

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a particularly

happy duty at the outset of this afternoon that I think all hon. members and all people in Newfoundland will be pleased to hear, I most especially, because it concerns my own area, not just my district but also the area in which I live. It has to do with an international competition on UNICEF and the Year of the Child, and I think hon. members will be interested to know, without my going into all of the details, that a contest was held to encourage students' awareness of UNICEF and to show a measure of thanks for their participation in the annual UNICEF campaign. There were over 2,000 entries received and judged accordingly. Ten winners were chosen and many honourable mentions given. The most outstanding pictures, by the way, in case members are interested and the public is interested, will be on display for a two week period in downtown St. John's. But what is particularly rewarding and gratifying is that one painting in particular stood out, so much so that the artist, sixteen year old Philip Hollett from Arnold's Cove, was awarded a prize for outstanding achievement and his picture was submitted to the UNICEF national office as Newfoundland's entry, and, as a result the outcome was that Philip Hollett's water colour will be the Canada official exhibit in this International Year of the Child art exhibit which is to be held in conjunction with the Moscow Olympics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON:

The reaction indicates that I was correct

in assuming that I would have the indulgence of the House to convey to Philip and to his parents, Albert and Dorothy Hollett of Arnold's Cove, the congratulations of the House on this quite outstanding achievement, which I think is in line with what we have been saying about encouraging the artistic endeavours of young Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what head of proceedings it comes under, but I would certainly wish to join in the congratulations to the young person and his parents on this very marked achievement, and it is particularly gratifying to know that, once again, in the field of the Arts here in Newfoundland that Newfoundland does not take a second place to any province, as witnessed once again by this achievement of the young person from Arnold's Cove.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to welcome on behalf of all hon. members a delegation from the Surin Town Council, headed by Mayor George Senior, who are in the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the hon. House of the projects and programmes that we plan to carry out this year in the Department of Forestry, the number of projects and the number of men to be employed and the cost to

MR. J. MORGAN:

the taxpayers of our Province.

Under silviculture programmes this year, this programme, of course, deals with improving the growing conditions of our forest stands and regenerating the cutover areas where natural regeneration has failed to come.

The first component of this programme consists of thinning our forest stands, the thick forest stands, and to provide adequate space for the tree growth. A total of thirteen projects will be carried out this year in the following locations; in Salmonier, in Lethbridge, in La Scie, in Robinsons, McIvers, Goose Arm, Taylors Brook, Bryants Raft Pond, in Roddickton, in Conch, in Main Brook and Otter Pond and Scammels Pond.

The amounts-instead of getting into details and giving the details of the amounts of the various projects to the House, the statement here will be tabled for all hon. members to see.

The total costs of these forest thinning projects is valued at \$572,000 and will employ a total of 205 employees, 205 men employed in this forest thinning project.

The second aspect of the silvicultural programme we are involved in this year, is the planting of nursery grown seedlings. These seedlings are grown, of course, in the new nursery at Grand Falls. We are seeing a production this year of 600,000 seedlings and next year we will see six million from the same nursery in the Central Newfoundland area.

Therefore, this year we are planting 500,000 of these seedlings in 400 acres, to be carried out in locations in the Northwest Gander River area, in the Bay d'Espoir area, the Lethbridge area and again in Roddickton or the Great Northern Peninsula.

MR. J. MORGAN: We will also, this year, be carrying out projects of site reclamation in preparation for planting next year, as I mentioned, of six million black spruce seedlings. It is a tree that is not susceptible to the budworm as are the other species we have in the Province. And these areas are, for the benefit of all members of the House, the projects are to be carried out in the following areas; in Lethbridge, in Drover's Ridge, in the Birchy Bay area, in Salmon Pond area and the South Pond area, in Stephenville, St. George's and in the Cormack area.

These projects will total \$399,000 and will again employ 120 people on this year's programme. Over and above that, Mr. Speaker, under the labour intensive forestry economic stimulation programme- this programme, of course, is a result of a recently signed federal/provincial agreement -we are going to carry a number of projects this year around the Province, and these projects again are outlined with details of the cost for each project.

We are looking at salvaging, in many areas of the Province, timber stands damaged by the budworm and carrying out again roadside improvements to the forest stands and the major road networks around the Province

MR. J. MORGAN: and pre-commercial thinning. The areas to be concerned this year are Sop's Arm, the Saltwater Pond area, Portlanu Creek; Southwest Brook, Hampden Road, Little River, Conne River, and Glenwood/Norris Arm area, in Clarendville/ Bonavista area and in the Swift Current area. The total value of these projects is \$1.1 million. This work will be carried out this year and will be employing 137 employees, the three different projects.

Also between now and the end of February of this year, we are looking at employing an additional 263 men along the same lines as these kinds of projects mentioned on forest thinning and the salvaging of budworm damaged timber stands.

Mr. Speaker, also I want to inform the House that in connection with the spray programme carried out this year we sprayed approximately 15,000 acres of forest areas in the Province. We did not get involved in a large scale spray programme using Matacil. We used an experimental project using Bt and the report of that spray programme and the total assessment giving the effects and the analysis of the results of that spray programme will be made to me shortly, maybe after the House of Asserby recesses. But I want to emphasize to members of the House that that report will be made public upon receiving the reports giving the effects of the Bt spray programme and also the present situation with regards to the infestation by budworm in our forests. That report will be made public upon my receiving it or a few days after.

On the harvesting and utilization of our forest products, I want to emphasize that the department is now developing new regulations and standards for forest management, not only for forest management but also for the harvesting and utilization of our forest products. Unfortunately, I will be unable to announce the new regulations in this session of the House but I intend to inform the House of these new regulations when the next sitting convenes.

MR. J. MORGAN: We will be also this year, Mr. Speaker, carrying out a cable logging operation in the Bay d' Espoir area where we will see most of the activity in regards to salvaging the budworm timber stands; that is because of the fact it is a high unemployment area. Unfortunately the member for the area is not in his seat today but it is going to be of substantial benefit to the Bay d' Espoir. It is going to overcome the problem of unemployment somewhat and it is going to also salvage the timber stands which, **after being** salvaged and stockpiled will be tendered and hopefully the local manufacturers of lumber in the area, the sawmill operators will be able to acquire the timber stands that will be cut and stockpiled and to use these timber stands in their own local sawmill operations in the Bay d' Espoir area.

And in conjunction with that we will be carrying out a cable logging operation and that cable logging operation will see men who will be employed on-the-job training and a new technique of cable logging which is, of course, logging on slopes in areas of our Province

MR. MORGAN: where logging is not normally carried out. In conjunction with that cable logging experiment in the Bay d'Espoir area, we intend to commence a training programme in the Bay St. George Community College of training people in our forestry industry throughout the Province for the purpose of learning new techniques and again learning the techniques of cable logging.

I want to say as well, Mr. Speaker, that we just completed a major study of the Goose Bay potential forest industry. That study was carried out by the company Sandwell Management Consultants. It has just been completed and I am hoping to be in a position to announce the results of that study within the next number of days.

We have also appointed, Mr. Speaker, a task force in the Department of Forestry, a task force to deal with modernization and improvements to the existing operations of the newsprint industry in our Province, the larger operations, of course, being in this case so far Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters. We are looking forward this time next year to the Price Abitibi operation at Stephenville. That task force is to determine means and ways of improving and modernizing the equipment being used by the larger mill operations in our Province and to make a report not only to us, the provincial government, but also to the federal level so that these companies can hopefully avail of possible funding from DREE to improve and modernize their equipment in their mill operations.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this year we are going to be carrying out a very significant forest access road construction programme. We will be completing the existing forest access roads commenced last year and will be conducting a construction forest access road programme in carrying out this programme this year of new forest access roads in the following areas. Now these areas are all listed here for members of the House to be aware of and I will table this information rather than list them off in my making this report.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in making this report to the House of Assembly that the Department of Forestry is

MR. MORGAN: determined to see over the next number of years, commencing as of this year, we are determined to see proper management of the resource that we have. We are determined to carry out extensive reforestation programmes to overcome the problems we have encountered both in regards to forest fires and infestation of our forests by budworm and the Hemlock Looper in the past and we are determined also to ensure that the large companies, Bowaters, Price (Nfld.) and Price Abitibi comply with our management regulations, that they manage and operate in the areas of our Province and in the forest areas in compliance with our terms and our regulations, and only by following our regulations will they be allowed to operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the forest industry, despite the fact certain members of

MR. MORGAN: the opposition may find it a joke, but the forest industry -

MR. ROBERTS: We do not find the forest industry a joke. The minister, yes, but not the forest industry.

MR. MORGAN: The forest industry in our Province last year contributed to the economic of our Province \$142 million, and that is no insignificant amount. And what our aim and objective is, the Department of Forestry, is to make sure that is increased substantially over the next number of years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a short reply to the minister, For this side I want to say to the minister that the Opposition welcomes \$2 million to enhance the forestry of this province and we welcome the projects where they are going to be implemented. But it has to be pointed out here, Mr. Speaker, that \$2 million, presumably of \$13 million undertaking, not a dollar of that is finding its way into enhancing the timber stands held by the various paper companies. This money is being spent in areas in Newfoundland that in effect are Crown lands.

And when the minister states that the paper industry in Newfoundland or the forest industry contributed one hundred and forty odd million dollars to the economy of this Province, he should also say that by far the greatest share of that came as a result of the operation of the two paper mills.

There was some indication in the past six months from the minister and the Premier that the Province has finally recognized that we could not tolerate any longer the kind of forest management that we have seen by the major paper companies in this Province, namely, Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters and recognizing, that, that the government was going to accept the responsibility of going in on the timber limits held or controlled by the various paper companies

Mr. Flight: and doing the things. The short-term benefit would have been jobs created and the long-term benefit would have been the announcement of our forests, and we would have taken the responsibility of guaranteeing Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters a wood supply that would sustain their operation over the next ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five or thirty years.

None of this \$2 million, Mr. Speaker, is going into - for some reason this minister, although I believe he understands the situation and I believe that he intends to look at what indeed is happening in the forest management from a harvesting and reforestation point of view, the kind of programmes that the companies have carried out over the years, but there seems to be a desire to shy away from anything in this Province controlled by those two paper companies. And, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to maximize, as the minister said in his statement, if we are going to maximize the benefits to this Province from our forest industry then he had better start taking a look now at the limits held one way or the other by grants, under lease, and controlled totally by the paper companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And that makes up the bulk, the great bulk of the timber producing lands in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And either he recognizes that, and goes in and either through negotiations has the

MR. FLIGHT: companies agree to start carrying on good forest management and stop the kind of waste that this Province has been subject to this past fifty years, either get an agreement that the company is going to do the reforestation that we deserve to have done, that we have to have done - the kind of clean-ups, the salvaging of wood left around the country, the rethinning, the reforestation - either they agree to do that or we tell them that, fine, we will go in and do it, because it is in our interest to maintain a sustainable wood supply for those paper companies.

Mr. Speaker, having said that I again officially for the Opposition welcome this particular programme and say to the minister it is just a very thin end of the wedge of the kind of programmes we are looking forward to in forestry over the next few years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Labour and Manpower.

The hon. Minister of

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker. I first of all apologize to the Opposition. I only got this Ministerial Statement made up after the previous minister started his statement, so it just arrived in the House or I would have provided it earlier.

It will be recalled that some weeks ago government decided to carry out a seven point programme aimed at investigation and alleviating the dust problems in the iron ores mines in Labrador West. Since that decision was made, intensive discussions have taken place between the unions and companies concerned through the medium of a technical committee. We said at that time that we had set up basically four committees, two in each, Sculley Mines and the Iron Ore Company of Canada with representatives of government, union and management.

Considerable work has been done to the point where today as chairman of the two senior committees, one dealing with the Iron Ore Company situation and the

MR. DINN: other dealing with the Wabush Mines situation, I held meetings of these two committees for the purpose of endeavouring to reach final agreement between the parties on certain aspects of the proposed programme. I am pleased to say that agreement has been reached between the two companies and the two unions involved that the Northern Institute of Memorial University of Newfoundland will be the co-ordinating body for this comprehensive programme.

I consider this agreement to be a major step in getting this programme off the ground and I am also pleased to state considerable progress was made with respect to the other steps in the proposed seven point programme. I hope to be able to make a further announcement with respect to progress on this important subject within the next few days.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
Baie Verte-White Bay.

