

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, As

you may recall, I gave notice on the last day, at the end of the day that I would ask leave of Your Honour to bring up this point of privilege at this point in time. It arises from an incident of two sitting days ago, some statements that were made in the House of Assembly. The one I refer to particularly is a statement by the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and I quote, if I may, from Hansard of July 30th., "And if the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) was covering up this seamy little affair, as apparently he was." Now admittedly the hon. gentleman said, "as apparently he was," I give him that benefit, but the point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the impression was clearly left that there was some sort of sordid affair that was raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) which involved a municipality in which I or someone in my department was effectively covering up. The point I want to clarify, Mr. Speaker, is very clearly this, that there indeed is no seamy little affair other than in the mind of the hon. member for LaPoile, I suppose, who suggested that there was something amiss in the community of Portugal Cove in relation to a community well that was drilled and in relation to a petition which he claimed had forged signatures. There was no petition, Mr. Speaker. In fact, there was no requirement for a petition. Under the old program as it existed at the time there is simply an application which has to have a list of names.

The hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in his comments a few days ago said that these names were all signed by the same person, by the secretary, and so they perhaps were; in fact,

MR. N. WINDSOR: they may indeed have been typed, it would not make any difference. It is not a petition. It is simply an application saying that we wish to have a well to serve these people. A well was drilled.

The hon. gentleman also said that it was drilled in a location that was not suitable to the majority of the people, that it was drilled only to serve one person who happened to be the chairman of that committee. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that that well was drilled in a location as determined by the Department of Health so that it was at a location where surplus drainage and pollution could not enter the well and therefore pollute the drinking water.

I have, as the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) pointed out, I have the original; the one that he attempted to table in the House was a copy and Your Honour ruled him out of order and quite correctly.

Mr. N. Windsor: I have the original of that with the signatures on it. I have had officials of my department check and several of these people really were not clear on what they were signing. They signed a petition which to them they thought that it was a petition that they wanted to be hooked up to the well. It was never the intent of the Department of Municipal Affairs, in that particular case, to connect people to the well. It was a well that was intended to be brought to the surface where residents of the area could get water, come to a pump house and receive water. The chairman is connected, as the hon. gentleman said, but he connected at his own expense, not as an expense of this project. And other residents of the nearby area if they wish to invest in that they can connect as well. So I just want to clarify that point that there is no cover up, and that I would ask that the allegations made by the hon. member to be withdrawn.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) has raised a valid point of privilege, and even if he had I would argue that he is badly out of time. But I do not want to discuss the matter on a procedural point, and inasmuch as he brought my name into it perhaps I may be permitted to respond. If what he was doing was making what amounts to a ministerial statement on a series of events that occurred in Portugal Cove, then I have no objection or quarrel; in fact, I can only wish that he had made that statement, what amounts to a ministerial statement, two days ago, on Tuesday, because the incidents to which he referred occurred here in the House, as I recall them, on Monday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: But having said that, let me go on to make it quite clear that I do not have the words I used before me, but I

Mr. Roberts: think the words were merited, and I think that the words stand and speak for themselves. I want to add to that two things; first of all, if the hon. gentleman drew from my words any impression, and he used the word "impression", I can only regret that and I can only cite to him the motto of The Order of the Garter, "Honi soit qui mal y pense;" which means evil be to him who evil thinks.

And I would like to go on and make it quite clear to the hon. gentleman, with whom I have no quarrel on this point, that I intended no implication of dishonesty or corruption on his part, I have no hesitation in saying so. I made no statements that in my view gave that impression, but if he thinks that they did, then let me say that I hasten to make it clear to him that I had no such intention. I think his ministerial conduct was not what it ought to have been, in my view. I think the statement which he made as a minister, now, in my view, makes it quite straightforward and quite clear what happened. I think the people in Portugal Cove and the people elsewhere who hear it can judge for themselves

MR. ROBERTS:

The fact remains, apparently, that a number of names were affixed to a document without the permission or the knowledge of the bearers of those names. The fact remains in addition that the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was asked by a number of people to raise in this House the matter growing out of that. That was what the incident was about. The minister has now made an explanation and I for one am quite prepared to accept. Let me say again, Sir, that I do not think there is a question of privilege. Even if it is, I submit it is completely out of time and even if it were not out of time I think it has no merit. But let me say there is no motion, as my friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. P. Rowe) says; it is simply an effort by the minister to set the record clear. Well, that is fine, that I welcome, and if he drew some offence, I am sorry he drew offence and I will tell him again there was no need to draw offence. I think that I can tell him that if I feel he has done something offensive, I shall make it perfectly clear in this House using the procedures and the rules of this House to what he has done and to what his remedies are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please! With respect

to the issue that has been raised, the point of privilege that has been raised, I believe the matter has somewhat resolved itself in that the hon. member for the Straits has withdrawn; I would assume, any implications that the hon. minister might have suspected.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Lewisports.

MR. WHITE:

Sir, I have a question I

would like to direct to the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and I should say that I do not want this matter to be in any way antagonistic or anything else. I just want to ask some straightforward questions

MR. WHITE: regarding the suspected case of Reye's syndrome with a six-month old boy in Stanhope, not in Lewisporte as was reported in the paper, but in Stanhope. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not there has been a definite diagnosis of the problem and whether it has been definitely determined that the situation is Reye's syndrome and the disease is Reye's syndrome?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have been in contact with the Janeway Hospital two or three days ago when first I heard about it and I think the term that they are using is that it has been clinically determined that that is what the case is, Reye's syndrome. It has all the symptoms but they have not made a definite determination that it is Reye's syndrome, but it has all the symptoms of it.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

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

MR. WHITE: I sort of gained from reading some press reports that maybe the medical staff who are dealing with this problem - I do not want to criticize them - are not all that familiar with it and I am wondering if the minister plans to bring in some outside experts, or if anything along those lines are being contemplated at the moment to determine whether or not

MR. F. WHITE: this definitely is Reye's syndrome, because it is a serious matter.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this case, as I mentioned, is at the Janeway. It is a medical problem and one, of course, where we expect them to do what can be done and we think they are doing what can be done, but I doubt if we could even try to direct them to do a certain thing. I believe that they are contacting all the resources they can to see what can be done, what they think is best for the child.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health whether or not any extraordinary attention is going to be paid to this. He says it is a disease and it is being handled by the medical people and so on, but in view of controversies that have arisen elsewhere, and in view of the spray programmes here and so on, and I certainly do not want to link the two at this stage - whether or not any extraordinary attention will be paid to this particular situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, yes, there is extraordinary attention being paid to it by the staff down there and of course, as I mentioned, by the medical officer here at the department. It has been stated, of course, as the member just mentioned, that there may be some connection between that and the spray programmes. I think that is only just suspicion. There has never been a determination that there is a link. I believe somebody used the terminology that it is a reaction that sets in with a virus and a chemical and they say this particular chemical that was used a couple of years ago may be the one. But that one was not used in the past year and this child is just five months old. But there will be extraordinary effort because there is a committee, I think, working on that, doing research in it, which is representative of the Maritimes or the Atlantic Provinces and the United States, I believe, the seaboard states where the spray has been conducted in the past few years.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the

hon. the Premier.

In view of the confusing and, to some degree, conflicting reports over the last couple of days with regard to oil supplies for Eastern Canada and a possible threat to them as a result of apparent indecision as to who is going to be the negotiating party for Canada, and since we in Newfoundland, of course, are very much involved in terms of security of supply on various petroleum products and the like, I wonder if the Premier has been in touch with Ottawa, whether or not he can cast any light on the situation or whether he himself shares any of the concerns that have been expressed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am, obviously, as concerned as any other Eastern Canadian in the whole question of oil supply and hydrocarbon supply for Eastern Canada as I guess we all are for all

PREMIER PECKFORD:

of Canada. I have not been in touch with Mr. Hnatyshyn this morning but I have talked to the Minister of Energy about it and we will be pursuing the matter with Mr. Hnatyshyn and other people in Ottawa over the next number of days. I had an initial talk with the Minister of Finance (Hon. J. Crosbie) in Ottawa about the matter on Monday but I have not had an opportunity this morning to follow it up with a talk with Mr. Hnatyshyn but we intend to do that, the Minister of Energy and myself, over the next couple of days.

I held off this morning, besides being busy and being involved in Cabinet meetings this morning, I held off also because I wanted to fully discuss it at an intergovernmental level with Mr. Jarvis, the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister, who will be here in the Province in the next couple of days; he will be here on Tuesday and I will be having extensive meetings with him. So we have been in touch with his office and we want to review that as well as other matters with him. So, we are concerned and familiar with the problem. I have also, may I say, fourthly, for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) and for the benefit of the House, met with the President of Petro-Canada, Mr. Hopper, had a full briefing from Mr. Hopper about a week, a week and a half ago, I talk to Mr. Crosbie, initially talked to Mr. Hnatyshyn very briefly on the phone about two or three weeks ago and I want to pursue it now again with Mr. Hnatyshyn and the Minister of Energy for our Province (Mr. L. Barry) and with Mr. Jarvis on Tuesday.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: I thank the hon. the Premier for his answer and I sure hope he will keep us informed. May I, on the broader question which obviously must have formed the basis of some

MR. D. JAMIESON: of those conversations to which he referred, may I ask him whether in fact Newfoundland through him or through one of his ministers has made known to the government in Ottawa its views with regard to the future of Petro-Canada? In view of the deep involvement of Petro-Canada with so much of the offshore development and indeed the rather complementary things which from time to time the hon. the Premier has had to say about Petro-Canada as a partner, whether or not he is in favour of and supports the idea if in fact the Federal Government carries out its original plan to change the status of that into a private corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have given some initial views to the Minister of Finance (Mr. J. Crosbie) in the context of the public statements that I have made over the last number of months especially as it relates to our own particular case of offshore development and exploration. We reserve a final position on the

PREMIER PECKFORD: composition, the longevity of Petro-Canada until such time as, for example, Mr. Hopper's comments. Now we have his briefing in the last week from him. I have talked to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) and talked to Mr. Jarvis, then we will be putting clearly a position forward as to how we see Petro-Canada in the next number of years.

