

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are already aware, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing has been administering a Provincial/Municipal Fire-fighting Programme. Under this programme, the Province has been providing financial assistance on a fifty - fifty cost shared basis to enable municipalities to acquire fire-fighting equipment and thus provide a fire protection service. This programme, while financing has been arranged by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, has been ongoing in conjunction with the Office of the Provincial Fire Commissioner. Since 1972, municipalities have acquired fire-fighting equipment to a total value of slightly over \$2.5 million. Of this amount, one half has been met by the Province through direct grants to local councils. While many municipalities availed of the opportunity to provide fire protection services under this programme, still many were unable to do so, even on a fifty-fifty cost shared basis, because of limited financial resources and the tremendous increase in the cost of equipment since the commencement of the programme. Since the inception of the programme, the cost of municipal fire-fighting equipment has increased by nearly 300 per cent, that is, the standard fire-fighting package increased from \$1,500 to approximately \$4,000, while the regular 625 gallon per minute municipal pumper has increased from \$18,000 to \$50,000. As a result, as I have already indicated, many municipalities have been financially unable to acquire the required equipment under the programme.

MR. N. WINDSOR: In order to ensure that all municipal authorities can provide fire protection services and because most councils are conscious of the increasing need for the service, government has decided to change the cost sharing basis from the present fifty-fifty ratio to a seventy-five - twenty-five cost sharing basis -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Another great Tory reform!

MR. WINDSOR: - with the Province, of course, meeting 75 per cent of the capital cost. In the main, the object of the programme is to enable as many municipalities as possible to provide minimum fire protection services, and with the increased proportion of financial input by the Province, the department will endeavour to ensure that areas of the Province presently without fire protection services, and areas with rapid expansion, are given priority. In order to avoid duplication of fire-fighting equipment in neighbouring municipalities, municipal councils will be encouraged to co-operate with regard to fire protection services. In the past, this programme has been limited to municipalities only and financial

MR. N. WINDSOR:

assistance could not be provided to unincorporated areas. Government has been concerned over the lack of this service in many areas of the Province where local government does not exist, or where distance from incorporated areas prohibited the availability of municipal fire-fighting equipment. In order to try to eliminate this problem and provide this urgent service to all areas of the Province, the department has now been authorized to employ procedures to provide financial assistance for the acquisition of fire-fighting equipment for use in unincorporated areas as well.

For obvious reasons, except in isolated cases, the equipment will be provided on a regional basis where possible encompassing a number of unincorporated areas and where this service cannot be provided by existing municipal equipment.

The establishment of committees for this purpose necessitates an amendment to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing Act to give legal status to such committees and enable the department to provide financial assistance. This matter, together with regulations and guidelines for the establishment of such committees, is presently being attended to by an official of the department and will be finalized as quickly as possible. The same cost-sharing basis, seventy-five/twenty-five, will, of course, apply to the acquisition of all fire-fighting equipment, whether by municipality or by an unincorporated area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this side of the House I must say that - I will say first of all that we are very happy to hear this liberal policy idea now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. CALLAN: -being expounded. For the past several months through the media I have been suggesting this. Especially over the past several month, not only have I been pressing

MR. W. CALLAN: Government for it through the media. In at least three areas of the District of Bellevue there are no municipalities. There are thirty-six communities in the District of Bellevue, only eight of which are incorporated and only five of these eight have fire trucks and fire-fighting equipment. In the Dildo, South Dildo, Old Shop, Blaketown, New Harbour area there is a fire committee set up about a month ago which will be happy, I am sure, to take advantage of the twenty-five/seventy-five and, of course, they are not just one community they are a region. Swift Current, North Harbour, Garden Cove, Hodge's Cove, Little Heart Ease area - there are at least three areas in the District of Bellevue, and I am sure that throughout rural Newfoundland there are many, many areas of people, joint communities who would be proud and happy to hear this announcement today as I am and as I know all members, especially the members who represent rural areas of this Province, would be proud and happy to hear it. We congratulate the minister on the announcement.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): Now before calling the next routine proceeding I would remind hon. members of a matter pending since yesterday and in order to dispose of it it was necessary to have the transcript, the Hansard of yesterday's proceedings. Hon. members will recall an allegation was made of illegality with respect to an hon. gentleman to my left, the Chair intervened, the hon. member withdrew at the instruction of the Chair and then the point came up by the hon. gentleman to my left that the withdrawal was not unqualified or that the allegation was again made. At that time I said I did not recall that, or did not hear it, but that I would need to have the **transcript** in order to be sure exactly what did transpire and in fact the hon. gentleman to my left's memory was accurate. I will read the section in question. This is the hon. member to my right.

"Mr. Speaker: I have no compunctions about that matter at all. I withdraw, without any qualifications, anything which is unparliamentary. What I said to the Premier and what I said to the House perhaps I should not draw conclusions from. What I said in my preamble to my question was that the minister used a helicopter to travel to his business premises and I will let the House decide whether that is legal or illegal."

I think it is obvious now that we do have the transcript in front of us that after having been withdrawn the matter was again introduced, if in an indirect or hypothetical manner and that of course cannot be done. So I hope that we can dispose of the matter quickly and I would ask the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir to give an unqualified withdrawal.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, very frankly I do not

MR. SIMMONS: know what it is I am withdrawing but I am quite prepared to withdraw any inference about illegality or whatever else the Chair directs me to withdraw. I fully and honestly and sincerely felt that I had made an unequivocal withdrawal yesterday and it was on that point I stood later. And if that were not the case, and it is perceived by the Chair not to be the case, I do so now.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have here a number of petitions but as they are all about essentially the same matter I would ask perhaps the indulgence of the House to be able to speak for a little more than five minutes. I am not asking to go on ad nauseam, or even indefinitely, but if I go a little beyond five minutes perhaps I could have leave; if not what I shall have to do is simply to present each petition individually in its turn, about thirty or forty of them. That would not help anybody. But if I could proceed on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I have to present a number of petitions, signed by 2,793 residents of the Northern Peninsula and Southern Labrador, most of them residents of my constituency as it now exists. Some of them residents of the Labrador portion, which will become part of the tentatively designated Eagle River seat hopefully we will find a better name in due course - ~~some~~ of them are

MR. E. ROBERTS:

from the district represented by my friend, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. E. Maynard), whose ministerial designation I have temporarily forgotten because they do tend to move around - Industrial Development, Minister of Industrial Development. I had not had the opportunity to speak with him of these and I imagine he will want to speak in support of the petition signed by a number of his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, these petitions are signed by 100 residents of Green Island Cove, which is in my district, 97 from Anchor Point, 116 from L'Anse-au-Clair, 140 from Raleigh, 97 from Quirpon, 15 from L'Anse-au-Meadows, 127 from St. Lunaire and Griquet, 180 from Goose Cove, 73 from St. Anthony, a further 20 from St. Anthony, a further 58 from St. Anthony, a further 74 from St. Anthony, a further 126 from St. Anthony, 22, 74, 45, 57, 24, 24, 19, 21, 117 and 11 all from the community of St. Anthony - obviously, petition forms were posted in a number of places or carried from place to place throughout the town of St. Anthony - 40 from the community of Boat Harbour, 80 from the community of Sandy Cove, another 35 from Goose Cove, 92 from Flowers Cove, 104 from Straitsview, 71 from Ship Cove, 27 from Croque, 78 from St. Anthony Bight, 59 from Green Island Brook, 111 from Main Brook, 117 from Black Duck Cove, 114 from St. Barbe; and then, coming into the district represented by my friend, the Minister of Industrial Development, 60 from Castors River South, 100 from Bartlett's Harbour, 43 from Castors River North; coming back into my own constituency, 43 from St. Carols, 150 from Forresters Point, 65 from Blue Cove, 55 from Pidgeon Cove and 48 from Pond Cove, totalling, I am assured, 2,793 separate

MR. E. ROBERTS: signatories. And given the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there are approximately 6,000 people living in these areas eligible to vote, I think we can see that this is a very high proportion of the citizens of this part of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of all of these petitions is substantially and essentially the same, and that is to protest -

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, if the government caucus is finished perhaps I could carry on. I would hope to get the Minister of Mines and Energy's (Mr. Doody) attention because it relates to matters which are within his ministerial jurisdiction. And I know the Premier, as a former Minister of Mines and Energy and as somebody intimately interested in these problems, would also, I am sure, wish to be aware of the way 3,000 people feel - all of them adults, all of them electors, all of them interested in public affairs.

The prayer is essentially the same and that, Mr. Speaker, is to protest against the proposals, the understanding which people have been given, an understanding which is founded on statements made by appropriate officials, that the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation, the Crown corporation which in these areas is the retailer of power acting through the Power Distribution District another corporate agency, that they propose rate increases. I will read the prayer of the petition very briefly, Mr. Speaker. It says, "We the undersigned of the district of the Strait of Belle Isle, strongly protest Newfoundland Hydro's application for another electrical rate increase. Taking into consideration that we have now the highest rates in the Province and looking at the huge profit made by Hydro last year, we strongly ask government to place a freeze on any future increases by Newfoundland Hydro."

Now I did not draw up the petition but I would say that I am not aware that Hydro have made an application. I am aware that they have said that they intend to make one, and certainly I do not think any of us will be surprised if before too much longer they are back under the terms of the Electric Power Control Act, I think it is called, but anyway the 1975 legislation, if they appear before the Board of Public Utilities to seek the board's approval. But let it be recorded and let it be clear that it is the Cabinet which decides

MR. ROBERTS: on the rates which Hydro charges.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition really speaks for itself. I would simply like to say that I support it and I support it wholeheartedly. These people now do pay the highest rate in this Province for electricity even though they are subsidized. There are heavy subsidies from the public chest in respect of electricity supplied by Hydro to these people, electricity which is generated by diesel. Mr. Speaker, they still pay by far the highest rates. Up to the first 500 kilowatt hours a month the rates are the same, but beyond that the rates diverge very rapidly and very widely.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the concern of these people and I share it. I am not sure it is realistic to expect a freeze to be put on hydro rates, I am not sure at all, but I do think the government should use the public chest. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I am sure, will have many pleas made of his good nature and his generosity for monies from the public chest but this is one which I would commend to him particularly. The public chest should be used to insure that these

Mr. Roberts: people pay no greater rates than anybody anywhere else in this Province. Because if that is not done, Sir, and it has not been done by this administration or by their predecessors, if that is not done, Mr. Speaker, then these people are being penalized for where they live. And I reject that, I have always rejected it, and I think it is unfair. It is discriminatory and it is wrong. If the price of power must go up, and I do not assume that it does but I can understand that it might have to, but if it has to go up then let all of us in this Province bear our fair share, **Let** us pay a rate related to the cost of consumption, the amount we consume, not to the **cost of generation**. I think that that is a principle which should **be enshrined** a principle which should be acted upon as public policy.

Mr. Speaker, these people already face the highest cost of living in this Province, **they** face many difficulties caused by their geographical location, **and** now, with the prospect of further rate **increases**, the differences will be made even greater, the hardships made even more to bear, and life made a little less tolerable. I do not think, Sir, in 1979 that should be allowed. I do not think it should be tolerated. I support the prayer of the petition. And I would ask the government not to take it into consideration but to do it. They can do it, Sir; it is simply a matter of equalizing the power rates and let all of us in this Province bear our fair share. I think that is the proper way, Sir, and I think it is what public policy should do. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the petitions tabled by my hon. colleague, Sir, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are two problems involved here. Number one, the people in Southern Labrador and on the Great Northern Peninsula are paying the highest electricity rates in the whole Province. And the second problem is that they are subject to the increases that everybody else in Newfoundland and Labrador have to pay every time the Newfoundland Hydro go and ask for an increase in

Mr. Neary: rates. So the first thing that has to happen, if the government decides to act on the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the first thing there would have to be an equalization of electricity rates in the Province. I do not know if my hon. friend the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) was aware that the people in Southern Labrador and the Great Northern Peninsula, and in a few other parts of Newfoundland, by the way, are paying higher electricity rates than anybody else in Newfoundland. And I do not think this is right, Sir, I think it is rank discrimination, and it is a matter that should be remedied, and the only way to do it is from subsidies from the **public treasury**.

And the second part of the petition of course deals with increases. Now I do not know what else we

MR. NEARY: can say or do, Mr. Speaker, about this matter of increases in electricity rates in this Province. Everything that can be said about it has been said in the last three years in this hon. House. What can one say? What can I say today, Sir, that would add any weight to support the petitions that have been presented to the House that has not already been said? And yet, Sir, the plea, the petitions have fallen on deaf ears and as I indicated yesterday, Sir, I believe the only way, the only obvious and logical and sensible way to clear the air, to get this matter rectified, to get the matter of proposed increases in electricity rates straightened out is to put it to the test. I know I am not allowed, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour gave a ruling yesterday, I know I am not allowed to get involved in debate and talk about a general election on this issue; that would be unparliamentary and out of order, it would not be in keeping with the rules of the House. But I have a job to restrain myself, Sir, from saying it but I think that would be a good issue and I was very happy to hear, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend mention the community of St. Carols, there were a number of people signed petitions in St. Carols.

I had the experience on a Sunday morning in 1977 to meet with the residents of St. Carols when they had no electricity. They had none. The poles were laid along the road, the washing machines and all the electrical appliances were in the homes, and the electricity was not run into the community. A promise had been made prior to the 1975 election that St. Carols would get electricity. The election was over, the electricity was not put there until either late last year or early this year. But I was there, Sir, and I think I can claim an assist for embarrassing the government.

April 4, 1979

Tape No. 719

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: and Newfoundland Hydro for putting electricity into the community of St. Carols. Every man, woman and child turned up for that meeting on a Sunday morning in the school in St. Carols. So, Sir, I am proud to have had something to do with that and I am proud today to support the petition, ~~now~~ that they have the electricty, now they want to pay the same rates as people in other parts of the Province. It is a reasonable request, Sir. And I have a feeling it is going to fall on deaf ears as all the petitions that we have had. I said yesterday we have had

Mr. Neary: about 75,000 names. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is possible, Sir, to get in this Province a law passed the same as the Government of Canada passed before Parliament **dissolved, a law to hold** referendums, forcing the government to hold a referendum when so many people are concerned about a public matter, a public issue such as the increase in electricity rates. Maybe the thing to do is to hold a referendum to see what the people want to do about it, if they want to put a freeze on, if they want electricity rates subsidized from the **public treasury** or they want to put a freeze on for five years as we propose on this side of the House.