The hon. member for

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me thank the hon. minister for sending me over a copy of his statement a few minutes ago. It was very co-operative of him and I thank him very much. For our part, we certainly welcome the announcement made today by the minister that there has been an agreement between both sides, actually four sides, the company and the union in each particular case, to set up as the overall body to do this study the Northern Institute of Memorial University. We are happy that there has been an agreement and of course we are happy too that our own university can become involved in this kind

MR. RIDEOUT: of technical evaluation of the dust problems in Labrador West. Of course, our prime concern, Sir, obviously is the health and safety of the workers in that particular industry in that part of our Province. We hope that the required studies can get underway quickly. We hope that the reports and the recommendations can be in quickly so that the necessary changes and implementation of recommendations can be put in place as quickly as possible so as to guarantee and maximize as much as we can the health and safety of Newfoundlanders who are working in the iron ore industry in Labrador. So, Mr. Speaker, for our part, we certainly welcome this positive announcement by the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). Would he care to indicate to the House now when the next deadline has been set with regard to the Come By Chance oil refinery? I say that because, as Hansard will reveal, I have been asking about this issue now a number of times and it was indicated that the environmental report was in. And I do not want to misquote the hon. minister, but I have a feeling that we were of the opinion that it would not take too long. Now today I understand there is going to be another - I have heard two reports - four or six weeks delay and I am just curious, first of all, as to whether those dates are actually correct. Is it, in fact, going to be another six weeks before the environmental report can be assessed by the government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should first clarify what these deadlines mean. The deadlines mean that we have given an indication to the first mortgagee a number of times that we would hope to have our response ready for the first mortgagee whether government would give its consent to the proposed sale of the refinery or not, that we have indicated a number of times that we would hope to have a response ready by

DR. J. COLLINS: such and such a date. Now it was difficult to predict when, in fact, all the factors would be in place that would allow us to make a decision that potentially has a tremendous effect on all the people in this Province and, certainly, a potential effect on people in the Placentia Bay area. It was difficult to predict exactly when all these facts would be in our hands. We have set a number of deadlines, I think some of them rather optimistically, but this was to give an indication that we were working diligently towards getting a result as soon as possible. The last deadline was the 15th of August. This was related not only to the environmental issue, although that loomed extremely large in our minds at that point in time. There had been a number of other issues that we have gone into in some detail which were of great concern to us and we felt, if I may use a colloquial expression, that we had a handle on those. But the environmental one, particularly the air pollution one, was one that was concerning us very deeply and this is the one that was alluded to a number of times when the new deadline was set.

Now we do have in hand

DR. J. COLLINS: most of the answers we want on the air pollution. As a matter of fact, I can inform hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that we now have the final report from the ERT group, the expert group, but it has just come to hand, just come to hand this morning and although there is not too much new in it, from a quick scanning, in addition to what was in the draft report, nevertheless it does have to be subjected to a certain amount of study by all concerned.

With that in place we expect that certain other factors that had to be looked at will move ahead quite rapidly. As hon. members now know, the deadline of August 15th. cannot be met, and I think it is in the best interest of the Province that we not stick to a deadline that we would think would be unwise. A new deadline has not been finally decided upon at this time but I would expect that it would be something of the order of another six weeks. I hope hon. members will understand that I am giving that just as an estimate at this time. We do have to consider a number of things before setting a new deadline.

Now the last thing I would like to say at this point, and there may be other questions come up, is that no matter what deadlines we set this does not mean that things are then concluded at that time. There are a lot of things to be gone through yet, many of them over which the Province has no control. There has to be certain numbers of transactions go on between the prospective buyers and the first mortgagee, there will have to be things go on with the Supreme Court of Canada, and the federal government has to take certain steps.

MR. ROBERTS: I think the minister means Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

DR. J. COLLINS: I am sorry. I meant to say Supreme Court of Newfoundland, yes. And there are certain issues that the federal government has to review and settle and then, of course, finally, or perhaps not finally but at the same time the Federal Review Agency has to get into the situation.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the minister will look at Hansard he will see that at least three and a half weeks ago I detailed precisely the sequence that he has been talking about and when he says that they were overly optimistic, I was the one who warned this House that the 15th. of August was just a facade. It may have been a misrepresentation but I will not get into arguments here and I will leave that. But the point is that it now is clear that there is going to be no movement, it seems to me, when that sequence is put within the current year and probably it will be well into 1980 before all of these steps have been taken. But the key point that I would like to ask the hon. minister, which is consistent with his own responsibilities, is will he now table in this House or make available to the public the environmental report?

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that

the deadlines we set were a facade, they were an honest aim. We aimed for these and we did not hit the target but -

MR. JAMIESON:

(Inaudible) to be naive.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Well, the hon. member may feel that

these were naive things. I might say that there were a lot of naive things said in this House concerning reactivation of the refinery and I think certainly all of these naive statements did not come from this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS:

With regard to whether the environmental

study will be made public at this stage, I do have to tell hon. members that this is not government's intention at this time. What we expect to do is when we have all things in place a definitive statement will be made to the House and to the public whether the Newfoundland Government should support the initiative taken by the receiver on behalf of the first mortgagee. It has not been our intention to make public or reveal or indicate our decision on a piecemeal basis. We feel that the situation is best served, so as not to raise undue expectations, if we had the whole picture in mind before we go to the House and the public.

MR. JAMIESON:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of

the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to ask

the hon. the Minister of Finance is this, If, in fact, the environmental report is negative, what is the percentage in going on with all of the other steps? What I have to ask him, therefore, is will he table the report or, at the very least, will he indicate to us that it meets all of the Newfoundland Government's requirements? Because if that is not the case, then all of the further negotiations - it would seem to me, logically, given the sequence that the hon. minister has put forward - will fail. Therefore, I do not understand why it is not possible to put the

MR. JAMIESON: environmental report into the public domain so that a) if it is good, that means the other steps can proceed; if it is not good, then it means that the rest of it is - and I will not use the same word as I used before - but it certainly is not going to be a very productive exercise to go on something that is environmentally unsound.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it would be illogical to go ahead with the procedure if there were an obstacle already identified that would mean that the government could not give its assent. So I think it is quite clear that the environmental report was positive to the extent - and I do not mean by this to diminish its positivity - it was positive to the extent that we are continuing with the investigative process that we have been undertaking from the beginning.

MR. JAMIESON: A final supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I do not doubt the hon. minister's word - it would be inappropriate to do so. The hon. minister, however, is aware that there is a great deal of

Mr. Jamieson: concern among my own constituents that the environmental report may be based upon a hypothesis as to the type of crude oil and the like that is going to be employed there.

Therefore, I suggest to the hon. minister, and I put it in form of a question, if it is sufficiently positive to proceed with these other steps, then I believe that I am entitled to say that the constituents of mine and others in Newfoundland, by the way, who are worried about environmental issues should have the report so that they can know whether or not, for instance, the actual oil that it is proposed to employ conforms to what it was the environmental tests were taken upon. And I emphasize once again that there are questions, legitimate questions in people's minds as to this matter, which really leads me back to the basis of my question, has the hon. member seen and does he know if a contract exists for a supply of oil and if that supply of oil is of the type that was tested in the environmental proceedings or whatever the work that was done by the company?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to reassure members of this House and also others that the environmental study was gone into in great detail and with the best advice available. This was not only so in regard to experts, and these were the most expert group that government could lay hands on, not only our own experts, but also Environment Canada had the same information made available to them and we received a report from Environment Canada.

So I think the assessments of the environmental impact - and I am talking about air pollution here, the possibility of air pollution - the assessment of air pollution impact from the re-opening of the refinery on the conditions or under the arrangements that were indicated to us in the proposal from First Arabian and from Ashland Oil, the proposed operators of the refinery, that study was gone into in great detail, I would suggest much more so than would be possible, say, by a series of public hearings or anything of that nature.

Dr. Collins: In regard to crude oil supply, I would only reiterate what the hon. Premier said a few days ago that the assurances we have received from Ashland Oil and from First Arabian are such that we are satisfied on that issue to date.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same minister, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). The minister undoubtedly will recall that the Premier during his successful bid for the leadership of his party indicated on or about the 15th. of March,

MR. R. SIMMONS: indicated publicly that should he become the leader and the Premier he could settle the Come by Chance deal within 90 days of his assumption of office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is is that one of the naive statements to which the minister refers, or if not could he tell the House what has happened since the Premier made that undertaking that has substantially altered the time frame? The Premier's time frame then would have had a decision by about the 15th. or the 17th. of June, now we are talking some time into September at the very earliest if we take the minister's definition of time frame now. What has so substantially altered, I ask the minister -

MR. F. WHITE: The election is over.

MR. R. SIMMONS: - since the Premier made that undertaking March that would now delay it so appreciably?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier is not here today and I would not presume to comment on any thoughts that he had in his mind at any point in time. I think that question should be directed to the hon. Premier when he returns.

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

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase it so that it is appropriate for the minister to give an answer without reference to the Premier's statement as such. Can the minister indicate to the House why there has been such a protracted delay in this particular matter from what the government had hoped would be the case initially? Why does there continue to be a delay? Is the environmental issue one that the government had not contemplated heretofore and is a Johnny-come-lately to the set of factors that has to be brought to there on the subject.? Why is there a continuing delay in bringing this matter to a resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I essentially answered that question in my responses to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. And just in summary I would say that government considers the re-opening of the refinery as potentially hazardous, as oil refineries are, and I would point out to hon. members that there has not been a refinery in the Eastern United States for I think something like ten or fifteen years. We therefore took it as our responsibility to go into this thing in the greatest detail possible to re-assure ourselves that if it is re-opened it will be opened with the minimum hazards to Placentia Bay.

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

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, when the proposal from the First Arabian Group was singled out as the only proposal that government would consider for whatever reason I do not know; something to do with, perhaps, their inability to concentrate on more than one problem at a time. But for whatever reason they said they would hear from First Arabian only and they would deal with that one on its merits and then in time perhaps hear from others. In view of the long delay, much beyond what was contemplated when that decision was made to deal with one proposal only, could I ask the minister would he now consider having proposals from other would-be operators of the refinery? For example, Petrocan, I am sure, might have something to offer in this respect if we could get a company of that stature involved in the Come by Chance operations. Would the minister now, in view of the long delay, contemplate receiving proposals from other would-be operators of the Come by Chance refinery?

MR. S. NEARY: Or consider the ones they have.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the negotiation with First Arabian and their proposed operators has been a long exercise. I do not think it has been an unduly long exercise in view of the importance, and government is sticking to its undertaking to either reject or complete the process before getting into other possibilities.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that would normally be directed to the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Barry), and if not him the Premier. But it deals with forestry so I will ask the question of either the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) or the Minister of Lands and Forest (Mr. Morgan), whoever would like to answer it. There is a rumour going around that the sawmill formerly owned by Rayc Forest Products in the Gambo area will be sold and dismantled and removed from the area. Can either one of the gentleman confirm that this is so?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I sincerely hope that it is only a rumour because as of yesterday I asked the officials of the Department of Forestry to convene a meeting today or tomorrow with the officials of the Industrial Development Department and the Development Corporation to determine the possibility of re-activating that mill for the sole purpose of looking at using the salvaged timber from the forest fire that occurred in that area this present season.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: I would like to compliment the minister on that action. Could he confirm that it is his intention that if that rumour is so, that they are considering dismantling, that he will use his influence to stop any action to bring about exactly the point that he has brought up? I think it is an excellent suggestion.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be more than pleased to disclose to the hon. gentlemen in the House tomorrow during Question Period or during the Answers to Question already asked the results of today's meetings being held by the different officials.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: In the Ministerial Statement earlier, and in the committee meetings earlier, the minister indicated that if he could get the approval from Ottawa he would allow part of the money for the spruce budworm salvage operation to be used for the same salvaged timber which has been burnt. Now would the minister indicate whether or not he has had any success at that as yet?

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

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis is now being placed on salvaging timber stands damaged by budworm because there is more timber damaged by the insects so far than by fire. We had, this year, a total of 160,000 acres damaged by fires, a substantial amount, and we are now discussing with Price

MR. MORGAN: (Nfld), with a company involving export of pulpwood and with the local sawmill operators in the general area of Gambo-Glovertown to determine possible means of salvaging. We may not need the funds from Ottawa to be diverted for that purpose of salvaging. We may just get involved in using the private sector. However, if the negotiations with the private sector fail, there is still a strong possibility of having funds allocated to salvage the timber stands this Fall.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. the President of the Council. There is bad news from Ottawa today, Sir, that there is going to be layoffs of public servants in all the provinces, and I would like to ask the President of the Council if he can identify the areas in Newfoundland where federal civil servants will be laid off? Has there been any prior consultation with the provincial government and does the hon. gentleman know how many federal public servants will be laid off in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the numbers or indeed the extent of any proposed lay offs of public servants in this Province. I think it is sufficient to say that the hon. Premier and the two ministers up there, I know, are up there fully protecting the interests of the people in Newfoundland and whatever impact there may have to be on the Canadian nation as such would be much less in this Province as a result of the representation we have up there.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman, Sir,

is no doubt aware that federal public servants in Newfoundland already receive less pay than their counterparts in other parts of Canada and that the number of federal public servants in Newfoundland is less per capita than in any other province in Canada, so in view of these facts would the hon. gentleman indicate if the government here, the provincial government, intends to raise strong objection to any cutback, and in the light of, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) told us yesterday, the economy not looking too bright for the months ahead, would the hon. gentleman indicate if this government will make a strong protest to the Government of Canada to stop any cutbacks or any lay offs or any curtailment of services or of the public servants in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this

government always looks very sourly at any attempts to cut back the provision of public services in this Province by the federal government. It is a fact that over a period of years it is our opinion that there have been too few public servants here in the Province of Newfoundland, too few federal public servants.