MR. D. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): One more supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Just seeking additional information, and I can understand that on something this important the Premier would not want to make any off-the-cuff comment, but may I ask him very directly, for example, whether or not the Government of Newfoundland would view with concern any significant change in the status of Petro-Canada from a Crown Corporation to one in which presumably private ownership would dominate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give a direct answer to that question because that is the whole substance of the discussions that we are now having and the briefing we are now having. I am also eager to talk to some of the other Premiers about this, especially the Eastern Premiers. I have not had the opportunity to talk to Mr. MacLean or Mr. Hatfield or Mr. Buchanan in any detail on this. At the Premier's conference I intend to raise it on the 15th. of August. I think it is important also, even though a detailed position by government right now cannot be given really, but I think it is important for us to give one very soon and I would look at a time frame of the end of August that we would be in a position to fully recommend to Ottawa how we think Petro-Canada should go in the next while.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir. Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if there are any new developments in connection with the Upper Churchill or the Lower Churchill, any pilot projects planned for the Upper Churchill or for the Lower Churchill, Muskrat Falls, anything at all new that the hon. gentleman can report on either the Upper Churchill or the Lower Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anything new. The Lower Churchill Development Corporation are continuing their studies and contracts have been awarded to various consultants for work both on the straits crossing and as it relates to doing detailed engineering and assessment work at Muskrat Falls. The court case is continuing on the Upper Churchill. There are many from around North America and the world, I guess, who are expressing interest in Labrador development of one sort and another dealing with power and other things. Most of the things are clearly known by everybody and we are eager to pursue and to encourage the Lower Churchill Development Corporation to bring in quickly a report on

PREMIER PECKFORD: their studies so that some kind of a decision as it relates to the Labrador power development can be made in 1980.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, Sir, that there are no extraordinary plans to try to develop the hydro potential of the Upper Churchill, of Lobstick Lake, for instance, to develop hydro actually from water that flows through generators that already develop hydro? Does the hon. gentleman have anything in mind along these lines in the way of a pilot project of anything of that nature?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, Lobstick is one potential generating source in Labrador that is available. I forget what the megawatt potential of Lobstick is -

MR. NEARY: 1.5.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - around perhaps 100 to 150 megawatts in total. But it would have to be combined with other developments in order to make it a feasible proposition. - That is the problem. If one could make it a feasible proposition from a whole range of different things, either Muskrat, or some of the headwaters of the five rivers being diverted up that way as well which could give you three or four megawatts which then could perhaps make the whole thing feasible. But it is an interesting part of an overall package which could be put together in Labrador power development as we get all the studies done.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate if one of the people interested in the development of the Upper Churchill, or

MR. NEARY: the Lower Churchill would be Mr. de Rothschild, and if so could the hon. gentleman give the House a progress report on his meeting yesterday morning at nine-thirty here in Confederation Building with my old buddy, Eddy de Rothschild?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think I will do some research down in the Registry of Deeds in the next number of weeks to see whether in fact I can find the shareholder list or directors list for a number of companies in Europe, it just might be possible that one of the names that I might come across will be Eddy de Rothschild and his buddy, Stephen A. Neary.

MR. SIMMONS: You will find it under Neary and Rothschild.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Who is that fellow walking down the street with Stephen Neary?

MR. F. WHITE: Riding in the car.

MR. NEARY: Riding in the Rabbitt.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. de Rothschild had a meeting yesterday morning with me and reviewed his ongoing interest in getting involved companies that he is responsible for or involved in in any additional development in Labrador. Of course, Mr. Rothschild at the present moment is involved in companies that are eager to pursue the uranium development at Kitts-Michelin. He was involved, of course, in the original Upper Churchill development and has expressed a general interest in

Premier Peckford: getting involved again, not of really specific interest, but a general interest of getting involved or and his companies participating in any development, private development of Labrador power.

The gentleman also was eager to sell some of his strafflow, low head hydro turbines. There is an \$11 million agreement with Ottawa now, just recently signed, which will see a number of experiments around the Province in low head hydro. There are four or five turbines on the market for low head hydro and we are going to develop a number of sites on the Island in the next number of years to try out this low head hydro. It is highly experimental. The mil rate for most of the low head hydro and the turbines that are used comes in around anywhere from eighty to one hundred mills, which is very expensive power. But it is an experimental thing to see if you can refine it.

So it is an interesting turbine that Mr. de Rothschild's company has and is marketing around the world, and I think they intend to begin production of it in Canada in the near future.

So these were the main things talked about in the meeting. And I was very eager to get Mr. de Rothschild's viewpoint on additional power developments in Labrador, and we agreed that we would meet again on a later date to further discuss these matters. But it was more general than specific. The two specific areas were low head hydro and the uranium development, and a general interest in having private capital, from sources that he is aware of, become involved in any future Labrador power development.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Premier is with regard to the Action Committee in Buchans; a Committee which the Premier is very familiar with, and he has encouraged them in their undertaking. That Committee held meetings over these past couple of

Mr. Flight: days with, quite possibly with the Premier himself; they had not met with the Premier when I talked to them, but they had met with the Resource Committee and other ministers, and they are in here under the threat of almost half the workforce of the town having notice of layoff and the rest working into the early 1980s. I wonder if the Premier would be prepared to comment on the results of the meetings and whether the Action Committee went back to Buchans with any kind of commitments or aware of any activities that would have any effect in retaining some jobs in the Buchans area or maintaining an economy there?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I did not meet with that group, but the Chairman of the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet did meet with that group and I will defer any detailed answer to him. But just let me say that, yes, I have been very involved in the Action Committee, and I think they are one of the best groups of individuals representing an area that I have ever dealt with, a fantastic group of people, wonderful. And I am sure the very competent Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and Industrial Development, and the Chairman of the Resource Policy of Cabinet can give you the details

PREMIER PECKFORD:

can give you the detailed answer

to that question.

MR. SPEAKER: (Sims)

Agreed?

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Premier, just briefly, the main areas

dealt with in discussions with the Buchans group were, first, the question of roads, and the Buchans group is strongly urging that steps be taken to see that there is a connection between Buchans and Southwest Brook. And along those lines we discussed possible developments in the mining and forestry areas which might lead to access roads for minerals, for forestry, which could then be extended on to link up with the Trans-Canada Highway on the West Coast. The second item that was discussed was the matter of involvement by workmen in the Buchans area in energy developments in the Province, and specifically we discussed the potential for the Buchans area of the proposed Upper Salmon hydro development. And the third item that was discussed was the matter of certain tourism initiatives which the group is proposing and there were five or six things that they had requested which government hopes to see carried out in the very near future.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for

Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

To the Minister of Mines and Energy.

quite recently, within the past week, since the House opened this time the Premier indicated that the government's cabinet was assisting the mining companies and it is an accepted fact now by the Action Committee and by other people that there is nothing in this Budget that would have any effect on creating jobs in the Buchans area in time to take up the slack as we lay off. So the only short-term hope we have is that the mining activity continues. And the Premier indicated that the Department of Mines and Energy, or government, was assisting the mining companies, that is Price (Nfld.) Minerals division and ASARCO, assisting them in every way possible to bring into production the various ore bodies around the Buchans area from Great Burnt - the minister is familiar with the ore bodies.

MR. FLIGHT:

I would like to ask the minister a two-fold question. Just what assistance is the government, up to this point in time, rendering to those mining companies with a view to getting those ore bodies into production? And the second question is whether or not the mining companies concerned have actually made representation to government for any assistance by way of their access roads or any kind of subsidy that would make it possible to bring those ore bodies into production?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: The types of assistance, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the officials of the Department of Mines and Energy are available and have in fact been involved in supplying assistance in the way of geological information and so on to the various companies. As far as specific subsidizes are concerned, the way this government operates is not to provide an open ended blank cheque to any development proposal, but rather to have a company come in with a feasibility study of a particular project, whether it be mining or otherwise, and then if the company satisfies government that certain assistance on infrastructure such as roads is necessary in order to make the project viable, government is prepared to look at that and to negotiate with the company as to government's involvement but not to give a blank cheque as had, unfortunately, in the past lead us into difficulty on many occasions.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: In view of the minister's answer, I

would like to ask this question and maybe we will see a new approach with a new minister. Price: (Nfld.) Mineral Division

in conjunction with ASARCO, have been sitting on ore bodies, known discovered ore bodies with up to one million tons of reserves

designated, indicated, fairly high grade and has shown no desire

or no intention up to this point in time into bringing those ore

bodies into production, and if brought into production would have

the effect of prolonging the mining life of the Buchans mines and

thereby providing an economy. How long does the minister or his

government, how long is this government going to be prepared to

allow those companies to sit on those deposits without bringing

them into production? The base metal prices are right, the

company admits that; they are the highest they have been for years

MR. G. FLIGHT: and no reason to believe they will go any higher. The ore is there, the price is right, how long is the minister going to allow those companies to simply sit on them without bringing those ore bodies into production?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is our information that the companies concerned are spending a considerable sum in determining the feasibility of developing these particular deposits and of discovering other deposits which might mean that there could be a continued work force in the Buchans area.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is unrealistic to assume that government can or should get involved in the mining industry. I believe personally that this is an area better left to private enterprise. It is an area where we have seen considerable private capital invested in this Province. It is not an area where I have seen government show any particular expertise in finding and developing mines. And I suggest that we have to depend to a great extent upon the profit motive and upon the free enterprise system. And I would be very surprised if there was any mineral deposit in Newfoundland that could be profitable that would not be developed. Maybe the hon. member could indicate to me why a company would not develop a deposit if it was a money-making proposition?

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question or so for the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). It has to do with the announced tax on media advertising which he gave notice of in the Budget. First of all as a preliminary I wonder could the minister indicate whether in fact the tax is now in effect and, further, if he would indicate - now I presume it is in effect according to the wording of the Budget but if he would confirm that - and secondly, if he would indicate whether government now expects to generate the kind of revenue from it that was projected, I think something in the order of the three quarters of a million dollars. I ask that in light of the statements that have been made or the allegations that have been made to the effect that the tax might have the result of decreasing the amounts of money spent on advertising. I wonder then if the tax is in effect and, secondly, whether the minister is still prepared to stick with his earlier projection of three quarters of a million dollars in the present fiscal year.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as part of the Budget debate there will be tax bills brought in to bring into effect the proposals outlined therein. One of them will be a bill, of course, in regards to the Advertising Tax and if that is accepted by the House, well, so be it. In the meantime, the date of the starting of the tax is already in effect.

In regard to anticipated returns, we have noted that there have been some comments made that the returns may not be what we originally projected. We have no reason to think that these are true. We are certainly intending to review the situation, but at this point in time we have no reason to think that the projections that were made by officials in the Department of Finance were not as accurate as these projections can be. They are not expected to be, I suppose, entirely accurate, they can only be done on the basis of information available; what will actually transpire is proof

DR. J. COLLINS: of the pudding but as far as the projections go we are convinced that the projections were valid ones but we will re-check them.

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

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same minister. I understand that in the last few days responding to some press questions - perhaps by radio, as I remember - the minister indicated that he had some second thoughts about the advertising tax in that he is prepared to consider certain changes, certain improvements probably by way of regulation and/or legislation. I wonder would the minister indicate to the House the nature of the changes he is considering?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is referring to one item that appeared in a local paper, I just forget which one now, but it did quote me, I believe, saying that some change was contemplated. I believe that was a misunderstanding on the part of whoever wrote the report. At no time have I stated that government was considering amending or otherwise changing the proposal that was in the Budget. I was interviewed by a reporter and I think I did say that when the matter is debated in the House it is conceivable that an amendment may be proposed and it is conceivable that the House may accept an amendment, but this will be in the ordinary expected situation in regard

DR. COLLINS:

to any debate going on in the House. I may have actually given the wrong impression and if so I am glad the hon. member brought it up because at this point in time there is no concrete proposal or concrete thought that this measure will be amended.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

A final supplementary. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister can confirm my conclusion on this, is he saying that he is satisfied with the nature of the proposal, that in the light of information that has come his way both publicly and, I would presume, privately during the past few days since he announced the proposal, is he still satisfied that the tax on advertising is not ill-advised, that it is not potentially a counter productive tax? Is he satisfied that he is doing the right thing in implementing this proposal without any changes since the time of its announcement in the Budget Speech?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think what I can say is this, that there had been a number of individuals and a number of interests who have since indicated to government that they are not happy with this tax. Now this was not expected because there was very much doubt whether anyone is happy with a particular tax. They have stated that they would like to meet with us and we have indicated that we would be glad to meet with them and receive any information they would care to give. And that is as far as it has gone at the present time. Whether this will be a counter productive tax - I think one could say that about any tax. All I would like to indicate is that I do not think that this is a particularly counter productive tax any more than perhaps any tax on business is. Any tax or any return governments expects from business in order to discharge its responsibilities can be looked upon as being somewhat

DR. COLLINS: inhibiting to business
but I do not consider this particular tax to be any more inhibiting
or a different class of inhibition, shall we say, than any other tax.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! The
time for Oral Questions has expired. I would like to welcome to the
galleries on behalf of all hon. members the Mayor and Councillors
of the town of Marystown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in
answer to a question for the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) July,
20th, 1979. Since January 1972 what lawyers or law firms within the
Province of Newfoundland have been engaged to carry out illegal
work for the Workmen's Compensation Board? And I have one copy
only.

