. Why PDD is just getting out the bills and the maintenance and the inspection up until now, that sort of thing. But the hon. member is correct and we are looking at changing the structure to not call it anything really but just be a part of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD:

That is right. Exactly. That is the difference

that the hon. member is referring too. But I also agree with him that it can be blended in there and just have it as a division which is a retail division rather than have it serve somewhere off on paper in any case and a number of other legislation dealing with it.

The second point that the hon. member from Burgeo- Bay d-Esvoir (Mr. Simmons) mentioned was what was the debt prior to 1975. We are looking at Bay d'Espoir, we are looking at the start of Holyrood, we are looking at the new transmission system around the Island and it comes to somewhere near \$400 million in round figures - do not hold me to the exact amount but around that-and we went another \$200 million then from 1975 until now. So we are looking at somewhere around \$600 million right now. The concern that everybody has, most members of the House, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) which is familiar territory to him, familiar ground, his stand as it relates to the level of borrowing that we are allowing under this act to give to Newfoundland Hydro. I can only say this, Mr.

MR. PECKFORD:

Speaker, and I think it is a very legitimate concern and I think I would be less than honest if I said I am not as minister concerned about this at all because I am concerned about it. I must say that right off the top, number one. I think all members of the House have a right to be concerned when we are giving authority of this magnitude to a corporation, a Crown corporation. But if I can just for a few minutes be specific: The \$200 million we are talking about now - we already mentioned the \$75 to \$80 million on Hinds Lake - why do I say \$75 million? Why do I not say \$80 million? Why do I not say \$75 million? Why am I bouncing over \$5 million? Simply because you do not know the final costs until all the contracts have been awarded and all the work has been done because then there could be overruns. On a \$75 million project it is not unusual to get a \$5 million overrun. Hence it could be \$80 million, it could be \$82, it could be \$76, it is somewhere in that neighbourhood. You must leave flexibility in there because you are not sure exactly how it is going to come in so we are looking at that right off the top. We are also looking at around \$30 million,

MR. PECKFORD: approximately \$30 million to complete Holyrood. You are looking at \$100 million right there, and perhaps more. Then add to that, Mr. Speaker, which is a legitimate defence, if you give Hydro under this act only \$100 million or so which they have to borrow in issues, you are not leaving them any flexibility at all to go to the market after they have borrowed that \$100 million for specific projects when the market is ripe. And they are looking at now not borrowing any less than \$40 million. They are in the \$40 million range of borrowing every time now they go the market. They have absolutely no flexibility. Right now they have very little flexibility because they want to go for a \$40 million one and there is less than \$40 million available to them under the old loan act. And so therefore they are doing short term borrowing, and Mr. Speaker, the result is that it is costing Newfoundland Hydro more because they cannot go long term under the act. It is costing them more. It is costing every citizen of the Province more money because we have not given them the proper flexibility right now to go and borrow long term in the capital markets. So we are paying a penalty.

So, you know, there are good points to it and there are bad points, and the good point to it, the advantage to it is that by giving them flexibility to go long term we can save money. It is cheaper money for us. Okay. So three points, \$75 million, \$30 million approximately around \$10 million \$115 million.

Number three, flexibility saves us money. Number four, we are also looking at another project besides Hinds Lake. We are not looking at it vaguely. We are not looking at it in general terms. We are not throwing it out for a foolish matter. It is not a red herring. The final design cost work is being done on another Hydro project on the Island which

MR. PECKFORD: we must give yes or no answers to in '79 and all indications are that the answer has to be yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: That is right because we will not be in position to project release anything in Labrador and be sure of an in feed in the year in which we are going to need power next after Hinds Lake. So it looks like another on Island Hydro. How much? Another \$80 million or \$90 million.

Then add to that number five, a fifth reason for it; we are looking at our capital budget for next year as it relates to "small" projects around the Province which will be a part of Hydro's capital budget, PDD's capital budget, diesels we have to buy, major improvements we have to make in a whole whack of communities which comes out of our capital funds.

MR. DOODY: Number four.

MR. PECKFORD: What number was that?

MR. DOODY: Five.

MR. PECKFORD: That is five. Number six, on base ten -

PREMIER MOORES: You need more money.

MR. DOODY: I am with you on five. Five, carried.

MR. PECKFORD: Number six is this, all the borrowings under this \$200 million have to go through Cabinet so there is that safeguard as well somebody mentioned.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Well it was mentioned by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) once removed, twice removed, and now it is back to once removed rather than twice removed. So that is an improvement. That is an asset. So that therefore for all of these reasons I am half tempted to ask for an amendment to increase it from \$200 to \$250 but I will not, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it as it is and I trust that I have answered the question satisfactorily.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Act, 1975, The Electrical Power Control Act, The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro (Loan And Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975, The Newfoundland And Labrador Rural Electricity Act, And The British Newfoundland Corporation Limited (Lower Churchill River Lease) Act, 1966/67," (Bill No. 88), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Order 11. Bill No. 57.

Motion, second reading of a bill,

"An Act Respecting An Increase In Certain Pensions". (Bill No. 57).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I will not take long, and my comment on this bill really can apply to all the pension acts. This is to ratify what was contained in the Budget Speech, the increase in pensions to public servants. They are already being paid,

MR. HICKMAN: and it gives authority to pay a 5 per cent increase as announced in this year's Budget Speech the increase provides for an award of \$240,000 a year or 5 per cent whichever is greater up to an individual maximum of \$600 per year. This is only the public service pensions are used in calculating this increase and other incomes such as old age security, Canada pension, private pensions are not taken into consideration for the purpose of our pension increases. I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions", read a second time, ordered, referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 18, Bill 59.
Motion second reading, a bill, "An Act To Amend The War Services Pensions Act 1975" (Bill No. 59).

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House for the said bill to be read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The War Services Pensions Act 1975", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 23, Bill 85.
Motion, second reading, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Services Pension Act". (Bill No. 85).

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House for the said bill to be read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Services Pension Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 38, Bill No. 82.

Motion, second reading, a bill

"An Act To Provide For The Payment Of Accelerated Pensions To Employees Of The Government Of Newfoundland Transferred To Services Of The Government Of Canada At The Date Of Union."

(Bill No. 82).

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House for the said bill to be read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Payment Of Accelerated Pensions To Employees Of The Government Of Newfoundland Transferred To Services Of The Government Of Canada At The Date Of Union." ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 19, Bill No. 64

Motion, second reading, a bill, "An Act To Provide For Change Of Name". (Bill No. 64).

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House for the said bill to be read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For Change Of Name", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 26, Bill No. 68.

Motion, second reading, a bill "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act." (Bill No. 68.)

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House for the said bill to be read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act", read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

November 21, 1978

Tape 5327 (Night)

DW - 3

MR. HICKMAN:

Order, 27, Bill No. 70.

Motion, second reading, a bill

"An Act To Amend The Management Accountants Act." (Bill No. 70).

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the pleasure of the

House for the said bill to be read a second time. Those in
favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act
To Amend The Management Accountants Act.", read a second
time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House
presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Order 29.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act," (Bill No. 73).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act," (Bill No. 73), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Order 28.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act," (Bill No. 67).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act," (Bill No. 67), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Order 30.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospital Insurance (Agreement) Act," (Bill No. 86).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

I would like to explain that one.

That was one of these situations where the Government of Canada brings in a programme that we avail of right away and then they come back and we have to make it retroactive in order to take advantage of it.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospital Insurance (Agreement) Act," (Bill No. 86), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 35.
Motion, second reading of
a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act,"

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
take a moment on this bill, Sir, if I may.

We are talking about the
Registry of Deeds down here, Mr. Tessier. Well, Sir,
I have to say this that I believe that with the volume of
work down there in the Registry office that Mr. Tessier
is entitled to a deputy, to an assistant.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is overworked.

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is why
I am supporting the bill. Because I have occasion probably
moreso than any other member of the House to use the
Registry office for one reason or another in the process
of carrying out my research from time to time and I know
how overworked that particular individual is, Sir.
And I am glad to see that finally the minister is taking
steps to see that Mr. Tessier gets an assistant.

On motion, a bill, "An Act
To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act," (Bill No. 78),
read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of
the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 12.
Motion, second reading of
a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration (Vital Statistics)
Act," (Bill No. 58).

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the
Minister of Health might take a minute here just to fill
us in on what is happening to the administration of

MR. SIMMONS: this division so far as
the dispensing of birth certificates is concerned.

Perhaps the minister did not hear me. People all over this Province are having an immense amount of difficulty getting birth certificate requests filled and it is taking many, many months.

I inquired of the minister about a year ago and he assured me that they had a bottleneck at that time, but that it would be taken care of in due course. I understand from members on both sides of the House that they are still getting a number of inquiries, as I am, on this subject, where it is taking up to five and six months to have a request for a copy of a birth certificate responded to by the Division of Vital Statistics.