The people have expressed their opinion. The only other way, Sir, I can see to settle the matter is to go to the polls and make it an election issue and let us fight it out and let us clear the air once and for all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by my hon. friend for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) —

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: — on behalf of 2,793 people. The voters in the Bay of Islands, Mr. Speaker, have shown their concern by a petition that I presented here last week or early this week when I spoke on behalf of 993 people, and there is another perhaps a similar amount to follow.

Now I have to agree with the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) who said yesterday **and noted** that this is becoming a social problem. Indeed it is, Mr. Speaker, becoming a social problem all over this Province. In many cases, Mr. Speaker, people are paying **less** for their mortgage than they are paying for their electricity.

Now I think the chief cause of the high rates of electricity, and I feel the government are aware of this, is

Mr. Woodrow: because of the high rate of crude oil in the Middle East. About ten years ago I was in the Middle East and at that particular time you could buy a barrel of crude oil for fifty cents and today it is in the neighbourhood of around \$16.00 a barrel, perhaps it is even higher than that, and perhaps the way things look it may even become higher.

MR. WOODROW: But I feel the government are concerned, because it is more than a political problem; in fact, the lives of our people are at stake and I would like to raise it above politics if I could. It is a very serious matter and I feel I know that the government are concerned about it and I feel they are going to try to take some measures to offset the increases which are proposed. And I feel sure that we will be hearing more about it in the next week or couple of weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I feel duty bound to support the petition presented by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) because some of the signatures represent people whom I had the honour of serving from 1970 to 1975, mainly the old district of St. Barbe North. And, Sir, if ever a group of people deserved a subsidy or some sort of assistance in order that their rates would be equalized or standardized with the rest of the Province, or even lowered - actually lowered - I would have to support it. Sir, you would not believe the hardships the people have to go through on the Great Northern Peninsula, and I speak from first hand knowledge for the old district of St. Barbe North where you get severe salting of the wires there in the district, you get flashouts, you get surges in the voltages of the electricity from time to time; consequently, Sir, the electrical appliances - refrigerators, deep-freezers, stoves and what have you - are actually blown out, actually burnt out during these surges for some strange reason because of the fact that you have these generating stations pumping or pushing electricity over long distances - and I am not an electrician in this respect, but you do get these voltage surges, I understand; I think that is

MR. F. ROWE: what they call them - which causes the burning out of people's electrical appliances and also in businesses, and this causes, of course, great financial loss in the goods that are stored in these machines becoming thawed or what have you, and, of course, extra cost to the people in the repair and replacement of their electrical appliances.

 Also, Sir, I have never heard any stories or reports coming from any other part of the Province where people have

MR. F. ROWE:

had to do without electricity

for such long periods of time as a result of a generator breaking down or a generator burning out or wires coming down because of the heavy wind that you get on that part of the coast. And we have had experiences where people have had to leave their homes in the Winter and sleep in their cars overnight with the heater going in order to stay warm, actually having to sleep in their cars because when with the new modernization obviously a lot of the people in the district, in that area have gone modern with respect to heating and do not have the old wood stoves and what have you that were so prevalent on the coast at one time. But, Sir, the conditions with respect to the supply of electricity are so desperate on the Northwest Coast in particular that everybody would have to support this kind of a petition. It is a wonder, Sir, that they are not just asking for standarization of their electrical rates but actually a reduction compared to the rest of the Province because the service is simply not there and it is a very difficult area to serve, a technically difficult area to serve, and economically expensive to serve. But I think the only fair thing to do here is to grant some sort of a subsidy to equalize or standardize their electrical rates, Sir, and I give this petition my wholehearted support.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

Hon. member for Conception

Bay South.

MR. NOLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support

the petitions presented by our hon. friend and I do so because and again I refer to the reference I made yesterday as quoting in part at least the hon. the Premier, this is now a real social problem and when I was saying as referred to by my hon. friend opposite that the economic burden now for heat and electricity exceeds in many instances the rates paid for mortgages and/or rent, I was not exaggerating, I was not attempting in any way

MR. NOLAN:

to make any political points.

The information that I stated then is clear and precise, I hope, and it is available to any member opposite who wishes to take a look at it and I am sure my hon. friend has taken that trouble.

We are now in this situation, Mr. Speaker: picture, if you will, the situation where you have a widow whose only source of income is the old age pension and she has the cost of drugs and food, normal upkeep, no luxuries, absolutely none

MR. J. NOLAN: she is looking for the bare essentials of life. She is an individual who has never gone to any government or any administration for any kind of a helping hand one way or the other. She has always through her lifetime paid her taxes, with her late husband and so on and family, and now here she is in a situation.

Well, let me give you another example. Take the example I know of of a lady who has a house on sixteen acres of land and a developer has offered to buy it and will pay good money which could be invested and would give her an opportunity to live with some dignity for the rest of her life. The only income she has is the old age pension. She cannot sell the land because it is frozen as farm land by this administration. So here she is land-poor, sitting on land which she cannot sell, unless it is to some speculators for half nothing, because she cannot develop it. You may say, Well, are you saying as a member of the House that you are opposed to the retention of farm land particularly in the metro area and so on? No, I am not but I do not believe a seventy-five year old woman should pay the economic burden for this law, for this regulation, that she should go to her grave. I do not believe this is right, I do not believe it is fair-but it is happening.

Let me quote you another example of people who are faced with electricity problems. A couple I know, who are now in their late sixties, have fourteen acres of land surrounded by houses, residences; they have been offered money for that land. They cleared the land back in the twenties and thirties with their bare hands- rocks, stumps and so on. It is now a very nice piece of land. If they put a cow or cows there, cattle, they are used as targets for pellet guns, If they put vegetables in, they are stolen-but they are not allowed to sell the land. I would gladly give my hon. friend opposite, who I am sure is familiar with the situation I am trying

MR. J. NOLAN: to outline, the details. Here are people who cannot understand why we are so heartless. I am not saying that they look at it as a PC/Liberal thing, I am not saying that, but they cannot understand why we are so insensitive, so heartless, not being able to understand their problem. I would gladly tell my hon. friend opposite, I can take him and show him the piece of land and I can bring him to visit the couple and so on, and I am sure they would tell him and show him what they have showed me.

So imagine how frustrating it is to be sitting in a position such as that where you apparently have great wealth on the one hand - well, not great wealth but at least an opportunity for you to do live in some dignity and respect for the rest of you life without turning to any government, any administration. They want to be independent, they have worked hard all their lives, and here they are now finding it difficult to pay their electric heat bills, food bills, drug bills, a very serious economic burden, and here they are sitting on a piece of property, or the one I referred to earlier, and they are forbidden from selling it unless they sell it to the speculators who are willing to pick it up at bargain sale prices, fire sale prices, hoping that the laws will change one one of those days and that they can make a fast buck.

So why should these people have to carry that economic burden? The petition that is presented here today is not a partisan one. If there were the referendum that my friend referred to it would be so massive against. There is a great distrust of all of us if we do not address ourselves to this particular problem. And it is not a partisan one, it should not be. It is something, as I think someone said, the rain falls on the just and unjust alike. Well, this burden is falling very heavily on people, not just in my district, I submit, but in every single district in this Province. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all of us will address ourselves to it. I am not suggesting we have all of the answers, I certainly do not, but I think we can do a better job with this than we have done up to now and it is not enough

April 4, 1979

Tape No. 723

DW - 3

MR. J. NOLAN: slough it off by saying that is Hydro or
that is this one or that is that ^{one}; people are not prepared to accept
that anymore.

I certainly support the prayer of these
petitions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Before I recognize the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) I would welcome to the gallery, on behalf of all hon. members, Councillors Payne and Hart and also the town clerk, Mr. Pomeroy, from Fogo. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming the visitors.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to support the petition so ably presented by the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts). Nothing, I suppose, can be said that has not already been said but I want to look for a second Mr. Speaker, at another aspect of Hydro's proposed increase. If Hydro brings in the proposed increase it will be across the board, I presume, it will apply to commercial accounts of this Province as well as the domestic accounts. And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier or the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. C. Doody) is going to have, or this House or somebody is going to have to bring Hydro to heel.

Over this past month I have had incidents where I have been called by fire departments - volunteer fire departments in communities in this Province who have been treated as commercial accounts, fire departments in a town the size of Millertown or Buchans Junction, which are surviving on their own initiative. We have just seen the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. N. Windsor) bring in a Ministerial Statement announcing that they were concerned about the various fire departments, in this Province, ability to survive while at the same time this Government allows Newfoundland Hydro to class the fire department of Millertown into a commercial category. Any individuals in Millertown today, or in any community in Newfoundland which has a fire department, the rate of their electric bills is fifty dollars, their fire departments is \$120. Now, by what logic, Mr. Speaker - the people of the town are paying to support the town council, the

MR. G. FLIGHT: people of the town are paying to support the volunteer fire brigade - by what logic does this Government while they are intercepting revenue grants, while they know the town and fire department are struggling to survive, by what logic do they allow Hydro to pass a fire department as a commercial account and charge them twice the domestic rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I personally called Hydro on this issue not long ago and the official I talked to hoo-hawed the situation. He said that is the way it is; fire halls, town councils are considered commercial accounts and therefore the commercial rate applies. We have the spectacle of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. N. Windsor) acknowledging the fact that fire departments cannot survive financially in this Province, have not got the ability. We also have the spectacle of the Government allowing Newfoundland Hydro to class a fire department as a commercial account and allowing Newfoundland Hydro to send cut-off notices to fire departments when they are two months in arrears - or Newfoundland Light and Power.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody), to whom Hydro answers, explain to this House why it is that Hydro has that kind of power, why it is that Hydro, on their own initiative, decides that a fire department or a town council, an organization that is in place to serve, voluntarily serve the needs of the community, why it is that Hydro is in a position to classify those kinds of organizations as commercial accounts, whereas for argument sake, if a merchant or a millionaire living in any given town, if his electrical bill -

MR. DOODY: You cannot argue petitions.

MR. G. FLIGHT: It is not argument, You cannot discuss keeping a freeze on electrical rates in this Province, Mr. Speaker, if you do not look at the alternatives and if you do not

MR. G. FLIGHT: look at what an increase is doing to me, to the people concerned. Now, I am telling this House of Assembly that there are fire departments in this Province and town councils in this Province who cannot afford to pay their electrical rates and will shut down, will accept the cut-off notices. And why is it that Hydro has got that kind of power, has been given that kind of power by this Government to say to the fire department of Millertown that you are a commercial account and, we do not care where the money comes from, you are going to pay a commercial account rate which means an electrical bill of \$100 a month when they are lucky to be raising, through voluntary efforts, forty or fifty dollars a month, enough to keep the fire department going? And that is happening in this Province. Mr. Speaker, if we are not prepared to sit down and talk to Newfoundland Hydro and say that you will not increase rates, or you will not classify town councils, volunteer fire departments as commercial rates, then Hydro is doing what they please, Mr. Speaker, and either this House moves or this

Mr. Flight: government moves or Hydro will bring in the 20 per cent increase, and all of the fears that have been expressed by members around this House about what kind of an impact that 20 per cent increase will have will indeed be true and this House of Assembly will live with it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Before recognizing the hon. member for the Bay of Islands, I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly a former member of this Legislature and present mayor of Corner Brook, Dr. Noel Murphy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: I have a petition from 124 residents in the community of Summerside. And the prayer of the petition reads as follows: "We the undersigned constituents in your district of Bay of Islands call your attention to the intolerable situation existing in the community of Summerside, namely, the impassable condition of Third and Fourth Avenues. The present condition of these thoroughfares upon which upwards of fifty families depend for service, access for firefighting and ambulance vehicles, is such that any vehicle venturing thereon is assured of either sinking in the mud or experiencing major damage due to the holes, etc.

"If an emergency such as fire or accident were to develop in this area, assistance could not reach the scene. Who then would be responsible? We as taxpayers and voters in this district seek your support in asking that you present this petition for assistance to the House of Assembly at the earliest opportunity. We feel that we are in no way overly demanding in asking the assistance of our government by funding this necessary upgrading!" They also, Mr. Speaker, sent me a copy of a picture of a truck and a car stuck in the mud.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you of what brought about this petition. During the past twelve to eighteen months, negotiations have been going on between the Department of

Mr. Woodrow: Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Council of Summerside over the upgrading of Third and Fourth Avenues and other roads in the Summerside area, and they were offered \$40,000 on a sixty-forty agreement, \$24,000 as a grant and \$16,000 as a loan. I have had many contacts with Council on this and with Municipal Affairs, especially the regional office in Corner Brook, and Council felt that because of other commitments it could not go along with that agreement, thus the road deteriorated more and more.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say, however, that before I got this petition I had contacted Municipal Affairs, and they sent the following telegram to the Town Council in Summerside: "This would advise that in view of the emergency situation existing in the municipality, the department has authorized work to be carried out on roads up to the value of \$2,000. After work has been completed to this value, invoices should be submitted to this department for payment." That is signed the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Mr. Speaker, in order to bring these roads up to standard it is going to take more than \$2,000. I am continuing to talk to Council and I hope they will be in a position during the road building season to go along with the sixty-forty basis and this will alleviate their situation.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to have the petition placed upon the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Before recognizing the hon. member for LaPoile, it has been drawn to my attention that another former member of the House of Assembly is in the galleries in the person of Mr. Aubrey Senior, and I wish also to welcome him to the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have no hesitation in supporting the petition so ably presented, Sir, by

Mr. Neary: the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow).

I am not quite sure if the hon. gentleman indicated whether or not this was a municipal problem or main roads in the community?

MR. WOODROW: It is municipal.

MR. NEARY: It is exclusively a municipal matter. It comes under the jurisdiction of the Town Council of Summerside, and the people have been driven to desperation, driven to circulating a petition to have presented in this hon. House. The member has done his best, he has gone on behalf of the people in Summerside to the

MR. NEARY: the Department of Municipal Affairs. He has appealed to his colleagues. They gave him \$2,000, which I consider to be an insult. I have not seen the picture, but a picture is as good as a thousand words. I would consider \$2,000 to upgrade and maintain these two roads, **Third and Fourth** Avenues a gross insult to the people in that community. And the hon. gentleman has done the right thing by now exposing this matter to the court of public opinion. That is what the hon. gentleman has done in this House. His colleagues have refused to co-operate with the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman had no choice but to bring the matter before the House of Assembly and thus before the people of the Province - in other words, exposed it to the court of public opinion in **the hope** that the pressure that he has brought to bear now upon the administration that he is supporting will come across with the 60/40 financial deal that is necessary in order to get these roads fixed up.