MR. ROBERTS: Law firms?

MR. DINN: Law firm or law firms? Just to cover briefly
what the answer says: "Workmen's Compensation Board, 1972. Thomas
E. Williams, consultation with safety officers, drafting summonses
and attendance at court, \$157.00. Thomas E. Williams, drafting
amendments to Workmen's Compensation Act, \$100,000. Thomas E. Williams,
opinions and drafting letters on various matters, \$245.00. Total for
1972 - the hon. member obviously does not want me to go through all
of them, the total for 1972 was \$5,947.50. 1973, Stirling, Ryan, Goodridge,
Caule, Gushue and Goodridge representing Mr. Leonard Hughes, Commissioner
at Workmen's Compensation Board enquiry, \$175.00. Williams and Williams
Consultation and Research, \$337.50. The remaining ones for 1973
were Williams and Williams for a total of, including Stirling,
Ryan, Goodridge, Caule, Gushue and Goodridge, \$3,123.46. 1974, Williams
and Williams, consultation and opinions - just giving examples, on

August 2, 1979

Tape No. 481

AH-3

MR. DINN:

claims, \$50.00 and so on. Williams

Williams and Coombs, consultation and opinion on claims, \$20.00, and

so on down for a total in 1974 of \$4,808.15. 1975,

MR. DINN: Williams, Williams and Coombs for that year, \$6,641.69; 1976: Williams, Williams and Coombs, Williams, Williams and Coombs, Williams, Williams and Buffett, Williams, Williams and Buffett, a total of \$11,708.36; Workmen's Compensation Board, 1977: Williams, Williams and Buffett all the way down the line, \$15,939.32; 1978, just to break the trend of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the total for 1978: Williams, Williams and Buffett all the way down the line, \$5,479.88. The straight line trend is broken and the hon. member is disappointed. I will lay that on the table of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Also, at this time I would like to answer the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who asked questions yesterday about the Selikoff report and the recommendations thereof. Working diligently this morning between 9:00 and 9:30 and my officials working yesterday afternoon, I only had time to get one answer prepared. I had the answer with me all morning and did not get a chance to get it copied, so I will lay this on the table of the House. And for the benefit of hon. members just to go through ~~The Committee met~~ July 7, 1978, November 15, 1978, May 15, 1979 and is scheduled to meet in October or November of 1979. ~~It handled various problems and various recommendations as they went through, analysis of present industrial hygiene practices, and there is an explanation of all the things that they have gone through there, respiratory programs, both company and union have been educating the work force on the necessity of wearing masks, especially in the dusty areas of the operation, the type of mask used has been studied and proven to recommend its dust education programs, acceptable dust levels, the standards for dust levels - these as set out by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, namely, five fibres per cubic centimetre, and it goes on to explain that I am sure any members who want copies of the information can get it from the table.~~ It goes through environmental considerations, control of emissions from mine and mill, medical surveillance, household monitoring. The registry which is of importance to the hon. member - the company has on file the names of all workers who have been employed in Advocate operations

MR. DINN: since 1963. Files of 1,600 workers which include the present work force are being processed so that the central registry may be established in the Occupational Health and Safety division. The names, medical certificate numbers and occupations held of all the workers will be stored with each individual's chest X-Rays in a place to be designated in the new building, as I said yesterday, when we get all of our staff in the one building here in St. John's. Special X-Ray equipment was given to Dr. McLoughlan, Professor of Radiology, Memorial University, and Dr. McLoughlan made five recommendations for improvements for X-Rays. The equipment is apparently satisfactory, but there are improvements with respect to film, etc., education programme, and so on. So I will lay this on the table of the House in the hope that any members who wish the information can get copies from the table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order 3.

~~Committee of Ways and Means~~

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this is the kick-off in the

Budget debate. Already we have heard from the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) in bringing down his Budget, and this is the first opportunity the House will have had to address itself to the Budget. And, as you will be aware, Mr. Speaker, the first speaker for the Opposition replying to the government motion in this particular case does have unlimited time included under the new rules. I have been known to speak in this debate

MR. SIMMONS: for two hours on one occasion and three and a half hours on another occasion, and I think my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will remember an occasion when I spoke for a total of seventeen hours.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Well, we had some things that had to be said and it took some time to say them. I want to give notice, Mr. Speaker, that I one, fully expect to avail of my unlimited time but I have no aspirations to enter into any new definitions of unlimited time. I do have a few things I want to say but I think we can say them fairly expeditiously and it is not my intent at this point in time to talk for any undue length of time though I will to some degree avail of the provision that the first spokesman for the Opposition, in this case myself, as the spokesman on Finance for the Opposition, I will avail of the provision of being able to go beyond the thirty minutes which is provided for all members under the new rules. but -

MR. NEARY: The guillotine.

MR. SIMMONS: - the guillotine rule of thirty minutes but not to go on indefinitely I assure members of the House.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the overriding consideration, before we get into matters related to the Budget as such, the overriding consideration we ought to bear in mind is that we have a very different House, it is a new House of Assembly, a new General Assembly elected on June 18th in which the people of Newfoundland gave a decisive mandate to the party which now forms the government, and with that in mind -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: There is still one person over there happy about that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I believe quite candidly and I have been saying so publicly, and in our caucus meetings, as indeed have all members of our caucus, within a month or two after the election it would be highly counter-productive for an Opposition to spend an undue amount of time taking the government to task for various programmes or various sins of omission and commission. I believe what we ought to do and what we owe to this House and the people of Newfoundland is to stand back for a while, not to neglect our function but to do it rather differently, to stand back for a while and to watch the performance of this government. And so I am giving notice and I think in our actions in the House during the past month you probably had notice, de facto notice, that it is our full intention not necessarily to talk all the time but to watch very carefully and to allow this government to operate within its newly garnered mandate in the June 18th. election, give it some time - give it enough rope and eventually it will do the job or hang itself as the case may be. I have my predictions on that point, Mr. Speaker, but I will save these too. It being so new into the new mandate, and so hot a Summer's day, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but admit that my mind, on certain occasions when I sit here in the House, does wander somewhat to matters other than the House itself. And I am sure my colleague from Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) shares my feeling on that particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, there are some things that need to be said about the budget and I shall try to say some of them during the next few minutes. First of all, I for one welcome a number of items in the Budget. I am very pleased, as I said to the Premier a few days ago, I am very pleased with the Premier's decision and the government's decision in respect to the

MR. SIMMONS:

Economic Council of Newfoundland and

Labrador. I hope that he will give notice, as he indicated the other day he might do, give notice very soon and perhaps through a white paper or whatever vehicle, give notice of something of the structure and the terms of reference and the mandate of that particular council. But I can see that if that council is properly constructed with the proper depth and breath of representation, with a good fairly unfettered mandate, not a licence to say nasty things for its own sake but a fairly unfettered mandate so it will have some manoeuvring room to do the job that it has to do. I believe if that council is so structured then we can look for some fairly productive work from it. We should not see the council as any particular panacea but again I believe I know the Premier well enough to know that he

Mr. Simmons: will not view it as such at all.

And I am looking forward very much to that Council.

I commend the government, Mr. Speaker, for its decision to set up the Council. I hope it will now move to do it fairly quickly without doing it in such haste as to sacrifice its real effect. Mr. Speaker, I commend, also, the government in its decision to support financially The Status of Women Council as provided for in the Premier's estimates. I think this, too, is very much a step in the right direction and others of my colleagues, including, in particular, the Leader of the Opposition, will be having something particular, some specific to say on this particular item. I am only disappointed that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is not here at this particular time because I was going to invite her at some point to give the House the benefit of her views, her considerable views and experience on this very important subject. And I hope in time, either in the Budget debate or elsewhere, the Minister of Education will take some time on this very important subject.

But just for me to say, Mr. Speaker, at the moment, in passing, that I commend the government for this particular initiative as well and look forward to its implementation.

Mr. Speaker, there are other groups in this Province which have been overlooked in the Budget, which need some attention, which need a strong voice, which need some financial impetus, I am thinking of groups such as senior citizens, such as the handicapped, such as the mentally retarded. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that we are giving enough attention to those particular groups. The need is there. And I hope government will see the need to a larger degree than it has, and do something about it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I do not wish to -

MR. SIMMONS: No. It is the noise problem.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is an awful hum coming from out in the corridor, Sir. I can hardly hear my hon. colleague even though I am seated right next to him. There is an awful distraction

Mr. Neary: coming from the other side of the House, Sir. Could we get it rectified, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): I agree. Order, please in the corridors.

MR. SIMMONS: I thank my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) because I was getting somewhat distracted and about to make the point myself, but I thank him for making it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend also the government in relation to the Budget for its giving notice to fund the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council. I think, too, that this is very much a step in the right direction. And I like the emphasis that has been articulated insofar as cultural identity is concerned, and I believe the decision to fund the Council is a step in the right direction. And it is like all these matters, they can be used or abused depending on how they are implemented, but only time can tell that and we in time will avail of our full opportunity to criticize or to appraise where necessary.

Mr. Speaker, while I am in the mood to commend there is one other thing in the Budget, at least, I say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that I would like to particularly commend, and that is the government's decision to take the tax off books. He will recall, I believe, that it was I who stood here just after he became Minister of Finance and drew to his attention the fact that we were the only Province in Canada with a tax on books, and I do not know if that is where the idea originated or not, that is not important, but I do know that we addressed ourselves to it here some months ago. And I was personally and particularly pleased to see the tax had been taken off books as it had already been taken off or never put on elsewhere in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things about the Budget Speech and the Budget measures which I particularly commend. I want to put that right at the top of my few words, because there are some items in this particular Budget that are not quite as commendable. Each of the items I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the Status

Mr. Simmons: of Women Council, The Economic Council, The Arts Council, the decision to take the tax off books, these four and others, each of these really deserve a fair amount of time, a fair amount of dialogue if we are to do justice to them. But as I said in the beginning of my remarks, it is not my intention to launch into extensive dissertations on each of the subjects as much, as perhaps, they are required. I believe the timing of the Budget Speech right now is such that, I am not sure a lot needs to be said right now until we give time for this government, over the next few months, to test its metal, to put its money where its mouth is, to see if it can deliver on the commitments to the Newfoundland people, and then come next Budget time, I think, we will be in a much better position to assess. I am aware of the argument that I have put and others have put that this-

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. R. SIMMONS: -right, the experts, you are right - this government has increased tax so that the rate is not the same the rate of collection, the percentage in 1972 is not the same as 1979. Well, what does that say? All it says is that the government must bear even more responsibility for the increase because it overtly, deliberately and through legislation increased the rate of tax.

And, secondly, Mr. Speaker, it will be argued, 'Well, the increase since 1972 is related to increases in sales volumes or in personal incomes in this case.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, that is the (inaudible).

MR. R. SIMMONS: That is right! And they are right again. Of course, a person is earning more per capita in 1979 than he was in 1972. And there I come to my point, Mr. Speaker, the government is the benefactor of a windfall tax. The government is the benefactor of windfall profits on income tax, on retail sales tax. Let me do a comparison for you on that one. I mentioned that personal income tax has gone up 443 per cent since 1972. What about retail sales tax? John 'put her under' Crosbie in 1972, told us that he expected to collect \$50 million on retail sales off the backs of the consumers of this Province. \$50 million! And he did. Everything Crosbie said he would do to the consumers, he always did. His promises to do something for consumers are another matter because he is up there now saying, 'Well, all the promises we made during the election we might not be able to afford them, you know.'