Now I wonder would the minister indicate what the problem is and if this bill is in any way going to facilitate its solution?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had some difficulty over a number of years in trying to meet the demands of people who want to obtain registration of births and the existing system, as all hon. members must know, is a pretty cumbersome one and this past year has proved to be more cumbersome than normal because of the great demand made by different people, brought about by the requirements of the federal government and it is not in a disparaging way at all but in terms of the federal government requirement for new registrations under social security demands.

This bill we hope, Mr. Speaker, will be able to streamline the whole operation and I might say, for the information of hon. members, that we are up to date in the department in terms of the backlog and one of the most discouraging parts of the whole operation was when people came in, went through the registration of births, through our registry, provided all the information which was necessary then found after waiting for hours they had to go upstairs to the cashier and pay their \$2.00 and come back with the receipt and stand in line again. We are correcting that procedure as well by the installation of a cash register within the registry whereby people only have to stand in line once, obtain their certificate and pay for it and so on and so forth.

There was a tremendous bottleneck but it is just about up to date now and we think from here on -

MR. HICKMAN:

It has cooled down a lot.

MR. H. COLLINS:

- we will have it streamlined to the extent that one will be able to pick up a birth certificate almost instantaneously.

MR. SIMMONS:

Is there a gap in the records of the department? I am thinking of a gap of some years past, perhaps

MR. SIMMONS: due to a fire or some occurrence before the turn of the century. Is there some kind of a gap in terms of the birth records of older people and if so could the minister, either now or undertake to find out what the dates of that gap are?

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there has been a number of problems in terms of older people who were registered through the church registry who were required to submit information to the department and for some reason or other sometimes the registrations were not completed to the extent that forms were sent in and the registry was completed, when they went back to the churches, I am not sure if there were fires or for whatever reason, but there was some difficulty. Some years ago, four or five years ago, an amendment to the regulations was made whereby people even though the proof could not be established at the church level affidavits could have been taken which would permit the person still to come in and prove to us that he or she was born on some particular date.

I believe that we have gone through most of those unfortunate circumstances and in the event that there is some hon. member who still has that problem, certainly the people in the department have been sensitized to the need to be compassionate and deal with it properly and the minister certainly has been most willing to also pay particular attention to that particular problem and do what we can for it.

MR. SIMMONS: Before the minister finishes, is he saying that he can on occasion, or his department can on occasion, issue a birth certificate on the basis of affidavits?

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that has been done. It is not always the case because we also find that sometimes there

MR. H. COLLINS: have been affidavits taken and affidavits following that when we try to combine the two and confirm it, there has been some difficulties. I suspect I know a particular case to which the hon. member alludes. There is not much we can do about that yet. Whatever we do in that respect is in the best interest of the person who is applying.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration (Vital Statistics) Act," (No. 58), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 15. Bill No. 62.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Facilitate Metric Conversion," (Bill No. 62), be no read a second time.

MR. NEARY: Metric conversion.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Is the pleasure of the House that the said bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye".

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is a question really, and I think this might be the opportune time to do it since this bill is under the name of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment. Maybe the Minister of Justice, the Government House Leader might like to a minute and tell us in view of all of the environmental and consumer problems that we have in the Province whether or not the present minister is going to make his appearance in the Chamber any more? And since he said publicly over the airwaves a day or so ago that he has no intention of coming here anymore whether or not the Premier has any intention of replacing him immediately so that we can have a minister, a full time minister responsible for this particular department not have to have somebody else put through his bills for him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am glad my hon. friend raised that; it slipped my mind, we were talking about it the other day, Sir. The Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment has stated publicly that he has no intention in this world of associating with the members of this House. He said they are not fit to associate with. The Minister of Justice, the Premier, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Social Services are not fit to associate with, so the hon. gentleman has made a public statement that he is going to withdraw himself from the House.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I agree with him there.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if he is going to opt out of society or not. I know the climate is getting kind of cold in this Province right now and Florida is starting to look pretty good.

Mr. Neary: But I believe, Sir, in all seriousness, that my hon. friend has a very valid point -

MR. RIDEOUT: I would remind him of Standing Order 80 .

MR. NEARY: - that if the hon. gentleman has resigned, and he has made a statement publicly which can be interpreted as a resignation, then his salary, his minister's salary and his sessional indemnity or whatever else he is entitled to should cease as of that date, and the Premier should not waste a moment longer in appointing a Minister of Consumer Affairs in this Province. As my hon. friend indicated, we have consumers in this Province crying out for help and we have a Minister of Consumer Affairs who has so much contempt for the House of Assembly and his colleagues that he does not think that they are fit to associate with, and he has withdrawn himself from the House. So his pay should be cut.

MR. RIDEOUT: Refer to Standing Order 80.

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

MR. HICKMAN: I realize this has got nothing to do with metric conversion.

MR. DOODY: I tell you one thing, you will never convert Murphy whatever else you will do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: In any event, it is my understanding that the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, who has served this Province as well or better than anyone I can think of, and if any hon. gentleman wants to lose favour with the eleven or twelve electoral seats in the City of St. John's, I would challenge him to suggest that because the Minister of Consumer Affairs who has been attending his duties but whose health is not as strong as it used to be -

MR. NEARY: Well, he should have said that.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the whole point.

MR. NEARY: He said his colleagues were not fit to associate with.

Mr. Hickman: I am sure that the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs does not mean that. But in any event if he does mean it it truly makes me sorry because I find him to be an outstanding Newfoundland gentleman, an outstanding Newfoundland statesman who is entitled to every solidary nickel that he has earned in the public service of this Province.

MR. NEARY: The member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) and the member for Placentia East (Mr. Patterson) -

MR. HICKMAN: I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): It is the pleasure of the House that the said bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay" carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Facilitate Metric Conversion", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave (Bill No. 62).

MR. HICKMAN: Order 6, Bill No. 45.
Motion, second reading, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act."

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 45).

MR. HICKMAN: Order 24, Bill No. 71.
Motion, second reading, a bill "An Act To Amend The Department of Forestry and Agricultural Act, 1973". (Bill No. 71).

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill to be read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay" Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Forestry And Agricultural Act ", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 4, Bill No. 44.
Motion, second reading, a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Detention Of Intoxicated Persons Act, 1973."
(Bill No. 44)

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill to be read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Detention Of Intoxicated Persons Act, 1973 ", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 8, Bill 46.
Motion, second reading, a bill,
"An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act." (Bill No. 46.)

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act ", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 9, Bill No. 47.
Motion, second reading, a bill,
"An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act." (Bill No. 47)

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Just a question or two with respect to this. Basically there are a number of things in the bill but one of the things that provides for an appeal of the mayors ruling which is probably a good thing and about time. I do not want to keep us very long but I would like to ask the minister whether or not it was considered to take away the power of the double vote. That is not in this bill and I wonder if that was given any consideration at all? The power of double vote.

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

MR. N.WINDSOR: That was basically based on the recommendations of the City of St. John's. It is a proposal to provide a mechanism whereby council can appeal on a point of order whenever the presiding officer, generally the mayor, rules on a point of order and a councillor disagrees with that, that council then has the right to appeal to the whole council who will without debate either uphold the decision or whater. It is much the same procedure as we use here in this House.

MR. WHITE: You did not consider the double vote?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill be read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion "An Act To Amend The St. John's Act ", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 21, Bill No. 83.

Motion, second reading, a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." (Bill No. 83)

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye" contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act ", read a second time, ordered referred

to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 13, Bill No. 60.
Motion, second reading, a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973." (Bill No. 60)

MR. NEARY: Hold on now, Mr. Speaker, Wait
until I get a gander at this.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is the one that provides for -

MR. NEARY: Is that the one where you beef up
the efficiency and make provision for more party hacks?

Is that the one?

MR. HICKMAN: No. It is a provision where we are
going to provide for a member of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation
to sit on the Liquor Licensing Board and vice versa.

MR. NEARY: Well, would that be a member of the
lounge society? They were advocating the other day that they wanted
somebody on it.

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NEARY: The brewers agents.

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NEARY: Okay. Do we have your word on
that?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Alright. Good enough.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House
that the said bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye",
contrary "Nay". Carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To
Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973 ", read a second time, ordered
referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 39, Bill No. 65.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, I have lost the order number.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 39. Bill No. 65.

Motion, second reading of a bill,

"An Act To Amend The Liquor Control Act, 1973," (Bill No. 65).

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

MR. NOLAN: I would like to know just exactly - and I have not gone through all the clauses here, I would assume from the clauses that I see that you are going to enlarge the board. Why? And who are the appointees? Where are they coming from?

MR. DOODY: The other board.

MR. NOLAN: The other board?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: You are just interchanging?

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Let us be honest about it; is this the Jim Mahoney Act?

MR. DOODY: I did not know Jim had an act.

MR. HICKMAN: He is not a member of the board.

MR. DOODY: Jim is not on the board. No. No.