So we have no hesitation, Sir, in supporting the prayer of the petition, and if the hon. gentleman is driven any further to frustration then there is a vacant seat over here somewhere on this side of the House; we would be always glad to have the hon. gentleman come over.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, I would like to acknowledge the petition so ably presented by my colleague and support his concerns in this regard.

I can assure this House that the people in Summerside were not at all insulted with

MR. N. WINDSOR: the emergency funding we gave them to make emergency repairs - that is essentially what it was. They were very pleased with that. We will certainly be giving every possible consideration to their request for financing this year under our Roads Agreement Programme as we do with all requests that have come in from numerous municipalities around this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the member for Fogo.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: I, too, would like to support the petition so ably presented by the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow). The hon. member is beginning to be a master at presenting petitions now requesting his government to take action either on the cost of electricity or the upgrading and paving of roads. However, Sir, perhaps that is the only way he can get some action.

The community roads within the municipalities has become a very burdensome task on many of the councils. They found themselves in a position where they were forced more or less to take over the roads in a very deteriorated condition. And then, of course, they had to find the money somehow to upgrade the roads. I can think of the road on the North side of Fogo. When the roads through Fogo were paved, the Northside Road in Fogo was left out and since then that road has caused a terrible financial strain on the community council of Fogo. And Fogo is only but one example of how much money has to be spent by the councils. It is not only upgrading and paving of the roads, it is servicing, plowing snow and sand and gravel in the Winter. For some reason or other the government has been able to manoeuver or persuade the councils or make them believe that it is now their responsibility to take full responsibility of all roads within their jurisdiction. And, Sir, this is too much

CAPT. E. WINSOR: of a financial strain. They just do not have the resources; they do not have the tax base to collect taxes to carry out a good job. They just cannot afford to upgrade and pave roads within their communities and I sincerely ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor) to take a very serious look - now today he made the announcement that the government would be paying 75/25 per cent for fire equipment in any community. I would also suggest to the minister that before any other roads are taken over by councils, the roads involved should be brought up to first class standard so that the councils can at least have two or three years of breathing space before they are called upon to spend money which they do not have but which they are forced to raise somehow. I would suggest to the minister now to go out on a limb and make the upgrading and paving of all the byroads in the municipalities - give them a 75/25 per cent rather than a 60/40 per cent.

I strongly support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the member for Exploits.

DR. TWOMEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present and deal with two petitions. May I have your permission?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman does not need my permission. He certainly has it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. TWOMEY: "To whom it may concern: "We, the residents of Cottle's Cove,

DR. TWOMEY: Moore's Cove and Fortune Harbour hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to commence the upgrading of a road between Point of Bay and Fortune Harbour during the coming Summer. The deplorable condition of this road is not confined to the Spring thaw but rather it is a problem all the year round. It is our hope that upgrading with future paving in mind can and will be started this Summer."

It is signed by 272 residents.

The other one from the community council of Leading Tickles. "We, the citizens of Leading Tickles and Glovers Harbour are hereby registering our protest about the condition of the road between Point Leamington, Leading Tickles and Glovers Harbour are hereby registering our protest about the condition of the road between Point Leamington, Leading Tickles and Glovers Harbour. We are urgently requesting that the road be upgraded and paved in 1979."

It is signed by 336 of the residents.

Each of these roads measure about twenty miles. They cover rough terrain, soft and boggy, varying from area to area. There are numerous curves. These roads are the only artery of trade and commerce from these communities and the rest of Newfoundland. They are used to carry their fish for processing, their wood to the paper mill in Grand Falls for pulp making, to travel to the doctors and the hospitals for their health needs, to the police for their protection and to the courts for their justice. So you can see they are of vital importance to these communities.

I ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) that he give serious consideration to the upgrading and paving of these roads. I

DR. TWOMEY: think it is vital to their interest and I am sure that he will at least give it a passing thought. I wish to present these briefs and ask that they be tabled and referred to the department to which they relate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to support the petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague from Exploits (Dr. Twomey). I am sure we are all delighted every time that he stands and I wish that every second or third day he would have a petition to present because we are so delighted with his delivery and the sensible way in which he presents a petition or he handles himself in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Winston Churchill.

MR. FLIGHT: Winston Churchill. The House of Assembly's Winston Churchill. I have to express, Mr. Speaker, some surprise though, having spent three weeks in that district during the famous by-elections of 1976, I think, I am surprised that there is an inch of road in that district not paved. I know, Mr. Speaker, that in submitting this petition that the hon. member is drawing attention to promises made. I spent three weeks in the district, Sir, and on every by-road in the district we had to pull off to allow paving equipment to pass or wait behind it until it was moving. The fact that there is not pavement between Cottle's Cove and the other communities comes as a shock to me. I know it is a great letdown to him because I know the promises were made. And so, Mr. Speaker, in presenting his petition, which was his obligation, he has drawn attention to the fact that the party that he is a member of,

MR. FLIGHT: the government which he supports is not very good at keeping their promises. The people of those communities were assured, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): Order, please! Order, please!

I think the hon. gentleman is aware that the Standing Orders are quite clear with respect to debate on petitions. Obviously, there may well be a relevant motion in which the hon. gentleman could debate the relevant values of various political parties or matters which were discussed during by-elections but here he is required to speak in support of the petition.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My only desire in saying what I said was to assure myself of the incredible fact that there is a road in that district not paved. I thought maybe for a minute that I was hearing the wrong names. But now that I know that we are talking about roads in the Exploits district, then I accept that as a fact. But based on my experience in 1976 it comes as a complete shock that there is a mile of road in that district not paved. And certainly it lowers my judgement of the present administration that they would break a promise that they made to the people of that district.

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

I think the hon. member

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) is aware of the ruling I made and the hon. gentleman is required to observe it.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, I will observe His Honour's ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete sympathy with the minister. It seems to me that we may have come to grips with the Trans-Canada. We see contracts in the paper every day and we have reason to believe that over the next two or three years the Trans-Canada will be upgraded to a point where it will be safe for a Newfoundlander to go on that road. But there is a great concern spreading throughout this Province, Mr. Speaker, as to what happens to our trunk road system, the type of roads that my hon. friend draws attention to in his petition. I live at the end of a trunk road system forty-nine miles long, Mr. Speaker, that, given the state of deterioration over this past three years, may well not be passable, certainly not safe to put school busses on, that have a twenty-one mile route, carrying children from kindergarten to grade eleven. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this administration - they have problems with Hydro, they have other problems but they are going to have to come to grips with what they are going to do with the local road situation in this Province. The fact is, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to hear a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: I had to rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is again wandering and I think that it is necessary for us to pay heed to the Standing Orders with respect to what may be brought up when petitions have been presented. The fact of the matter is that the hon. gentleman is now getting into a general debate with respect to the policy of the government and for the alleged policy of the government and

MR. MARSHALL: government's performance with respect to roads generally.

MR. NEARY: Government has no policy.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: We have a petition before the House now and I again reiterate that you speak to a petition, you speak to the prayer of the petition, the number of names as set down there in Standing Order 97. There is an ample opportunity in the Throne Speech debate and the Budget debate and what have you, for the hon. gentleman to make the observations he is now making. I think it gets the whole procedures of the House out of kilter when you enter into debate in response to a petition.

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order, I would draw to hon. member's attention that the requirement to speak in support of a petition - hon. members will recall that there have been rulings on earlier dates that when a matter is being supported, obviously it comes under some administrative responsibility of the government. But the overall policy, governmental policy with respect to that department does not automatically become involved in speaking to a petition.

The hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely congratulate -

MR. SPEAKER: Apparently the hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. FLIGHT: I sincerely support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fishing and Coasting Vessels Rebuilding and Repairs Bounties Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVENMR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

Hon. Minister of Public

Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like

to table the answer to a question from the hon. member for La Poile (Mr. Neary). Question No. 24 on the Order Paper of March 29th.

ORAL QUESTIONSMR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like

to direct a question to the Premier, Sir. Having told us twice, I believe, in this hon. House in the last week that the Thorne Riddell Report on the evaluation of the Shaheen proposal to take over and operate the oil refinery would be in today or tomorrow and that both proposals, the First Arabian Corporation proposal and the Shaheen proposal would be laid on the table down in the Cabinet Room and looked over and whichever one was the better proposal that is the one the government would support, having told the House that, what are the implications of the statement made publicly this morning on Q radio by the hon. the Premier that we may end up back to square one and that neither one of the proposals before the receivers may be accepted? What was behind that? What are the implications of that statement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the implications

of that statement are simply that I was trying to outline for the reporter who asked me the question what the alternatives were to government. The

PREMIER PECKFORD: alternatives to government are, as I understand it, there is a proposal from one of Mr. Shaheen's companies, there is a proposal from a company called First Arabian Corporation so that the alternatives facing government are to examine the Shaheen proposal, examine the First Arabian proposal and the third alternative is to - Well, the two alternatives then are to either accept Shaheen, to accept First Arabian or to accept neither. These are the alternatives that we have before us. These are the only three I can think of.

I did not mean to imply that we were not going to accept the Shaheen proposal, or were not going to accept the First Arabian proposal, I was trying to detail what the alternatives were to government, and there are three; to accept one, two or neither. That is how I see it. These are the alternatives that government will have before it when it sits down to decide upon how it wants to proceed from here on the Come by Chance refinery.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman think that it was wise for the hon. the Premier to go public, in view of the answers that the Premier had given in this House in the last week or so, and I would suspect from the Premier's answer now that he hopes that one of the proposals will be acceptable, but is there any indication - I got the impression from the Premier's statement this morning in trying to read between the lines, trying to follow the hon. gentleman who is being very erratic over this oil refinery thing so far, he does not seem to be following

MR. NEARY: a straight line - is there any indication at all, did the Premier when he made that statement realize the implications and the reaction that came from Mr. Shaheen on radio this morning - they are ready to go into the next quarter of the ball game, is the way I think he put it - but does the Premier realize, and was it wise for him to come out publicly and make a statement at this time when we are so near the point where both proposals are going to be looked at and compared and evaluated to see which one is the better proposal to take over and operate the oil refinery?

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I guess we could debate for a long while the wisdom of a given statement. All I was trying to do was to put in perspective the whole series of alternatives that were before government, and that was all. It was no way intended - You know, my hope, obviously, and I guess every member of the House and every citizen in Newfoundland, it is their hope that we can see the reactivation of the refinery at Come by Chance on a long-term, economic, viable basis. I think that would be all our hope, everybody in Newfoundland, that is their hope, that we can do that.

All I was trying to do was outline the alternatives and there are three; to either support one proposal or another proposal, or not to support any. That is how I see it, or some mix of the two, I do not know. I was just trying to outline the various alternatives that were available. I am extremely optimistic that we will be in a position in the next two or three months to see very tangible evidence of the refinery getting started again. Whether

PREMIER PECKFORD: that actually occurs or not will depend on how good these proposals are and how well they are developed and how quickly we can expedite the whole situation.

We can all question the wisdom of a given statement by a given person, I suppose, but I do not know if I was wise or unwise to make that kind of statement. I was just giving the three alternatives as I saw them and that is what they are, as far as I can see.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman then, Sir, tell the House, in view of the fact that the government is looking at that possibility, that alternative, what would be the consequences of going back to square one and having to go around the world a second or third time looking for proposals taking into account the condition of the oil refinery which is, we are told, deteriorating rapidly? What would be the consequences if we have to go back to square one again and we have to call or start looking for other people? Does the Premier have anybody in mind? If neither one of these proposals are accepted, does the Premier have anybody in mind? Has anybody indicated to the hon. gentleman that they might be interested in the refinery? What would be the consequences if there is a further delay, if we have to go looking for proposals again taking into account the condition of the refinery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the consequences would seem on the surface and, I suppose, even below the surface from the information I have, that it would be a serious blow to

PREMIER PECKFORD: the possibilities of getting the refinery opened in the next couple of years and would mean that additional funds would have to be found from the first mortgagee or second mortgagee or whoever to keep funding, to keep the facility in place, which would be very difficult to do. So I think it would be a serious blow if the third alternative had to be considered, I really do. And as I have told the hon. member, I am extremely optimistic that we will not have to do that, and I hope that we do not. But we must look at what is best for the Province in the long term, and if one of those proposals happens to have a good chance of being successful, then we should push it with all our might. But whether we will be in a position to do that will depend upon the information we get in the next few days.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if there is any pressure on the government? Is there any pressure being brought to bear on the Premier or his ministers to reject either one or both of the proposals presently before the receiver? Is there any pressure to bear either by the oil companies, the **Seven Sisters** or even within the **Cabinet**, any pressure at all that the best way out of this is to reject one, if not both of these proposals?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no pressure on me or on any of the ministers that I know of to reject one or both of the proposals - none, absolutely none, zero. I think the whole question of what I said yesterday or what was on the radio today has been somewhat exaggerated. I was just trying to be extremely objective

PREMIER PECKFORD: in how I looked at the alternatives that were available to government, that is all.

MR. NEARY: To get your name on the radio.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, the hon. member might use that now and then, but I try to be responsible and try to make statements, Mr. Speaker, which have something to say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and I was just trying to indicate the three alternatives that were available, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman from Carbonear, followed by the hon. gentleman from Windsor - Buchans.