MR. S. NEARY: No, because he is blaming it on the Liberals. He is doing the same thing up there as he did here, having a witchhunt.

MR. WHITE: He changed the script.

MR. R. SIMMONS: That is right! Fish and Chips they call them. Chips is it?

MR. S. NEARY: Yes.

MR. R. SIMMONS: They call him 'Chips'. We will find another name, will you work on it?

MR. SIMMONS: "Retail sales tax, \$50 million", says John 'put her under' Crosbie in 1972. Then there comes another John.

MR. NEARY: Oh doctor, oh doctor, oh dear Doctor John/ Your cod liver oil is so pure and so strong.

MR. SIMMONS: Another John tells us in 1979 that he is going to collect not \$50 million as 'put her under' John did in 1972, but 'Sunset' John, good old 'Sunset' John -

MR. NEARY: The cod liver oil man.

MR. SIMMONS: - is going to collect off the backs of the Newfoundland people, \$203 million - a 300 per cent increase! A fourfold increase. While food prices go up 77 per cent, retail sales tax, thanks to this government, goes up 300 per cent. We get all worked up about food prices. This guy in the States, what is his name? The tax revolt guy, proposition 13?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hughes.

MR. SIMMONS: Hughes, yes. He had the right idea.

MR. WHITE: That is Howard Jarvis.

MR. SIMMONS: Jarvis, he had the right idea. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of those days you are going to have a Jarvis here in Newfoundland because we are missing the whole point, Mr. Speaker. It is a great game for government to draw attention to items like electricity prices, like food prices, both of which are killing the Newfoundland consumer, but relatively speaking, Mr. Speaker, they are not nearly as crippling as the real cause of the consumer's problems, the windfall profits from escalating taxes, the increase in big government.

When you look, Mr. Speaker, at the salary detail - it is here somewhere - for this year and compare it to seven years ago and look not only at the salaries - I understand the individual salary has inflated in seven years, in fact, I get the feeling they have inflated more than mine has in seven years - but I draw your attention to something else, look at the numbers, Mr. Speaker. If it takes four times as many mandarins to advise the minister in 1979 than it did in 1972, what does it mean? That the minister seven years ago was four times as stunned? That the

MR. SIMMONS: mandarins were only one-quarter as intelligent? I can understand you might need a new analyst or a new advisor, but I ask government members to just look at the salary detail and look at the unrestrained growth in government. Look at the numbers who depend on the public treasury for a livelihood and it is absolutely frightening. And there is a good part of your cost, in this little blue, appropriately Tory blue document again.

The government gets the windfall profits because of inflation and says, Well, we have the money, we might as well hire a few more people. The Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) finds himself in a very unenviable position.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Indeed his performance in committee, if I can read, if I can interpret from or extrapolate from press reports, his performance in committee indicates that he gives his answers more in sadness than in pride. His answers about the programmes of his government, his administration leave him embarrassed. He is not very proud, he does not defend with very much enthusiasm I gather from press reports. And I know the man, I know him well, and I know that his embarrassment reflects his true commitment to rural Newfoundland. And it must be difficult, I say to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. J. Goudie), to defend the indefensible, to defend a cutback, to try and verbalize that a cutback is justifiable when in your heart of hearts you know it is not justifiable, as he knows.

I deplore the cutbacks in the resource areas, Mr. Speaker. I deplore, Mr. Speaker, about this Budget - Mr. Speaker, I can make this speech in an hour or I can make it in ten hours and that will depend on whether I have to compete for the rest of the afternoon with the two ministers across the House who, after you asked them to be quite outside, came inside and continued their conversation. It is very distracting and I have got all the time in the world.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Order, please! Allow the hon. gentleman to proceed in silence.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I deplore the overall deception in this Budget on two points. First of all, in respect to its pronouncements about resource development, if you read the first half of this document, the sentences and the paragraphs the message is this, the message in the speech itself is, we are going to increase our emphasis in resource development. That is what the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) is saying. We are going to increase our emphasis in resource development. Our big thrust this year, the Budget Speech says, is resource development. That is what the first half of this

MR. R. SIMMONS: document says. That is what the half before the nice picture on the front, which I am told is a sunrise - I showed it to a photographer and I said, "What is it?" and he said, "It is either a sunrise or a sunset." and I said, "That is my dilemma, that is my dilemma, too. I can not make up my mind." If I read the first half of the document, it is definitely sunrise talk but if I read what comes after the good Tory blue page, it is all sunset, dusk talk. There you are not really sure, Mr. Speaker, it is all nice, new dawn, a new day beginning talk, right there, increase in resource development. But then the minister's enthusiastic remarks are undermined by whoever added up the figures, they are undermined because, you see, he says we are going to do more in rural development but the pages which follow the Tory blue page say we are going to do less, do not believe what the minister tells you over here because the other minister tells you we are going to spend a million dollars less on rural development. And that is the message all through this Budget. Do not believe what the minister says about forestry because we are going to spend less. That is it. And that is why, like the photographer told me, it could be either. It could be a sunrise or a sunset. And up to this particular page - I am not sure what is wrong with him but I am going to figure out pretty soon what is wrong with all of you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Order, please!

MR. R. SIMMONS: Well, if they want the ten hour speech I will give it to them, Mr. Speaker, if they want the ten hour speech they will have it, personally, I wanted the one hour one.

AN HON. MEMBER: So do I.

MR. R. SIMMONS: It could be, Mr. Speaker, it could be. The Budget has the potential to be either a sunrise or a

August 2, 1979

Tape No. 486

SD - 3

MR. R. SIMMONS: sunset document. But it is the figures that give the government away. It is the figures that betray the rhetoric, it is the figures that

MR. SIMMONS:

make it a bad speech for the minister. The minister himself did a good job, a nice delivery, fantastic wording, a nice setting that day. Everything was right and positive about the speech until we got a look at the book, until the mandarins made the mistake of putting some facts in the back of the book and when we saw the facts there was no doubt. As the photographer said to me, "How could you tell? How could you tell whether it is a sunrise?" I mean, can you not tell from looking at it whether it is a sunrise or a sunset? And he very coyly said, "Now you need to know more about it," And I said, "Like what?" He said, "Like when the picture was taken." Yes, that is what you need to know about this budget too, some of the hard, cold facts. And when you read them, just behind that appropriately Tory blue page, it dawns on you, excuse the pun, it dawns on you, it is a sunset document. It is a sunset document.

The sun is going down for Rural Development I say to the minister responsible. The sun has long since gone down for the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) -

MR. NEARY:

Oh yes.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is Arctic midnight over there.

MR. MORGAN:

Gone down for the Liberal Party.

MR. SIMMONS:

Keep on dreaming 'Jimmy' baby.

Keep on dreaming.

MR. SPEAKER- (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Keep on dreaming. Keep on dreaming.

Keep on dreaming.

MR. NEARY:

Not a hair out of place.

MR. SIMMONS:

The sun, Mr. Speaker, the sun sets for

the resource departments if we can judge from the figures in this particular book. And that is one thing I deplore over this budget,

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, is the deception of the budget because all the people out there heard that day on television were the words of the minister's speech, they never had time to scrutinize the real figures. That is happening in small committees, which may or may not get reported since there are two or three of them going on at the one time, not getting reported very fully. And so if the Minister of Finance, who is a reputable man stands up and says, "We are going to put an emphasis on resource development," the public will believe him. It is only later down the road that they realize that what he said was not, in fact, the case, that what he said was a contradiction of the case. It is only later down the road they realize that where he said more he meant they should have read less. And that is what I deplore over this budget, Mr. Speaker, the deception about the government's emphasis on resource development.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, about this budget, I deplore the deception in terms of the government's relations, or alleged relations with Ottawa. Now, we can have a long discussion about there being kindred spirits now in Ottawa and St. John's but I want to get away from that particular discussion to the overall theme of this administration and the theme is this, in the budget, in other statements by government officials, the theme about less dependence. Have you heard that before, Mr. Speaker? The government is going to be less dependent. The Province is going to be less dependent on Ottawa. Does that not sound familiar from a Tory platform? Does that not sound familiar somewhere? Less dependent on Ottawa, did you hear that somewhere before? Let us look at the figures, Mr. Speaker. Let us see how less dependent we have become since the Tories took office seven years ago. Let us have a look at it. Let us deal in figures. I know it is embarrassing, Mr. Speaker, for the government to talk about

MR. SIMMONS: hard cold facts, because the hard cold facts usually belie the nice statements they write in Budget speeches. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, as hard as it is to do, sometimes you actually got to look at the facts. And it is a nice statement. It is a motherhood statement. We will become less dependent on Ottawa, but somewhere the records should say something, somewhere they should put their money where their mouth is. Well, let us have a look at their money, Mr. Speaker, to see where their mouth is. Let us get on to this theme about dependence on Ottawa. Let us watch how it has changed over the last seven years since this progressive government took office. Let us go back to the beginning of the millenium, go back to 1972. Do you remember this document? This is an historic document, Mr. Speaker, this is Budget '72. This is the first budget presented by the Tory administration. Do

MR. SIMMONS: you remember who presented it? The hon. John C. Crosbie.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Hear, hear! I say.

AN HON. MEMBER: A great man (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: He was a great man. He was a great man. Mr. Speaker, this document is historic for two reasons, because it was admittedly the first document by a Tory administration in this Province but, you know, it has now become of national historical significance. Once the people up along, in Ottawa and BC and New Brunswick and all these other places up there, once they hear about this document I suppose it will become a collectors item, a collectors item. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, what I hold here is the first speech made by John Crosbie as he began the process of fiscally putting Newfoundland under. Now, Mr. Speaker, all Canadians should read this and they will learn his method, ahead of time I hope, about how he has the capability to put Canada under. It should be required reading, Mr. Speaker, required reading for all governmental people across this nation because it demonstrates clearly where we went wrong fiscally and how we began to go wrong under the stewardship of John Crosbie, the man who now holds the purse strings for all of Canada. The Budget of 1972. And here are a couple of things that the Budget of 1972 tell me. First of all it tells me that in 1971-72, the last year of a Liberal government in this Province, Ottawa paid out to Newfoundland \$249 million. A quarter of a billion dollars Ottawa paid out to us. Now that is a lot of loot and can you not sympathize with an administration that says, "We have to stop that. We have got to stop this quarter of a billion dollar dependence on Ottawa." Well, let us put it in context. What is a quarter of a billion? How much of the Budget was it in 1972? Our total sources in 1972 were something in the order of \$590 or \$592 million, all sources. Federal government, sales tax - then called Social Security Assessment, SSA, you remember -

MR. SIMMONS: gasoline tax, licenses and fees, all sources of revenue, \$592 million. We got \$249 million of that from Ottawa. That works out to about forty-two per cent. Forty-two per cent of our current and capital requirement in 1972 came from Ottawa and that was the last of the bad Liberal years, Mr. Speaker, that is when we had so increased the dependence on Ottawa that it was time for a new government to come in and reverse the trend, do something about it. We had her up, Mr. Speaker, to forty-two per cent of all the money we needed in this Province coming in a handout from Ottawa according to the Tories, Forty-two per cent, almost half, forty-two per cent. Forty-two cents of every dollar. Shameful, according to the Tories. We have got to reverse that trend. And so here is what happened, Mr. Speaker. Give them a year or two, it takes time to do these things. 1971 and 1972 we were getting forty-two per cent from Ottawa. By 1978-79 - I have some figures, actually, for a year or two before that if the House is interested, by 1975-76 that forty-two per cent dependence on Ottawa had gone, not down under the Tories, but has gone up to forty-five per cent. Now we are getting forty-five per cent of our money from Ottawa. Two years later it had gone to forty-seven per cent. A year later it had gone to forty-nine per cent and this year, Mr. Speaker, or last year 1978-79 would you believe that of all our money that we need to run this Province, fifty point five per cent, over half the money was coming from Ottawa last year. Fifty point five per cent up from forty-two. Eight and one-half points up from forty-two by a government that was going to decrease our dependence. But then you say, "That was under the former administration. That was under Frank Moore's administration. That was under the albatross Premier. That was under the fellow we are trying to forget." Why do you not look at the record now under our

MR. SIMMONS: new Premier. Well, I will. Last year under bad boy, Frank it was up to 50.5 per cent. This year when it has been announced that they are going to decrease the dependence on Ottawa it is not 50.5 per cent. No! This year the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) hopes to get \$51.7 million from Ottawa. How is that for decreasing your dependence on Ottawa? This year he hopes to get 51.7 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible):

MR. SIMMONS: The minister from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) asks where I get that. I get that on Page 25 of the Budget, Exhibit III - Current and Capital Revenues, Federal Government \$664,889 or 51.7 per cent of total revenues. The minister can ask a question to imply that I do not have the facts but in this particular case I have them right in front of me - 51.7 per cent of current and capital revenues for the coming year and this year which we are in now will come from Ottawa, 51.7 per cent rounded off to 52 per cent, compared to 42 per cent seven years ago when this government took office. And this government wants us to believe that they are decreasing dependence on Ottawa? What a deception! What an untruth!