It it just an interlocking of the two boards.

MR. PECKFORD: An interlocking, this is the other part of

MR. HICKMAN: It is the other part of the other bill, 'John'.

MR. PECKFORD: - the Liquor Licencing Board and the Liquor Corporation are going to interchange on membership.

MR. HICKMAN: I will answer it when the hon. gentleman -

MR. NOLAN: Do we have the answer to that on the membership? Are you enlarging the board or not?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NOLAN: No. Okay. Could you also tell us what

MR. NOLAN: board members are paid, and how much was paid to members in the calendar year 1977, '76 and so on, per year?

MR. WHITE: The Corporation and the Licencing Board.

MR. NOLAN: Okay, members, that includes expenses if any.

MR. HICKMAN Mr. Chairman, in closing this debate as I indicated on the other bill the main purpose of this bill apart from administrative and definition problems that we have been having is that the liquor corporation, which I might add the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation is an exceptionally well run organization and we can take some pride in the fact that other provinces rank us as ahead of them and that is in no small measure to the merchandizing approach that has been used in the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, under the leadership of Mr. Gregory Canning, C.A. He has to be good, the nephew, I understand -

MR. NOLAN: And even he is leaving.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, Well, he is like so many others that have come into the public service, recruited by National Sea Products and/or the Nickersons. And in one sense we hate to see -

MR. NEARY: Rollie Martin is going to have to find new hacks.

MR. HICKMAN: - we hate to see these gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, move out of the public service. We really do. On the other hand we do take a certain sense of pride out of the fact that it shows that in the public service of this Province we have been attracting very able people.

The members of the Board at the present time of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation are Mr. G. Sorenson, Mr. Dave Norris, the Secretary of Treasury Board, Mr. Gilbert Gill, C.A;

MR. HICKMAN: the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Wareham - what is the Wareham -

AN HON. MEMBER: Harold.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Harold Wareham, C.A., from Gander, Dr. Frederick Russell.

MR. NOLAN: He was the Tory candidate or aspired to be one.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right. On the Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Board, the Chairman is Mr. Cyril Banikhin, Mr. J. Haliburton, and Mr. William Morry, the president -

MR. NEARY: All political appointments.

MR. HICKMAN: I believe you are right, you know.

MR. NEARY: Haliburton and Bill Morry now and -

MR. HICKMAN: In any event, to answer the other question, it does increase by one the members of the board, but that will be taken up by putting - because it is very obvious that there should be a closer liaison between the two boards. So one member of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation will go on the Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Board, and vice versa.

I move second reading.

MR. NOLAN: How about how much is paid?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, Mr. Banikhin, who is a public servant -

MR. NOLAN: Tell us about Dr. Russell and Mr. Morey, How much do they get paid?

MR. HICKMAN: They get paid on a per diem. I cannot tell you the amount.

MR. NOLAN: The Minister of Finance does not know?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NOLAN: I mean this board is under his administration. Now how much are they paid? Let me just - to shorten the whole thing, will the minister undertake in the next sitting of

November 21, 1978

Tape No. 5332

NM - 4

MR. NOLAN:

the House -

MR. HICKMAN:

Yes. Yes. No problem.

MR. NOLAN:

- to provide us with a detailed list of how much was paid to each member of both boards in say the last three years. How much per year? And I am talking about expenses and salaries or stipends or whatever you call it. Is that fair?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. Those who are not public servants are paid on a per diem basis depending on whatever days they are called to sit.

MR. NEARY: You mean Dr. Russell is not volunteering his services?

MR. HICKMAN: To the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, that profitable organization? That would be like asking -

MR. NOLAN: Why do you not just lower the price of the booze to the poor guy? Remember the poor man's champagne?

MR. NEARY: God's gift to Newfoundland, you know.

MR. HICKMAN: I will get that for the hon. gentleman.

MR. FLIGHT: Before the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

MR. HICKMAN: Alright, before I take my seat.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Canning, the President of the Liquor Corporation's resignation has been in effect now, it is the public knowledge, for months and he, himself, has addressed himself to the fact he is leaving. Could the minister indicate who is going to take Mr. Canning's place? Has a successor been named at this point?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: No. As of today, a successor has not been named.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are waiting on 'Alex Hickman' (inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: No, and I can tell you that is not the procedure that was followed.

MR. FLIGHT: 'Ank' is not around now.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight),

MR. HICKMAN: but I will remind him of the public statement that was made on the date of Mr. Canning's resignation. A committee was appointed consisting of Kates, Peat, Marwick and Mitchell, Mr. Gregory Canning, C.A., Mr. David Norris, Secretary of Treasury Board and Mr. Gilbert Pike, the A.D.M. of Finance and one member of the board, to advertise for a successor to Mr. Canning. And I will say without any hesitancy at all that the recommendation of that Committee will be the next Chairman of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation.

MR. NOLAN: No interference.

MR. HICKMAN: No interference.

MR. FLIGHT: So who is going to get the job?

MR. HICKMAN: When the final recommendation comes in and the final decision is made, which has to be very soon - because I am not very happy with leaving - the board now has been without a chairman for two weeks.

MR. FLIGHT: Right.

So who is going to get the job? That is the question I am asking.

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot tell you that.

Order 39.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Control Act, 1973," (Bill No. 65).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Control Act, 1973," (Bill No. 65), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Order 22.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Require The Provision Of Facilities In Buildings For Physically Disabled Persons," (Bill No. 84).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. NEARY:

We do not have the bill.

MR. DOODY:

The bill was distributed during the last session and I am amazed that anybody could mislay it. It is a bill that - I certainly do not mind waiting for a few minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: ()
alright now?

Hon. members opposite

One of the objects of this bill is to try to help those people who are unfortunate enough to have to live like that. It has been overdue for quite a while and I do not pretend that all the answers to all the problems of the disabled are contained in this bill; however, it does give us an outline or a skeleton or at least the forum in which to operate to try to make facilities of the Province particularly in terms of access to public buildings, which this bill is all about, available to those people who are somewhat less fortunate than we are, I think primarily in terms of the wheelchair people.

As we go through other parts of Canada and see the telephone set at a low level in hotel lobbies or airports, and as we go into the washrooms and see the hand bars and so on, we tend to take them very much for granted, the wide door elevators and so on. For those people who are anxious to make their own way in life and who do not have the

MR. DOODY: opportunity because of their incapacity, these things are of vital importance to them. As a matter of fact, they are just as important to these people as roads and motorcars and the things that we take so very much for granted ourselves. In an effort to try to let this Province catch up with many of our counterparts in other parts of Canada, we have introduced this bill. The bill is best described, I guess, in clause (3) and it sets out the purpose of the bill very clearly. I do not know if the margin of your bill reads the same as mine if it does 'purpose' is spelled incorrectly and will have to be amended or perhaps it is amended already in the version that has been distributed to the members. The purpose of this act is to require that certain public buildings and apartment-type buildings in the province be constructed in such a manner that physically disabled persons will have entrances available for their use for lawful purposes as members of the public and have access made available to facilities that are provided within buildings for members of the public within apartment-type buildings or the guests of the residents generally. Of course it goes on to say then that it excepts various private homes, foster homes, boarding homes, lodging houses and so on except that type of accommodations which provides for ten or more boarders or lodgers.

There were some amendments which I would ask the Minister of Justice to move in this bill as we go along because we have been working with the Committee the Accessibility Action Committee on this bill and still do not think that we have got it completely conquered, completely cured. The bill really as I have said earlier, gives us the opportunity to put in the necessary regulations to make all the opportunities available to the people who need them. There is not much point in having a bill here that says that doors must be of a prescribed minimum width in meters and

MR. DOODY: corridors of a prescribed minimum width and so on unless these are spelled out and they will have to be spelled out in regulations. We have undertaken to work with the Accessibility Action Committee, they have given us certain recommendations so far which the Deputy Minister of Public Works working with his counterpart in the City of St. John's have looked at, they have examined various buildings around the Province and have looked at the regulations that have been suggested. They have made certain modifications that will be going back with them. One of the difficulties of course that we ran into is the fact that Newfoundland is not necessarily St. John's and many parts of Newfoundland are not necessarily the Royal Trust Building and so on and it is all very well to put in an insist that you have this sort of elevator or ramp or this sort of washroom facility and so on that might be very, very appropriate for St. John's or Corner Brook or Grand Falls or what have you and it may mean that some person with a two storey building in some small community may be incommoded or what have you because of this sort of legislation. And so we are trying to make life acceptable to both sides of the community those under the disability or the handicap of the necessity to have this sort of a facility available to them and at the same time try to remember the fact that there may be some small businessman putting in a small two storey building in some small community in Newfoundland to whom some of these regulations may not necessarily be sensible or reasonable. Most of the people who are most concerned with this recognize that problem and we have discussed it and I think we have pretty well conquered it. You just cannot do it on the basis of a one or two storey building unfortunately we have some of the new buildings in the St. John's area which are a two storey building theoretically and you can - like the Village Mall or the Avalon Mall and they are really just big sprawling

MR. DOODY: complexes which without access to the upper storey would be just as difficult for handicapped people to have access to as if it were a ten or twelve storey Royal Trust or Atlantic Place building and so what we are trying to work on regulations that would take a square footage into consideration rather than the height of the building.