Before the hon. gentleman asks his question, I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly on behalf of all hon. members, three recently elected officers of the Council of Students' Union at Memorial University, in the person of the President, Mr. Steve Delaney, the Executive Vice-President, Mr. Kevin Saunders and the Academic Vice-President, Mr. Kirk Anderson. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. R. MOORES: A very timely introduction,

Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier, and by way of clarification, preamble the question by saying that last year in May or June, I directed a question to the former Premier regarding student employment or unemployment for the Summer. If I recall correctly,

MR. R. MOORES: I asked the Premier at that time if he were to undertake any extraordinary procedures or programmes or policies by his government to employ more university students. I understand that we are now a week or ten days away from about 4,000 full-time students being injected into the labour force. Would the Premier be kind enough to tell me if he will undertake any extraordinary programmes this year?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are not in the position at the present moment to undertake extraordinary employment generating programmes for students at the university or for any other group in our society. At the present moment we are going through our budgetary process. Hopefully we will be able, in the next couple of months, to generate some economic activity around the Province which will be of general application to whosoever will or has some abilities in those activities to get jobs. So there are no extraordinary programmes planned at the present moment. Hopefully, through the budgetary process we will be able to put in place a number of programmes which will generate employment for our Province.

MR. R. MOORES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. R. MOORES: Would the Premier be more specific and say, please, yes or no. Are there going to be any extra programmes for students? In this case, I am concerned only with students - not, of course, to say that I am not concerned generally with Newfoundlanders, but my question was concerning students - yes or no?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can ask as many questions as he likes and try to dictate the kind of answer he is going to get. He will get the

PREMIER PECKFORD: kind of answer that a minister or myself wishes to provide. Given that the question might not have as explicit an answer as he would like, there is a Budget being prepared and I cannot prejudge the kind of Budget that we are going to have at this particular moment, because we are still talking about it and still considering various options and various

PREMIER PECKFORD: developments, therefore I cannot answer the question with a yes or no answer. It is impossible for me to answer with a yes or no answer. I can say no at the present moment as I did say in my original answer and that stands as I said it earlier but whether in fact there will be extraordinary programmes in the future will depend upon the kind of decisions we have to make now as it relates to the Budget.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that raises a very interesting question, the answer that the Premier gave my hon. colleague, Sir. So much is riding on the Budget when can we expect a Budget to be brought down?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the once.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. S. NEARY: You are getting worst than 'Frank'.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my questions to the hon. Minister of Forests and Lands (Mr. Morgan) and it relates to a passage in the Auditor General's report which regards to Forest Management Tax. The Auditor General indicated that since the Land Management Tax was brought in in 1974 only seven returns have been processed by the Auditor General's department, and six of those were submitted by the major paper companies which indicates that either both major companies did not submit the report required by legislation and the revenue that would have resulted therefrom or one company missed two years. So my question to the minister is which of the two paper companies have not submitted their annual reports as required by the Tax Land Management Act up to the time of the Auditor General's report, March 1978.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Hon. minister.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, having just moved into the portfolio of Forestry I will take the question under advisement and attempt to get the answers to that question over the next number of days.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General also indicates that up to his 1976 audit which was a year prior to this one 1977 that the Province had not identified, **had only received one** return under the legislation from any individual or company holding in **excess** of 300 acres of timber rights in this Province. And up until that point in 1978 only one individual or company had submitted a report as required by the legislation. So, therefore we have to assume that the Province has been deprived of any income that it was entitled to under this law apart from one. Now would the minister indicate to the House whether or not companies holding in **excess of** 300 acres of land in this Province have **up to** this point in time been identified - 300 acres - have **up to this point in time** been identified and, if they have been identified, what action is the government going to take with regards to the fact that they have not submitted the required reports under this legislation? Number one; they have not submitted the reports and number two; what action will the Province take to regain any revenue owing the Province as a result of their not having submitted the reports?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, number one, I understand that the department is now making every effort to make sure that the **com-**
panies concerned submit their reports and number two based on that informa-
tion from the companies concerned the clear indication is that we will **not lose any revenue based on the reports that will be forthcoming in** the next number of months.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Is the minister in a position and I realize the minister has only been in the portfolio a couple of weeks and I will defer the question to the previous Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Maynard) to get an answer -

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot do that.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - if it is necessary. But is the minister in a position to give this House some indication as to the amount of revenue involved here? How much money is owing this Province, estimate it if necessary but a figure, a ballpark figure to use a cliché that would be owing to this Province as a result of the two major paper companies number one; not submitting reports and all of the companies in this Province who own over 300 acres. What figure are we looking at, so far that has been deprived from this Province as a result of these companies not abiding by the law brought in in 1974?

MR. S. NEARY: Enough to pave the roads and -

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would have been following what has been happening in the House of Assembly the last three years, as the spokesman for forestry he would have realized that the forest management plan and programme brought in by this government a couple of years ago gave all the companies in the Province two years grace to get their reports into the government. Because the plan was brought in and introduced in 1977,

MR. MORGAN: they are given two years to report to government, therefore the companies are still within the legality of not reporting to date. But as I mentioned earlier the indication from the forestry officials are that they are now in the process of filing the reports with the department and therefore I will make sure as minister, I will make sure all my colleagues on this side will agree that we get the maximum revenue that is due the government from the companies concerned.

MR. FLIGHT: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have to take exception to that. The legislation said two years grace but we have all the companies who own more than 300 acres and two of the major paper companies who have now used up four years grace and have not submitted their forms. So there is no excuse for the companies. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessarily a supplementary, I wish to advise you, Sir, that I am not satisfied with the minister's answer and would request the right to debate this issue on the Late Show Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay, Trinity-Bay de Verde, Bellevue, and Terra Nova.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question too is to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan), it might give him a chance to cool down a little bit. It appeared that he was getting a little riled up that time. Mr. Speaker, I remain cautiously optimistic as a result of hearing the minister in the media this morning make a few comments with regard to a possible enlightening of the situation, the terrible economic situation that presently faces the town of Roddickton in my district. I wonder if the minister could inform me and the House what

MR. RIDEOUT: exactly the situation is in Roddickton at the moment with regards to the economic problems facing that community?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as of the last few days the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Development and myself have been closely involved and connected with the problems in the hon. gentleman's district at Roddickton and attempting to resolve the problem there. Over the past weekend, as the hon. gentleman is probably aware, a company called Northern Logging Limited from Hawkes Bay met with a number of loggers in the area and put forward to them the terms and conditions under which they would move in and establish a woods operation. Because all the loggers were not there in attendance at the meeting on the past weekend, today the forestry officials are arranging to meet with the loggers concerned and put forward to them the terms and conditions outlined by the company concerned in the hope that the conditions will meet the requirements of the loggers in the Roddickton area. If the conditions outlined by the company meet the satisfaction of the loggers, the company has indicated to my colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Maynard) and myself that they are willing to move into the Roddickton area in the next number of days and establish a woods operation.

In the meantime I understand as of yesterday in discussion with the council for the community of Roddickton, I discussed the matter with them over the phone and they have arranged to call tonight a public meeting to also outline to them the government's position and the position of

MR. MORGAN: the company concerned and I am hoping that after tonight that all concerned, the committee established, the loggers concerned and council, agree with the conditions set out by the company and if so the matter will be resolved within the next number of days.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for the information. The minister has told us that the company is making a proposal to the town, to the loggers committee, the citizens committee and so on, could the minister tell the House what the involvement of the government financially or otherwise will be in the setting up of a new company in the Roddickton area to create the much needed employment in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, at this time there is no indication that government will be involved except to the point I mentioned earlier. The company is not really a new company in regards to woods operations. They have been well established in the Province, in another area of the Province over the past number of years. They have a good reputation in woods operations and at the present date there is no indication that government will be involved financially or otherwise except to co-ordinate the negotiations if you wish, between the company and the loggers concerned.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell me whether or not this company, Northern Logging of Hawkes Bay, will become involved in what appears to be a very bright and prosperous overseas pulp export market

MR. RIDEOUT: vis-a-vis other than that Bowaters since that is the two major holders of claims in the Roddickton area.

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is understood from the company as of yesterday at a meeting with them that they will be exporting their prime pulp wood from the area.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell me whether or not the company has made a definitive offer to provide logging equipment to the loggers in the Roddickton area, as that appears to me for some months to be the real crux of the problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, without giving all of the details of the terms and conditions set forth by the company, there was a total of ten conditions. One of them being they would provide unnecessary equipment like, for example, chain saws and parts for the heavy equipment. Also they would provide a garage for the repair of the equipment, and transportation to and from the wood sites.

MR. RIDEOUT: Are they going to supply timber jacks?

MR. MORGAN: The acquisition of heavy equipment like timber jacks was not one of the conditions put forward by the company, but they put forward ten conditions. And as I indicated earlier, I am of the opinion at this time that the majority of the loggers and the people in the area will accept these conditions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde I had indicated.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I would like to address a question to the Premier with respect to the ministerial statement made today, which obviously was approved by the Cabinet, and relating to the acquisition of fire equipment for unincorporated communities and the intention to set up committees for that particular purpose. An excellent idea. But what I would like to know, Sir, the ministerial statement indicates that such committees will be set up and regulations will be brought in as quickly as possible.

Mr. F. Rowe: Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are a number of large unincorporated communities particularly in my own district, could the Premier give some indication as to what is meant by as quickly as possible? Because I know of a number of fire halls that have been built under LIP or Canada Works projects and this sort of a thing, and these people are now in the process of trying to find funds for the purpose of acquiring some fire equipment and I am sure they would like to know approximately what time frame is involved here so they would - some of them, for example, are embarking on fund raising episodes at this point now, and if they could get a reasonably fair definition of approximately when such regulations will be brought forward for the setting up of such a committee it would be deeply appreciated?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it will be as quickly as the regulations are put in place. And the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not available right now, but as I understand it, as quickly as the regulations can be established, so it is standard for all unincorporated areas then we will be ready to move. How quickly, the hon. member could ask, I suppose, how quickly is that? I do not know how long it takes regulations to get in place, I would imagine two or three weeks time it would be ready to move, you know.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, well you know I would not expect the Premier or even the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to indicate exactly, you know, what week. Are we talking about weeks or a month or two months or three months?

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is why I said two or three weeks.

MR. ROWE: Two or three weeks. Thank you.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): I recognize the hon. gentleman for Bellevue next. Before his question I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly on behalf of hon. members some visitors from Pasadena in the persons of Mayor Pardy, Councillor Norman, and the Town Manager, Mr. Roland Major.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural Development, who is outside of the door, I hope he can get in in time to answer a little question. It relates to the Auditor General's report on page 34. The Auditor General says, regarding the Department of Rural Development, Section 50, "My audit of the Rural Development Authority for the year ended 31 March 1978 disclosed nine instances where the guidelines established by the Authority for issuing loans were not followed." Later on in the report, on top of page 35, the Auditor General says, "The issuance of guidelines, especially guidelines which are not followed, instead of having regulations, which would be enforceable, borders on the ridiculous and makes a reasonable audit impossible." He says, "I note that the Internal Audit Division, the Department of Finance,

MR. CALLAN: in its report on audit of the Rural Development Authority dated July 12, 1977, expressed a view that former regulations should be enacted." Let me ask the minister then, does he or the government that he is a part of intend to replace these guidelines with legislation enacting regulations?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the Minister of Rural-Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, yes, there will be an amendment to the Rural Development Act introduced during this sitting of the House to allow the Rural Development Authority to make regulations governing the granting of loans.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: That is good news, Mr. Speaker. We are going to have the gate closed after at least nine horses have escaped. But anyway, it is better late than never. Let me ask the minister, then - the new minister, I should say - I think the last report that the House of Assembly received on a list of loans and grants that were made by the Rural Development Authority - the last list was presented to this House about five or six years ago. Other former ministers refused to present a list showing the loans and grants. Does this minister intend to have an open department? Does he intend to present us with a list or are we to be still kept in the dark?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, this minister intends to have a fully open department. It has been that way since I have moved into the department. The door has never been closed to anyone who has come to it to ask for information, to ask for loans or whatever it is they want to do. However, the maintaining of an open department

MR. GOUDIE: does not include the publishing of a list of loans or grants in this Province.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Okay, Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that he will not present a detailed list, but in view of the fact that obviously there has to be a suspicion regarding these nine instances, perhaps to allay any fears that these loans which were granted without following the guidelines may have been done for political or other reasons, Would the minister table a list of these nine instances of loans being granted without the guidelines being followed to allay any fears or any mistrusts and so on that people may have that it was done for a friend and so on? Would the minister do that, table the nine?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, no, I do not intend to table that list of the nine loans which were approved according to the Auditor General outside of the guidelines. I should clarify one point, I think, that under the guidelines which exist presently, it is not illegal or improper -

MR. CALLAN: No, no.

MR. GOUDIE: - for the RDA to provide loans to anyone or anything.

MR. CALLAN: It smells bad, that is all.

MR. GOUDIE: It smells bad, but -

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. NEARY: I meant to do this yesterday, Mr. Speaker. I am sure my hon. counterpart, the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall), my good friend, will second the motion that I am going to make. I meant to do it yesterday, Sir, on the 100th anniversary, the birthday of

MR. NEARY: The Evening Telegram in this Province. In my opinion, Sir, it would be a very serious oversight -

AN HON. MEMBER: You waited, hoping that they would mention it.

MR. NEARY: Well, I had held back.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: I had advised Your Honour, as a matter of fact, in advance, but I held back hoping the Premier or the Government House Leader would do it.

 But it would be a very serious oversight on our part, Sir, as members of this hon. House, if we did not take note of the fact that the St. John's Evening Telegram yesterday celebrated its 100th birthday. In 1894, as hon. gentlemen are aware, a humble printer in the person of William James Herder founded The Evening Telegram, Mr. Speaker, which turned out to become one of Newfoundland's most successful dailies. Later, in 1900, Sir, we are told that The Western Star began publication in Corner Brook and has been publishing for at least seventy-nine years providing news and information and providing a public service to the people in the Western part of the Province.