MR. NEARY: It is hypocritical.

MR. SIMMONS: It is hypocritical. It is hypocritical for the Minister of Finance to get up and tell us in a Budget speech that the Budget will help decrease dependence on Ottawa when the figures put a lie to it when the figures indicate that the very reverse is happening that since 1972 our dependence fiscally on Ottawa has increased ten percentage points from 42 per cent to 52 per cent of total revenue, that even in this year when we have had a change - this quasi-change from the bad Tories to the good Tories - that is a good way to put it, is it not?

MR. NEARY: There is no such thing as a good Tory.

MR. SIMMONS: The out-Tories to the in-Tories - you know, it used to be said about parties that the only difference in it was that one was in and the other was out. Well, now you can apply it to the Tory Party, the Tories that are out of power and the Tories that are in power - well, the Tories that were in power last year that are now out of power,

MR. SIMMONS: the outlawed Tories, the un-Toried Tories
In Russia after you commit the ultimate misdemeanour they unmake you,
you become an un-person. Well, that is what I mean when I say the
un-Toried Tories; you know, Frank Moores' un-Toried Tories, the bad Tories,
had the dependence up over 50 per cent.

MR. NEARY: Did he give them back their (inaudible)
coupons yet, I wonder?

MR. SIMMONS: The un-Toried Tories were getting 50 per cent
of all their funds to run the government from Ottawa. 'A shameful thing!'
said the Tory Tories, the in-Tories, the good Tories. So what do they do?
They go and say, 'Yes, we will take the 50 per cent and we will take a
couple more percentage points too. We will increase the dependence.'
But, Dr. Collins, but, member for St. John's South, but Minister
of Finance, do not tell the public that, tell them the opposite.
Tell them in your Budget speech, 'We are decreasing the dependence,' because
they will buy that, because you have an honest face. They will believe you.
What hypocrisy! And that is what I deplore in this Budget, that the people
of Newfoundland are being deceived on two or three points - on the
government's alleged emphasis on resource development when they are actually
cutting back in the resource areas, on the government's deception in respect
to dependence on Ottawa when they say the dependence is less and I think
I have clearly demonstrated that the dependence is more. And I have quoted
chapter and verse, I have quoted figures from the budgets concerned to
show that dependence has gone from 42 per cent of capital and current
revenues to 52 per cent since this government took office. And since this
quasi-change in administration, this change from the bad Tories to the
good Tories, there has even been an increase there from last year to this
year, from 50.5 per cent of revenue to 51.7 per cent or 52 per cent of
revenue. Deception, Mr. Speaker, absolute deception! And I hope the
minister, honest man, man of integrity that he is, will rectify this
apparent contradiction between

Mr. Simmons: his statement and the fact which he proffers to support his statement, but which contradicted the statement. I hope he will somehow reconcile this shameful contradiction when he rises to speak at some point in this particular debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said a couple of things I deplore in this Budget. There are one or two others. I think I implied in Question Period that I cannot see the rationale for the tax on media advertising. I think it is counter-productive. I think that the government will collect some dollars on it, but, I think, it will have the net affect of reducing the would-be advertisers advertising budget by the amount of the tax. That has an effect on local radio stations - I know the minister said the other day that it is not going to hurt the locals, it is the national people. But do not forget that it is the national advertisers who supply a large part of the revenue for the local stations and the local papers here. And you cannot affect the national advertisers adversely without having a domino effect, without having an effect, an adverse effect on the local media outlets, for example:

I believe it is a counter-productive tax. I think it was very ill-advised. I think the minister demonstrated today in answering questions that he is not very sure he is doing the right thing. As a matter of fact, I got the impression from his statements today that they made the decision and now they are going to listen to advice after - Well, that is a poor time to listen to advice. - I am not suggesting that every time they contemplate a tax they give notice to the people who do not want the tax, but I would hope that they did a fairly intelligent and widespread sounding around to see what the economic impact of such a tax would be. There is only one other province in Canada and that is Quebec, or one other jurisdiction in North America, I am told, which levies a tax on advertising, and that is Quebec, and I think that is only on an aspect of the media, I think, broadcast revenues only.

MR. WHITE: Radio sales.

MR. SIMMONS: Radio revenues, and the rate is 2 per cent rather than 4 per cent. We are taking a fairly basic departure from the established tax policies of other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States, and I would like to hear the minister say some more things about it. But for the time being I find the tax on media advertising counter-productive. I think, it will be... I predict it will be... I think it is very ill-advised and I would hope the minister would reconsider before he goes too far with it and brings in the Tax Bill concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something else that I deplore about the Budget. There is quite a talk about studies in the Budget. They are going to study everything in Education again, they are going to study everything in Health again, they are going to study everything in Fisheries again. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing whatsoever against studies. But you see it is the contradiction in terms again. This government was elected on a mandate of going forward into the 1980s, and one assumed that when they talk about going ahead they knew where the gears were, they knew how to put her in forward gear to get her to go ahead. But now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) gave you the gears.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, we over in Stephenville, gave the member the gears in more ways than he knows yet, in more ways than he knows. That is more of a comment on him than us.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: We know, we met a number of your embarrassed constituents.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I had forgotten how pleasant it was when the member was back in Stephenville practicing law. Mr. Speaker will agree with me on this, that I started out today to be very nice, very kind and very positive. I am being unduly harassed, I think, by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and I will try to ignore him

MR. SIMMONS:

as difficult as that is.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland were given the clear impression prior to June 18th that they were electing a government which had a sense of direction, which knew where it wanted to take this Province. We are told by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) now that such is not the case, that it is a hold-the-line, that it is a wait-and-see, it is a buying-time budget while they study some more. Well, Mr. Speaker, no number of studies will prove that you do not need a hospital on the Burin Peninsula. No number of studies will prove that you do not need an extension to the Grand Falls Hospital which affects a number of people in my district. No number of studies will prove that you do not need a hospital in Claranville or Port aux Basques, no number of studies. Or is the government

MR. SIMMONS: government now telling us that when they put up the billboards before the '75 election, they were wrong, or that they were out deliberately conning some people. No number of studies, Mr. Speaker, will tell you that the kinds of school facilities that exist around this Province, the fire traps in many communities, are adequate. No number of studies will prove that. I deplore, Mr. Speaker, the deception in this Budget, the false hopes it raises about education and about health. Mr. Speaker, I have spent some time talking about what I like about this Budget and some time talking about what I dislike in the Budget. There are more things I dislike that I could talk about, but I want to emphasize the three or four I have mentioned. The one that I want to underline is the overall deception about resource development and about the government's financial relationship to Ottawa, and then I have come, Mr. Speaker, to a couple of specific points that I dislike. Before moving on to what will be my final one or two points, I want to address myself to the very specific point which is not particularly mentioned in the Budget but obviously is a financial matter and, therefore, bears mentioning right here now. It is a very particular point and a point which affects a number of individual Newfoundlanders and I am hoping I can get the attention of the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) on this in a moment because it is a point that I would hope he could — I was just saying I hope I can just get the ear of the Minister of Finance for a moment on this particular item. It is an item partly of information. It would seem like a small item, but it is an item that affects a number of people. It has always puzzled me that on the one hand if you owe the government, as a small businessman, a tax return and you are a few days over, they drag you into court, which I suppose they should do to collect their receivables given time. I do not argue that given the appropriate number of months and notices and all that, that eventually if a receivable is owing government and the person that owes does not pay up, then you have to take the appropriate legal steps to get it.

MR. SIMMONS: What I always found a bit of a contradiction in terms was while the government will only allow the fellow who owes government money a month or so to pay up, he expects the same fellow to allow the government six months to pay up, and I can give the minister a list as long as his arms, mine and feet and all to show people who, for instance, have - and I am talking about small people who need the 30 bucks or the 100 bucks or the 200 bucks involved - I can give him a list as long as your arm where it takes five months for a fellow to get \$30 for a chainsaw rental, for example.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Right. Or where a fellow is cutting wood for Department of Transportation and Communications, I say to the minister responsible, and I can give the minister - show him bills now - \$3,500, \$3,500, some of them as much as five and a half months old. One individual trying to make a living in a small sawmill operation where he is cutting specialty items for Transportation and Communications and he has waited five months, five months to get his receivable on that from the public treasury. Now, that kind of person, and we are talking about creating jobs or helping to make small industry healthy in this Province, that kind of an individual, a one-man operation, does not have that kind of cash flow. He just cannot carry \$3,500. He needs it for payroll, for example, and Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Finance there are hundreds of people in those two categories I have mentioned who are working, say, on a forestry project or a social services project and they rent their chainsaw or their equipment or their vehicle, and then there are the small suppliers to government who are being owed, you know, miscellaneous sums of money in terms of total government revenue, but sums large enough to put the fellow into bankruptcy viewed from the vantage point of the person concerned. I will not dwell on that in terms of taking time or not, but I see from the minister's indication that he obviously has the point and it is a point that I have talked at some length with various of his officials about, and sometimes

MR. SIMMONS:

the problem is not in his department as such but down in the supplying department or the department that has supplied or, in this case, received the services. But wherever it is it is a point that affects a number of hundreds of people. Now, Mr. Speaker -

DR. COLLINS: Would the hon. member permit me?

MR. SIMMONS: Sure.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, has brought up a point of considerable importance I think. I think there is no doubt about it that in the past government was slow in paying its bills. However, there are two measures underway: Firstly, one of the problems was that our accounts were not computerized and accounts now are of such a size that it is difficult to keep track of them unless they are computerized. There is a project underway now which will see this remedied as quickly as possible.