Mr. Doody: I think that is the sort of thing that we have to get into place. We have a deadline in here saying that no person shall carry out any substantial reconstruction of a building after the 31st. day of December, 1978 unless provision is made to have the building comply with the requirements of the section in here, the section is Section (7). Then Section (7) indicates over a series of sub-paragraphs the sort of things that are necessary, but once again they are generalizations. The elevators, the washrooms, the ramps and so on, the telephones, and these things have got to be done by regulation, and I would hope that we can get the regulations in place by the 31st. of December. I see no reason why we should not because our people in Public Works and our people in Rehabilitation and Recreation, working with the Accessibility Action Committee, and there are people from the HUB and other areas, have done an awful lot of background work and it was really their initiatives in this area which brought us to the point that we are now. I am very grateful to them for bringing it forward. I rather feel that it would have been one of these neglected things that is very easily put on the shelf if it had not been pushed and pressed. But I am very happy, perhaps I am a little prejudice, but I am very happy to see it put forward. There is nothing in here for straight-legged people who cannot sit in CN buses, but I guess that will come later on when we get some of a -

MR. SIMMONS: Maybe we can get rid of the CN buses.

MR. DOODY: That is right. That is right. I cannot get rid of the straight leg I am going to have it for quite a while.

MR. NEARY: Do you have that problem in the government jet?

MR. DOODY: We do not have a government jet, that is another thing that I am against, but we will get that organized too under the new regime. You stay with us comrade we will even her up!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible). You are ahead now.

MR. DOODY: That is one thing about this new regime, Sir, all of us are equal although there are a few of us who are more equal than others.

Mr. Doody: I do not know very much more that I can add to this Act, I suppose to push it would be embarrassing to the people who need it, to press it too hard might be a bit maudlin. There are obviously, as I said in the beginning, many things in here that are necessary that are not covered and they are going to have to be done by regulation. Until the regulations are formulated and published perhaps the Act is not all that important. I think the spirit of the Act is very important and I am quite pleased to move second reading and I will be happy to answer any questions that I can on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I detected a certain amount of pride in the minister's tone as he introduced this particular bill, and I cannot say that I blame the hon. gentleman, Sir, because I think this is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this session of the House, and I congratulate the minister for having the wisdom and the foresight to bring this great reform before the House in the dying hours of this session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would secondly like to congratulate the Accessibility Action Committee, really the ones who are probably more responsible for having this piece of legislation before the House tonight than the minister or any other person in this Province. This piece of legislation only came about, Sir, after a lot of hard work, intensive research, the presentation of numerous briefs, meetings with two ministers, I believe. The Accessibility Action Committee had been meeting with one minister and had persuaded that particular minister on the wording of the legislation, and then lo and behold the Premier announced a change in the Cabinet and then the Accessibility Action Committee had to go and talk to a new minister and practically start all over again, start from scratch, although I have no doubt that they had some sympathy from the gentleman because of the reasons he gave a few moments ago, of not being able to

Mr. Neary: straighten out in a CN bus.

 And so, Sir, we have before us tonight, in my
opinion, a very worthwhile piece of legislation, very worthwhile
indeed. And all those who had anything at all to do with it, Sir,

MR. NEARY: are to be congratulated. We have no hesitation at all in supporting this bill but in so doing, Mr. Speaker, I want to express one little bit of concern that I may have about it and that is the minister's reference to the regulations, and the proclaiming of the act.

The minister should indicate, Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, should indicate to the House if his officials and if the department are going to press on now with the regulations because the act is no good, it is useless, it is worthless without regulations and too often, Mr. Speaker, in this House we have bills passed that involve the drawing up of regulations and the regulations are never drafted. And I am afraid, Sir, I am afraid that that could very easily happen in this particular case and I want the minister, when he is closing the debate, to indicate, or sort of put a time limit on it, set a critical path if you want, a time limit on the drafting of the regulations and the proclaiming of the act. This is the most important thing of all. Everything else is useless, Sir. People have worked hard night and day doing research, meeting with ministers, a lot of these people volunteers, trying to bring about a situation whereby the handicapped will live as normal a life as is possible, will become a part of the public, if that is the right way to put it, and live as close to a normal life as they possibly can. All that work will be in vain, it will be futile unless the minister is sincere in what he said and will press on and have the regulations drafted and have the act proclaimed.

I do not think there is anything else I can say about it, Sir, except I want on behalf of the members on this side of the House, to once again extend our sincere congratulations to all those people who worked so hard and who had so much input into the drafting of this legislation and seeing to it that it is brought before the House tonight, only about an hour probably before the House prorogues. It is

MR. NEARY: indeed a worthwhile piece of legislation and the kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that we like to see brought before this House. You could almost call it a great Liberal reform. I suppose, Sir, it is about as close as you can get to a Liberal reform and we are quite proud of it and we want to congratulate all those who had anything to do with it.

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

MR. NOLAN: Very briefly I would like to commend the minister and all those who were associated with him in bringing this bill forward. Just a couple of questions that occurred to me. The minister, as he indicated earlier, had this bill tabled some time ago, I do not know exactly what date, but since that time, for example, he has leased a considerable amount of space for public use, say, in Atlantic Place, what is the situation regarding Atlantic Place and accessibility?

MR. DOODY: All in accordance with this act.

MR. NOLAN: All in accordance with the act? Well, very good.

MR. DOODY: Some of the bids were disallowed because they were not in accordance with the act.

MR. NOLAN: Well, again I commend the minister.

Also, I am wondering to what extent it might be feasible to provide, perhaps, some tax alleviation? You would have to get co-operation from the federal government as well for any buildings that are presently built and some of them, department stores and so on that I can think of, are virtually inaccessible to those in wheel chairs and handicapped and so on, I am wondering if we could not induce those that have not been, perhaps, as sympathetic and as considerate as they should have been the past, again using the power of the dollar which is the only language some of them, I am afraid, understand, if we could not induce

MR. NOLAN: them to make some alterations and so on and even get a tax benefit as a result?

 There is another matter that occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, and it is this; that in some areas where you have regulations similar to this, people building buildings in order to get around the regulations, if you like, have built ramps that are really not suitable for those ^{who} are handicapped or in wheel chairs, so much so that you will see places, I believe maybe in Ottawa and other places as well, where although they -

MR. LUSH: The University of Ottawa has them.

MR. NOLAN: The University of Ottawa, my colleague reminds me as an example, where the contractors or the builders, have built ramps but, really, when they set out to put them in use they have had to close them up, to bar them off.

MR. LUSH: They are all chained off.

MR. NOLAN: They are chained off because they are impractical, in fact, in some instances a hazard. So I hope that the minister, with his colleagues, and with the Accessibility Group or any others that might be involved, will see to it that when buildings are being built that they will be checked on not merely to comply with the act, but to see that they are serviceable, that they are useable, and not let some skinflint try to get around it by trying to beat the act in fact.

So I hope the minister would consider these things as he tries, together with those that he might be involved with, to see that this bill, and the spirit of the bill is carried out. I can certainly join with my friend in complimenting the minister and all those involved in this bill and I hope that as we go down the road we will see still further improvements and additions and amendments or whatever is necessary to see to it that these matters are implemented and in the way that they should be. So we do indeed compliment the minister and also the Accessibility Group and any others involved.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I have very little to add to that. The point that the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made with regard to the regulations is certainly a very valid one and it is one which I had stressed myself in my preamble or opening comments on the regulations. It is our hope that they will coincide with the date that is contained in the bill. The various sections of the bill are considered to be applicable after the 31st. day of December, 1978, and there are various subsections in the bill which say that, "After the 31st. day of December, 1978, no person shall carry on any substantial reconstruction of a building without

MR. DOODY: reference to this particular act."

And then it goes on to describe what substantial reconstruction and so on is. Obviously there is great reason, even from a very practical, administrative point of view, to make December 31st. the deadline for the promulgation, formulation and publishing of the regulations. We had, as I had said earlier, a tremendous amount of input from the group with whom we worked on this, the Accessibility Action Committee and their advisers, as well as the people in the Department of Public Works and in Rehabilitation.

I really do not think we have that many hurdles to climb in order to get the regulations in place. I would hope that all the people involved can get together very quickly and put the regulations together and have them published and have them enacted.