 To the surviving members of the Herder family, Sir, and to the editorial staff and the news staff and to all the employees of The Evening Telegram, we wish them, Sir, a happy birthday and a happy anniversary. And I think it is only fitting, Mr. Speaker, that I should move in this hon. House that you, Sir, through your good office, send a note of congratulations to the publishers on this occasion. Therefore, Sir, I move that this House, in recognition of the 100th anniversary or the 100th birthday of The Evening Telegram, send a message of

MR. NEARY: the fact that the press foreman at the Evening Telegram, Mr. Walter Churchill, has been with that company sixty-three and one half years. Mr. Churchill could have resigned, could have retired rather but elected to carry on his duties with the Evening Telegram. I think he is to be commended. He has been with that company sixty-three and one half years, Sir, which is a remarkable and outstanding feat indeed. So I take great pleasure, Sir, in moving that Your Honour compile a letter of congratulations to the Evening Telegram on its 100th birthday.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we have no hesitation whatsoever in wholeheartedly endorsing and seconding or co-proposing a suitable letter be drafted by Your Honour - perhaps Your Honour could even deliver it because the Evening Telegram itself has been a very noted force in this Province and a very beneficial force over the past 100 years. As the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has indicated particularly under the impetus and the leadership and direction of the Herder family which when one thinks of publishing in this Province today one thinks of the Herder family. In recent years it has gone to the Thompson chain on the Mainland but I think the last 100 years certainly belong to the Herder family and the employees and the reporters that have been in the operation for that period of time. They have made a very significant contribution to the life of this Province on many times particularly and I think we will all agree that they were one of the main carrying calls in this Province for freedom in recent years and have done in large measure a great deal of service in this Province to what a lot of people feel is restoring democracy to the Province of Newfoundland. So we have no hesitation whatsoever in endorsing the motion proposed by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) which I am quite sure will pass unanimously and with a great deal of genuine feeling by all members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) It has been moved and seconded that a suitable letter be sent to the Evening Telegram expressing the House's sentiments and congratulations upon the 100th anniversary. Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", Carried.

It being Private

Member's Day we proceed to Motion No. 1.

Hon. member for

Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) compares to match wits with the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). The total match comes to a half-wit, both sides included.

Mr. Speaker, I should note of course that history was made in the House a moment ago when the motion to congratulate the Evening Telegram was on the floor the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) - I am sure I heard him say that he wanted to congratulate all the reporters. Now one of the reporters is Mr. Joe Smallwood and let the record show that the member for St. John's East indirectly said something nice about Mr. Smallwood and moreover the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) was silent and silence is consent I am told, He was actually silent on that point so he, Mr. Speaker, indirectly has given his support to a resolution praising Mr. Smallwood. He will be awake all night tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution moved by my colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe) the member for Twillingate proposes that we establish a select committee of this House, a committee of several members to travel around the Province - how nice -

MR. MORGAN:

Have you started a leadership campaign?

MR. SIMMONS: A leadership campaign. Already he is calling for a leadership review in his party, Mr. Speaker. I knew he did not take it very well. There they are, Mr. Speaker, number fifty-six, one hundred and fifty-seven and sliding. There he is, the helicopter kid, number fifty-six.

MR. MORGAN: I was not one of the people arrested this morning.

MR. SIMMONS: You would know if you were in jail when you came out on your day permit this morning you would have seen him.

MR. MORGAN: Wait until I show you the film on the Newfoundland Hotel.

MR. SIMMONS: Show us the film 'Jimmy'.
Show us the film 'Jimmy'.

MR. MORGAN: You are a movie star, 'Bill'.

MR. RIDEOUT: Let us get the Minister of Tourism to get a projector, let us get him up to see it.

MR. SIMMONS: 'Jimmy', some day -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, he is referring -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, some day the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will have to put his money where his oversized mouth is.

MR. MORGAN: What about yourself?

MR. SIMMONS: He will have to put his money where his oversized mouth is.

MR. RIDEOUT: I hear you are in trouble.

MR. SIMMONS: He will have to prove all the innuendo he gets on with in this House. Then as soon as somebody gets up and suggests and tell the House some facts of life about his using helicopters, then he starts to smart and then he hides behind the Chair. But it is okay, Mr. Speaker, as long as the innuendo is coming from him about members of this House being in jail and that kind of nonsense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: That is all very well, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Cross): A point of order has been raised.

MR. MARSHALL: I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member has to resume his seat I

MR. MARSHALL: believe. It is customary.
Mr. Speaker, the subject of this debate is unemployment or employment and I suggest to Your Honour that the debate is not taking the tenor or the tone along the subject matter of the debate itself and I think we would be better served if it did because we are getting off into an area now that could lead, I think, to points of order and countercharges and what have you. I think that the hon. member is out of order. Perhaps he is responding in other areas, I do not know, but I think we should get on with the debate.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I could not agree more with the government House Leader. He could solve the problem very simply by restraining his colleague from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). I submit, Mr. Speaker, I am a victim of the most serious provocation here on this matter and if he will restrain his colleague from Bonavista South I will get on with the subject at hand. I would rather at any time, Mr. Speaker, I assure you, talk about employment than about the hon. member, as much as I have to say about him.

MR. SPEAKER(Cross): Order, please!
I would certainly ask hon. members to my left to refrain when someone is speaking. And I would ask the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to also keep within the realm of relevancy in his debate.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the attention of the struggling member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). I was about to tell him that the resolution would have us set up a select committee to travel around this Province and get the views of the

MR. SIMMONS: people of Newfoundland on this subject, to allow these people to have some input into the very serious problem of economic development, job creation, the whole employment - unemployment dilemma.

I was disappointed to learn from one or two speakers from the government side that somehow they did not think this was a good idea. Indeed, I actually heard one of the members, the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) suggest that he had the answers. He had them, he said last Wednesday, there was no need of any select committees, no need of any input from the public, he had the answers. Of course, the obvious question for that member is when is he going to tell the Premier the answers so that the Premier can do something about implementing them.

I do not believe for a moment, Mr. Speaker, we have all the answers on this particular subject. I believe one way to find some of the answers is the very excellent suggestion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W.N.Rowe).

Last Spring the government brought down its budget and the then Minister of Finance included in the budget a Blueprint for Development. It talked about what the government would do over the next five to ten years to create jobs, and the promise was, Mr. Speaker, that in the five year period following - or in the three year period, I ought to have said, in the three year period leading up to 1982, there would be the creation of 40,000 new jobs, 40,000 new jobs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are one quarter of the way along that route now. Since

April 4, 1979, Tape 736, Page 4 -- apb

MR. SIMMONS: last Spring, since the
Spring of 1978, we are one-quarter of the way to

MR. R. SIMMONS: the year 1982 and I have difficulty finding one quarter of the jobs, Mr. Speaker. I cannot see where the quarter, the 10,000 jobs or even the 5,000 jobs or even the 1,000 jobs have been created. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not to say that this Government will not take credit for all kinds of jobs that may have been created during that period, for example, only in the last few days the minister in the Federal Cabinet for Newfoundland, Don Jamieson, announced just about \$400 thousand funding for a sawmill in my District of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, the former Ralland's sawmill at Milltown. This will create in the mill and in the woods sixty jobs and I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that when the Government comes in with a list of jobs created that it will list those sixty jobs among the jobs it will claim to have created. I have no doubt that the various small and medium size enterprises which are getting money through various federal programs like the JET the Job Experience Training Program and the various other manpower programs of the Federal Government, the DREE programs, the various industrial incentive programs and through these programs are able to create some additional jobs over and above what they would be able to create without those incentives and that financial assistance.

I have no doubt that the Government will claim credit for these particular jobs, too. Mr. Speaker, all of that begs the real question. What is this particular Government going to do about the subject of unemployment and, even more particularly, when is it going to set about doing it? I am not talking about talking about it in budgets or telling us or projecting great figures of 40 thousand jobs by 1982 and so on, I am not talking about that, I am talking about some tangible evidence such as jobs to take the thousands of people around this Province off the unemployment roles, off the welfare roles and to put them into jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are criticized for not having any ideas and for not putting forward ideas about job

MR. R. SIMMONS: creation. Well, now that we have the new minister, the brand new Minister of Lands and Forestry (Mr. Morgan) here in the House, I will pass on to him a suggestion as it relates to my own district and it is a suggestion that he could apply not only in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir but in many parts of this Province which depend on the forestry industry or could potentially depend on the forest industry if the Government would take the right initiative. The whole question I say to him of timber royalties, timber royalties on the wood salvage operation and I hope I have the attention of the Minister of Lands and Forestry on this particular issue. The whole question of timber royalties on wood salvage operations. There is one now under the auspices of his department together with the Department of Social Services ongoing in my district right now or in process, and the question of timber royalties - the question of cancelling is what I am talking about, take off the timber royalties altogether. As one of his predecessors, by the way, the man sitting directly behind him undertook not to do - I will not commit him to that - but undertook in a meeting in Bay d'Espoir in last November to take up with Government, we have heard nothing about it since, publicly - but in a meeting on November 15th the then Minister of Forestry and Agriculture undertook to take up this very issue with Government, the question of whether Government would be prepared to cancel timber royalties on the woods salvage operation. This would have -

MR. E. MAYNARD: We are still at it.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Okay. The former Minister indicates that matter is not a dead issue yet, and I am very glad to hear that because that would have some implications for the employment situation not only in Bay d'Espoir but in other parts of this Province as well. The question - Still on the Forest industry -

April 4, 1979

Tape 737

RT-3

MR. L. WOODROW: Salvage operation is an ongoing programme in the department.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Salvage operation. Yes. I thank my good and eloquent friend from Bay of Islands (Mr. L. Woodrow) who is always helpful at all times. We had occasion to be together at a function in his district not too long ago and it was an excellent time, I must say. It was good to be with a Liberal at heart at the head table. A real Liberal at heart. As Smallwood used to say about some other people, Mr. Speaker, his heart is in the right place; there is no question about that, his heart is in the right place.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Now if he had the intestinal fortitude do something about it.

MR. R. SIMMONS: I say to my colleague from Baie-Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), I believe the member for Bay of Islands will do the right thing.

MR. SIMMONS: He is coming very close to it now. He has already criticized the government's Hydro policy. He has criticized it openly in this House. He told us today that he was over in the Middle East and right after he came back the price of oil went up. He did not say whether it was because he was in the Middle East or because he came back, but the price of oil did go up; but I say to my colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) it is only a question of time - just a question of time before - only a question of time. I hope he has more luck with King Husein than he had with the person he sat next to at the table in Bristol or -

MR. MORGAN: That is a cruel thing to say about your partner.

MR. F. WHITE: And a lot of others, too.

MR. SIMMONS: 'Jim', jealousy will get you nowhere, 'Jim'. Yes. I tell him that one of those days he will appear in some of these memoirs - a little sub-list. He will be in the list. The list will be entitled People I Did Not Want to Have an Affair With.

Mr. Speaker, another idea for the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) on the subject of forest industry and some employment opportunities is another one that came out of that particular meeting we had with his predecessor in Forestry, and that is an ongoing exchange program between the paper mills and the sawmills. The duplication and the waste that you have in this Province where we talk on one side of our mouth about having a great forest industry and having controls for the new forestry policies that this government brags about, and then to realize that on the other hand we have sawmills with all kinds of pulpwood sitting beside the mill just because they cannot market it, and then a few miles down the road we have loggers in cutting wood for paper mills.

MR. SIMMONS: Because these sawmills cannot market these logs, the overall sawmill is not a viable operation. If through that by-product of pulp logs they could generate some additional cash flow, for example, it would improve their overall financial situation particularly in the Spring of the year when the government has to step in every year and give them some cash flow essentially. It would help them over the hump and, of course, improve their overall cash position, not only in terms of cash flow but in terms of the bottom line as well. Yet, we have sawmill upon sawmill in this Province where pulpwood is literally rotting in the woods because somebody cannot get his head together, because somebody cannot get the paper mills to make an equitable deal with those sawmill operations. I would hope that that issue, which is one the former minister of Forestry undertook to pursue for us, will have some resolution in favour of the sawmill operators before too long.

The paper mills have to buy their sawlogs somewhere - I am sorry, their pulp logs somewhere - whether they buy them from contractors who are cutting, as they will have to continue to do in large measure. I am not suggesting the sawmill operation - by-product operation with sawlogs - will ever replace woods cutting or woods contracting as we know it in this Province; but I am suggesting and asking and pleading really that in the interests of some job creation in places like my district, the sawlog problem ought to be resolved simply by selling the logs to the mills. It requires the intervention of government. It is not as simple as I stated today because there are issues on the side of the paper mills. I realize that. There are issues involving the unions, for example, but issues I believe that are able to be resolved.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I got off on the issue of sawmills. I was onto another subject which is very dear to my heart and that is the Blueprint for Development which appeared last Spring. It is called grandly enough Into the Eighties - a pretty document - nice picture of a ship there all in full colour. Now just as I turn to the subject of this blueprint they tell me I am just about out of time today.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that member

MR. SIMMONS: for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will give me leave to talk about this for an hour or so. I will have to leave this one, Mr. Speaker, for some other time - this subject of the Blueprint for Development. It is a subject very dear to my heart and I would like to have some answers from the government. One, is the blueprint all scrapped now that we have this newfangled administration - the administration that is going to solve most of our problems this week? I heard a rather interesting comment on that subject. I was talking to somebody on the phone a couple of days ago and he was talking about the new Premier and it was a fellow with a pretty wry sense of humour. Into the conversation a bit he said, "Simmons, what does the Premier plan to do next week?", and the implication being that at the rate he was going he would have all the problems solved this week.

The public, Mr. Speaker, already are beginning to laugh - beginning to laugh - because they realize that their expectations now are being raised higher and higher than ever on top of a promise of last Spring where you are going to have 40,000 new jobs. You are going to have an increase in the per capita income. You are going to reduce our rate of dependence on transfer payments from Ottawa. You are going to optimize benefits from the resource industry. All sounds very flowery. I commend the fellows in New York and Toronto who wrote this - the PR fellows up in Montreal, I think it was, who wrote this one. Well, let us talk some facts, Mr. Speaker. We still face the highest unemployment rate we have ever had and we still are struggling with a government that is prepared to do nothing about it, and now we learn last Wednesday from the Minister from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) that the government is not even prepared to strike a select committee to have a look at the problem.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course, Mr. Speaker, without detracting from my colleague's motion in moving this, my colleague from Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe), we still have one idea that is much better than a select committee. We will vote for this one because it is the only option in this House, but we have a better option, Mr. Speaker. If the government is afraid of a select committee, call the election. Call the election and let us get a new select committee in here of 51 or 52 and perhaps there will be enough in that new group who are prepared to take the unemployment situation in hand. **That is our first priority. That is the kind of committee we would like to see selected, a select committee of 52 members elected by the people of this Province. If they will not do that, Mr. Speaker, let them at least support this particular resolution** which will allow several members of this House to go around the Province. Let us put the M.H.A.'s **here** to work - the backbenchers on the government side - the people on this side. Let us put us to work, not only when we are in the House and we are answering our mail and visiting our district. Let us put us to work generally and more full-time out doing the people's business, and in particular concentrating on a very, very serious problem and one that is not going to go away despite the rhetoric to the contrary in this particular House from the government side. It will not go away. Let us do something about it.