Steps have been taken over the past number of years to alleviate this problem or this effect and we are pleased to observe the policies of the central government at the present time to continue to decentralize services and I would hope and I would expect that any cutback in services would be felt more in Central Canada itself than it will be here because this Province has no intention of seeing any diminishment in the services available to the people of this Province and that they should not be certainly any less than their fellow Canadians in other provinces.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.
The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the last part of the answer there, Sir, I think is an indication of the attitude of this government, that the lay offs here will be in proportion to what takes place in other parts of Canada, so the hon. gentleman did not really answer the question.

I am going to ask the hon. gentleman if he will undertake, on behalf of the people in this Province, to identify the areas where federal civil servants will be laid off in this Province? Will they be lighthouse keepers, will they be CN employees, will they be in the forestry or fishery department? Will the hon. gentleman undertake, as quickly as possible, to find out from the hon. Sinclair Stevens, who made the announcement on behalf of the Government of Canada, and identify the areas where public servants will not be replaced, will be laid off or where the cutbacks will take place in this Province?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already answered that question quite adequately, that this government is certainly very cognizant of any steps that may be taken in that direction. It remains to be seen the full import of them; when we know the full import, if any, on this problem, we will take the appropriate steps which will involve the definition of the measures that have been taken.

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn). I understand that twenty-one members of the St. John's Allied Printers Union have been locked out by the St. John's Publishing Company. What steps is the government taking to resolve the dispute?

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

MR. J. DINN Mr. Speaker, it is not generally my policy to discuss specific union-management problems in the House of Assembly because this situation is a very, very touchy situation in that the printers at the Evening Telegram, the particular problem there goes back basically to the Anti-Inflation Board when it was set up and the fact that they were rolled back or never had an opportunity. So we have a conciliation officer in touch with that situation at all times and we would hope that we could get the resolution to the problem but I certainly would not, nor should I, discuss the specifics in the House of Assembly or anywhere else publicly.

MR. J. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: In view of the fact that the company has brought people in from outside the Province to do the jobs of the member unions, who are presently locked out, what does the government plan to do to resolve this situation?

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

MR. J. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is another very risky situation to be talking about in the House of Assembly or publicly. The fact of the matter is there are things that can be done with respect to legislation in this Province, I was in touch with senior officials in my department. I am having them look at the situation with respect to the printers and when I get out of the House, hopefully in another five or ten minutes, I will be in contact with him to see what the whole story is because I only have it piecemeal now.

MR. J. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: I would like to ask the minister a final supplementary. The fact that the union has called on

MR. J. HODDER: the company to return the the bargaining table on a number of occasions, I was just wondering how long the government plans to sort of tolerate this particular situation?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, basically what has happened up to this point in time, and there are a few things that have happened that we should not be entirely happy with, there are some things we need clarification of, and we are getting that clarification. I have, as I said, senior officials in the department attempting to clarification as to specific items. But with respect to the negotiations and the attempts by both sides to get an agreement, to get a collective agreement, they are following the normal process. There are some things that I am concerned about down there that may not be part of the normal process and that is what I am having checked right now. So I basically can not say anything as to what the government will do with respect to these actions that I have heard rumour of and, indeed, some of which have been reported. So I am getting a full report on that and when I do I will take the appropriate action.

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

MR. D. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HOLLETT: in the absence of the Minister of Justice I will address a question to the hon. President of the Council. I would like to ask the hon. member if the reduction in the RCMP Marine Division in Newfoundland, a recent announcement announced it was reduced by fifty per cent, if it was done with the concurrence or after discussion with the government?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take notice of that question. I will get the answer for the hon. member tomorrow.

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

MR. JAMIESON: If I may and there is a moment I would like to return to the hon. Minister of Finance. In view of the questioning that went on earlier, could I ask him if he would, either on motions or in some other way, make available to members opposite and to me in particular, if you like, a timetable. I am not asking him to be specific but an indication of what unresolved issues remain, just a simple straightforward indication of that in some form that spells it out with a degree of precision. Could I expect that? I am not asking him to do it orally but if I could have that I think it would be very helpful in clearing the air, and I am not using a pun there about the environment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. Leader of the Opposition's concerns in this area, particularly in view of the district he represents, and I think I can tell him that I will take his request under advisement and do what seems appropriate and what can be done in the circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bill, "An Act To Further Amend The Government British Newfoundland Exploration Limited Authorization of Agreement Act, 1957."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a question asked by the hon. member for LaPoile, a list of public servants who have been relocated to Atlantic Place and have been issued free parking permits to date. The answer, Sir, is the Minister, Deputy Minister, and Assistant Deputy Minister of Industrial Development; the Minister, Deputy Minister, and two Assistant Deputy Ministers of Fisheries; the Chairman of the Fisheries Loan Board; the Deputy Minister of Northern, Rural and Agricultural Development; the Assistant Deputy Minister of Agriculture; and a parking spot for the pool car, not the fleet.

000

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have forty written questions on the Order Paper that I have not received answers to yet and I would like to ask the President of the Council, the Deputy Premier when I can get the answers to these questions? Will I get them before the House adjourns?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I believe that question is more appropriately asked at Question Period and I believe the hon. member raised the same matter yesterday and it is very clear in the Standing Orders -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: - very clear in the Standing Orders that

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): the minister does not have to answer a question. The hon. member I believe knows that.

MR. NEARY: - they have not answered.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from 249 residents of Island Harbour in Deep Bay in the district of Fogo and the prayer of the petition reads:

"We urgently request the Minister of Transportation and Communications to take immediate action to have our roads upgraded to a standard of secondary roads. At present our roads are in a deplorable condition, especially for this time of year when they should be at their best. The present condition of our roads leaves a lot to be desired with the local maintenance concentrating their efforts on the Joe Batt's Arm - Tilting section of highway which McNamara Construction has been awarded the contract to upgrade and pave."

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the petition I would like to point out to the minister the terrible condition of the roads in that section of the Province. I point out to him that the Island Harbour-Deep Bay Road is perhaps one of the worst that you will find on the Island portion of the Province. It is possible at this time of year to drive over the Island Harbour-Deep Bay Road and lose the bottom out of your car in spite of the fact that we are in the middle of the Summer.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the grading of the roads of Island Harbour and Deep Bay is practically impossible because there is just not enough gravel to grade.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting a petition on Stagg Harbour two weeks ago, I pointed out that the economic condition of Fogo Island has steadily improved. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the productivity of Fogo Island, if you use a multiplier effect of 2.5,

Mr. Tulk: was worth something like \$20 million to the Canadian economy.

Mr. Speaker, besides the argument for upgrading the road for the quality of fish, surely, given such productivity, the people of Fogo Island have earned the right to good roads.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, on Thursday last, questioned the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) concerning increased amounts for paving of roads in the Province this year. The minister's reply, I believe, indicated that machinery was just not available even if government had the funds. Mr. Speaker, McNamara Construction is already on Fogo Island. My information tells me that they will probably be finished their construction by the middle of September. Surely it will be much more appropriate to use their equipment for the rest of the Fall in paving rather than having McNamara Construction take the last two weeks in September and October to move their equipment back to the Mainland.

AN HON. MEMBER: contractors

MR. TULK: Sure, you have done it before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: And it cost a lot of money too (inaudible).

MR. TULK: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. TULK: After October, Mr. Speaker, the company could then move its equipment back to the Mainland.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed upon the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SIMMONS: Ferryland - but that was a by-election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition as presented by my hon. colleague for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I am sure everybody is aware of the need that exists. It was about eight or ten years ago that I had occasion to go to Fogo Island to attend a Development Association meeting. At that time there was a desire being expressed to have the roads upgraded and paved. Even then, eight or ten years ago, the need was there. It apparently still exists. I have not been back there since.

Resource development demands roads most certainly in all parts of the Province. Fogo is no exception. Roads are so vital! The needs of people with regard to roads cannot be expressed. Roads are a must for the development of any area. St. Barbe, the district I represent, seems to have the same problem, having emphasis placed on the construction of roads for the development of the district. As I have said so many times already, Gros Morne National Park which of course, is a federal thing we know, but most of our money comes from federal funding for road construction.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, at this time if we are not experiencing neglect; if we do not experience neglect on the overall picture of roads? Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for Transportation and Communications will deny that, this neglect with regards to the construction of roads. And as I have said, roads have always been vital to development, for the economy, for the convenience and comfort of people.

While I am standing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my thanks to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications for having met with delegations from my district. He showed a lot of kindness towards them, which I surely appreciate, and we look forward to lots of action in the future.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

Under Orders of the Day it is my understanding there is agreement to proceed with Order 3, The Motion To Concur.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: The answer is , yes we have agreed for our part to allow the government to treat this as a government day, and if they want to go ahead with Order 3 that is fine. If they want to have some other order that is equally fine. But, you know, as far as we are concerned it is their day for this day only.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I would like to get a few first readings over first and then we will get into it.

Order 6, Bill No. 14

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 6.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act," (Bill No. 14), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 14, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 7.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Dispensing Opticians," (Bill No. 11), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 11, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 8.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Provision Of Lower Cost Prescription Drugs," (Bill No. 12), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 12, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act, 1975," (Bill No. 13), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 13, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 10.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Consumer Affairs And Environment Act, 1973," (Bill No. 4), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 4, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 11.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Drilling Of Water Wells And The Conservation And Use Of Ground-water," (Bill No. 5), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 5, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 12.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fishing And Coasting Vessels Rebuilding And Repairs (Bounties) Act," (Bill No. 9), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 9, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 13.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975," (Bill No. 10), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 10, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 14.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Schools Act," (Bill No. 6), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 14, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 15.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Government Printing," (Bill No. 27), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 27, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 16.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Garnishment Against The Remuneration Of Public Officials," (Bill No. 7), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 7, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 17.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Fuel Oil Tax Act," (Bill No. 8), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 8, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 18.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Tourism to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Historic Objects, Sites And Records Act, 1973," (Bill No. 29), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 29, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 19.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Tourism to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And Enjoyment Of Present And Future Generations In The Province," (Bill No.28), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 28, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 20.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act," (Bill No. 25), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 25, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 21.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Amusement Rides, " (Bill No. 24), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 24, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 22.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act," (Bill No. 31), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 31, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

August 15, 1979

Tape 831

EC - 1

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 23.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Crown Lands Act," (Bill No. 33), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 33, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 27.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase In Certain Pensions," (Bill No. 38), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 38, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 3.

Motion, to concur with the report of the Social Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the meat of my few comments, if indeed there is any meat to my comments -

MR. NEARY:

Start off -

MR. THOMS:

I will.

I would like to apologize to you,

Mr. Speaker, for using what may not be an unparliamentary comment yesterday afternoon, however, I do not believe that I should have used the word in the context in which it was used. At the time, I was questioning a particular minister on something that I feel is important and that, of course, was in connection with the recent tragedy involving the helicopters. And I still believe, Mr. Speaker, that all civil servants, all ministers, all government officials, should be grounded. I am not suggesting - I have never suggested, of course, the helicopter because only M.O.T. can do that, but as far as government officials travelling on helicopters are concerned, as far as ministers travelling - anybody within the ambit of the civil service, or ministers, I think, should be asked to refrain from travelling pending the outcome of the M.O.T. investigation.

MR. THOMS: That was the only thing I was asking in the question. It is something that concerned me and I was disappointed that I could not get an undertaking from the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the comments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday when he spoke during that debate. These are new rule changes and, of course, like everything else, with experience the changes need refinement. I agree in principle with these rule changes and I think that this House, Mr. Speaker, will be restored to a debating forum, which is what the House should be. It should not be a place where you get personality attacks, it should not be a place where the names of private individuals are hissed across the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: It just should not be. I really do not mind somebody on the other side of the House attacking me, in a sense. I do not mind somebody on this side of the House attacking somebody on that side of the House. Because if the Minister of Lands and Forests has something thrown at him, he can get up on his feet in this House and he can defend himself. But your Harry Steeles and your Bob Coles - they cannot get up on their feet and defend themselves in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would like to associate myself with the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition. They are all constructive comments.