As to the present buildings,

how to encourage the owners of these to come along and comply with what is obviously socially necessary and acceptable and indeed essential, I think that that is something we will cope with during the coming months. I do not think, really, myself that tax incentives is the way to go, I think there are other pressures, other means of public pressure. I think that if enough public buildings, I do not mean necessarily public service buildings, buildings that are open to the public show the sort of spirit that is contained in this act, I feel that there should be enough public pressure put on to force these other less aggressive or less reasonable companies to come along to the party and join in. If not, then perhaps we will have to take some measures to make sure that they do. I certainly would not want to reward people for doing what is obviously socially necessary and socially acceptable, the buildings should be accessible to all segments of society.

MR. DOODY: I would hesitate very much to recommend to government or indeed to the Province that they should give tax breaks to people who make their sales floors available to people in wheel chairs or people on crutches or people in what have you, I think that that may just not be the way to go. I think there may be more subtle ways of applying the pressure that is necessary to have all sorts of society -

MR. NOLAN: What about existing buildings?

MR. DOODY: That is right. I appreciate that but I just throw that in for what it is - It is obviously an area that we are going to have to tackle next. That is section (2) and we will get down to that eventually. The important thing is, I think, that we have made the major step and hopefully we will have concluded that step by the 31st. of December. As we get into Committee there are various

Mr. Doody: amendments that will have to be made, the amendments that have been suggested by officials both of the Accessibility Action Committee and of our own Public Service and ourselves and which will make the Act even now more meaningful than it is. There will be improvements and I think, Sir, that once we get into Committee we will get that cleared up and then we will get on to some of the things that my hon. friend suggested later on. Thank you, Sir. I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Require The Provision Of Facilities In Buildings For Physically Disabled Persons", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill No. 84).

MR. HICKMAN: Order 37, Bill No. 75.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 37. Before reading Order 37 I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly on behalf of all hon. members, a former member and a former Speaker of the Legislature, a gentleman who hangs, if not literally at least pictorially to my right, Mr. James Russell.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion, second reading, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act." (Bill No. 75).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are really two principles in this bill; one is that the original Act specifically excludes from the Brotherhood the Chief and the two Assistant Chiefs. It does not put Commissioned Officers in the Brotherhood but it has been an irritant in practically all negotiations as to whether or not Commissioned Officers should be in or should be out. This makes it very clear that Commissioned Officers are not members of the Brotherhood. I think the more important part of the bill is that this has been, again, a result of collective bargaining and discussions between management and the Brotherhood with respect to regulations in The Newfoundland Constabulary.

Mr. Hickman: There is a procedure now that is a carry-over from many, many, many years, I would say, before the turn of the century. If a member of the Newfoundland Constabulary is disciplined the rights and procedures are set forth and the complaint or the charge can be dealt with by the Chief of Police, if the member of the Force so elects, or alternatively it can be dealt with by a panel consisting of two men; two officers appointed by the Chief of Police and a constable or member of equal rank. That in itself is reasonably satisfactory.

But the appeal, in the event that an aggrieved member of the Force is not satisfied with the decision of this panel or alternatively with the decision of the Chief of Police, the appeal is to the Minister of Justice, and I have found that to be most unsatisfactory indeed. Fortunately there have not been very many appeals, I might hasten to add. In ten years I cannot think of more than four or five. But it would be unreasonable to expect a minister, except in very untoward circumstances where you have a panel with a unanimous decision, having heard all of the evidence or the Chief of Police having reached a decision, to reverse that decision. And this Act now provides that if a person has gone through the disciplinary procedure, a member of the Force wants to appeal, he appeals to somebody who is totally independent, a totally independent arbitrator, and I think that is very satisfactory. I am sure that it will continue to improve the morale of the Newfoundland Constabulary. The morale of that Force is very strong right now, and this is a step forward which on the face of it may not appear to be too significant, but it is very significant to the officers and men of the Newfoundland Constabulary. And it is with a great deal of pleasure, genuine pleasure, that I move second reading of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: I am wondering if the minister could answer a couple of questions. Item one, the bill, of course, affects the members in the Newfoundland Constabulary, have the executive body or members of the Constabulary had an opportunity to see this bill or the items in here?

MR. HICKMAN: As far as I know they have.

MR. NOLAN: Right.

MR. HICKMAN: In fact they were after me. Why I think that, is they were after me in

MR. HICKMAN: July as to why the bill had not been passed before adjournment.

MR. NOLAN: Right. Well all I am saying is that they are familiar with the act or the bill.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes.

MR. NOLAN: And I am also under the assumption, if I may digress for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, that the Accessibility Committee and those interested saw the bill that we discussed just previously before being tabled in the House.

MR. DOODY: As it has already been pointed out they are mainly responsible.

MR. NOLAN: Well that leads me to one good point; how is it that we will make available to some people copies of bills but in the case, say, of Bill 50 which we had last year the councils in the Northeast region never had an opportunity to see it? How come the denturists never had an opportunity to see it? To what extent are we going to continue in this House to make chaulk of one and cheese of the other? The Law Society, I am sure, has an opportunity to look at any bill that comes before this House before it is discussed.

MR. DOODY: The denturists can look at this bill any time at all.

MR. NOLAN: Yes that particular bill but not the one that applies to them which has been promised in this House on three separate occasions. What I am asking the hon. House Leader -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) the denturists.

MR. NOLAN: What I am asking the hon. House Leader is what is your policy regarding bills coming before this House? Why is it that certain people and certain groups apparently have the opportunity to study the bills while others are being discriminated against? This is a very, very important question that I am asking and I believe that it deserves an honest answer and no evasiveness. I support this bill, I am not against it one bit here, not one bit, but

MR. NOLAN: what I am against is the outright discrimination that is practiced time after time after time in this House, and I would like now for the House Leader, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice to please tell me now what the policy of the administration is regarding bills coming before this House? Why is it that certain groups apparently can sit down and discuss them in some detail, have some real input and the like and other groups are barred and ignored, in some instances, even elected people such as councillors, in the Northeast Avalon bill? Surely the minister has to address himself to this very, very important point.

MR. DOODY: Which council was barred?
Were there any councils barred?

MR. NOLAN: The council of Conception Bay South did not see the bill prior to its being tabled in this House.

MR. NEARY: The Horse Cove Line crowd were the ones.

MR. NOLAN: St. Thomas, Paradise, the City of St. John's I think, although it was discussed with them to some extent, but let us not get into quibbling about that.

MR. DOODY: Any time they wanted us the door was open just as the door was open for the denturists.

MR. NOLAN: The denturists were turned down and promised in this House on three separate occasions in the last three years by the Minister of Health that a bill was coming in here. It never came in.

MR. DOODY: Sure we have not seen it. How can they complain?

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister says it is drafted.

MR. DOODY: Well I will see if I am allowed to see it and then I will check it out.

MR. NOLAN: Look, all I am asking for is fair play and the minister knows what I am talking about. As far as I am concerned

MR. NOLAN: if you have one or two groups, or three or four or five with whom it is almost biblical writ that you must consult with before bringing into this House why discriminate against other groups? Now there are members on the opposite side who know what I am talking about so now -

MR. DINN: I never did.

MR. NOLAN: It is not revolutionary, is it?

MR. DINN: No.

MR. NOLAN: No. Therefore, I hope that the House Leader will address himself to that.

MR. SPEAKER: If the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: The policy of this administration is very similar to the policy of the previous administration and to the policy of all administrations in Canada that there are certain bills that you can discuss with interested groups in advance. Obviously the administration, the government would not consult anyone with respect to a bill; "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act." That is a matter of public interest, where the government makes a policy decision, either it is enunciated in the Speech from the Throne or it is decided sometime during the session to introduce that kind of legislation. Legislation involving -

MR. NOLAN: It is done repeatedly.

MR. HICKMAN: No. Mr. Speaker, legislation involving special groups - I will give this House other clear examples.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about Bill 50 and tell us about the denturists.

MR. HICKMAN: The Public Service Collective Bargaining Act was another one that was discussed with the Trade Union Movement, with those who represent the public servants. Bill 50, which is a public bill, not a bill with any special group, a bill that I understand was examined, and I know it was supported by the Newfoundland Federation of Mayors and Municipalities because their President Mr. Ronald Fagan sat in the House when it was debated the year before last and had no hesitancy at all in saying that he supported it,

MR. HICKMAN: but that is a different type of legislation from this one.

MR. NOLAN: Tell us about the denturists' bill. They came time after time after time for meetings with their lawyer sitting up in the gallery half the day.

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

MR. NOLAN: Does not the minister have any shame at all?

MR. HICKMAN: I do. I am ashamed of the behaviour of the hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), but other than that, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of any reason why I should have any shame this evening.

In any event, I move second reading of the bill.