MR. SPEAKER (CROSS): The hon. Minister of Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me congratulate you, Sir, on being elected unanimously by the House of Assembly to assume the position of Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker of the House.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in this debate because I think that what we have in this Province is a very serious problem and, number two, in listening to hon. members opposite I can certainly understand why they would want to set up a select committee, because I have listened to several speakers opposite now and I have not heard one idea. So, obviously they want to go out around the Province to find out if there is somebody out there who has an idea because they do not have any. "Put us to work", says the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), "so that we can go out and find out from the people", because they do not know. Well, Mr. Speaker, they are being paid by the people of this Province. They can go out whenever they wish and they can find out from the people of the Province what they obviously do not know. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir waffled back and forth -

MR. DINN:

and he talked about not collecting royalties from the people who are operating our woods operations. Maybe what he should have gone on to say was, "Let us give the land back to Liechtenstein." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not our position. It never will be our position and, Mr. Speaker, we are going to develop this Province for the people of the Province.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) during today's sitting said, "Let us collect the money owed by the people involved in woods operations in the Province." The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir says, "Let us not collect." Well, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the hon. members opposite want to set up a select committee to go around the Province to see if there is something, one idea that they can agree upon to get more people employed in this Province, because obviously, Mr. Speaker, they have no such idea. I have not heard of one put forward and obviously they just simply do not have any. They scoffed, Mr. Speaker, at the blueprint for development. Well, Mr. Speaker, anyone in this Province who looks around and sees what is going on can see that there is a definite plan. Anyone who looks at the highways situation in this Province, the different peninsulas that are served in this Province today with paved roads so that we can transport fish to the plants, would obviously know, the hon. member sitting in the Chair knows that down in his area of Bonavista North that there is a road circling the whole peninsula where people can transport what they catch to plants on these roads and this will in the future obviously provide employment. I believe the figure from the Minister of Fisheries or I read in the paper there not long ago that employment in fisheries alone last year increased, the work force in the fisheries, increased by some 2,400. So, Mr. Speaker, this is the way that we see this Province developing and, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do this, we will develop an excellence in what we have. I heard an hon. gentleman say many times and that is exactly what we are going about.

MR. DINN:

But it has to be a planned, well co-ordinated effort. It has to include roads. It has to include not burning your boats but building your boats, Mr. Speaker. It has to include industrial development, not by putting the money into industrial development but making it available so that people, private enterprisers can come in here and get involved in the development of Newfoundland and also the entrepreneurs and private developers within the Province can get involved in developing this Province for the people of this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to happen tomorrow. It is not going to happen next year but it will happen and it is happening. It is happening in the fisheries. It is happening in offshore oil and gas right now. We have a registry in this office and I heard an hon. member in the press of late criticize this government for having a registry and only having it available to the people in St. John's. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is available to all the people in this Province through our regional offices and through our offshore employment officer here in St. John's who is a co-ordinator, a man who co-ordinates these people and makes sure that the companies are aware of the skills that we have in Newfoundland so that Newfoundlanders will be employed in our offshore oil and gas drilling, exploration and hopefully if and when it is discovered in that total operation also.

Mr. Speaker, in this registry of people, Newfoundlanders whom we want to employ in Newfoundland, we have people from the East Coast, the West Coast, Central Newfoundland, the Northern Peninsula,

MR. DINN: the South Coast, Labrador, Burin Peninsula, Avalon Peninsula, St. John's is included and Pleasantville is included most assuredly, and also, Mr. Speaker, hon. members might be surprised to know that Newfoundlanders outside of the Province who want to come back to Newfoundland and who want to participate in what is happening in Newfoundland also have their names on this list for offshore oil and gas exploration and, as I said, hopefully when and if oil is discovered offshore then these people will be given the first opportunity to be employed in that operation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do have a problem. The problem is that we have a labour force right now that is larger than the number of people that we can employ in this Province at this particular time, but as I said in fisheries we had some 2,400 get back into that operation last year. In offshore oil and gas this year my personal target is to get a thousand Newfoundlanders employed in that operation. I may not reach that target but certainly I will reach six or seven hundred and, Mr. Speaker, let it be made clear right now to anybody who wants to come in here and explore and develop our resources that they will employ Newfoundlanders when Newfoundlanders are available for work and when Newfoundlanders are skilled enough to do the work that is required to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I have also seen in the past few days a comment by a private citizen in the Province who aspires to the House of Commons - a comment that we are not going to employ Newfoundlanders on our supply vessels, that they are going to get the menial tasks, that Newfoundlanders are not qualified and are not going to get the jobs. Well, let me also say that we have in Newfoundland

MR. DINN: some of the best seamen in the world; and in checking the erroneous statements out I find that on these supply vessels, for example, we have the capability of employing about ten people per vessel, that Maritime law in the countries concerned where the supply vessels are coming from states that we have to. The captain, the chief engineer, I believe, and the mate have to be resident of the country where the ship originates. They call it a flag mate, I believe, but outside of that, over and above that Maritime law, every other person on these supply vessels will be Newfoundlanders if Newfoundlanders are available to take these jobs; that is to say that the mate - there are two mates on these vessels - will be a Newfoundlander, the second engineer will be a Newfoundlander and the cooks and the deckhands, etc., will be Newfoundlanders. They will be Newfoundlanders or the ship will not operate unless, for example, we just simply do not have the people available to work on these rigs. I say that today. I say that I am sure the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) will say the same thing and, Mr. Speaker, that is what it is all about. That is what this government is about - is to protect the rights of the Newfoundlanders and give them the first opportunity to do the work in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Blueprint for Development - I was a little bit surprised to hear hon. members opposite scoff a little bit at our Blueprint for Development. Well, Mr. Speaker, anybody who was ever involved in industry or in government or wherever know that in order to do something to change the face of a province or a nation, they have to start out first by planning and it took -

MR. DINN:

four or five years to get some kind of a plan in place for our fisheries, for our transportation, for our Departments of Municipal Affairs and Housing and Tourism and Forestry and Agriculture and so on. It took four or five years to get this planning underway, to find out, for example, where we should be going, how we should be going about it and what is needed to be done, what infrastructure is needed to be put in place in order to achieve what we are trying to achieve and that is to develop this Province for the benefit of the people in this Province and so that the people in this Province will get the most benefit out of whatever we attempted to do.

As I said in our transportation system, our roads, we have gone a long way now to making sure that just about every peninsula in this Province, or the Island portion of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has a good road system. There are some roads that are not completed yet and this year I believe that the Province will be spending somewhere upwards of \$80 million. That is Trans-Canada Highway agreements and DREE agreements and provincial dollars to upgrade and pave more of the roads in this Province. And that is just about all that we can afford to do per year in this Province, Mr. Speaker, about \$80 million worth of roads.

Also I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, if you look into the record that going back over the past three or four or five years you will find that we have also developed our water and sewer. Our water systems for example centered around and prioritized for the development of our fisheries or other industries in this Province. In other words in order to become a top priority you had to have, if you had an industry that wanted to develop in an area, if you had the people in the area who wanted to pay a basic rate for the operation and maintenance of a system, if you had these certain criteria you ended up on the top or pretty close to the top of the list and you were done. There is a five year programme but what government in its right mind would come out and say that we are going to do Harbour Mill next year or

MR. DINN:

the road to Harbour Mill this year and you are going to have to wait four or five or six years before we get a road over to English Harbour paved? There is no government in its right mind would do that, Mr. Speaker. There is a five year plan both in roads, in transportation. There is a five year plan in Municipal Affairs and Housing with respect to water and sewer systems. There is a five to ten year plan in fisheries and the hon. the Minister of Fisheries I have to say a few words about today, is probably the best Minister of Fisheries we have ever had in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: He never just went around this Province, Mr. Speaker, and considered this Province to be just the Island portion of the Province but he travelled from Mary's Harbour and L'Anse-au-Clair all the way up to Nain and met all the fishermen -

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not been to Englee.

MR. DINN: I am surprised to hear, Mr. Speaker, there is a community in this Province that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries has not visited and has not talked to the fishermen in that area. As a matter of fact I find it very, very difficult to believe but, Mr. Speaker, I am not about to break the rules of this House and call any member of this Legislature a - well I just will not say the word because it is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. But I am sure that 99 per cent of the fishermen in this Province have had meetings with, have visited with both in here in St. John's and also out in their communities or have had a visit from the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. And, Mr. Speaker, he is one of the most dynamic ministers in this Province. He is one of these guys who just cannot sit in his seat. He wants to get out of this House. He wants to talk to the fishermen. He wants to find out what their problems are and, Mr. Speaker, most importantly he wants to solve their problems.

His policy, Mr. Speaker, is not to burn the boats. His policy

MR. DINN: is to get into Treasury Board and get into Cabinet and get into these places and fight for every single dollar that he can get for building boats for the fishermen of this Province so that they can get on with the job of harvesting that great resource for the benefit of all the people in this Province. I have yet to hear the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) get up and talk about all the number of jobs that he has created in this Province because he is not one for blowing his own horn. But, Mr. Speaker, there comes a time -

AN HON. MEMBER: A man of the future.

MR. DINN: - there comes a time, Mr. Speaker, when somebody has to get up and blow the horn for a guy who just sits back and relaxes and does his job and gets out and talks to the people of this Province. And to suggest to the hon. Minister of Fisheries that he should be part of or he should want to set up a select committee in this House to go out and find out from the fishermen what their problems are or what they want is to insult a minister of this Crown, Mr. Speaker, and I have no intention of supporting a motion in this House that would have anything to do with that kind of an insult to a man who has worked day and night for the people of this Province and specifically for the fishermen in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is only one area - fisheries. Industrial development: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the past and we can look at what happened to industries in the past - in the past it was dole it out, give it to Liechtenstein, give it to this one and give it to that one and if they did not make a go of it, well, that was all right, the people of the Province bore the brunt and it took some years to get some of these major industries on the right road.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, one of these industries out in the Bay St. George area was an industry that was ill-conceived. The Labrador Linerboard Mill was ill-conceived.

MR. MCNEIL: Oh, oh! Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: The hon. member from that area out there (Mr. McNeil), Mr. Speaker, can get up and say what he wants to in this House when his turn comes. He has the opportunity as every hon. member in this House has to get up whenever his turn comes and say his few words about the area, the Bay St. George area, because we are very concerned about the Bay St. George area, but, Mr. Speaker, I would ask him today to sit back a little while and take a few and take them on the chin because that is where they are pointed and directed.

The hon. member last year said, "Do not close the Linerboard Mill" or "You cannot close the Linerboard Mill. This mill has to stay open. We have to pump \$50 million in a year. It does not matter." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way to develop this Province. The way to develop this Province is to create a climate so that an industry can be viable. Mr. Speaker, we were successful enough to turn that mill over to Abitibi Price who is a good corporate citizen in this Province, has been for years, and, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly that will be another successful operation - will employ people in Newfoundland and it will not cost the people of Newfoundland \$50 million a year to keep it going.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) wants to get into the debate, Mr. Speaker, and I will give him the opportunity when I am finished. I am not quite finished yet.

MR. RIDEOUT: I did not change districts, did I?

MR. DINN: But obviously the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) - the people up in Baie Verte - White Bay do not know where he is from. The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay would do well to listen for a little while and to see if he can control that part of his body that is making the noise right now - but the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay is obviously going to stand up in this House and elucidate the policies of the hon. members opposite and obviously support going about -

MR. C. POWER Did you say 'elucidate' or 'hallucinate'?

MR. DINN: 'Hallucinate', too.
- the setting up of a select committee to go around the Province to find out what the people are saying because he does not know what the people are saying and he does not know what to do about the problems in this Province. Mr. Speaker,

MR. DINN:

if he looked back at the record of the administration that was of that colour, that will never be returned in this Province again - as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that they had better watch out or the NDP may very well replace them as the official Opposition in this Province.

MR. RIDEOUT: It was the Tories who found out what the NDP could do.

MR. DINN: That is right and so did the hon. member opposite find out.

MR. FLIGHT: Let us look at the Grand Falls-Bishop Falls Trans Canada upgrading.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants to talk about the Grand Falls-Bishop Falls Trans-Canada upgrading right now. The hon. member usually shoots little tidbits of information across to see if we will bite and this particular one we will. The federal government set up a commission to investigate and find out what the transportation problems were in the Province of Newfoundland and they found out what the transportation problems were and they do not like it. They do not like the idea that that commission recommended that the federal government pay 90 per cent of the costs. They do not like that idea at all and I do not think they are going to do a thing about it. It is a recommendation that is one of the main recommendations of the report. The hon. member opposite just slides his little suggestion across and what I would recommend for the hon. gentleman is, if he can get an opportunity to get up to Ottawa and have a little chat with Mr. Lang, which is generally a one way conversation because he does not say much. he generally grunts back and says, "Who is next?". But if he will go up to Ottawa and have a chat with Mr. Lang maybe he will have a little more success with Mr. Lang than a lot of people in a lot of provinces in this country. And it is one of the reasons why we have a problem in this country with unity.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a four letter word.

MR. ROBERTS: Two four letter words, Otto Lang.

MR. DINN: That is right, Otto Lang is certainly two four letter words. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen between Bishops Falls and Grand Falls? Well I guess we are going to have to see what happens in the budget for the Province of Newfoundland when it comes out and see if there are any dollars involved, see if there is any money in there for the upgrading of that portion because we think on this side of the House that it is a very, very important road. It is very important that it be widened and developed up to Trans-Canada standards which it never was, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that it will be done this year. Certainly we hope that Mr. Lang will come through since his commission recommended that they pay 90 per cent and we would be only to glad to pay 10 per cent of that piece of road between Bishops and Grand Falls.

MR. FLIGHT: We need a permanent member for Grand Falls.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is obviously chomping at the bit and wants to jump up and tell us about all the ideas that he has with respect to employment or he probably would like to dwell on unemployment. I prefer to dwell on employment for the people in this Province. We, as I say, Mr. Speaker, have many things on the go. Another thing in transportation is the opening up of Lake Melville for ten months of the year. We think that is possible. We think -

MR. FLIGHT: Ken Prowse had an idea (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right Ken Prowse had an idea.