The second thing that we have done - and this is a new departure - is that government will now undertake to pay interest on the outstanding accounts after sixty days. This is now in effect and this will afford some relief, especially to the small suppliers to government.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I am glad to hear it is in effect and I thank the minister for his response. I would suggest it has not been long in effect. I talked to an individual on Monday of this week who is owed about \$3,500. My colleague from Torngat (Mr. Warren) had a similar example as recently as yesterday. But the point has been registered and I do not think we ought to debate it in any detail here and I hope the minister will pursue it further and report to us in time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come to another point or two before closing up. I had a look at food prices in the last few years and I found, Mr. Speaker, that in the last few years there has been a dramatic increase in food prices, not surprising to anybody here but I want to relate it to another point in a minute. I found that since the new government took over

MR. SIMMONS:

in 1972, the price of food, the consumer price index has risen by 77 per cent in seven years. The consumer price index has risen by 77 per cent in seven years, that means that in 1972, if you bought a dollar's worth of groceries, you are paying now \$1.77 for the same groceries. One dollar in 1972 and \$1.77 now today. So you say, well what is he on this particularly mundane point for? Well, I want to impress that upon your mind because I want to make a comparison with another rise, a rise that we do not often look at, another rise in cost over the past seven years since this government took office. The one I am talking about first, the consumer price index, is not one that you can completely lay at the feet of this government. There are other factors over which this government has no control when we talk about food prices going from a dollar to \$1.77, when we talk about the person who paid out \$100 for a grocery bill in 1972 and he pays \$177 for the same groceries now in 1979. Some of the reasons that has gone from \$100 to \$177 are completely outside the control of this particular government.

But let us look at something else.

Mr. Speaker. Let us look at how taxes have increased since 1972 and compare it with food prices because now we are talking about something that is within the control of this government. What has happened to taxes since 1972? Well, food has gone up by 77 per cent, almost doubled. Have taxes doubled since 1972 would you say? Have they gone up by 77 per cent? Perhaps 50 per cent? Perhaps 60 per cent? Let us look at the figures. In 1972, the year that this government took over, this administration, the Province collected from about 500,000 Newfoundlanders, exclude those who were not on income, the children and so on but in terms of population, the Province received, the Public Treasury received in personal income tax \$28 million in 1971-1972 according to John C. Crosbie. In 1972, the man who will now do for Canadian finances what he did for Newfoundland finances - I did not hear too many 'Amens' that time,

August 2, 1979

Tape 492

IB-3

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker - the man who will do for Canadian finances what he did for Newfoundland finances, the man who will put her under nationally like he did provincially

MR. NEARY: He will be hated in six months in Ottawa.

MR. SIMMONS: He is looking over his shoulder already and the six months are not up yet. As a matter of fact, if he can keep Sinc Stevens under control for three months he will be a lucky man. The saving grace for the people of Canada is that under the federal system the institution of Treasury Board is quite well established, and while the Minister of Finance in Ottawa may decide that something is going to be done, it is Treasury Board that makes the final decision concerning his decision. He might recommend that something is going to be done, he, the Minister of Finance, but it is he, Sinclair Stevens, the President of Treasury Board, who makes the final decision. Now, the financial market might not find that particularly sobering - they may find it very sobering, they might not find it very helpful, but I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada have reason to thank their Maker that the final decision is Sinc's, not John's.

Mr. Speaker: John C. Crosbie told us in 1972 - this is John C. Crosbie's 1972 put-haz-undar Budget - in 1972 he told us that he expected to collect \$28 million in income tax and he did.

MR. NEARY: Purple is about the best color to use because it reminds me of a casket, you know.

MR. SIMMONS: It is kind of an undertaker's Budget, I agree. It looks something like an undertaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, seven years later, the member for St. John's-South, the present Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), the man, by the way, I tell new members of the House, who was physically present when my little fellow, my two-and-a-half-year-old son, was delivered - I must say, he is much better delivering babies than he is Budgets. He is a lot better delivering babies than Budgets. Let me put it another way. I hope my son's health can in no way be connected with the health of this particular Budget. He is kind of a - I will not say it. Look, I think.

I have milked the analogy for what it is worth, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right.

MR. SIMMONS: I think I will get back to Budgets.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: How come I get all those ideas now and never got either one in caucus at all today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: We should hold our caucuses up here.

In 1972, Crosbie tells us \$28 million in personal income tax off the backs of the Newfoundland people. In 1979, the present Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) tells us he expects to collect not \$28 million off the same half million population but \$152 million, an increase, Mr. Speaker, of 443 per cent, while food prices, which everybody is awfully worked up about, go up 77 per cent, while we are paying \$177 now for what we bought for \$100 in 1972, personal income tax is going up from \$28 million to \$152 million, going up by 443 per cent. And we are supposed to take that on the chin because our benevolent government did it. Now there, Mr. Speaker, is something that we can lay at the door of this government, a 400 per cent increase in personal income tax. Now, the experts are going to come back and say, 'Oh, but, I see, I will say it for them, 'Oh, but, two reasons for that.' Yes, there are. I will tell you what they are. The first reason is that the government has increased every tax since 1972.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Every tax it increased and invented some new ones. Every single tax that is within provincial jurisdiction, gasoline, tobacco, retail sales, insurance, insurance premiums, every tax without exception and every licence and every fee without exception, this government has increased at least once and in the case of the sales tax, four times since 1972. So you are right,

MR. SIMMONS:

it says, "Well, we got the money, we might as well hire a few more people", and that, Mr. Speaker, is the issue, the issue of increased tax burden over the past seven years.

I have picked seven because this is the life of this administration.

I could easily have picked another time frame, and it is not happening only in this jurisdiction, but that does not make it right in this

jurisdiction. Food prices -- 77 per cent increase; tax rates, tax burden - 300-440 per cent; that is the issue, Mr. Speaker; that is

the issue. The tax burden in this Province has become intolerable, absolutely intolerable and the fault for that must be placed at the

feet of this particular administration, because this particular administration committed two sins on this matter, one a sin of commission, and two a sin of omission. The sin of commission was

in continuing to sock it to them; increase the retail sales tax, the personal income tax, that was a sin of commission. The sin of omission, the thing it did not do, was it did not recognize at

least publicly that it was receiving windfall profits through taxation because of inflation, because of increased prices, and increased

per capita income, and did not plough those windfall profits back to the consumer. And that is what the consumer needs, then he can afford

his 77 per cent increase in consumer prices... if we started giving

them back some of the taxes he should have because of this windfall profits factor that I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the new Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) has to take a long, hard look

at the effect of the rising burden of taxation; the effect it is having on the average consumer's purchasing power; the average con-

sumer's and homeowner's ability to meet budgets; to make financial plans within the family context. I find it, Mr. Speaker, absolutely

shameful that such windfall profits should have been made, and I find it somewhat curious that it should be made without any particular

MR. SIMMONS: public outcry. Yet, while I say I find it curious, there is a context in which I do not, because the process of taxation, the way it is taken from the consumer, is in bits and pieces. You go down today and your tax is seven per cent, -- so if you buy a dollar item you pay seven cents, and two or three years later you go down and it is 11 per cent, so instead of paying \$1.07 for the dollar item, you pay \$1.11. It only sounds like four cents and four cents does not sound like much until it is all added up in terms of a budget receivable, in terms of revenue for a government and you find that that four cents or whatever translates into percentages of the order of 300 per cent increases over the seven years.

MR. MORGAN: Are you all finished?

MR. SIMMONS: I was just giving the crowd over there a chance. There are so busy talking, I thought they wanted to do it without my interruption.

Now, Mr. Speaker; that I have their attention.

MR. NEARY: If you had the hon. member for Humber East (Ms. Verge) for a seating partner, you would be talking too.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not know, I think I would listen, I think I would just listen.

MR. NEARY: I cannot blame the member for Humber Valley (Mr. W. House). We are all jealous of him.

MR. SIMMONS: I only saw him that happy once before and I should not say where that was here. I must say though since the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has come back into the Chamber, early in my comments on the Budget debate I mentioned that I was hoping at some point she might address herself to the status of women issue. I did it very briefly and I think my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, will be doing it a little more fully, but I am hoping that with her particular background in this area she might use the occasion, perhaps in the Budget debate or elsewhere, to give us the benefit of her views and her knowledge on it.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

I know it is considerable and she and I have talked about it on a number of occasions.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, we thought she was a Liberal when we were down around the table there.

MR. WHITE: She is a Liberal.

MR. R. SIMMONS: She is a Liberal. Of course, she is a Liberal.

MR. S. NEARY: The member for St. John's Centre (Dr. P.J. McNicholas) has no authority, he is a Liberal, too.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Of course, she is a Liberal. Look where she is put

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I suggest (Inaudible).

MR. WHITE: Sit down, boy, sit down;

MR. NEARY: Sit down, do not be making a fool of yourself.

MR. SIMMONS: Is the member on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: I will certainly hear his point of order however ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. I certainly will, if he has a point of order.

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

Has the hon. member yielded? The hon. member cannot stand in his place and say nothing and expect other hon. members not to ask for the floor. So, if the hon. member is going to speak, well by all means, we will hear him.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has to rule on a point of order and it is just a matter of formality and we have to get it off the record. There is no point of order. The hon. gentleman, obviously, Sir, the hot weather outside is getting to him. If he does not like it, he can always get aboard Newfoundland's

MR. S. NEARY: finest and just head her back to the West coast.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Order, please! On the point of order. This is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members, please continue.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, certainly it is that in parliamentary terms, it is that and it is more than that but in terms of substance it is much more than that. It is an insult, not only to me but to the member for Humber West (Mr. R. Baird). As a matter of fact, while the member may not have been listening, what I was doing when he says I was doing nothing, I was inviting his colleague to address the assembly at some point on a very important subject. Now, he may think that is nonsense but I happen to think it is not nonsense. I would like to hear what the lady from Humber West has to say about the status of women and if he does not like it -

MR. BAIRD: From Humber East.

MR. R. SIMMONS: - from Humber East, the member from Humber West (Mr. R. Baird) is no lady.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: He walked into that one.

MR. STIRLING: The member for Humber West does know

a lot about the status of women.

MR. R. SIMMONS: I would like to have his views as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, without pursuing the point, I would hope that as non-sensical as it sounds to the mind from Stephenville, I want to hear some dialogue on it and the lady from Humber East (Ms. L. Verge) has been so good to indicate that she might do that in time. I was referring, in particular, to Head 309, the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

MR. S. NEARY: I cannot wait for her to make her main speech.

MR. R. SIMMONS: She will, she will. Now, Mr. Speaker, - I do not know what I do to this House, but everytime I get up it seems there are about twenty guys talking at one time. However, the girls in Hansard can not blame me. They will have to blame the fellows who are kicking up the fuss.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am trying so hard to clue this us within an hour, but I have run just over an hour but I am just about through and then I will be sitting down. And I would hope

MR. J. MORGAN: That is good news to hear.

MR. R. SIMMONS: It is better news for me than it is for the member from Bonavista South (Mr. J. Morgan).

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. S. NEARY: He is not allowed to speak this session. He has not spoken yet.

MR. R. SIMMONS: - that, more than any other issue about this Budget that needs to be talked about is its deception. It is a very deceiving document. The document says there will be an increase in resource development. The figures say there will be a de-emphasis in resource development. The document says we will be less dependent on Ottawa. The figures say we are even more dependent on Ottawa than ever before. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I deplore most about this document. I have said that there are certain things I welcome about the document and I suppose the highlight of that, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier's decision in respect to the Economic Advisory Council. I have long held the view that we do not often enough seek the expertise which is available to us in various fields before we make a decision, sometimes a precipitous decision, sometimes a decision which we get locked into and we can not alter very easily for

MR. SIMMONS:

parliamentary reasons or for political reasons or for fiscal reasons.

I have long held the view that before getting into large economic and fiscally oriented decisions that we ought to have available the best advice, the best knowledge, the best research that there is.