On motion,

a bill, "~~An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act,~~"

(Bill No. 75), read a second time, ordered

referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: If the hon. gentlemen opposite agree, I will call the other bills first and leave the Workmen's Compensation one for last. Agreed.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 34. Bill No. 69.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The College of Fisheries Act, The College Of Trades And Technology Act And The Polytechnical Institute Act," (Bill No. 69).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: That gives the colleges and the board the right, as the explanatory notes say, to co-operate at the beginning of courses, and secondly it makes sure that these volunteer members on the board have no liability.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The College of Fisheries Act, The College Of Trades And Technology Act And The Polytechnical Institute Act," (Bill No. 69), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 33. Bill No. 89.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Law Respecting School Attendance," (Bill No. 89).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Law Respecting School Attendance," (Bill No. 89), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 41. Bill No. 79.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act," (Bill No. 79).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act," (Bill No. 79), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 17. Bill No. 63.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Animals," (Bill No. 63).

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, just a few short words of explanation on this bill. We already have an Act which has been in place for some years, The Protection Of Animals Act, and that Act is now somewhat outdated and inadequate for present day use. It deals with some problems that are no longer under the jurisdiction of the Province that are now under the Criminal Code of Canada. It also fails to provide the necessary authority to deal with some

MR. MAYNARD: problems that occur frequently with protection of animals, and it gives the S.P.C.A. of the Province a much wider latitude in dealing with the various offences that may be created in regards to animal welfare. It is really an updating of the old act, and it is not a new act which might be indicated by the Order Papers. I move second reading.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe without referring back to the bill there is a provision there whereby, depending on what monies may be collected, or fines, by the S.P.C.A., a certain percentage will go to the Government and a certain percentage will go or revert to the S.P.C.A. Is that correct?

MR. RIDEOUT: One-half.

MR. NOLAN: One-half - fifty-fifty split.

MR. RIDEOUT: Fifty-fifty.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, I am wondering about the methodology

MR. NOLAN: be utilized to finance this project.

I do not object to the bill, in fact we should, and I am sure the minister is attempting to help out a very fine group, the only group, in fact, I suppose in many ways, that are attempting to look after animals on a scale as best they are able, but why is it that we are adopting this attitude with the SPCA? In other words, you know, if you collect \$5,000 you get \$2,500.

We do not use that with other groups and so on. I mean if we appreciate the efforts of the SPCA and what they are trying to do, why do we not give them an outright grant to help them finance their operations and not tie it into a sort of fifty-fifty split the way it is outlined in the present bill? And I would like for the minister to address himself to that. I do not like the - at least on the surface I do not like the method used to finance the operation. I think, like you would handle most other groups, this surely is one of the few bills where you have, you know, if you get \$5,000 worth of fines you will get \$2,500 back. I do not like that particularly. Maybe the minister might have a very good reason as to why that is done but I would rather see a grant in the estimates to the SPCA as there is so many other groups and give them money and give them all the help and assistance that we can and not tie it into the system that we have outlined here.

MR. SPEAKER: If the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual provision. I suppose one might say that it is one that we are trying out with the SPCA. We thought that the SPCA would be the

MR. MAYNARD: most appropriate group to handle this sort of legislation, or to enforce this sort of legislation.

MR. DOODY: That or the Liberal Party.

MR. MAYNARD: It will not cost the Province any money, obviously, because we are not paying anything out of the general revenue fund other than half the fines and half be retained in the Consolidated Revenue. It is a way of funding the SPCA without going through the system every year of trying to find somewhere in the budget a grant of \$10,000 or \$5,000 which quite often, as the hon. member is aware, when you are doing the budgetary process these things come low on the totem pole and this sort of thing.

So we thought that the best way to ensure that the SPCA would receive a relatively adequate amount of funds to carry out this programme on behalf of government, more or less, was to divide the fines equally and in that way they could more or less gear themselves up to expanding their efforts in the Province as well.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Animals," (Bill No. 63), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 16. Bill No. 55.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Plants And The Prevention Of The Spread Of Pests And Diseases Destructive To Vegetation," (Bill No. 55).

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the first sentence has to be that this bill has nothing whatsoever to do with the spruce bud worm problem. Again it is a bill designed to replace an act that is already in existence which could become an environmental protection act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried; Carried!

MR. MAYNARD: No problem?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. MAYNARD: Okay.

On motion, a bill No. 55 read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 3, bill No. 43.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Wild Life Act." (Bill No. 43)

MR. HICKMAN: There is a redefining of the act as I understand it, in certain sections.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Wild Life Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 32, Bill No. 76.

Motion, second reading of
a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act."
(Bill No. 76).

MR. SPEAKER(Young): The hon. the Minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses some seventeen items that resulted from the Workmen's Compensation Board review and it includes, mainly, benefits to the claimants, monetary benefits. There are also some administrative changes, some additional group coverages and, of course, it also amends the act by setting out a list of industrial diseases.

The results of this bill, of course, will be effective retroactive to January 20, 1978. The clauses 2 and 3 bring in the working directors, the working executives under coverage upon application, and also it brings in under this part, part (1) the volunteer firemen. That is a fairly important one because it gives them full coverage. Of course, that is upon application of council, and I understand at this point in time there are only about four councils in the Province that are covering the volunteer firemen. This will set it out clearly that they will be covered for the amounts that they would be getting had they been working on their own jobs, if they received an injury.

Clause 4 increases the clothing allowance from \$150 to \$250, and lifts the ceiling for rehabilitation or retraining. It used to be \$15,000 but we have lifted that in this particular act to, 'No maximum'.

Number 5, again lifts the ceiling that was there from the accident fund for retraining and that one, of course, was \$75,000 per year and, again, there is no ceiling on that particular one.

Number 6, is an administrative change; it gives the board the authority to create new posts

MR. HOUSE: on its own without having to go back to government because they find this takes a little longer and they feel they are quite capable of recruiting and going for their own staff when they need it.

Number 7 lifts the ceiling. It was \$500 and \$150 in case of funerals, and that has gone to \$600 and \$175 for transportation.

I think the (b) part of that lifts the lump-sum payment to widows from \$500 to \$750, and from \$250 per month to \$300 per month.

The (c) part of that provides for a 5 per cent increase in compensation.

Number 10, that is a fairly important one because if after a person retires he becomes invalided and the injury was received before retirement, going back, I believe, to ten years, he will be eligible for payments and that will be based on his earnings for the year immediately before retirement or the longest period of time he worked immediately before.

Number 11. Right now there is no provision made in the act to take care of children who are born after a person has been disabled. That is a fairly important one in that they do get 75 per cent of their earnings unless they come under a family plan, and a family plan, of course, could give them more than 75 per cent of the earnings.

Number 12 is an increase from \$173 per week to \$201 as a maximum claim.

Number 13 provides for improving the payments made to apprentices. For instance, if an apprentice receives an injury and he is claiming, they will reflect what he would have earned had he continued on his training and become a journeyman.

MR. HOUSE:

That is a new part to the Act there.

No. 15 is an administrative change, I suppose, and that should be Section 2 of 88, instead of 82, and it makes the board a preferred and secured creditor in collecting their assessments.

16 brings farmers under the ambit of the Act and, of course, 17 adds the industrial deafness, lung cancer, and stomach cancer, I think, to this list of diseases that can be covered under the Act.

That covers all the items in the Act,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Young):

Hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me say very quickly

that we certainly agree with basically everything that is included in the amendments here to the Workmen's Compensation Board Act. Thank God, finally, after sitting on this report for a couple of years the Government have finally in the ninth hour been able to get a piece of legislation drawn up to benefit the workers of this Province and to bring into effect, through legislation, recommendations that were made by the Workmen's Compensation Board Review Committee to the Government a year and-a-half ago. The final report went to the Government in June 1977 and it took a year and a half to get seventeen little amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Board Act before the Legislature. But, we are happy that they are here. They are basically good amendments. They will make the lot of the worker in this Province more enshrined in legislation than it was before. I am especially happy with the amendments to the schedule of industrial diseases taking into account stomach cancer caused by exposure to asbestos dust and so on. So, we are happy with the recommendations. We notice that there are a number of the recommendations in the Workmen's Compensation Board Review Committee report that are not in here, but I would hope and suspect that most of it can be taken care of under the

November 21, 1978

Tape No. 5343 (Night)

RT - 2

MR. RIDEOUT new Occupational Health and Safety Bill which was passed in this House earlier in this session.

So, all in all, we are happy and, Thank God, the Government after two years finally got the piece of legislation before the House.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act" read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 76).

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Wild Life Act." (Bill No. 43).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Detention Of Intoxicated Persons, 1973." (Bill No. 44).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act." (Bill No. 45).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act." (Bill No. 46).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act." (Bill No. 47).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase In Certain Pensions." (Bill No. 57).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration (Vital Statistics) Act." (Bill No. 58).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The War Service (Pensions) Act, 1975." (Bill No. 59).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Animals." (Bill No. 63).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Provide For Change Of Name." (Bill No 64).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." (Bill No. 83).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973." (Bill No. 60).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Facilitate Metric Conversion." (Bill No. 62).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Plants And The Prevention Of The Spread Of Pests And Diseases Destructive To Vegetation." (Bill No.55).