MR. FLIGHT: What does the government intend to do?

MR. DINN: Imagine that, Mr. Speaker, the enemy of Price speaking about Prowse.

Mr. Speaker, opening up Lake Melville a very, very important item on the agenda for discussion with the federal government. We have already had several discussions with the federal government with respect to getting an ice breaker to see what the possibilities are up there. But that is a start, the opening up of one of the greatest resources and resource areas in this whole Province, that area on the mainland called Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, that would only be a

MR. DINN:

start. Then there is the possibility of the development of the Makkovik uranium. The road across Labrador is another priority and if the federal government does not move fairly fast on that we are going to have to take initiatives ourselves as we did with the Lower Churchill and we are going to have to do something with respect to opening up Freedom Road in Labrador.

The hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) I do not think there is a day passes,

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. J. Goudie) is not pushing the needs of the people of Labrador and I would say something else that he is one of the best representatives I have ever seen for any area in this Province and Labrador -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I can go along with that.

MR. J. DINN: Do you really? I finally said something that the hon. member for Bale Verte-White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout) agrees with. And there you go, Mr. Speaker, I am almost tempted to sit down now.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another minister of the Crown, a man who works day and night for the people in Labrador and for all the people in the Province, the Minister of Rural Development -

MR. I. STRACHAN: He should have been in the Cabinet in October of 1975.

MR. J. DINN: - and, Mr. Speaker, if I were forming a Cabinet in 1975 he would be in that Cabinet -

AN HON. MEMBER: You would have been, too.

MR. J. DINN: - but, Mr. Speaker, I had no control over that and -

MR. G. FLIGHT: So would you have been in there.

MR. J. DINN: And so would I have been, obviously.

So, Mr. Speaker, if people were to look around this Province and look at any department of Government they can see that opening up this Province, making the resources available to the people, allowing them to develop those resources, is the way to go. That is the way we have been trying to and attempting to go. It takes some time to do it. It is not an approach that can happen overnight, it is not something that just happens; it takes years of planning and it takes years of implementation. We are well on the way and it looks like it will not be long before the

MR. J. DINN: eighteen per cent unemployment which is a disgrace in this country, a disgrace in this Province - that eighteen per cent unemployment will be just about eliminated if we keep going the same road, if we are not tempted by the Liechtenstein people and people like that, if we are not tempted in that direction. If we keep going down the same road that we are going, in three, or four, or five years the unemployment rate in this Province will be the lowest of any Province in Canada and, indeed, every province in Canada has a fear that we are going to be the top province in Canada. Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario are now shaking in their shoes at the rate of growth, the potential that we have in this Province, and the way that we are going to develop this Province. It looks as though we will overtake them in no time flat, and will be not only a 'have' Province but the 'have' Province in this great country of ours.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Cross)

White Bay.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

almost caught me sitting in the front benches when I should not have been there.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen

MR. J. MORGAN:

(inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY:

Go out and play with your helicopter.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

from Bonavista South (Mr. J. Morgan) will agree to listen for a minute - Having heard the hon. gentleman from Pleasantville (Mr. J. Dinn) this evening and the hon. gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. T. Hickey) a few days ago, I suppose it is fair to say that it is difficult to believe that a people, a parliament can be subjected to so much malarkey and baloney

MR. T. RIDEOUT: as we have been subjected to coming from those two particular gentlemen during the past couple of days' debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Here come the heavyweights.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: It is hard to conceive, Sir, that - Yes, they put up their heavyweights, there is no doubt about that. It is hard to conceive that that could be true. To hear the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) as he is now get up so piously today, having bungled already two departments of Government in this Province and will shortly bungle one of the most sensitive departments in all the Government of this Province, to have him get up so piously today and nonchalantly dismiss one of the most positive private member's resolutions to come before the House in some time, it is almost unbelievable, Sir.

The private member's resolution put forward by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) addresses the real problem facing this Province today, the most serious problem. There are many problems, I realize, but it addresses the most serious problem, I would submit to Your Honour, facing this Province today. And to have it dismissed on purely political, partisan terms, as those two hon. gentlemen have done, Sir, would almost stun the imagination of anybody. The hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. T. Hickey) did nothing only squirt

MR. RIDEOUT: poisonous little political wimps across the House. He did not address the problem whatsoever. He seemed to believe that the problem of 18 per cent unemployment, the **worst** by the way that this Province has faced since the Depression years in the 1930's, **he** seemed to believe that by talking about the past administration, that by talking about the mistakes of the past, that by collaring all of us with those mistakes, those problems would disappear. He seemed to believe that. Well, I said in this House, Sir, I believe, the first year I was elected, in 1975, that I do not live by the philosophy that I have to sing the old tunes and dance the old dance. I do not believe that. I said it then and I will say it today, * party that cannot change philosophy and direction, there is something sick, there is something wrong with that party, **But** that hon. gentleman has not changed. The Opposition mentality that developed when he was on this side of the House so long he has taken it with him across the floor. He cannot come back. I have never seen him in a debate yet in this House come back with anything positive - have not seen it in a debate yet. The hon. member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) is in the same boat exactly. They get up and they say, "Why do you not tell us what you are going to do? Why do you not tell us this? Why do you not tell us something else? All we can hear out here is negativity?" Mr. Speaker, I heard the same words come from the former provincial member for St. John's West when he was a **Cabinet Minister in this House. I heard it come from him many times.** "Why do you not tell us what your plans are? Why do you not tell us what your ideas are? Why do you not tell us what you are going to do?" And he did not have his seat warm in Ottawa, Sir, he did not have it warmed up properly in Ottawa when he was saying in the Hansard of the House of Commons, "I am not going to tell you what our plans are. You fellows got the research assistants. You fellows got the executive assistants.

MR. RIDEOUT: You fellows got all the planning and priority committees behind you. Do not look at little old me, the federal member for St. John's West, a former minister of the Crown in this Province. Do not look at little old me in the Opposition. Do not look at little old me to provide you with the answers, **you** are the government." Anybody can check the records of the House of Commons in Ottawa and I was so flabbergasted when I heard, I had to make sure I got the Hansard for that day just in case the hon. gentleman had been reported incorrectly. I had to get the Hansard and read it with my own eyes that he had no sooner landed in Ottawa than that was the kind of approach that he took. Then you have his colleague from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) and all of them, really, bouncing the same thing over on us.

Mr. Speaker, you know it is almost laughable and if that hon. gentleman were to arrive in some other political forum on the Opposition tomorrow or the next day which he will shortly, you will hear the same thing out of him again. You will hear the same thing out of him again, Mr. Speaker. You know that is the kind of defense that you get in the most serious problem that faces this Province. We put down this private members' resolution for a reason. We put down a private member's resolution for a reason - so we could tell some of our ideas - mention some from the debate and we expected - you would expect, Mr. Speaker, from the Queen's ministers that they would tell us what the administration's plans might be for the next number of months, but no, they do not tell us anything. They get up and they say, "What have you got to tell us?" They get up and they start **squirting** little political juices across the floor of the House, you know. It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: Of course, it is impossible to defend the indefensible and the record of this administration, Sir - I do not know if somebody could get me a glass - the record of this administration, Sir, has been a very pitiful one indeed. The record of this administration - the hon. minister from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) gets up and he says, "You cannot do anything unless you plan". Well, Mr. Speaker, this administration came into power on the fact that we had to sit down and plan and they are still planning. They are still talking about plans.

AN HON. MEMBER: Seven years.

MR. RIDEOUT: Almost eight years and they are still talking about plans and we have yet, with some minor exceptions which I will be the first to give credit for where credit is due, to see the result of those plans. All they have talked about is planning. All they have talked about is planning and priorities,

MR. RIDEOUT:

and when they get up in a debate like this where there is a chance for the administration to tell us what their plans are they still talk about more plans. Their planning is still going on. We have not arrived at the action stage yet. Well, Mr. Speaker, this administration has outlived its usefulness. It will never arrive at the action stage. If after all the planning they have done during the past eight years they have not arrived at the action stage yet, well I say God forbid. Do they want eight more years to arrive at an action stage. All you can hear is plans, plans, plans, plans.

MR. FLIGHT: That was how they were planning it.

MR. RIDEOUT: And that was another plan. You know to hear the hon. ministers trying to defend and talk about plans, Mr. Speaker, is enough really to get you upset. They came in here just before we closed for Christmas and they told us that the single most important thing that had to be done, that this Legislature had to do this year was to create the new Department of Housing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: You know they even attempted to get the Government House Leader to make deals with us to get the bill through speedily. But because of the dangers that we saw in that bill we said, "No, we want to debate that bill." There was a minister, Mr. Speaker, who lasted three or four months. One of the best civil servants in this Province had been yanked out of the Department of Municipal Affairs to become the Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and then when the minister became the chairman to become the vice-chairman I guess it was. No, he was supposed to become the Deputy Minister of the new Department of Housing and now he is in limbo. The Department of Housing is in limbo. I wish for the sake of this Province, Mr. Speaker, that the minister would go to Limbo because, you know, it is just crazy. He comes in here before Christmas -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is compromise time.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is a compromise, yes. He comes in here before Christmas and tells us the single most important piece of legislation

MR. RIDEOUT:

that we have is this Department of Housing. That was another plan, Your Honour. That was another plan that, you know, took numbers of years to develop, another plan that went by the wayside, just like every other plan that this particular administration has talked about over the years have gone by the wayside. There is no Department of Housing. The Department of Housing is right back now where it was five or six months ago. The Department of Housing is right back where it was. One of the most competent senior civil servants in this Province does not know where he is. He is lost at this particular moment. It is unbelievable.

MR. FLIGHT: And the minister lives with it, the minister laughs at it.

MR. HICKEY: Is it in the same shape it was?

MR. FLIGHT: The minister laughs at it.

MR. NEARY: There are two enquiries going on now. It is in worst shape.

MR. HICKEY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman talks about squirting poison. There is the essence of poison for you. I will inform my hon. friend opposite that the two enquiries he refers to were well on the way long before I became even remotely associated with Housing. Now get that straight and stop squirting your poison around or I might squirt some of the poison that the hon. gentleman refers to.

MR. NEARY: I know that better than the hon. gentleman.

MR. HICKEY: Do not point there is a nail in it.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: There is no point of order, continue on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is obviously no point of order. It is just a matter of a difference of opinion between two members.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it is so obvious how the truth hurts. Where is that great Department of Housing that this Province needed

MR. RIDEOUT:

so badly in the Fall of 1978?

MR. HICKEY: You would not go along with it.

MR. RIDEOUT: We would not go along with it. We did agree to go along with it but give us time to debate it, not do what you have done in this House, Sir, hundreds of times in the last four years, make a mockery of passing legislation that people in this Province have got to live under, not do that kind of thing, bring it in one night and expect to have it through this House the next day or the next evening, operate under impossible time restrictions with all the time that is wasted in this House. You can look at the Order Paper now and see the great legislative programme that is on that Order Paper. In another two or three months if the life of the Legislature goes on that long there will be cries - you know there is a different House Leader over there but I am sure he will be wringing his fists and doing the same thing as his predecessor, "We have got to get it through. We have got to get it through. It is getting warm. We have got to get out of here." And that is the way we do legislation in this Province. It would turn your stomach, Mr. Speaker, the way that the legislative programme of this legislature has been handled and is being handled up to this present day.

A number of years ago the answer was the great restructuring and they erected Municipal Affairs and Housing. Well that was not good enough. So they had to restructure again a few months ago and come up with a Department of Housing. And that was not the answer so now it is back to Municipal Affairs again. When the new Premier took over the other day he had to restructure again. I mean there are ministers over there that I do not know if they are legally in office or not for the

MR. T. RIDEOUT: departments that they have been talking about except that they have been sworn in by the Lieutenant Governor. This Lands and Forests Department, is there legally a Lands and Forests Department in this Province yet?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: So we have to have a bill brought in to make that legal yet, have we not? Do we not have to have a bill brought in to make the Department of Rural-Agricultural and Northern Development a legal entity? You know, Mr. Speaker -

MR. S. NEARY: That is right. You do not change the name of a department without bringing a bill before this House.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: And they talked about the great re-structuring programme.

MR. S. NEARY: This is the crowd that brought democracy to Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: They talked about the great -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right, play your games, ignore the Speaker of the House.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, they talked about the great re-structuring programme and we are no closer to the answer of re-structuring the Government of this Province yet, eight years later, than we were when they announced that very plan eight years ago. That is the simple fact of the matter. This hon. crowd, you know, they are just flicking from crisis to crisis. That is all they are doing. Lurching from crisis to crisis. Re-structure might be a good thing to talk about today, they will say, we have not talked about that for the past year or two, so we will

MR. T. RIDEOUT: revive that old one again and we will put up one of the most incompetent ministers that is in the Administration and continues to be in the Administration, the member from Pleasantville (Mr. J. Dinn) and we will let him talk about Government plans again. Maybe we can get another little bit of knowledge out of planning and priority.

You are going to see Government plans, Mr. Speaker, when the labour movement of this Province has to deal with that hon. minister. We have seen the arrogance of that hon. minister in this House in other portfolios. A lot of people in this Province have yet to see it.

MR. R. MOORES: Regional government.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: We saw the regional government escapade of last year. We saw him in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing the year before. Wait until delicate negotiations depend upon the diplomacy of that particular minister and you will see what is going to happen to labour relations in this Province between public employees and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. The future does not look very bright and he gets up and he talks about plans. He says the problem is the size of the labour force. Mr. Speaker, the real problem is that this Government has not kept up, they have not even come close to keeping up with the growth in the labour force in this Province. That is the real problem. And they can publish a five-year blueprint and end off with Terre-Neuve - Newfoundland and spoil the Paddy's Day for all those Irishmen.

The hon. theatrical Minister of Finance - I was going to say, "Thank God, he is gone" but then again I am not so sure. One thing I am sure of, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see him leave the House Leadership.