I guess I was what you would call a 'floater' when it came to the Committees. I went in and I sat down and enjoyed almost all of the privileges that were enjoyed by the people who were appointed to these Committees. There were certain ones that I had a particular interest in. I had a particular interest in Justice, since it is my shadow.

MR. L. TROMS: I sat in on some of the meeting involving the Social Services and also, of course, I had a particular interest in Mines and Energy and in the Fisheries. So I confine myself to these four general areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to burst any bubbles. There has been a great deal of euphoria connected with these committees. The hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) most of the people who have spoken in this debate so far have had nothing but the highest of praise for the committee system. I think it is about time that somebody said, 'Okay, let us stop and have a critical look at the committee system.' I think that is necessary. But the euphoria with which I have heard the President of the Council, particularly the members for St. John's West West, Stephenville speak of all of the co-operation that we got from the hon. ministers opposite in this House.

Well, that just was not so. We did not get the full co-operation of the Ministers from the Government. We saw in lots of cases the same co-operation that we got from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) this afternoon when he refused and said that they probably would not table in this House an environmental study. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, really what can be wrong with tabling in this House an environmental study? There certainly cannot be anything secretive about it that members of this House should not know about. I saw ministers, particularly the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), who has done a complete 360 degree turn in the committee. Everything that he stood for prior to the May 22nd. federal election, prior to the June 18th. provincial election all of that - I mean, there was going to be full co-operation, there was going to jurisdiction in the fisheries in this Province with all the milk and honey that was flowing between Ottawa and St. John's. So what do we get from the Minister of Fisheries; very simply, all he really wanted he said was more consultation. suddenly jurisdiction is not a question anymore, all he wants is more

MR. L. THOMS: consultation. So you owe the praise - and this is one thing that is wrong with this particular type of debate that we are having right now in this House instead of maybe in a Committee of the Whole where we can direct questions at ministers in this debate. One of the problems is, really, to a certain extent, it is turning out to be a forum in which member after member and we are not unguilty of this ourselves, gets up and praises the ministers who are supposed to be giving us all of this information.

Now, I just did not see this information coming forth. What I saw in the committee system in lots of cases was some very, bombastic statements, pompous statements by an awful lot of ministers and that is all I saw. We did not get the co-operation, we did not get the information. We did not get the co-operation, we were supposed to have gotten from them. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) really knows what I am talking about. I mean, he played that game very, very well in the committee. One of the best! One of the best!

MR. S. NEARY: He had some great teachers in the House in the last year.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we saw these ministers, I saw them, we all saw them, I think, we saw them hedge, we saw them squirm but we did not see them, at times, giving us the information that we wanted. We just did not get it. So for the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), for the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) to get up and say differently just is not so. It just did not happen.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Of the Opposition.

MR. L. THOMS: Maybe I should retract everything I have said.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the Daily News, who by the way, Mr. Speaker, still owes me an apology and a correction, but the Daily News, a couple of days ago, called for a royal commission into the administration of justice in this Province. And they called for, one of the terms of reference of that royal commission to be the setting up of a Police Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I would be awfully surprised, I have not checked this with him, but I would be awfully surprised if my friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) has not in the past called for a royal commission into the administration of justice.

MR. S. NEARY: I have for years and on various and sundry occasions.

MR. L. THOMS: Now, I do not presume, of course, to speak for all lawyers in this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Good.

MR. L. THOMS: - nor would I want to speak for all the lawyers in this Province -

MR. S. NEARY: No, I do not blame you for not wanting to speak for the lawyers.

MR. L. THOMS: - but, I think there is a great deal of merit to the request and I think it is a request that the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) should look very seriously at. I think it was brought out here with the Ministerial Statement by the Minister of Justice a few days ago, that there are things, that there are problems involved with the administration of justice in the Province that need looking into

There are things like whether or not a Police Commission is needed. What happens every time there is a controversy surrounding the police force? Chief Browne is the one who has got to answer to the public. Maybe this is not fair, maybe there should be a Police Commission that

MR. L. THOMS: can answer to the public, after all, it is the public purse.

The minister made a statement in connection with our city police or our Royal Newfoundland Constabulary that they, in connection with the issuance of tickets, I said at that time and I will repeat here, that the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary should not be meter maids, they should simply not be meter maids, they should not be on Water Street giving out tickets, they -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) for that sexist statement.

MR. L. THOMS: - they should not be, Sexes or not, the statement is made and I will stand by it, they should not be giving out tickets. I think the question of policemen who are instructed, and they are, who have a quota, which they do have, to give out tickets in this city, you know, I think this is a question that should be looked into. I think that anything that demeans our police force, whether it is the RCMP or the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, it should be looked into.

MR. RIDEOUT: They do have a quota system, do they not?

MR. L. THOMS: Of course, they have a quota system. Everybody is prepared to admit they have a quota system except the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) and this is the government we are getting all of the co-operation from. He has not the fortitude to admit that there is a quota system existing and that is why the policeman is up behind the Jewish Synagogue, and that is why the policeman is parked in the Pius Tenth driveway or that is why he is parked by Prince Philip Place, to get unsuspecting drivers so they can fill their quota.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is absolutely wrong.

MR. L. THOMS: Of course, it is wrong.

MR. S. NEARY: Terrible.

MR. L. THOMS: Of course, it is wrong. This is the sort of thing that maybe, the terms of reference, this royal commission should look into. The alleged, and I say this, the alleged hustling of young women by the RCMP which I do not for a minute believe is true, however, there is a widespread belief that it is so. Maybe the commission can look into this sort of thing, maybe they can.

Mr. Speaker,

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) on his feet.

MR. L. THOMS: Maybe it is time that happened.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice, (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) or the Superintendent of the RCMP admitted through the Minister of Justice the other day that there is a deliberate practise of just willy-nilly stopping people who

Mr. Thoms: are driving home at night. They do do it. Mr. Speaker himself has complained of this, people having been stopped three and four times for no reason. I mean, whatever happened to the legal aspect, you know, the reasonableness of the whole thing, that you had to have a reason to stop somebody?

AN HON. MEMBER: Boo! Boo!

MR. ROBERTS: It is a shameful act by the police to stop people.

MR. THOMS: Of course it can become - but these are things that maybe a royal commission into the administration of justice can look into.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) should tell the police to enforce the law, not to be going around stopping innocent people going about their innocent business.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I promised the Caucus that I would not take up the sixty minutes I am permitted, but I would like to reiterate again that, you know, basically I am in favour of the Committee system. I think it needs refinement as any new system would need. I would ask the Minister of Justice to look into the question of whether or not to appoint a royal commission and give it some very broad terms of reference. I think the people of Newfoundland, and I think the police forces in Newfoundland deserve that. And I believe they want it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. BAIRD): The member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that I have to disagree absolutely with what the person who previously spoke just said. I had the good fortune and the honour to Chair the Social Services Committee, and certainly in no instance whatsoever did any minister fail to give anything less than full and complete and frank information. Anything that was asked, any information that was requested was supplied. And if it so happened

Mr. J. Carter: that the minister did not happen to know the answer right at that moment he undertook to supply it shortly afterwards, and it was done. I cannot understand what Committee the hon. gentleman sat in.

MR. THOMS: One of them was yours.

MR. J. CARTER: So I understand. I understand one of the Committees that he sat in was Justice which was under the heading of Social Services, and I must say, I found that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) was as frank as a minister can be. I do not believe that the quota system came up to the same extent as it came up later on in the House. But if the Minister of Justice tells me that there is not a quota system or a bag limit or whatever you would like to call it, I am prepared to believe him. I see no reason to believe otherwise.

In any event, what the hon. gentleman has just said, or very little of what the hon. gentleman has just said is correct. The ministers were as frank as it was possible to be. Insofar as they were informed by their officials they informed the Committee. So I just do not know what the hon. gentleman is trying to do or trying to say. And I would just like the record to be cleared on this point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Social Services Committee dealt with five committees, Social Services, Justice, Consumer Affairs and the Environment, Health and Education. And the members on the Social Services Committee were the member for St. John's North, myself as Chairman, St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), Humber West (Mr. Baird), Exploits (Dr. Twomey), Fogo (Mr. Tulk), Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), the gentleman for Port au Port was the Vice-Chairman, St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and several other members of the House did come in to participate in the Committee system, in the deliberations.

Mr. J. Carter: Now, I would like, also, to take issue with what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday. He complained that with the three Committees sitting at the same time that the members were spread too thin, the press was spread too thin, and it was not possible to attend all the meetings that one would like to, and it was very difficult for the press to cover all the meetings that they wanted to.

Mr. Speaker, the three Chairmen got together and made up three schedules, one which called for only one Committee to meet at a time. Another schedule which called for only two Committees to meet at a time. And another schedule which made it possible for three Committees to meet at a time. We compromised and said let us try and have just two Committees meet at a time and if there seems to be a great interest on the part of members or of the general public or of the press, then we can always revert to the first schedule, that is, one Committee meeting at a time.

MR. J. CARTER: This would, of course, mean meeting both in the morning and at night. However, there did not seem to be an excessive interest by either the general public, or other members of the House, in these committees. The impression was left that although this was a welcome change from dealing with the estimates in the House nevertheless, just a very casual interest was expressed by members other than those on the committee and I must say that those on the committee showed great interest and very active participation. But the members who were not on the committee, with a couple of exceptions, did not show that great an interest so we continued with the two committee meetings at a time, or two committees meeting at a time and towards the end of the hearings we increased it to three committees meeting at a time. There was no objection offered at the time and I find it very strange that there should be any objection mentioned now.

I would just like that to be on the record. I have to disagree quite strongly with the Leader of the Opposition. However, the criticisms themselves are good ones. If it were the case that there was so much interest that people would like to attend all committee hearings then it is certainly possible for schedules to be set up so that only one committee sits at a time and then if every member of the House wants to sit in and participate in that committee, so they may.

As for the criticisms levelled by the member for LaPoile, that they were held in the basements and in the subterranean chambers of Confederation Building, I think he is letting his imagination run away with himself and I think that no more attention should be paid to it than is normally paid to that individual. He likes to call himself the watch dog of the House, I will say this, he is half right. He is certainly half right. However -

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we are on fair -
If he gets personal and tries to smear me and I will have to get personal and -

MR. MORGAN: Order! Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER: I think the hon. gentleman there is well acquainted with smearing. I would say the hon. gentleman's favourite dance is certainly the twist. No question about that.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Mr. Speaker. I would retaliate but I would not want to lower the decorum of the House.

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. gentleman should be well aware of -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) lowering the decorum of the House.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it is intolerable the wild charges that one has to bear and to listen to from the hon. gentleman. I only hope that he has the intestinal fortitude to make these charges before the Public Accounts Committee, because there he is not, as I understand it, protected by the privileges of this House, and yet he will be in a forum where if his charges have some merit that they can be swiftly dealt with and I will be -

MR. NEARY: Which one do you refer to?

MR. J. CARTER: - very interested to see. Well there are so many charges the hon. gentleman has laid. I think every single person who has ever come inside the confines of this House -

MR. NEARY: You supported the most corrupt administration -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please and address the Chair.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I got carried away by the tremendous number of wild charges that the hon. gentleman likes to - Fortunately the press pays very little attention to him. The charges that he makes are now being carried near the astrological column and the Ripley's Believe It or Not, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in future, in the very near future they will be close to the death notices.

MR. NEARY: You worked that pretty smart, pretty smart.

MR. J. CARTER: I believe, Mr. Speaker, I have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER: I think all members of all committees have agreed that they would like to see the Colonial Building used as a building for committees. If it is not possible for the House to move back to the Colonial Building, and perhaps it is not because the facilities are not there for all fifty-two members, then certainly the building could be used for committee hearings, both for the Public Accounts Committee and any other committee that wished to sit. Possibly the upper chamber, there are two chambers down there, the Legislative Chamber or the

MR. J. CARTER: Chamber, there are two Chambers down there, the Legislative Chamber or - What do they call it? - the Upper House. That Chamber, which is now used for stacks of books, could be used for another Committee hearing room, and it seems to me that this would be an ideal use for such a building. It has the facilities there for the general public, for the press, and it also has, if I might say, the ghosts that would remind us of the important business that is at hand.

Now, very quickly, to go through the various departments that were questioned and the items that were brought up. In Social Services there was quite an interest expressed in the 'special homes', these are the homes for people who do need some care and are not able to live on their own but yet are able to benefit from a home environment. And the minister was very interesting on this point and quite a lot of time was spent. There was a great deal of interest in foster homes and the work that they do, and it was gratifying to note that foster children, according to the minister, are kept in the same home as much as is possible. In other words, if a foster child shows a successful relationship with the foster mother, the department will try and see that that child, or those children, are kept in that same home for as long as possible.