On motion clauses 1 through 11, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 12 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, strike out the word on the side there, 'licencing' and replace it with 'registration' and delete sub-paragraph (a) and that means the renumbering of (a) (b) and a subsequent renumbering in (2).

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 2 as amended carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 13 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: In 13 there is an amendment.

Strike out (1) and that will mean a renumbering.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 13 as amended carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 14 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, in 14 strike out the words 'or any licence' in (a) and 'or licence' in (c).

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 14 as amended carried.

On motion, clauses 15 and 16, carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Require The Provision Of Facilities In Buildings For Physically Disabled Persons." (Bill No. 84).

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the long title be changed to read, "An Act To Provide For Accessibility To Buildings By Physically Disabled Persons."

On motion, clause 1, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: In 2, Mr. Chairman, I move that section 2(a) be amended by deleting what is contained therein and substituting therefore, "Apartment type building means any building intended for residential purposes in whole or in part that contains ten or more residential units."

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 2 as amended carried.

On motion, clauses 3, 4 and 5, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 6 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: In 6(1)(3) the last word 'obligations' should be deleted and 'alterations' substituted therefor.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 6 as amended carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 7 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: 7(e) should read as follows: "Must, if the building contains any washroom intended for the use of members of the public, or for the use generally of persons residing on the premises or their guests, have a washroom on each floor that contains such a washroom that is constructed to conform to the design standards set out in the Building Code Supplement referred to in paragraph (a)".

MR. HICKMAN:

Then 7(h) of the same section to read: "Must, if telephones are installed for the use of members of the public or for the use generally of persons residing on the premises or their guests, have at least one telephone accessible to and useable by physically disabled persons on each floor that contains such telephones that are installed in accordance with the guidelines therefor set out in the Building Code Supplement referred to in paragraph (a).

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 7 as amended, carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 85).

On motion, clause 1, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Does clause 2 carry?

MR. HICKMAN:

2 (3.3). Notwithstanding the provision of Subsection (3.1) contributions held pursuant to that subsection may be paid out pursuant to a reciprocal agreement made under Section 33 and upon such a payment being made the election deemed to have been made under that subsection come to an end.

(3.4). Subsection 3.3 is deemed to have come into force on the 17th day of June, 1977.

On motion, Amendment carried.

On motion, clause 2 as amended, carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Forestry and Agriculture Act, 1973." (Bill No. 71).

On motion, clauses 1 through 8 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act." (Bill No. 68).

On motion, clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Management Accountants Act." (Bill No. 70).

On motion, clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act." (Bill No. 67).

On motion, clauses 1 through 3 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act." (Bill No. 73).

On motion, clauses 1 through 3 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospital Insurance (Agreement) Act." (Bill No. 86).

On motion, clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." (Bill No. 76).

On motion, clauses 1 through 14 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Does clause 15 carry?

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Chairman, insert the following clause:

(1) For the purpose of avoiding doubt it is hereby declared (a) that the amendment contained in Section 15 of the Workmen's Compensation Amendment Act, 1975 adding the words, "Silicosis, or carcinoma" to paragraph (a) of Subsection (1) of Section 93 (b) of the Workmen's Compensation Act is deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of September, 1969 and (b) that all compensation paid by the board based on the date of coming into force as set out in this section is hereby confirmed.

November 21, 1978

Tape No. 5347

RT-3

MR. HICKMAN:

(2) Subsection (4) of Section 93 (b)

of the said act is repealed and the following substituted for this section as amended is deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of September, 1969. That is St. Lawrence.

On motion, Amendment carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Law Respecting School Attendance." (Bill No. 89).

On motion, clauses 1 and 2, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 3 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: In 3 the word 'sixteen' is stricken out in line 2 and 'fifteen' substituted therefor. And in (b) again 'fifteen' for 'sixteen'.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 3 as amended, carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The College Of Fisheries Act, The College Of Trades And Technology Act And The Polytechnical Institute Act." (Bill No. 69).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act." (Bill No. 78).

On motion, clause 1 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: 1(2), section 4 of the said act is repealed and the following substituted: "4, in the following cases such officer or officers as the Minister of Justice may name shall perform the duties of the Registrar: (a) Where the Registrar is absent from St. John's; (b) Where the Registrar is prevented by illness or other cause from performing his duty; (c) In the event of a vacancy in the office of the Registrar or (d) Where the Registrar deems it necessary to delegate his authority."

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, section 2 as amended, carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act." (Bill No. 75).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Provide For The Payment Of Accelerated Pensions To Employees Of The Government Of Newfoundland Transferred To Services Of The Government Of Canada At The Date Of Union." (Bill No.82).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Liquor Control Act, 1973." (Bill No. 65).

Motion, that the Committee
report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Quarry Materials Act." (Bill No. 79).

Motion, that the Committee
report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting
The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Act, 1975, The
Electrical Power Control Act, The Newfoundland And Labrador
(Loan And Guarantee Limitations) Act, 1975, The
Newfoundland And Labrador Rural Electricity Act, And The
British Newfoundland Corporation Limited (Lower Churchill
River Lease) Act, 1966-67." (Bill No. 88).

On motion, clause 1 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 2 carry?

MR. HICKMAN:

In 2 delete 'order' and
substitute therefor, 'orders'.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 2 as amended,
carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Revise The
Newfoundland Architects Act." (Bill No. 72).

On motion, clause 1, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 2 carry?

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move an
amendment to (k) by striking out in the fourth line the
words, 'together with all their components and systems'.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 2 as amended,
carried.

On motion, clauses 3

through 28, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 29 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: In 29(b) after the word 'services' "other than where used to describe building materials appraised".

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 29 as amended, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 30 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: No. 30 would commence with the words 'subject to all applicable regulations and orders' and then, again, after the word 'owner' "and where such work does not increase the safety of the general public or property of others":

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion clause 30 as amended carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 31 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Delete and substitute therefor in section 31, "This act does not apply to any member of the Newfoundland Professional Engineering Association or licensee thereof or the holder of a certificate of authorization issued by that Association, or any employee or person working under the responsibility of such member, licensee or certificate holder who confines his practice to engineering within the meaning of the Newfoundland Professional Engineering Act."

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 31 as amended carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 32 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: 32 is amended by the following words: "A member, licensee, certificate holder, employee or person referred to in section 31 shall not style himself nor hold himself out as an architect unless he is an architect

MR. HICKMAN: registered and licenced in the Province."

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 32 as amended, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 33 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: In 33 there is a 33(2),"All final drawing, specifications, plans, reports and other documents involving the practice of architecture when issued shall bear the signature and seal of the architect who prepared or approved that."

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 33 as amended, carried.

On motion clauses 34 and 35, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 36 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: No in 36, after the word 'services': 36(d) "other than where used to describe building and materials and trades" to be inserted after the word 'services'.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 36 as amended, carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Social Assistance Act." (Bill No. 81).

Motion, that the Committee
report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Memorial University Act." (Bill No. 91).

Motion, that the Committee
report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that the clock
be stopped? Agreed!

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Public Utilities Act." (Bill No. 93).

Motion, that the Committee
report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Brinco Limited (Labrador Agreements) Act, 1974." (Bill
No. 94).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 1 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: There is an amendment, Mr.
Chairman. Section (3) in 1 should be (4) and that means
then there should be (5) a step down below, and then the
renumbering again of (3) to (4) and again in 1(3) it is
(4) instead of (3).

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 1 as amended,
carried.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Chairman of
Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee
of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred
and have passed the following bills with some amendments:
Bill Nos. 55, 84, 85, 76, 89, 78, 88, 72, 94 and ask
leave to sit again.

On motion report received
and adopted.

On motion, amendments read
a first and second time, bills ordered read a third time
now, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Chairman of
Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of
the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and
have directed me to report bills without amendment: Bills
Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 57, 58, 59, 63, 64, 83, 60, 62,
71, 68, 70, 67, 73, 86, 69, 75, 82, 65, 79, 81, 91 and 93
and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received
and adopted bills ordered read a third time now, by leave.

On motion, the following
bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their
titles be as on the Order Paper:

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Wild Life Act." (Bill No. 43).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Detention Of Intoxicated Persons Act, 1973." (Bill No. 44).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Fish Inspection Act." (Bill No. 45).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
City Of Corner Brook Act." (Bill No. 46).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
City Of St. John's Act." (Bill No. 47).

A bill, "An Act Respecting
An Increase In Certain Pensions." (Bill No. 57).

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Registration (Vital Statistics) Act." (Bill No. 58).

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973." (Bill No. 60).

A bill, "An Act To Facilitate
Metric Conversion." (Bill No. 62).

A bill, "An Act Respecting
The Protection Of Plants And The Prevention Of The Spread
Of Pests And Diseases Destructive To Vegetation." (Bill No. 55).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The
Protection Of Animals." (Bill No. 63).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
War Service (Pensions) Act, 1975." (Bill No. 59).