MR. S. NEARY:

It is in a terrible mess.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

The member from Pleasantville (Mr. J. Dinn) talked about the five-year plans in transportation. Five-year plans in transportation, Mr. Speaker. You can bring in community after community from your district, go to the Minister of Transportation and Communications - not only the present Minister but all previous ministers up to this point - and I have heard the question asked point blank. I have heard there is a five-year plan. Where does our community fit into that five-year plan? They will not tell you. I do not know if they can not tell you, Sir, but they will not tell you. Maybe it is because they are in an Opposition district. Maybe communities in the Tory districts know where they fit into the five-year plan. That could be, but they will not tell our people where they fit into the five-year plan. They will not deny that a five-year plan exists, they will make passing reference to it and they will say, "Well it has had to be adjusted now because of fiscal difficulties and all that kind of thing" and they will come up in the House as did that hon. member today and throw out five-year plans. They have a five-year plan, maybe, for Tory districts, that could very well be, but they had better get what they are going to get out of their five-year plan this year. I do not know what particular year this is in the five-year plan whether it is year one, or year two, or year three, or whatever, but they had better get what they can get out of the five-year plan this year because there is going to be a new five-year plan sometime this Fall or sooner.

So, Mr. Speaker, they talk about another plan, another plan to haul out, you see, Your Honour, when they can not find anything else to talk about. The hon. member says the Opposition has no idea so they will send out a select committee. Sending out a select committee,

April 4, 1979

Tape 748

RT-4

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, is not all bad.

If you ever wish to get an idea you will die in your seat before you hear an idea coming over from the hon. crowd that is supposed to be providing leadership, ideas and government to this Province. You will die in your seat waiting for that day to come. It has not come. All they have talked about is the plan, and he has the gall, Sir, and the gumption to throw in the Linerboard

MR. RIDEOUT: mill again as an ill-conceived idea. In their negotiations, Sir, I wonder did they tell Price Abitibi that it was an ill-conceived idea and then convince them to pay forty-odd million dollars for it?

You know, Mr. Speaker, the same old tired arguments that I have been hearing every day that the House has been open since I came here first in 1975 you are still hearing them.

AN HON. MEMBER: No wonder you have (inaudible) too heavy.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, that is right exactly. The same minister having spent - what? - three or four months, I suppose, at the outset in the Department of Transportation and Communications who with - to be kind and to be more than kind to his predecessors - did more harm in that department in three or four or five months than has ever been done in that department in decades. Mr. Speaker, we have never yet in our history, despite the unique weather conditions that we had, experienced the driving conditions in this Province as they existed this year because of the bungling of that minister. We have never yet experienced that kind of - we have had problems. We live in a geographic climatic zone where you are bound to have problems in the wintertime. Of course, we have had problems. Nobody can deny that we have had problems, but because that minister bungled and destroyed, even before the first snowflake fell, the morale and confidence of every employee in his department. This was the worst winter on record.

MR. NEARY: Is that the whirly bird minister?

MR. RIDEOUT: No, it is not him. He did a little bit better.

MR. R. MOORES: We are talking about 'Doody', are we?

MR. RIDEOUT: No, I am talking about the hon. member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn).

MR. DOODY: Oh, there were so many of us.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, I said there were three or four of you. The hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doody) can rest easy. I would say he was a good minister of T. & C. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - a good minister, and with one or two exceptions the member from Bonavista North (Mr. Morgan) was not a bad minister of T. & C. - with one or two exceptions and we have had our differences over that before -

MR. R. MOORES: Bonavista South.

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh, Bonavista South - I think his heart was in the right place. He did not turn off all his employees in one smack, you know. He did not tear the guts out of his employees like the hon. member from Pleasantville did. I never, Sir, in the four years I have been here had as many calls from employees of the Department of T. & C. telling me how turned off they were with the policies that had been handed down to them by this dictatorial minister that they had to operate under. Never did I have those many - you will always get one or two. You will get the agitators everywhere; but man for man, not only in my riding but in ridings close by where we were having the same kinds of problems - the things that they were - you know, the morale - the guts were hauled right out of them because of the policies and I enunciated on them in some detail in this House last fall - the policies handed down by that particular minister. He has the nerve, Mr. Speaker, to get up and try to lash back at the federal government about the Trans Canada Highway deal.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, if we never had a deal that we could live with we should not have signed it, if we did not have a deal we could have - we might have had a deal we could have lived with had it not been for the unique negotiation procedures undertaken by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). We might have had a deal we could have lived with, Sir.

MR. R. MOORES: That is right. That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: We might have had a deal we could have lived with if that hon. gentleman had to negotiate - and I will be the last one, Sir - I have criticized Ottawa harshly at times when I felt they deserved it and I will do it again. I will be the last one to defend them when I think they are wrong. I do not care what political stripe forms the Government of Canada, but the negotiation procedures undertaken by that minister where he would be negotiating confidentially one day and the next thing the federal people would know about would be when he appeared on television or in headlines the next day talking about the negotiations the previous day and flattening the feds all over. You know, that is the man to blame for the deal we got, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: I could not bend to them -

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the man. Right - right thing. Do not bend to them, but as soon as the Premier had no choice but move that hon. gentleman from that portfolio it was not very long after when somebody bent to them, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it was too many months after and that hon. gentleman was hopping mad.

MR. RIDEOUT:

In fact that was one of the 10,000 times in three years he threatened to leave the Cabinet. But then again, of course, Sir, you know, the hon. minister - I do not know what he got now but I know what he had then because he said it publicly and said it in the House, "If I go I will tell it all." And of course that was the thing, Mr. Speaker, that the former Premier could not stand of course. He was afraid, Mr. Speaker, that that honourable gentleman might just do that. He was afraid that he might tell it all and he could not afford to let that happen of course before he retired. Now I do not know what the hon. member's lever is at this particular point in time. One of those days he will be looking for the George McLean film again no doubt and that will infuriate his colleague from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) and the new Premier will have to decide whether or not the things that the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) might tell are embarrassing enough to let him go or if he has to keep him in. You know, he has used that lever now a number of times. He may be able to use it again to his advantage. I do not know what the hon. gentleman knows but he might be able to. I think it is sort of running out. I do not think the new Premier will buy that kind of thing. I would hope he would not, Mr. Speaker. I would hope he would not.

MR. R. MOORES: Marshall will not for sure.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is just as positive as the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) said and if nobody believes it, all they have to do is look at Hansard because the hon. gentleman for St. John's East Extern has been living in the Opposition since he moved over to the other side. He still thinks that those dirty Liberals that he hated with a passion are still the people who are over here you see. He still thinks that these are still his enemies and all that kind of thing and he could not even get up and talk about the new Department of Housing. He had to go back - I guess he went back before I was born to tell you the truth. He talked about a number of things that I could not even remember, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: Why do not half a dozen of you come down and run against me?

MR. RIDEOUT: I will take the minister on in Baie Verte-White Bay happily anytime at all. Anytime at all I would be happy to take the minister on in Baie Verte-White Bay. I cannot go to St. John's East Extern, Mr. Speaker, because I might get lucky and win and then I would have the hon. gentleman for a constituent and I could not live with that possibility. It is bad enough having the isle of the House separate us. I could not live with the possibility of him phoning me with constituency problems.

MR. HICKEY: It would be like winning Loto Canada.

MR. FLIGHT: Deputy minister.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT: A Liberal Deputy Minister.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the same hon. gentleman who made some comments at the Leadership Convention about the cleaning up of the civil service I believe was it. There might be some truth to that, Sir, but I think -

MR. R. MOORES: Clean them out not clean them up.

MR. RIDEOUT: - there is an awful scare gone through the civil service people in this Province and I do not know what the new Premier is going to do to allay that.

MR. HICKEY: If the cap fits they should wear it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes I happen to agree with the minister, if the cap fits. But I do not think the minister should paint everybody with the one brush.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, no I did not.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well that is what has happened, Mr. Speaker. The minister may not have intended to do that but that is what happened on this civil service thing. He has painted everybody, I think, with the one brush and that is the unfortunate thing.

MR. NEARY: Well that is only what the Government House Leader has been saying for years, fire all the civil servants. Too many Liberals heading departments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. members to my right and left.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Your Honour. I do have a few more things I want to say and I know it hurts but they have to be said. So that is the first thing I wanted to get off my chest, Mr. Speaker. I sit over here and I listen and I take it and I hear them getting up and talking about the negativity and all that kind of thing and they get up and do exactly the same thing, probably worse. They do exactly the same thing. The two minister who have spoken so far have said nothing positive whatsoever. If they were not criticizing us for being negative they were taking it out on Uncle Ottawa again. It seems like every time they turn around, blame it on the Opposition down here and if that does not work, if that cannot pull us out of the problem blame it on the federal government in Ottawa. My colleague

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

is having some trouble, I think.

The hon. member for Pleasantville (Mr. J. Dinn) again, Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Transportation and Communications, has made some reference to all the DREE roads, I assume he was talking about Bonavista North Loop Road and all those kinds of roads, that this Government was doing. And good! More power to them for negotiating those deals with Ottawa and getting 90/10 arrangements on them, and so on. But there is supposed to be a concept behind DREE agreements for roads. The Federal Government has no constitutional responsibility whatsoever for road-building anywhere in this country but they have seen the need in a number of provinces, especially in ours if we are to develop proper transportation systems and proper infra-structure, and help develop growing economies in some of the rural areas, and so on, they have seen the need to build major trunk roads. And, of course, that is the whole concept and principle behind those DREE agreements. But there is another one behind it, Sir, and that is that in so doing, in so providing those 90/10 dollars the Federal Government is actually or ought to actually be freeing up over the years that we have had DREE agreements, hundreds of millions of dollars that this Province would have had to spend ordinarily on those major trunk roads, the Bonavista North Loop Road, the Northern Peninsula Highway, the Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir Highway, the LaScie Highway, and so on. If those major trunk roads were to be done and, obviously, they were the priority ones and had to be done, then it would have cost this Province, had not Uncle Ottawa seen the need to help and help so generously and liberally, no pun intended, to help this Province, this Province would have had to spend hundreds of millions of dollars doing that kind of thing, doing that work.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Now by the Province entering into an agreement with Ottawa, of course, they only had to provide ten per cent, Ottawa provided the rest. So all of this money that would have had to be spent on those major trunk roads should have been freed up over the period to be spread around the Province on the - I do not want to use the words 'less important' but I guess I will have to use them for the want of better words - on the less important, or less major -

AN HON. MEMBER: Secondary.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: On the secondary roads serving our various communities. So you would think, Sir, that since the conception of such beautiful things as DREE programmes that a real dent could have been made in providing proper transportation systems to fishing communities, logging communities where those products had to be transported over very poor roads, you would think all over the Province now, I do not mean in a certain few specific districts, I do not mean that; I mean spread generally throughout the Province. But, Sir, I am sorry to say that that has not occurred. It has not happened. In my district, and that is related to unemployment - in my district the Baie Verte Highway access road from the Trans-Canada to Baie Verte was done under a DREE agreement, 90/10, Ottawa paying the ninety. The LaScie Highway was done under a 90/10 agreement, Ottawa paying the ninety. Two of the major trunk roads in the district. The road from Baie Verte to Seal Cove and Wild Cove, and Baie Verte to Fleur-de-lys and Coachman's Cove, has been done under a specially negotiated DREE agreement, 50/50. There has not been a road since the DREE agreement concept was introduced and since this Administration took office eight years ago, there has not been a road in my district, one of the most prosperous districts in the Province, I will venture to say, Mr. Speaker, a district that turns more tax

MR. T. RIDEOUT: dollars into the Treasury of this Province than any other district in the Province - with the possible exception of Labrador West - with the two mining operations, the Fishery and the Forestry there is hardly a man unemployed, there is community after community with nobody unemployed. In all those years there has not been a single mile of road, not a single mile of road re-constructed and paved totally out of the Treasury of this Province. Not one. Not a single mile re-constructed or paved totally out of the Treasury of this Province. Not one. Not an inch.

MR. J. MORGAN:

The Fleur-de-lys Road was done.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

The Fleur-de-lys Road has not been touched since this Administration took office other than a bit of gravel on top of it, but it has now been done as I said under a 50/50 DREE agreement.

MR. RIDEOUT: My point was simply this, Sir, that with all of the hundreds of millions of dollars that Uncle Ottawa freed up in this Province by pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into transportation systems, major trunk systems which was right and proper - all of those hundreds of millions of dollars that this government would have to spend otherwise was now available to them to spread over the Province in a fair and equitable manner based on priority, I realize that, but not one inch of road has this government in its eight years in office reconstructed, built, paved or anything in the district of Baie Verte - White Bay since they have been in office. They would say, "Well, he is some negative now, is he not, Sir?" But, Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. They have not created a job in the construction sector on their own. They have not created a job in the construction sector on their own in that district - not one. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the record. I did not invent it. You can go down to the Department of T. & C. and check their ledgers. You will not see a cent - not a cent in eight years for new road reconstruction or paving - total provincial dollars that is with no help from Ottawa. You will not see a cent - not one - in the Department of T. & C. ledgers down in that department right now. That is the record, Mr. Speaker. That is the five-year plan that they have in Transportation. That is the hon. crowd who say we have a plan. Communities come in from my district - community after community - and they ask where they are on the plan. Well, the simple answer, Mr. Speaker, is that they are not on it at all. They are not on the plan at all, because if they were it would not have mattered what their political stripe was, there would have been some, maybe not a lot, but there would have been some. At least a mile or so, Your Honour,

MR. RIDEOUT: in eight years, that is not too much to expect - a mile or so - there would have been some money spent out of the provincial treasury on the reconstruction and building of a proper transportation network in that most prosperous area of this Province. There would have been some, but we know the answer. We know the answer, Your Honour. The present Premier put it very eloquently, however poisonous, he put it very eloquently in his letter to the strikers in Baie Verte in the middle of a strike last year when he said, "Depart, ye have sinned against us. Ye did not vote Tory."

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate?

Order, please! It being six o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, 3:00 p.m.

VOL. 4

NO. 15

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
TABLED
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4th, 1979

April 19

Answer to Question No. 24 asked by the Member for
Poile to the Minister of Public Works and Services
placed on Order Paper #79 dated March 29, 1979.

QUESTION: (a) List of Ministers who used motor vehicles
from the Government's transportation depot
this year to date for reasons other than
specific and identified Government business;

ANSWER: None.

QUESTION: (b) Statement of the number of hours, days or
weeks vehicles were used by Ministers other
than for specific and identified public
business;

ANSWER: None to my knowledge.

QUESTION: (c) Government policy on who can personally
operate motor vehicles borrowed or on loan
from the Government garage?

ANSWER: Ministers and Public Servants.