There was a lot of interest in the Social Assistance programme and in the possibility of building incentives into those payments.

It was noted that there is a very great burden in that department on staff and that there has been quite a turnover of staff in the last few years. But the pressures in that particular department and on the social workers who have direct contact with the public were noted and it was suggested that these pressures are greater in that particular job than in most other civil service jobs, and this was possibly the reason for the turnover.

There was considerable discussion on the special services for the handicapped and it is noteworthy that

MR. J. CARTER: there is a very, very great emphasis on this particular aspect of the department.

There was also some discussion on alcohol and drug related problems and some very interesting statistics were presented.

In Consumer Affairs and Environment, consumer protection was probably the most important theme discussed and the need to protect the public in all respects of their dealings with salesmen and sales people.

The Landlord/Tenant relations, the fact that the tenant seems to have all the privileges, all the rights, and the landlord only has a few - it was felt that perhaps a more equal division of rights would be advisable.

Environmental protection was also a great concern, as was the management of waste material. And it was enlightening to hear that there is going to be a great deal of emphasis placed on the management of waste over the next few years.

In the Department of Justice, the powers of the police were discussed and the fact that sentences seem to vary from court to court even for the same offence. Some questions were asked about that.

And, of course, some questions were asked about the electoral office.

In the Department of Health, which is one of the very large departments, the costs of administration were discussed, and it was enlightening to note that the cost of a hospital bed can vary anywhere from \$100 to \$500 per day. A foreign seaman would be charged possibly \$150 a day - that would be the average cost of all the beds on the Island. But

MR. J. CARTER: a person who went in for, say, a heart operation or an operation requiring a lot of support services, his bill could legitimately be put at \$500 a day. So, there is no question about it, health care is expensive. Ambulance services and the transportation of the sick were discussed at great length, as was Medicare and dental health, and there were some remarks about the denturists and some anxiety was expressed in getting this very difficult situation straightened out so that there will be some control over that particular group of people. Nursing services and homes for special care were also brought up.

The fifth department, the last department to be considered, was Education, and there student aid was gone into and the minister was very helpful in giving us the formulae that are applied for student aid so that all the members of the Committee were able to understand just how much a student was entitled to get. The fact of Grade XII was noted, whether it was debated at some length, there was some suggestion that perhaps the pupil-teacher ratio should be increased rather than Grade XII, and all the implications of Grade XII were looked at and considered. The operating grants to school boards were looked at, bus transportation and bilingual education, and it was noted that - it seems a pity that each dollar that is supplied, not only to the school boards but to quite a number of boards and agencies, comes with a tag on it. In other words, this dollar is for this, and this dollar is for that and you must spend it on this, and if you do not spend it on this particular heading you would have to give it back, presumably, or you would not get as much next year. I wonder if members of the Committee did ask themselves and the minister whether or not this was the best way to use such funds. The schools for the handicapped, vocational education and St. George's Community College came in for a lot of discussion,

MR. J. CARTER: as did adult education, and it was enlightening to note that in the last four or five years a new type of examination has been brought forward that anyone may write and it is then marked by the Department of Education and a grade is supplied. In other words, a person might have left school in Grade III or IV and not bothered to go back, gone to work, grown up and be ashamed or not have the time to go back to school but, in the meantime, he may have taken it upon himself to educate himself and so it is now possible to write a particular exam and get a certification for whatever level one has achieved, and that certification has to be accepted, I understand, by Memorial University and by a number of institutions of higher learning. I think it is a very interesting and a very good step forward.

In all of these deliberations there was a tremendous feeling of co-operation and conciliation, but I do not think anyone should forget that the criticisms that were heard were trenchant and were quite, you know, sincerely meant. In fact, it is high time that we all were able to accept criticism. I do not think that members were all lovey-dovey, there is no doubt about it that the members sitting opposite us are dedicated to the overthrow of this government, dedicated to the peaceful overthrow, that is true, but they are certainly dedicated to the overthrow of this government and we should not forget this, and we are dedicated to the maintenance of it. But that does not mean that we cannot observe the courtesies, with the possible exception of the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), and we should all be able to accept strong criticism as being meant for what it is. It is certainly possible to inject a certain vigour into the debate if you start by insulting hon. gentlemen's mothers, but I do not think it is necessary for good debate.

MR. J. CARTER:

In closing, I would like to note that there is a circular gone around about the Auditor General, the new federal Auditor General, who says that there is a new concept in the role for the Auditor General although this is peripheral to these estimates. It really, I suppose, should come in for discussion under the Public Accounts Committee. Still, the new concept that Auditors General are embracing is what is called the 'value for money auditing'. In other words, up to now members of the House and certainly Auditors General

MR. J. CARTER: as well have said,
"If a heading has been properly authorized, and if the money has been properly spent for that heading, well there is not much more to be said about it." But this Mr. Macdonell has said recently in an article, and I believe also in a speech, that that is not enough. One should also ask, "Has there been value received for the money spent?" In other words was the money wisely spent? And I think that this is a question we could all address when looking at any heading. Not only was the money properly spent but was it wisely spent, did we get full value? And I think with that remark I can quite well close my statement.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Sit down and do not be delaying the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Maiden speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

Carry on, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker it seems that certain members of the Opposition want to even advise the Chair what ruling to make. The fact that I have been recognized by the Chair, I would like to have some order from the Opposition. Now first of all, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to listen to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and his comments whatsoever but I did not see who was standing on the other side and I -

MR. NEARY:

Oh my!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile - look, he is the most unruly member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. J. HODDER:

If the hon. minister had any grace he would yield.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) would give me time to indicate what I was attempting to say, I was saying I am not going to be dictated to by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) whatsoever in this House. I have been here for seven years now and I have no intention of listening to the hon. gentleman whatsoever, in any of his comments. But I will say that because the member standing in the Opposition is a first-time member of the House who I welcome here like all new members, I willingly yield to the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. B. Tulk)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would the Chair now, Sir, give a ruling whether or not the hon. gentleman has made his speech, that he can no longer participate in this debate, that he has finished, he has made his speech.

MR. MORGAN: I yielded to the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member has yielded to the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). The member for Fogo please.

MR. NEARY: But you cannot do that.

MR. MORGAN: I yield my turn.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, he cannot speak after that.

That is it, it is finished now.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, one thing -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo, please.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and clarification, if the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would just -

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

MR. MORGAN: Yes. Mr. Speaker, because the point was

MR. MORGAN: raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that if I now yielded to my good friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) in his maiden speech that I would lose my turn to speak in this debate. I think, Mr. Speaker, what I am doing is saying that I am yielding my turn and after the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) speaks I will then speak.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, he cannot direct the Chair. He cannot tell the Chair what to do.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Chamber although I heard some of what passed if I may say a word to the point of order. First of all there is a long tradition in this House that the debate goes back and forth. Your Honour, nonetheless and not improperly, recognized the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) now, I will say for our side that if the gentleman from Bonavista South will - I do not care whether I use the word yield or not, but if the gentleman from Fogo speaks then I for one, and I think I speak for everybody here, will not object if the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) gains the Speaker's eye when next it is the turn of somebody to Mr. Speaker's left to speak. It is utterly irrelevant to us who on that side speaks. I think the important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that there should be a back and forth in debate within the time at the disposal of the House, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Fogo was on his feet.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Thank you. The point of order is just a difference of opinion between two members.

The hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) and I am happy that you are in the Chair. You are quite a humourous man and -

MR. ROBERTS: Do not get carried away now.

MR. TULK: - perhaps can appreciate the inexperience
of a person like myself.

 Mr. Speaker, in this my first attempt
to enter into debate in this hon. House I would like to look at the
head being debated, that of Social Services, from the point of view
perhaps of the non-voter and I am speaking, of course, of those under
the age of eighteen years.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, given the fact that this is the International Year of the Child and given the fact that the heads under discussion probably affect those people most, I believe a discussion of this nature can be claimed to be somewhat relevant. Before I make my few points however, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate it seems to offer my congratulations to yourself, Sir, and the Deputy and Assistant Deputy Speaker on your elections by this House in the distinguished positions you now hold.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I am about to make are made perhaps to remind all of us in our concerns that we seem to have for energy, resource development and financial affairs that there is another component in the well-being of this Province that is equal or perhaps ever greater in importance than any of the above, namely the development of young people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a matter of grave concern for our young people in this Province is capital funds for school construction. Many children in the Province, as most of us are aware, go to schools that are just not fit to live in. For example, Mr. Speaker, Frederickton is a community in my district which happened also to be one of the schools I was responsible for as a supervising principal. It is a school of eighty-nine students. Last year that place was closed for two days because a furnace going full blast could not get the heat up in the building. A child's boots left in the vestibule of that school on a rainy day were filled with water when he went to put them on for lunch. There is exposed electrical wiring in that building which could electrocute any child. Mr. Speaker, the Fire Commissioner has said that the building itself is a fire hazard. As a matter of fact, at the present time he has given the school board ninety days to make it fire safe or close it down.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the weaknesses in this school and I can mention others in my district; for example, Fogo Primary in Fogo, and they serve only, Mr. Speaker, as an example of a problem that is widespread in this Province. Now,

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the body responsible for financing school construction is the Denominational Education Committee. But, Mr. Speaker, I have heard the point made on many occasions that that is where the funds come from for school construction in this Province. It is true those people allocate the funds but, Mr. Speaker, the DEC, the Denominational Education Committee depends upon the provincial government for its funding.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: So in the final analysis funds for school construction in this Province is the responsibility of the provincial government.

This year, Mr. Speaker, I sat in this Chamber and I was pleased when I saw an increase of \$500,000 to the Denominational Education Committee. I felt that now we would see at least some school construction. But, Mr. Speaker, as I found out to my chagrin that amount of money is totally inadequate and in pointing out my reasons for making that statement I will confine my remarks to the Integrated Education Committee with which I am familiar. Now for those who are not familiar with the Integrated Education Committee, it is that part of the Denominational Education Committee which is made up of the Anglican, Salvation Army and United Church schools.

AN HON. MEMBER: Plus Presbyterian.

MR. TULK: Presbyterian, all right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Should be like us and have our own.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the point that has to be considered in this House is that the Integrated Education Committee has an immediate priority list of \$28 million. In other words to construct the schools that must be built immediately they need \$28 million. They have a long-term construction requirement for an additional \$75 million and they presently owe \$57 million on schools built from 1969 onwards. Now, Mr. Speaker, out of the \$500,000, which I believe gave \$14,500,000,

MR. B. TULK: the IEC share was \$300,000 and you would normally expect some school construction to take place. But there is a fact which escapes us and that is that the Intergraded Education Committee has what one could call a floating interest rate, And as everybody knows, the Bank of Canada's interest rate recently rose one-half a percentage point. The net effect, Sir, was that the \$300,000 grant from government is wiped out and there is unlikely to be any further school construction this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shock.

MR. B. TULK: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, government grants extend only to 1987. And I am told by an official of IEC that this amount is probably not sufficient to pay off the \$57 million now owing.

I point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, that with delays the matter can only become worse. In my opinion, the government should immediately out of its own finances, or in co-operation with that co-operative Federal government that we now have in Ottawa, see this problem through so that our young people have decent educational facilities.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, which is of very great relevance, I believe, to young people and that is the retention rates in our schools. We have heard over the past year and a half about the great problems that we have with declining enrolments. And being situated in a high school in this Province when I heard the words 'declining enrolments', I immediately said, "What nonsense!" The problem that we have is one of retention. Dr. Llewellyn Parsons at Memorial University some years ago, I believe it was two or three years ago, two years ago, did some research on the retention rates of Newfoundland schools.

In 1971 of the number of people who had entered Grade II in 1971, which was 14,700, nine years later

MR. B. TULK: 4,300 of them graduated from high school, a retention rate of 29 per cent. In 1972, there were 14,900 people who had entered Grade II and nine years later 4,800 of them had graduated, a retention rate, Mr. Speaker, of 33 per cent. What about the last few years? In 1977 of the people who had entered Grade II, 15,915, five thousand of them are graduating, a little less than 30 per cent or about 30 per cent.

Now, Dr. Parsons estimated that counting those who do not successfully complete Grade XI public exams, and there are some of them, that perhaps 38 per cent of our people finish high school. The recent Task Force disagreed with Dr. Parsons' figure saying that it was somewhat low. But yet, counting those who even after they leave school and do not successfully graduate and those who enter trades of Grade X, Grade IX, the Task Force estimated that fewer than 50 per cent of the people who start school will eventually graduate from high school.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is, as I said earlier, our problem with enrolments is not as much a declining population as it is a drop-out problem. Mr. Speaker, add to that the fact that of those who drop out, 50 per cent are unemployed and only 17 per cent hold regular jobs at the time of a survey done by the Task Force on Education.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, as a former teacher and as a concerned citizen, that such a waste must not be allowed to continue in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let us look at what the Task Force said about the people who drop out of school. They interviewed some twenty-five school principals and, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will read what it says.