A bill, "An Act To Provide
For Change Of Name." (Bill No. 64).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Highway Traffic Act." (Bill No. 83).

A bill, "An Act To Provide
For Accessibility To Buildings By Physically Disabled
Persons." (Bill No. 84).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Public Service (Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 85).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Department Of Forestry And Agriculture Act, 1973." (Bill No. 71).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Automobile Insurance Act." (Bill No. 68).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Management Accountants Act." (Bill No. 70).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Accident And Sickness Insurance Act." (Bill No. 67).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Real Estate Trading Act." (Bill No. 73).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospital Insurance (Agreement) Act." (Bill No. 86).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." (Bill No. 76).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Law Respecting School Attendance." (Bill No. 89).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The College Of Fisheries Act, The College Of Trades And Technology Act And The Polytechnical Institute Act." (Bill No. 69).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act." (Bill No. 78).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act." (Bill No. 75).

A bill, "An Act To Provide For The Payment Of Accelerated Pensions To Employees Of The Government Of Newfoundland Transferred To Services Of The Government Of Canada At The Date Of Union." (Bill No. 82).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Control Act, 1973." (Bill No. 65).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act." (Bill No. 79).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Act, 1975, The Electrical Power Control Act, The Newfoundland And Labrador (Loan And Guarantee Limitations) Act, 1975, The Newfoundland And Labrador Rural Electricity Act, And The British Newfoundland Corporation Limited (Lower Churchill River Lease) Act, 1966-67." (Bill No. 88).

A bill, "An Act To Revise The Newfoundland Architects Act." (Bill No. 72).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act." (Bill No. 81).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act." (Bill No. 91).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act." (Bill No. 93).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Brinco Limited (Labrador Agreements) Act, 1974." Bill No.94).

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-governor.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a bill for the appropriation of Supplementary Supply granted in the present session.

A bill, "An Act for Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For the Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Eight And For Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."

HONOURABLE GORDON A. WINTER (Lieutenant-Governor): In Her Majesty's name, I thank Her loyal subjects, I accept their benevolence and I assent to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province have at its present session passed certain bills, to which, in the name of and on behalf of the General Assembly I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act To Amend the Wild Life Act." (Bill No. 43).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Detention of Intoxicated Persons Act, 1973." (Bill No. 44).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act." (Bill No. 45).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The City of Corner Brook Act." (Bill No. 46).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The City of St. John's Act." (Bill No. 47).

A bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase In Certain Pensions." (Bill No. 57).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration (Vital Statistics) Act." (Bill No. 58).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973." (Bill No. 54).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973." (Bill No. 60).

A bill, "An Act To Facilitate Metric Conversion." (Bill No. 62).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Plants And The Prevention Of The Spread Of Pests And Diseases Destructive To Vegetation." (Bill No. 55).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Animals." (Bill No. 63).

A bill, "An Act To Amend the War Service (Pensions) Act, 1975." (Bill No. 59).

A bill, "An Act To Provide For Change Of Name." (Bill No. 64).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." (Bill No. 83).

A bill, "An Act To Provide For Accessibility to Buildings for Physically Disabled Persons." (Bill No. 84).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 85).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Forestry And Agriculture Act, 1973." (Bill No. 71).

A bill, "An Act To Provide For The Administration Of Certain Facilities Constructed For The Canada Summer Games." (Bill No. 74).

A bill, "An Act to Amend The Automobile Insurance Act." (Bill No. 68).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Management Accountants Act." (Bill No. 70).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident and Sickness Insurance Act, 1971." (Bill No. 67).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act." (Bill No. 73).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospital Insurance (Agreement) Act." (Bill No. 86).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." (Bill No. 76).

A bill, "An Act To Amend And Revise The Law Respecting School Attendance." (Bill No. 89).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The College Of Fisheries Act, The College Of Trades And Technology Act And The Polytechnical Institute Act." (Bill No. 69).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration of Deeds Act." (Bill No. 78).

A bill, "An Act to Amend The Constabulary Act." (Bill No. 75).

A bill, "An Act To Provide For The Payment Of Accelerated Pensions To Employees Of The Government Of Newfoundland Transferred To Services Of The Government Of Canada At the Date Of Union." (Bill No. 82).

A bill, "An Act To Amend the Liquor Control Act, 1973." (Bill No. 65).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976." (Bill No. 79).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Act, 1975, The Electrical Power Control Act, The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro (Loan And Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975, The Newfoundland And Labrador Rural Electricity Act, And The British Newfoundland Corporation Limited (Lower Churchill River Lease) Act, 1966-67." (Bill No. 88).

A bill, "An Act To Revise The Newfoundland Architects Act." (Bill No. 72).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977." (Bill No. 81).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act." (Bill No. 91).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act." (Bill No. 93).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Brinco Limited (Labrador Agreements) Act, 1974." (Bill No. 94).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Tax On Users Of Tobacco." (Bill No. 37).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Taxes On Persons Who Pay Certain Insurance Premiums." (Bill No. 40).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Taxes Upon The Consumers Of Gasoline And Other Like Liquids." (Bill No. 39).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957." (Bill No. 48).

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957."

HON. GORDON A. WINTER (Lieutenant Governor): In Her Majesty's name I assent to these bills.

Mr. Speaker and members of the hon. House of Assembly the Third Session of the Thirty-Seventh General Assembly of this hon. House of Assembly is about to be prorogued. But before releasing you from your duties I wish to convey to you my appreciation for the careful and sympathetic attention you have given to the important matters brought before you by my ministers. Eighty-one pieces of legislation were enacted during this session of the hon. House of Assembly. Major legislation initiatives were taken in the areas of occupational health and safety, mineral development, workers' compensation, consumer protection, recreation and rehabilitation and pensions.

The Occupational Health and Safety Act was enacted, providing for an Occupational Health and Safety Division under which the protection of workers will be centralized. Among the important provisions contained in this Act is the right of a worker to refuse to do any work that he reasonably believes is dangerous to his health and safety. This Act represents an important step forward in providing protection to our workers.

Substantial amendments have been made to the Worker's Compensation Act, providing for increases in compensation and adding to the schedule of compensable diseases.

Mr. Speaker and members of the hon. House of Assembly, this session has again seen another advance in the area of consumer protection. The Trade Practices Act was enacted. This Act is designed to prevent unfair trade practices and unconscionable acts and provide for a Director of Trade Practices to administer the Act. It allows the Director to take actions on behalf of consumers and provides for substantial fines for non-compliance with the Act. The Income Tax Discounters Act was also passed and provided for strict regulation of tax discounting, including the amount that must be refunded.

The emphasis on proper management of the natural resources of the Province was continued in this session. The Mineral Holdings

HON. GORDON A. WINTER (Lieutenant Governor):

Impost Act was passed to encourage the increase in the amount of mineral exploration work being done by the owners of large areas of the Province having mineral potential. Amendments were also made to the Mineral Act.

The Protection of Animals Act was also passed, providing for increased protection for animals kept for sale, hire and exhibition. Further amendments were also made to the Wildlife Act. The Plant Protection Act was enacted, providing for the prevention of the introduction of new insect pests and plant diseases into the Province.

Mr. Speaker and members of the hon. House of Assembly, substantial progress was made in the areas of social services, rehabilitation and recreation. The Rehabilitation Act was passed providing a legislative framework for the rehabilitation of mentally and physically handicapped persons. The Buildings Accessibility Act was enacted. This Act requires that buildings to which the public is invited have access and facilities for physically disabled persons. The Detention of Intoxicated Persons Act was amended, permitting a peace officer to escort an intoxicated person to a detoxification center for rehabilitation, rather than charging him.

The Canada Games Park Commission Act was passed. This Act establishes a Commission to administer the Aquarena and the Canada Games Park constructed for the Canada Summer Games.

HON. GORDON A. WINTER (Lieutenant Governor):

Mr. Speaker and members of the hon. House of Assembly, amendments were made to the Conveyancing Act to ensure that out of Province companies providing mortgages in the Province have the ability to execute releases of these mortgages in the Province. The Provincial Court Act was amended to permit the use of retired magistrates. Amendments were also made to the Constabulary Act. The law relating to change of name has been modernized by the Change of Name Act, 1978. The Architects Act was also passed, providing for the self-government of the practice of architecture.

All the tax legislation has been revised in this session. This includes the Tobacco Tax Act, the Retail Sales Tax Act, The Gasoline Tax Act and the Insurance Premiums Tax Act. Increases in pensions to public servants have been set out in the Increase of Pensions Act, 1978. Important amendments have been made to the Financial Administration Act relating to the question of increased financial control by the comptroller.

Mr. Speaker and members of the hon. House of Assembly, I thank you for the large measure of supply you have granted. I assure you that the appropriations that you have granted will be expended by my ministers with care and efficiency.

It is my pleasure that the Third Session of this Thirty-Seventh General Assembly now be prorogued and it is prorogued accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Pursuant to the Speech of His Honour this House stands prorogued.