MR. WHITE: I want to raise a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay, go ahead.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMONS): The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: I want to raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I am rising because it is almost five o'clock and under Standing Order 31 (k) "Not later than 5:00 o'clock p.m., on any Thursday, the Speaker shall indicate the matter or matters to be raised at the time of adjournment," referring specifically to the Late Show. That has not been done and I just wondered if it was going to be done today or not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER (BUTT): The Speaker will take the Chair and he will make known of that.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): It is not quite five o'clock but rather than have to interrupt the proceedings later on I would like to inform the House that I have received notice of one matter for debate at five thirty when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House, notice given by the hon. member for Lewisporte arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook). The subject matter, I believe, was related to the spraying of chemicals on our highways.

The hon. member for Burgeo

Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is the deception in this particular budget that is particularly disconcerting and I hope the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in time will address himself to it because it kind of puts him out on a limb. I am sure that the speech he made he made in good faith. I think he made it

MR. SIMMONS:

feeling he had the best command of the facts but somewhere, either his colleagues in Cabinet or his senior officials let him down because in one mouthful you cannot say there is less dependence on Ottawa and then in the next, the few pages in this particular case, you find that the dependence on Ottawa in terms of actual dollars or percentage dollars has gone from 42 per cent in 1972 to 52 per cent seven years later. That is more dependence on Ottawa and it is deceiving for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or for the government to make statements to the contrary, very deceiving.

The resource development issue is one that we will address ourselves to more. But again the message is out somehow that this government is doing things for resource development. But the figures do not back up that message and, therefore, it is a very deceiving, a very deceitful message. Mr. Speaker, the consumers in this Province have a bone to pick with this government because while this government has lamented and talked long and hard about how the food prices have gone up to a shocking degree and they have, do not get me wrong, they have. They have gone from a base of \$100 in 1972 to \$177. They have gone up 77 per cent. That is a hefty increase. But compared to tax increases, Mr. Speaker, tax increases decided by this government, brought on by this government, in terms of tax revenues on personal income and on retail sales, food prices pale in terms of comparison. Seventy-seven per cent increase in food prices, 400 per cent increase in income tax, 440 per cent, 300 per cent increase in retail sales tax. That, Mr. Speaker, is the bone these people out there have to pick with this government.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that this government is prepared to sit there and finance their mad schemes, their Cole contracts, finance their mad schemes, Mr. Speaker, on the windfall profits of the average Newfoundlander, the windfall profits from these taxes. Why not, Mr. Speaker, instead of continuing

MR. SIMMONS:

to add to the bureaucracy, instead of continuing to dream up mad schemes like the Cole contract, why not, Mr. Speaker, a tax rebate, why not for a year or so a tax decrease.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier during the election

promised there would be no increase beyond 11 per cent in the retail sales tax, no increase beyond 11 per cent in the retail sales tax. Well, do not forget, Mr. Speaker, who put it up from 7 per cent to 8, or from 6 to 7 to 8 to 9 to 10 to 11, the Tories put it up there to 11 per cent. They socked it to them, Mr. Speaker, and then they got it up to 11 per cent and after socking it to the taxpayer, then the leader of the government said, "We are not going to increase it any further". Now, what kind of an undertaking is that? That is the equivalent of saying, "First I am going to kill you, and then I will not hurt you. First I will shoot you, and then I will not lay a finger on you. First I will knock the financial good out of you, I will drain you for what you are worth, and then you got my word that after that I will leave you alone. First I will kick you, but then I will not kick you any harder. I will just keep kicking you to the rate of 11 per cent, but no harder." And then he goes on to admit, of course, that the real reason he is not increasing the tax is because increasing prices are going to give him more return on the same tax anyway. He is going to get the windfall profit. We are back to the old windfall return again. Mr. Speaker, I say this government could do a great service to the people of Newfoundland if it looked at its tax policy as it affects the Newfoundland consumer and redistribute some of that windfall tax profit back to the consumer, instead of using it to build on an already large bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the concerns I have about the Budget. I have already said that at once I would like to address myself to many, many other issues in this particular Budget. There are many here that need to be addressed. Some of them we will have the opportunity of addressing in Committee, others, I am sure, we will get an opportunity to address in the Address and Reply and in the various tax bills, the money bills as they come before the House. But, Mr. Speaker, for the time being, I just wanted today to highlight my concern about the Budget deception

MR. SIMMONS: on a number of points and the escalating tax revenues which the Newfoundland people are paying, and I believe paying unjustly, and I believe this government ought to be doing something about it. The onus is on this government to do something about it and I hope they will do it fairly quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, thank you, hon. gentlemen and ladies.

Well, I think that Hansard may record and maybe the people who listened to the hon. member this afternoon can say that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir droned interminably or at least what appeared to be interminably, because he had five or six points to make, he made them, and then because he had made them in the first ten minutes he decided that, "Well, I have unlimited time, consequently I must speak as if I have unlimited material". Unfortunately, he had very limited material and one of the main points in his argument was to attack the Minister of Finance, the former Minister of Finance for Newfoundland, and the present Minister of Finance for Canada. The hon. member seems to have the opinion that the Minister of Finance for Canada is in disgrace, that somehow or other the people of Newfoundland and the people on this side of the House and the people generally think that the Hon. John C. Crosbie made a fool of himself while he was Minister of Finance for Newfoundland, and has gone up to Ottawa and done the same thing. Now, I will say to you and I would suggest that the people of Canada and the Hon. Joe Clarke think otherwise, that the Hon. John C. Crosbie, whose talents were recognized very early by the then Premier of the Province, the Rt. Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood, who nabbed him into his Cabinet in 1966 and

MR. NEARY: He is not Rt. Hon.

MR. STAGG: - Not Rt. Hon., well, maybe he should be - the Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood wanted him and he proved to be such a handful and he was so competent that he had to get rid of him.

MR. STAGG: He had to get rid of him, and I would suggest that the Hon. John C. Crosbie is one of the great patriots, one of the great Newfoundlanders that we will see in this quarter century, maybe one of the great Newfoundlanders of the twentieth century. And it ill behooves any member of this House of Assembly to be standing up and casting aspersions on him, and I will give you another example, ladies and gentlemen of the gallery and hon. members, Mr. Speaker, and whoever else may be listening, of the sort of thing that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is capable of. I have before me a publication called Atlantic Insight, a very good publication, I recommend it to anyone, and there is an article in there by Bill Kelly. I presume that is the Bill Kelly who used to be with the Evening Telegram, a Newfoundlander. It says, "Linerboard Farce May Get Happy Ending",

MR. STAGG:

and in the second paragraph there - I am quoting from this magazine now - it says, "Liberal, Roger Simmons, accused provincial Cabinet Minister, John Crosbie, of having a "vested interest" in the government takeover of the mill from John C. Doyle's Canadian Javelin back in 1972." Now, if the hon. member did not say that I would certainly like for him to at some stage get up and say that he did not. But it appears quite clear to me, at least Bill Kelly, a Newfoundlander, says that the man who is presently the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) accused the hon. John C. Crosbie of being a crook. It is as simple as that. "Simmons said Crosbie, now a heavy", - I am quoting again from the publication - "Simmons said Crosbie now a heavy in Prime Minister Clark's government provided "a gravy train for one or two members of the Conservative Administration".

Again quoting, "Liberal, Steve Neary, unleashed his own tirade. He talked about a monumental rip-off while Crosbie was the Chairman of the Crown owned mill." Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself a little bit to industrial development generally and to speak about Labrador Linerboard somewhat. I think this is relevant to the Budget Debate. It certainly is as relevant as the type of dialogue or the type of tirade that the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir had. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is a possibility that if the people of Bay St. George in 1975 had seen fit to elect P.C.s to the House of Assembly that maybe the linerboard mill might not have closed down. You might say, well they closed it down because they had elected Liberals. Indirectly that may be true because it became the policy of the Liberal members from Bay St. George and with the active participation of the, however many there were on the other side, twenty or so, to kill the government through Labrador Linerboard and it did not matter that Labrador Linerboard might go down with it. That did not matter. And I know, Mr. Speaker, having lived there and gone through the mental anguish

MR. STAGG:

and the economic anguish that besets a community when your main industry is becoming a political football, being paraded about and thrown about by people who do not care anything about you. All they are after is power, power. And so as a route to power the destruction of Labrador Linerboard.

What encouragement would the hon. C.W. Duddy have to keep Labrador Linerboard open

MR. STAGG: When through some Liberals who were workers at Labrador Linerboard, messages and embarrassing information was fed in these proverbial brown envelopes to members of the Opposition to be publicized at the most propitious moments politically, and I submit that hon. members on the other side are responsible for the closing of Labrador Linerboard in 1977. I make that as a political argument. Maybe hon. members on the other side may wish to respond to it. But as a person who was living there and not in politics at the time, that is the way I saw it. I would suggest that if a more constructive approach to it had been taken it is possible that the government might have struggled along with it for another couple of years to find a buyer, but what encouragement was there for the government to do anything with Labrador Linerboard except close it when all that was coming out from the Opposition was negativism and embarrassment and scandal? And if there was no scandal you had to find some or make it up. And this sort of thing that turns up in a national well, it is a national publication published in Halifax talking about The Linerboard Farce May Get a Happy Ending! - it is the sort of thing that I have alluded to in my earlier statements, my earlier speech here in the Throne Speech debate. It is part of the feeling about Stephenville industrial development that pervades political circles in this Province, and I zoned in on the public service, but I suggest that there is a certain feeling abroad in the whole of Newfoundland that things that happened in Stephenville are by their very nature things to be questioned. And I submit that the members of the Opposition who would say things like this - and as far as I know they are not refuted - a member of the Opposition who would say that John Crosbie, the Minister of Finance in 1972, one of the great patriots of Newfoundland history, had a vested interest in the government takeover of the mill from John C. Doyle and that there was a gravy train for one or two members of the administration, if that is the sort of thing that hon. members want to occupy themselves with, well, I suggest it is a reflection on them and I suggest

MR. STAGG: that the people of Newfoundland gave a verdict on the type of representation, the type of philosophy that they want to see, the type of philosophers, if you wish, that they want to see running this Province, and they gave their verdict on June 18, and they opted for this side over here. They opted for positivism. They opted for a fresh look into the 1980's. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) may have been the Freudian slip. He talked about looking forward into the 1970's and he did not correct himself. It may have been the Freudian slip, that is all I know about Freud, but maybe the hon. member might be a good subject for Freud with some of the things that have come out of him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having dealt with that as expertly as I possibly could, which, I suggest, was adequate, I would like to talk about one of the main initiatives taken by this administration, albeit with the co-operation of the Opposition but nevertheless, it was a main plank in the election campaign and in the Premier's announcements thereafter. It was the setting up of the Committee system. Now, as one of the Committee chairmen, I am able to say that I believe the Committee system is working very, very well -

MR. F. B. ROWE: In spite of the chairman.

MR. STAGG: - and I would suggest - in spite of the chairman, well, the hon. member can address himself to that, maybe during the concurrence debates, but I would suggest to hon. members and to anybody who has been following the Budget debate or the Estimates in the past, that the type of speech that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir gave here in the Budget debate is typical of the type of speech that used to come from two or three of the "heavy-weights" on the other side during the Estimates. They would get up and having practically unlimited time during the Estimates, that is the sort of thing would come out of them, and I just want to tell the people here who spoke this morning in the Estimates on Transportation and

MR. STAGG: Communications. The minister spoke first, then the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), then the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward), the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), Fogo, Terra Nova, Eagle River, Burin - Placentia West, St. Barbe, Bay of Islands, Terra Nova, Burin - Placentia West, Eagle River, Bay of Islands, Eagle River, Burin - Placentia West, Terra Nova, Kilbride, Terra Nova, Eagle River, Kilbride, Eagle River, St. George's, and that is the sort of thing that has happened because of this administration. We have backbenchers, private members who are getting involved in the Estimates, they are not intimidated by the three or four heavy-weights on the opposite side who hog the show. It has been revealed to me as chairman of this committee that there are some very good Newfoundlanders on the opposite side of this House. We never get to know them. We did not get to know them. There are members of the opposite side from 1971 to 1975 that I never met, except maybe coming up and down in the elevator. I did not know how they spoke because there were two or three members of the Opposition who hogged the show. They are the two or three heavy-weights, and I point out that when we are into Committee of Supply on the Executive Council that the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) would not let any of these other members get up and speak. He was up and down and he is very adept at getting up and catching the Chairman's eye, and that is the sort of thing that after a while, private members on the other side, they say, "Well, what the heck?" They may say something even stronger than that, they say, "What is the good, what is the good" -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) No wonder they would not make you Speaker, now I know why.