MR. B. TULK: They asked the principals what their views were on the drop-out problem. And in general, Mr. Speaker, the principals cited the classic reasons for low ability, low interest, poor family background and similar factors. However, the Task Force goes on to say, 'Added reasons such as immediate availability of jobs, especially in fish plants, opportunity for later return to school through Canada Manpower upgrading programmes and low community interest in education were also given.' There is the important point, Some principals in the interview sample and others to whom we spoke expressed concern that the school will receive the blame for the drop-out problem when the underlining causes rest with the individual,

MR. TULK: the family and the community. The Task Force, having heard from Newfoundland, went on to give some recommendations. They gave three, and the recommendations were: Recommendation 610, that each secondary school in the Province establish a committee on retention whose function would be to identify students with particular academic or personal problems which would lead to their contemplating leaving school and to involve students and parents in an intensive program designed to keep the student in school; Recommendation 611, that schools with more than a 30 per cent attrition rate from Grade VII to XI establish a target of reducing the rate to 30 per cent within three years; Recommendation 3 puts the onus on high school principals, teachers and community. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Task Force in this Province that has just recently sat evaded the question. That is no answer to say that schools and the people who have been trying for years to keep the drop-out rate down are still to be held responsible. But they did point out, Mr. Speaker, that many of the students who drop out are students from low, social economic backgrounds, have little interest in school and are absent for most of the year from school. You ask any educator in this Province who is worth his salt where the real problem and, perhaps, where the real solution is, and they will point out to you that the greatest need is for greater co-ordination and co-operation at a regional level. It is well-known that we have medical services, health services, social services and justice at a reasonable level in this Province. Well, as a former school principal, I know only too well the difficulty in making any headway in getting the four of those heads or departments of government to co-operate. They operate in isolation from each other and the result, Mr. Speaker, is a less than 50 per cent completion rate of our high school students.

MR. TULK: I want to mention before I close, Mr. Speaker, one other thing, and that is the amount of social assistance that is available to people and, as a result, to children in this Province, and to point out perhaps the effect that those rates may very well have on perhaps retention and perhaps just the general welfare of our students. If you take some of the figures from the social assistance rates that are normally available and just came into effect in June of this year, you will note that a single parent family with three children for a month can receive \$310, or \$10.19 a day. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you divide that, that comes out to \$2.54 per day per person and so on, you can go down through it. If you take a single person with six children in the family, it can work out to \$1.79 a day. If you take two people with seven - and it seems that the larger the family the smaller the amount - if you take two people with seven children it works out to \$1.73 a day. Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly subscribe to the bad backs here in this Province, of politicians and people who say that our people do not want to work and will have bad backs, will try to get bad backs, and get medical notes to get rid of it. I do not particularly subscribe to the effect that raising social assistance can have on the minimum wage rates in the Province. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can use them as excuses for inaction in the area of social care for the poor and the working poor. I believe that they deserve a better break.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, for those of us making \$20,000, \$25,000 or \$50,000 a year it becomes somewhat easy for us to forget and to turn our backs on those who are less fortunate than ourselves. What does it mean, though, for the child

August 15, 1979

Tape No. 841

GH-3

MR. TULK: in school or the social welfare recipient in this Province? That is what I am trying to confine my remarks to. I have seen many children and most of them are from social welfare families, and in many cases not much fault can be laid at the parents' door, but

MR. TULK:

I have seen many children, Mr. Speaker, come to my school with no breakfast. And I expect them and teachers expect them to carry on an adequate performance. The other point that must be raised is that many of our schools in the Province have no cafeteria facilities. Mr. Speaker, I say to you and to this House that if these people are to use our educational facilities and break the vicious cycle in which many of them find themselves, all levels of government and all concerned groups must get their heads together and come up with a better solution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak on the problem of child abuse in the Province but I yield the floor for perhaps more knowledgeable people than myself. I thank the House for listening to this young fellow from Ladle Cove in Fogo district and I sincerely hope that in the few moments taken there has been some wisdom in what was said.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not very young.

MR. TULK: Young compared to you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - I do not intend to take up too much time in this debate. I did not get involved in the Throne Speech Debate intentionally. I did not get involved in the Budget Debate intentionally. I wanted to sit back and listen in particular to those newcomers to this Assembly all of whom I congratulate. I congratulate all of them in being elected to this Assembly. So I sat back and listened in both debates and now to the last two days of Concurrence Debates and reports from the Estimates Committees. So in my brief comments I will, Mr. Speaker, being my first time on my feet to speak in any debate, congratulate Yourself in your election to the authority of this House and of course your colleagues in the positions of Deputy and Assistant

MR. MORGAN:

Deputy. But in my remarks this afternoon I want to commend one man who has not been mentioned to date in the Debate on the Estimates or in the Budget Debate and I am talking about our Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I think that our Minister of Finance has put together a Budget in such a short time, a very short time. It is indeed a 'hold the line' Budget as it indicates. It is a seven or eight month period to manage the fiscal affairs of this Province. In the short time that the minister had to do it he put together a Budget which in my view shows financial realism and shows fiscal management. That is exactly what this Budget is doing.

I have listened to the debates and I was quite surprised that in most of the speeches there was little or no concern expressed about the management of the fiscal affairs of this Province, and that is what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker; we are talking about the proper management of the fiscal affairs of this Province. We are not talking about the problems in our own districts. Sure we are, some of us. We all have our own concerns in respective areas and respective districts but the main part of this debate is to deal with the proper management of the fiscal affairs of our Province. I think that this Budget, looking at the fact that it is a \$1.4 billion Budget and the fact that we are in that \$1.4 billion Budget having a surplus of \$10 million in a current account, to me clearly indicates that the new reborn, energetic, dynamic administration, the Peckford Administration, intends to properly manage the financial affairs of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: True it does not reflect all the aims and objectives of the new, reborn administration, the new administration. I was part of the old administration for a number of years, in fact four or five years, but this administration is under new guidance, new leadership, and these aims and objectives have to be portrayed in government policies whether they be policies to develop our resources or policies of managing our financial affairs.

MR. MORGAN:

I listened to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) when he spoke in the Budget Debate and this, in fact, really is a mini Budget Debate we are talking about now, we are involved in now, and he said the government has lost touch with realism. At the same time in debate the Opposition

MR. MORGAN: At the same time in debate the Opposition Leader on whom I will comment in more detail later on - he said that he had read five budgets prior to making his comments in the House on this, today's Budget, the present day Budget, this session, and he says that the Government has lost touch with realism. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the same hon. gentleman when going out looking to become the premier of our Province and leading his party into a general election showed he was completely out of touch with realism, showed complete irresponsibility in his policies and the policies of his party. But the people of our Province are no longer naive, they can recognize that these policies could not work. They were going to pave all the roads in the Province. Money from where?

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you not going to do that?

MR. MORGAN: They were going to bring in a pharmacare programme. They were going to place a freeze on hydro rates. They were going to abolish school taxes. They were going to bring back mothers' allowances.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. MORGAN: They were going to do all these things,

Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - but where was the money going to come from?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Where was the money going to come from?

And on top of that I listened to the Leader of the Opposition who was aspiring to become premier, who came back from his position in Ottawa as a Member of Parliament and I am assuming he was given advice by his colleagues in the Liberal Party, when he promised he was going to build hospitals in Channel-Port aux Basques, a new hospital in Placentia, a new hospital in Clarendville, a new hospital in Bonavista, and an extension for the hospital in Grand Falls. He was going to do all this, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MORGAN: but when asked by a very good reporter, a commonsense reporter, "But, Mr. Leader, where will the money come from?" "Oh, I do not know where the money will come from; I will have to get in to assess the situation financially of the Province." At the same time, he confirms in debate that he had read five previous budgets of this assembly, of this previous administration.

MR. STIRLING: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: So it shows, Mr. Speaker, the -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Point of order.

MR. MORGAN: - irresponsibility -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: By way of information - I was following the President of the Council - Are we on the Budget debate? Are these things relevant to the Social Services Committee?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: Speaking to the point of order, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: - we are debating the concurrence reports of the estimates committees dealing with the spending of monies by this Government. We are dealing with the spending of funds allocated for different departments, in this case the Social Services field -

MR. NEARY: Sit down, sit down!

MR. MORGAN: -and we are talking about the spending of these dollars. Therefore, we have to speak accordingly in regard to managing the Province's fiscal affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, the point of relevancy, I will repeat again, is sometimes difficult to determine but I will remind all hon. members participating in this debate that we are, indeed, discussing the - it is a concurrence motion to concur with the report of the Social Services Committee who debated the estimates and discussed the estimates of the Department of Justice, the

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Department of Health, the Department of Education, the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment, and the Department of Social Services, and I would like to suggest to hon. members that they keep their comments pertinent, at least, to that particular point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MORGAN: Agreed, Mr. Speaker. I fully agree with your ruling and I am confident your rulings will always be wise rulings in this House.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about the unrealistic attitude of the opposing party who aspired to become the government of this Province, you know it is fortunate, in my view, that that party did not become the administration -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - because I look at the turmoil on the other side and I look at the conflicting statements by difference members of the Opposition in the estimates debates.

MR. STIRLING: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: For example, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. MORGAN: What?

MR. STIRLING: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. When you ruled on the point of order, for the last number of minutes the member has not returned to the subject. He has again continued to attack the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: He is thumbing his nose at Your Honour.
Thumbing his nose.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, again let me repeat what I said a few moments ago on the same particular ruling but I will also suggest to hon. members that I believe I have allowed other hon. members in this debate to be very flexible and I would ask the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) to continue his remarks.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is sort of a turmoil situation because I have sat back and listened to the speakers in the Opposition, in particular, and listened to the good points made by some members from the government side of the House of Assembly. Particularly I recall the suggestions put forward by certain speakers, like, for example, the Chairman of the Resource Estimates Committee regarding the establishment of a fund whereby the private sector could invest for development of our resources, a good suggestion. I listened to other suggestions as well, but looking at the Opposition members, the conflicting statements being made. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) stands up and says, "The Province's debt is a greater burden on the Province today."

MR. NEARY: So it is. Right.

MR. MORGAN: His colleague next to him stands up, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir and says, "You are not spending enough money. You are not spending enough money. You are not going out and building roads and building schools and putting in water and sewer. You are not doing these things. We are talking about social services, you are not doing enough for the social services programmes." But the same time his other colleague stands and say, "Oh, you have borrowed too much and you have the Province too much in debt."

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking about being relevant in this debate, I sat and listened yesterday and I cringed in my chair and I saw the reaction of the Leader of the Opposition who also cringed in his chair -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. MORGAN: - at the personal attacks being made again, the same old Opposition tactics by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) attacking people who cannot stand in this House and defend themselves, attacking Mr. Steele in Gander, Andrew Crosbie, Mr. Frank Moores, Mr. Hickman, and Mr. Crosbie. These are the kind of things that I thought, Mr. Speaker, we got away from with this new decorum and the level of debate in the House.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, is right on all the names that he mentioned except Mr. Steele, except Mr. Steele, he was the one I did not attack. But the rest of them can be included in the category that the hon. gentleman just specified.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: There has been a point of order raised and I wish to make a ruling in that I do not consider a point of order to be raised except a difference of opinion between hon. members.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I thought we got away -

I am going to do something this afternoon - I am known to be a partisan animal on this side of the House but I am going to say today sincerely that I think that the Leader of the Opposition in coming back to Newfoundland politics has brought back with him and established in this Province a new level of politics in this Province. He has done that in my view.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And I have no hesitation in saying that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And I think he has achieved to a point, to a certain limit, in working in co-operation with our Leader and our Premier, in bringing about a new level of co-operation and somewhat improved decorum in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: But sometimes I look across the House and I sympathize with him. I really do. I sympathize with his position. He is a man who has great experience behind him, a great Newfoundlander, a great Parliamentarian, known to be a child of the House of Commons he mentioned and referred to in his early debate. I agree with that. A man whom I could listen to, and watch and learn from and I agree with that as well. But I sympathize with him because what he has to do on that side of the House of Assembly, he has to root out those people who are destroying this Assembly, destroying it, destroying the dignity of this Assembly, certain members, and I would say that the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly has got to - if we are going to get involved in debating the affairs of our Province, as we all should be doing in a proper way, we have got to overcome these kinds of personal slanderous attacks we see on individuals outside the House who cannot stand here to defend themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about the economy of our Province for a while. I am going to get away from being partisan but before I do that I am going to say one thing, I do not think there is much point in me standing in the House today and talking about the economy and the things I see that we are doing right, the things that we

MR. MORGAN: should be doing in the future things we should have done in the past, if I am expecting tomorrow morning to have some kind of coverage going out from the House to the general populace of what I said today, because I am a bit disturbed as a member of the House in this session - I listened to some excellent debates, excellent speeches, made by the members of the House - one made this afternoon by the member from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) and these members from Labrador made some very passionate speeches on behalf of their respective districts, but I did not see too much coverage in the local media. It is only when the Leader of the Opposition stands up and says I am like some kind of a brass band or something it is carried by the electronic media, but if he gets up and scores some good points on the development of the Lower Churchill, which he did that day, I listened carefully, there were not two sentences carried in the media. So, who are we talking to, Mr. Speaker, talking to ourselves? I think we have to get us some improved standards of reporting of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Maybe the answer is to bring in television -

MR. NEARY: Bring the Newfoundland Bulletin back.

MR. MORGAN: - maybe the answer is to bring in television. But I am concerned about one thing with regards to the media; I never did believe in abuse of freedom of the press, but I think there is some today. I cannot see how a man can go out and fight an election campaign, to defeat a minister, as a candidate and he can turn around and go into a newsroom the following day and not be partisan in his reporting, I just cannot see how it can be done. For example -

MR. NEARY: Who are you talking about?

MR. MORGAN: I am talking about the Daily News.

I look at some of the headlines in the Daily News -

MR. NEARY: Who is the smear artist now?

MR. MORGAN: - the headlines in the Daily News, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Who is the character assassin now?

MR. MORGAN: - and I am saying that if a man is partisan one day, he cannot be impartial the next day in regards to reporting in the media.

MR. NEARY: Name him.

MR. MORGAN: And I am saying that - we all know who we are talking about - we are talking about the Daily News -

MR. NEARY: Name him, Mr. Speaker, name him.

MR. MORGAN: - and how can members of the electronic media one day go out and campaign as candidates against this government and the following day go into the newsroom and say, "Oh, yes we are going to give bouquets to the government".

MR. NEARY: You should be ashamed, you should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. MORGAN: So, I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we are not getting a - and this goes for both sides of the House, in my view - first of all, we are not getting adequate coverage of this Assembly, and number two, I am bit concerned about some bias seeping in, seeping into our media, I am concerned about that. I will say one thing, that I listened carefully during the election campaign to a certain moderator of an open-line show, in fact, the brother of the Leader of the Opposition, and I must say today that he was the fairest individual all through the election campaign that I heard anywhere in this Province. He had the chance to be biased, he had the chance to be partisan, in fact, he could have used the total airways of the Province and he did not do it, he did not, he was fair all through.

MR. NEARY: Who?

MR. MORGAN: I am talking about Mr. Bas Jamieson who is the moderator of an open-line show, and I have to commend him for the stand and the fair way he dealt with the open-line show.

Now, getting off and away from the media, I am going to say a few things today about the economy of our Province. Now, let us look back, Mr. Speaker, at what has been happening in the past six or seven years. I have been here as a member since 1971 and I think we have come through the worse economic times that we have ever experienced as a Province, not only as a Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - but as a nation.

MR. NEARY: Tory times are hard times.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the world economy was hurting over the past number of years. It came to a major recession in 1974 or 1975, where we saw unemployment go to over one million across Canada, where we saw inflation go beyond the 8 per cent figure in Canada. Now, what effect, do you think, that would have on a small Province of a half a million people with a limited revenue and a limited taxation base to get their revenue from? The overall economy of Canada and the overall economy of our neighbours to the South are going to have a very serious effect on the economy of a small Province like our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. But despite that, Mr. Speaker, and despite these problems in the economy of Canada, couple these with the fact that we had closedowns of two major industries in the last five or six years, the Linerboard mill at Stephenville and the Come by Chance oil refinery at Come by Chance, coupling these with the fact of an overall bad economy across the nation, we are surviving in a very proud way as a Province, our economy is on the upturn. The fact that we, as a Province

MR. MORGAN: in this case, we have to sell all our products we produce like fish products and newsprint industry products, forestry products and mineral products, outside the Province, we are depending on world markets. At the same time, we are counting on the bulk of consumer needs to be imported, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, coupling these things it is obvious that we depend on the conditions of world markets, and fortunately, the dollar devaluation over the past few years has helped this Province substantially with regards to its exports. It has helped our exports to be able to compete in the marketplace.

MR. MORGAN:

and get better prices. And that is the reason why we see a very buoyant economy in relation to the newsprint industry today, the forestry industry. The large companies like Bowaters and Price and these are seeing good substantial profits the last couple or three years because of the increased price for their products in the world market place. But, Mr. Speaker, despite the tough times we have come through we are now debating a Budget for the next seven or eight months and I recall listening to some speakers in the front bench of the Opposition talking about how we mismanaged the affairs in the past. Well, last year, Mr. Speaker, as part of the previous administration, I was quite proud of the fact that we had a surplus in our current account last year to go towards our capital account of \$20 million.

MR. ROBERTS: Thanks to Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN: \$20 million.

MR. ROBERTS: Thanks to Ottawa.

MR. STIRLING: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, irrespective of where the dollars came from -

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

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: I would hope that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) will note from the points that were made yesterday that now the minister has admitted that he is on the Budget Debate and this further points out that this is supposed to be a Concurrence Debate and we are strictly on now - excellent comments but for the Budget Debate and maybe the President of the Council can now understand the concerns that this side have about the purpose of this Concurrence Debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, if the hon. gentleman for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) would just sit back and listen, as I did to his speeches he made in the House, I will clearly

MR. MORGAN:

come to the point eventually of pointing out why we are not spending more on social services programmes and why we are spending more on resource policy programmes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, in view of the explanation given by the hon. minister I would ask him to continue his remarks.

MR. ROBERTS: And conclude.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude when my time is up and not when the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) tell me to.

MR. ROBERTS: Men grow weary (inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, he will have his time when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) resigns. I am sure he will win the next convention, the present member for the Straits of Belle Island and I will be the first man to congratulate him.

MR. ROBERTS: I will get a lot more than the hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN: He will probably get fifty-seven votes, yes.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the economy of our Province has come through some tough times and I think there is not one Minister of Finance in any Province in Canada but will agree that they have all had tough times with the exception of a few like Alberta, maybe British Columbia. But they have all come through some very severe, tough times. But the fact is that I am willing to stand here and I think most of the new members of the House will agree with me, and I think we should all work together to make sure we see that day, that our economy is going to be a very buoyant economy in the not too distant future. And here are a few reasons why: The value of our fish products last year, just this past year, increased by 33 per cent to a value of \$335 million, a record for our Province, increased by 33 per cent. Now, that is one aspect of our economy, the

MR. MORGAN:

fishery which is finally coming into its own primarily because of the 200 mile limit and increased catches by the fishermen and better markets.

Looking at our forestry industry in newsprint. Because of the - I mentioned earlier - the depreciated dollar value and because of better markets, the production of these companies we have in our Province, Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters, they increased their production this past year again by 14 per cent to a value of \$220 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, there are two major industries, the fisheries and the forestry which comes to \$545 million per year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order. No, it is not a point of order. I was going to ask if the minister would permit a question.

MR. MORGAN: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. I have listened -

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

MR. ROBERTS: - to the figures and I appreciate the minister's courtesy. Could he perhaps tell the House whether he meant a 14 per cent in the increase in production of the paper industry, the pulp and paper industries in the Province, or whether it was a 14 per cent in the value of the production which I know he will agree is a different thing. And if it is the latter, how much of that 14 per cent is the result of the devaluation of the dollar as against the American dollar to which he referred earlier in his remarks.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the increase in production, the quantity of newsprint produced.

MR. ROBERTS: Fourteen per cent more tons?

MR. MORGAN: Fourteen per cent. That is right, 14 per cent of the total quantity produced by the two mills in our Province.

MR. ROBERTS: How much did its value grow?

MR. MORGAN: And, of course, looking at the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have coming on stream this year a third paper mill which is going

MR. MORGAN:

to produce 75,000 tons of newsprint on the first machine and a further 75,000 newsprint in the second machine employing approximately 850 individuals directly or indirectly, that is going to add to that sector of our economy.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, looking at the mining industry, unfortunately the last year we had a very low production in mining in the Province because of the strikes we had in Labrador. We had some very severe strikes affecting the mining industry and the reduction was down but so far this year, the first quarter of this year 1979, the first quarter of this year the volume of iron ore mined in Labrador increased by 39 per cent over the same first quarter last year, 39 per cent. So, there is the fishery, the forestry and the mining. But before I leave mining, Mr. Speaker, the fact that this year we have 3,000 claims staked in this Province for exploration work, for mining activities, exploratory work. 3,000 claims whereas in 1971, Mr. Speaker, guess what?-we had a total of thirty-five.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty-five!

MR. J. MORGAN: Thirty-five claims in 1971 and 3,000 in 1979. Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned these parts of the economy and the big thing, I think, I do not want to--as the Premier mentioned yesterday in answering questions of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson), he does not want to build up expectations, he does not want to build up the hopes of the people, but the fact that yesterday, for example, an announcement was made that there was some hydro carbons found 200 miles off St. John's in a depth of 280 feet of water, that is significant. I do not want, nobody here wants to build up expectations and hopes but the fact is that this year the five major companies, five major oil companies are spending \$200 million in exploratory work off our coasts.

And thanks to the regulations brought in by the former Minister of Mines and Energy, now the Premier, that these dollars are benefiting us by means of employment, employing Newfoundlanders -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. MORGAN: the servicing of the vessels, the rigs off our coast.

How many are there?

MR. J. MORGAN: 800 or more jobs this year according to the Minister of Manpower a few days ago in the information he gave the House, I think it was in this session.

Mr. Speaker, I have only got a few minutes left but I want to talk about the hydro developments. Sure, we got a Lower Churchill Development Corporation with us in there for 51 per cent and the Federal Government 49 per cent, we can eventually take over if we get the hydro development going. It is a study period now as mentioned in debates, but the fact is that I am convinced with the new spirit of co-operation between both levels of government, here and in Ottawa, that that hydro development, despite the Opposition Leader's seemingly light suggestion, backed up by his colleagues, it would never be developed by a PC administration. I am saying it will be and it will be over the next few years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Would the minister resign his seat if it is not?

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks I want to say that there is not one minister on this side of the House in this Cabinet but will listen carefully to the pleas of the different members on the government side and the Opposition side with regards to problems in their different districts. They want water and sewer and new schools, last week they mentioned new schools, a requirement there, paving of roads, infrastructure needs of facilities, etc. around the Province but the fact is that we must do some sacrificing for a period of time and place emphasis on fisheries, this year \$23 million, rural development this year \$27 million,

MR. J. MORGAN: forestry this year, \$21 million, tourism this year, \$31 million and I can go on to say that these kinds of things are the objectives of the new administration. The objectives are and the emphasis is being placed on developing properly our resources that we have so that one day down the line all the members of the House can come in here and there will never be a need for petitions requesting for people services they so rightly deserve.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. B. Tulk) on making such a wonderful speech this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: I thought the hon. gentleman did extremely well in his maiden speech, Sir, and I want to complement him and in so doing I want to also add, Sir, that following the hon. gentleman then I am afraid the level of debate in the House took a nose-dive and I do not think in my long history in this House, Sir, that I ever can remember such a vicious attack being made on an individual as was made on the Editor of the Daily News in this Province. I think it -

AN HON. MEMBER: The publisher.

MR. S. NEARY: The publisher rather.

MR. NEARY: I think it was scandalous, it was scandalous, Sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to remind hon. members of the House, I have to remind them, I should not have to but I am going to remind hon. members of the House that these remarks came from the lips of a gentleman and then his advice to members of the House that there is no smear, or no character assassination on that side of the House, it is all over here, these remarks, Mr. Speaker, came from the lips of a gentleman who carried on the most savage, the most savage, and the most cruel and probably the most successful whisper campaign and smear campaign against a former leader of the Opposition and his family that has ever been known to mankind.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: The whisperer.

MR. NEARY: The smear artist himself is up now giving us advice. Hon. gentlemen should not have to be reminded of what transpired in the last session of this House from the lips of that hon. gentleman. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that nobody over at Memorial University will invite the hon. gentleman over to give a lecture to the class over there doing social studies, or studying the economy of this Province with the logic that just came out of the hon. gentleman. Taking credit for the increase in production at Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters, taking credit for that, two mills that were built in this Province by a Liberal Administration, taking credit for the increase in the mineral production in this Province. Every mine, I believe, in Newfoundland was started by a Liberal Administration, including Wabush and the Iron Ore Company of Canada, every one of them started by a Liberal Administration.

MR. SIMMONS: Labrador Linerboard.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman tells us now - they are boasting about the fact that Labrador Linerboard is going to be onstream producing paper after all the bellyaching we heard from the President of the Council that it is built in the wrong place, it is ill-

MR. NEARY: conceived, ill-founded, was doomed from the day it started, now they are telling us what a great enterprise it is going to be. What a great enterprise it is going to be. Built in the wrong place, built out on the Harmon Corporation where you had all the infrastructure, where you had a deep-sea port, where you had everything, study after study proved that Stephenville was the best place to put that mill, and then the President of the Council and his colleagues telling us in this House it was ill-conceived and ill-founded and put in the wrong place, now they are telling us what a great industry it is going to be, and what a great employer of Newfoundlanders it is going to be.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very concerned.

MR. NEARY: Is that not something? What a turnabout. What a turnabout, Mr. Speaker. But, anyway, I do not want to get down in the mud and roll with the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what the hon. gentleman did, he proved one thing, Sir, and that was yesterday when the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) got up and criticized the direction that the new reforms, the so-called reforms, in this House and the committees had taken, that the direction they had taken, the hon. gentleman got up because I raised strong objection in caucus and that was why the hon. gentleman stood in his place and criticized the system, the way it was working, because I raised it in caucus, and I had a convert in the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I had a convert today in my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), two converts I had. And before I am finished there will be more converts because I will say this to Your Honour right now that as sure as I am standing here in my place in this House, before another session of this House is over the rules will have to be changed again to eliminate this charade that we are carrying on here in the House for the last three days. When we are supposed to be debating estimates what are we doing? All we are hearing is a lot of wind and hot air.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We are not.

MR. NEARY: debating - I am not debating estimates, Mr. Speaker; we are not asking ministers questions; we cannot get answers; the 75 hours that we had to analyze the estimates have been eroded, further cut down, by, for instance, the likes of what we heard this afternoon, that low level debate that we heard this afternoon, the lowest that I have ever heard in the House, where a minister did not even get into the debate on his own department - Transportation - we are not debating Transportation this afternoon, the minister felt he should get into the debate to make some general statements, to make a budget speech. What an abuse, as I said yesterday, Sir, what an abuse of power? What a farce this has turned out to be when we are supposed to be analyzing the estimates? We have ministers, not even in their own departments - yesterday we had Transportation, that is when the minister should have gotten up and answered questions. Mr. Speaker, my understanding, Sir, my understanding of this whole procedure that has turned out to be a great joke and a farce and, as I said, was cleverly designed by little Mussolini to muzzle the Opposition, to turn this House into a farce, to remove the power of the purse and that does not seem to have filtered through yet to the people who sit to my left over my shoulder, that the whole reason for this exercise, Mr. Speaker, the whole reason for it is to reduce debate in this House, is to give the government a free ride, is to cut down on the criticism, is to cut down on the amount of information that we can get out to the public.

MR. J. CARTER: Rubbish, rubbish.

MR. NEARY: Ah, rubbish, we heard the Leader of the Opposition yesterday get up, get up and - he was very mild I would have been a little more severe myself - talked about the committees meeting simultaneously and talked about the abuse now

MR. NEARY: that we are seeing in this House,
the abuse.

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible) were not interested (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman
started the low level of debate earlier this afternoon.

MR. J. CARTER: What about the chaos in the House?

MR. NEARY: She started to go downhill earlier
this afternoon, and the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan)
really polished it off.

Mr. Speaker, the last three days in
this House when we should have been getting information from ministers,
when we should have been asking questions like I asked, one day I
asked 18 questions, ministers wrote down the questions that I asked
them and they never got a chance to answer. Six o'clock came, bang,
whizz-bang, she goes through. This afternoon, I would submit, at
six o'clock this report will go through with not one thing accomplished.
The estimates will be over, the budget will be over, the estimates
are gone through and that is the end of it.

MR. MORGAN: Let somebody else speak, what is
wrong with you?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman
did not elect me to this House. I will speak when I feel like it not
when the hon. gentleman feels like it. The hon. gentleman, instead
of giving us a lecture on the economy of the Province, would be
better off down in his little bistro down in Bonavista, down in
his bistro.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible), not even in Bonavista.

MR. NEARY: Well, wherever it is. That is right,
that is right, we had a report of the helicopters bringing the hon.
gentleman down there a couple of years ago at public expense.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we are allowed, and my hon. friend, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), said earlier today, you know, we should not be mentioning names in this House. Well, I have a question that I want to put to the Minister of Justice, and the hon. member should have been here by the way, the hon. gentleman has pious hopes - should have been here for the last 17 years if he wanted to hear names being bandied about. The hon. gentleman, I do not know where he was if he was in law school or where he was when the name of Mr. Smallwood was being kicked around and bandied about this House and when the name of Mr. Arthur Lundrigan was being bandied and kicked around this House and when the name of Mr. Joe Ashley was being kicked around this House and the name of Mr. Bill Tiller was being bandied about this House, and I can go on and on and on and give the hon. gentleman a long list

MR. NEARY:

of men who were smeared by some of the people who are sitting on that side of the House right now. But are we supposed to just forget all that, forget it all? We cannot ask when somebody receives money from the Public Treasury, We cannot say, Did Mr. So-and-So -

MR. HICKEY: I am the oldest one here.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and I heard the hon. gentleman at it too when he first came into this hon. House.

MR. HICKEY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): A point of order. The hon. Minister of Social Services. I am sorry, I did not hear what you said at the beginning.

MR. HICKEY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was saying to myself, I do not know who the hon. gentleman is referring to because aside from the hon. gentleman, I am the most senior member on this side and I do not recall any of this. And I sat over on the other side and I do not ever recall raising the name of one single citizen of this Province by way of smear or anything else. Now, the hon. gentleman and myself have had a few cuts back and forth but he is in here to defend himself.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I hesitate to get in the midst of the grey beards and grey heads of the other two of the troika of us who have survived in one way or another. I would simply say that I do not think that there is a point of order for the reason that I do not mind the hon. gentleman for St. John's East Extern talking to himself but we are now at the point where he is answering himself, Sir, and that is surely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, I would have to rule that there does not exist a point of order but again a clear difference of opinion between both hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to remind the hon. gentleman, Sir - one thing about it, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with my memory and I have to remind the hon. gentleman and I have to ask him, who turned the phrase in this House, LSD? No, the hon. gentleman does not remember. He does not remember.

MR. HICKEY: I do not know what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman knows full well what I am talking about. And, Mr. Speaker, let me say to my hon. friend, who I know means well, Sir, that it is virtually impossible to get away from names when you are talking about people who have been recipients of goodies from the Public Treasury. It is impossible. And if you put a question on the Order Paper concerning the Premier's brother-in-law, if you do not mention his name, how will the person you are asking the question of, how will he know who you are talking about? Will you say it is somebody over in Harbour Grace who breeds Newfoundland dogs? Is that what you put on the Order Paper? Or, Mr. Speaker, if you are talking about my hon. friend - well, I will not divulge the information right now but I will shortly - if I am talking about the person, Sir -

MR. MORGAN: Give us a name, you can say it.

MR. NEARY: No. If I am talking about the person who was commissioned by the Minister of Justice of this Province to study the Companies Act to report on proposals for a new company law for Newfoundland. Now, we are under this head now because we are discussing the Justice Department and under the Justice Department comes the Registry Office, the Companies Act. Now, I want to ask some questions about this report, this gentleman was commissioned to do a report but I cannot mention his name. So all I can say, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: But he is in the House.

MR. NEARY: No, he is not in the House now.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Mines and Energy.

MR. NEARY: No, but I am not allowed to mention names. So can I say, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to find out what happened to the study that was done by a man who was a minister in the Moores Administration who went down to Marystown, got defeated, then got elected again on June 18 of this year and is now back in his old department but in the interim period he was a professor over at Dalhousie University in the law school. And while he was a professor in the law school he was commissioned by this government, with unlimited expenses I am told, to report on proposals for a new company law for Newfoundland. Now I cannot mention his name but I would like to ask the minister if he would bring us up to date -

MR. MORGAN: You could give us a clue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: That is what you have been saying 'Steve', the other crowd have not got a clue.

MR. NEARY: The only clue that I can give the hon. gentleman that in their resume, in their describing this gentleman, they said in 1977, he accepted an appointment as an associate professor of law at

MR. NEARY: Dalhousie University, and in order to complete his report and prepare proposals for the government, an arrangement was made in late 1977 for Professor Blank to work with Mr. Ryan and the office of the Legislative Council. Perhaps somebody at the table will give the hon. gentleman a clue. This cooperative effort led to a further review on the direction of the government of the present - " I am reading by the way from a Ministerial Statement made by Mr. Hickman when he was Minister of Justice, made in this House. Although he mentioned the professor's name, I am not allowed because my colleague says I should not do it. So I am not going to mention his name.

So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps somebody - and I know we are not going to get the answers because in another three or four minutes I will start to get the hard looks, I will start to get the black looks from my left here and I will have to sit down and, Mr. Speaker, we will not get any information on whether or not this was a good study, whether it was a good report, how much we paid Professor Blank for the report and will the report be made public, will it be tabled in this House, will the recommendations be implemented?

MR. MARSHALL: It has been tabled.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it has not been tabled. Has it been tabled?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, I have not seen it.

Oh, there it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, now I will have to read it but in the meantime I would like to know what the Minister of Justice thinks about the report, if the recommendations of that report are going to be implemented, and if we are going to have a new Companies Act in Newfoundland because it is about time that we did have one. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we brought in an act in this Province

MR. NEARY: making it illegal for lawyers and for legal assistants to put their names on the share lists down in the Registry office. It is time we did that, Sir, so we can find out the real owners of these companies that are doing business with the government and that are involved in skulduggery. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, we changed this procedure. You cannot go down in the Registry office and find out the real owners of companies that are set up, are incorporated under the Companies Act in this Province.

I went down one day and I discovered, I am not allowed to mention any names, but I discovered that one of the companies that was in trouble with the Department of Public Works had on its share list a member of this House, a gentleman who is very high up in the government. I cannot mention his name. I do not know but his name is still on the share list, and when I raised the matter he said, "Oh, I only hold a qualifying share." Well, I do not care what it is, it is only playing with words if you say it is a qualifying share. You are just playing with words. And Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman, Sir, who rides a bike in the evening, even when it is raining the hon. gentleman is out riding a bike, if the hon. gentleman does not believe me then he can go down to the Registry office and check the share list himself.

MR. ROBERTS: He does not know enough to come in out of the rain.

MR. NEARY: That is right. My hon. friend says he does not have enough sense to come in out of the rain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Only for your colleagues you would be lost over there.

MR. NEARY: I think it is time, Sir, to change this abuse. They found a loophole in the Companies Act, the lawyers did, found this loophole and they have been using it ever since and it is wrong, it is wrong, Sir. There are too many ways that situations can be covered up.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not like you.

MR. NEARY: No. I like my hon. friend. My hon. friend and I get along all right. And another thing that I would like to see happen to, my hon. friend was talking about a Royal commission to investigate the administration of justice in this Province, and that I agree with. I certainly agree with it and I could give probably a dozen or so more reasons than the hon. gentleman gave. But one reason I would like to see it set up, is to look into the loan sharking that goes on in this Province, the loan sharking, the so-called second mortgage business, and the loan sharking.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman heard me. And if the hon. gentleman wants evidence of it come down to my office and

MR. NEARY: I have a few files down there, a few files that might make some hon. gentlemen's hair stand on end in this House. That is something that should be looked into. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how the Minister of Justice feels about - it may be a minority group but sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we have to listen to minority groups - I would like to know how the Minister of Justice feels about a movement that seems to be growing in this Province that marijuana be decriminalized, that marijuana be removed from the Criminal Code and that it be placed on the Drug and - what is it called? - the Drug and Alcohol -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) the Criminal Code but possession be not a crime (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Adjourn the debate.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Would you like to clue up the debate?

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not care. I do not care what you do. Look, it is all in vain anyway. I am not going to get any answers anyway, so I do not care what you do with it.

MR. MARSHALL: I think the hon. - I think we are ready for the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is to concur with the report of the Social Services Committee. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? Those in favour, 'Aye', contrary, 'Nay', carried.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the debate, I give notice that tomorrow the business of the House will be concerned with the finance bills, starting with the Supply Bill, the Loan Bill, and the other tax bills that will follow.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may, Sir.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman mean the main supply bill for the current fiscal year -

MR. MARSHALL: The Main Supply Bill and the Supplementary Supply Bill.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. We will be in committee on ways and means tomorrow, Committee on Supply and then -

MR. MARSHALL: Committee on Supply and then we will go into committee on the tax bills.

MR. ROBERTS: Ways and means then.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3 o'clock and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? Those in favour, 'Aye', contrary, 'Nay', carried.

This House does stand adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3 o'clock.