MR. STAGG: - We have a hierarchy in our party, they do all the talking -

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) - Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - and we cannot do any of the talking. Now, I say to you that the private members on the other side have

August 2, 1979

Tape No. 500

GH-3

MR. STAGG: our Premier to thank for them getting
into Hansard, and I think you should give him a good rousing round of
applause.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) has contributed significantly to the deliberations, especially in Municipal Affairs and Housing, excellent points. Again this morning the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), the member for Eagle River and others, they were good. Do not get a chance in the ordinary kind of debate in this House. Why do they not get a chance? Because members on the other side have taken that as their lever to power. How have they tried to lever themselves to power? By this sort of nonsense. By saying and I repeat, by saying, "Liberal Roger Simmons accused provincial Cabinet Minister, John Crosbie of having a vested interest in the government takeover of the mill from John C. Doyle", and so on. And its being a 'gravy train' for one or two members. That is the type of activity we have had in this House. And I am certainly pleased that some fifty hours of the estimates will be spent in analyzing the estimates. And that is the kind of administration that is over here. And I am sure that if some hon. members on the other side had their choice that they would rather be over here than over there. And if they had known -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: If they had known then what they know now they would have run for this side. And I will give you an open invitation, come on over and bring your shopping list. Maybe the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) might be able to look after you. I do not know. I do not know if that is the way we work or not actually.

I would also like to say one other thing, that the Budget estimates, the consideration of the estimates for the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, I wish the minister was in his seat because I think it was the first we did and it is a classic of its kind. The minister was forthcoming. His knowledge of the department was exceptional and his ability to explain some of the rather technical things that happen in Municipal Affairs and Housing, their negotiations with Ottawa and so on, they were extremely rewarding for all members who were there. I would suggest

MR. STAGG:

that the department - I would guess the minister may be too modest to do it himself but maybe the Premier or whoever might have a look at it - and with some editing and some editorial comment and some footnotes and so on I would suggest that it would be the type of thing that you send out to the various councils, some 309 as he told us in Committee, the 309 councils in this Province as required reading or suggested reading for councillors as to how the department works. And it could be required reading for members of the House because previously you were afraid to ask, members were afraid to ask things they did not know because they thought somebody might say, "Do you not know that. How dumb are you." Within these informal, relatively informal - I still try to have members keep their coats on and drink coffee outside and not smoke during the deliberations but they are relatively informal - it is possible for a member to display his lack of knowledge of a certain area, and not to be ridiculed because he does not have the knowledge but to actually get the kind of information that is going to be of benefit to Newfoundlanders. That is the kind of thing that this administration has brought forward.

Now my colleague from Kilbride who is a surveyor - and of course I am a bit of a geographer myself - I am able to say without fear of contradiction that the picture on this Budget, the picture on the 1979 budget, is Barachois Park looking to the Southeast and it is a sunrise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: And if the hon. members think it is a sunset, well, it is as I said in one of my intemperate interjections into the debate, it is a sunset on the Liberal Party. It is a sunrise on the P.C. Party. That is what we are looking at here in this Province, and the man who led it is the man who is not here, whose ghost-like Banquo's ghost is presiding over this speech that we have here in this House of Assembly. The man who led it back in 1969 - and how many of us heroes are here who were with him at the time? There are

August 2, 1979

Tape 501

IB-3

MR. STAGG:

several of us here I know - the hon. John C. Crosbie who lost out in his bid in 1969 to led the Liberal Party and to make it into something remotely resembling what we have here today, he is the man who led it. No wonder the member for

MR. F. STAGG: for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. R. Simmons) is outraged at the Minister of Finance (Mr. J. Crosbie) If it had not been for the Minister of Finance for Canada, he would probably be sitting over here now. He is one of the reasons that they have been kept from power. And I suggest with the type of co-operation that we are going to see between our Premier who worked for John C. Crosbie back in 1969, as an organizer for us - some of us have a past we are not too happy about, we were once members of the Liberal Party, at least we had our card. We were subversives perhaps but we were members of the party. But we were born again. The member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) talks about the born-again Premier, the born-again administration. Yes, many of us were born again. I was born again in 1971 and I continued to be born again. And my constituents, on three different occasions have agreed with me and I think they are going to agree with me on two or three more occasions because the pension plan is so good that I can retire by the time I am forty-five.

Now, how am I doing here, I got a few more points that I would like to make. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called backbenchers on the other side of the House that they rise up in rebellion, that they rise up and take the two or three people who have been hogging the debate in the House, as far as the Opposition is concerned, and take them and say, Look, we are elected, you are no more than we are, we want to participate in debate, we want to get some headlines ourselves. Rise up, rise up, be born again yourselves.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say. I know I have got a lot more I should say but that is about it. Maybe hon. members will take my suggestion. I see there are two or three of them ready to jump to their feet right now, so have at it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. L. TEOMS:

I am not quite sure whether I find this House confusingly chaotic or chaotically confusing. I was somewhat taken back this afternoon when my friend here from

Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) started talking about the Late Show. I never associated the House of Assembly with the Late Show.

However, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to take this opportunity first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to your office. Since this is the first time I had an opportunity to say a few words, thank goodness the rules are changed and I only have thirty minutes.

I am confident, Sir, that as you have demonstrated so far, that you will display the impartiality and the fairness to all members of this House. And I think that this fairness and this impartiality is so vitally important to this House if we are going to have the type of House that this Province so earnestly desires, the type of House where I am afraid we are going to need a little bit of toning down of members like my friend from Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) if we are going to have that type of House. I should also, Mr. Speaker, of course, congratulate the Deputy Speaker (Mr. J. Butt) on his election to the position of Deputy Speaker. And it is just as important that he display the fairness and the impartiality that you have displayed and that he is displaying.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be remiss of me also if I did not congratulate all members of this House on their election on June the 18th. I believe that some twenty-three of us are new to this House if we include my friend from Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg), my friend from Mount Scio (Mr. L. Barry), my member in this House and of course, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson).

Mr. Speaker, I believe that at no time in recent Newfoundland history have the people displayed

MR. L. THOMS: the cynicism that we see in Newfoundland today. There is a pox on both your house's syndrome in this Province. Time and time again during the recent election I heard these words, "It does not really matter who gets in, things just are not going to be any better for the people of this Province. Things are not going to be any better for me." I heard it time and time and time again. Well, I hope that if I am around and running in the next election, whenever that may come, three, four years, I hope there has been some change in that attitude in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this, if I did I think I would get the heck out of here immediately. But it is up to us to prove to all the Newfoundland people that all of us are not in politics for our own personal gain, in fact, none of us should seek election for our own personal gain. Across the floor of this House I see a lot of people I have known for a long time,

MR. THOMS: people who I consider friends of mine, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) with whom I practiced law for three and one-half years, my good friend; the member for Mount St. Charles (Mr. Barry) with whom I went to university, with whom I practiced law for some ten years. I know these people. And I hope that everybody in this House is here to do what is right for the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would suggest that it is a great responsibility on all of us and especially on the new members of this House to ensure the people of this Province are proud of the House and proud of its members.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

It being 5:30 P.M., would the hon. member like to adjourn the debate?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, it being 5:30 P.M., I will adjourn the debate at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 5:30 P.M., a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

A matter of debate raised by the hon. the member for Lewisporte.

The hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. P. WHITE: When I brought up this matter earlier in the week and asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook) about it, I did not know at that time that this Reye's syndrome thing was going to occur, and I am sorry that it has become confused, particularly in Central Newfoundland, because it has about to talk about now has absolutely nothing to do with that at all, it is not related and it is a totally separate issue, and I want to make that distinction, because if there is a correlation or a link between any Reye's syndrome that might occur in the Province and any spraying, it is certainly not the kind of spraying that I am talking about in this particular item. What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the blatant destruction of the scenery along the Trans-Canada Highway and other

MR. F. WHITE:

highways in this Province because of a number of factors. We have a situation where forest fires have destroyed large parts of the Province and I know it is damaging in terms of the economy but, also, in terms of the scenery it is also very damaging and there is very little we can do about that. There is also the budworm damage that has caused a great deal of destruction across Newfoundland, and you will see dead trees everywhere as you drive along. There are also the construction activities that are going on, and I must say that the new upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway when it is completed should be very good and it is starting to look good at that, but now we have another situation where Newfoundland Light and Power and Hydro are spraying the shrubs and trees along large sections of the Trans-Canada Highway and those shrubs and trees are dying almost immediately and it is looking pretty bad. I think that home members who drive back and forth to their districts would agree that East of Gander towards Glovertown and into the Terra Nova National Park area one whole section, one whole side of the Trans-Canada Highway is practically black, and it has been caused by a substance known as Picloram. It is sort of a solid pellet kind of substance that is sprayed on the ground. It goes down into the ground and kills the roots of the trees and shrubs and results in those things turning black.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government should halt the spraying of this kind of thing on sections of the transmission lines that border on the Trans-Canada Highway. I think it is probably okay to do it along transmission lines throughout the wilderness in wooded areas that are not visible to the Trans-Canada Highway and that would be fine. But I think that once the transmission line comes to the Trans-Canada Highway a halt should be put to it there and it should not be permitted to continue, because it is destroying the environment and goodness knows, we should be concerned about that now. I think a better solution would be for the companies concerned, the government, or

MR. WHITE: someone to hire people to cut the trees and shrubs that are causing problems with the transmission line and do away with this blatant destruction that is really disrupting our scenery and I know is going to cause problems down the road in terms of the tourist business. So I hope that when the hon. Lady from Gander (Mrs. Newhook) speaks to this, that she makes a statement that the government are indeed going to stop this kind of activity and not permit companies to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Now, Mr. Speaker, although I am not absolutely sure, because my department has not had the time to investigate the area to which the hon. member refers, it does seem as if this might be the transmission right-of-way of Newfoundland Light and Power. Now, I am advised by my officials that Tordin-T-10-K is being used by Newfoundland Light and Power and Hydro for which these companies are properly licensed and the chemical is approved by our department. Now, I do realize that the alternatives to chemical treatment are mechanical or manual cutting. Now, Highways at present do carry out some mechanical cutting using greater mounted hydraulic rotary cutters. The utilities, of course, cannot use this type of equipment which can only operate within thirty feet of roadsides. They then can only employ manual brush and cutting methods, and although I have no data for Newfoundland, Nova Scotia Highways estimated that their cost increased fourfold by a provincial ban on highway brush control. The ban resulted largely as a spin-off of the bud spray controversy. The utilities estimate that a similar ban on their chemical programs would increase costs eight to tenfold. An added consideration is, of course, the worker hazard which accompanies manual use of chainsaws, etc., for brush removal. Workmen's Compensation requires a very high level from employers who have employees involved in this type of work. Also, the cutting of such species as alder stimulates

MRS. NEWHOOK: growth so that after two years the growth is even denser than when they first began. I would also like to point out that at normal application rates, the Tordin does not affect grasses. The object of these right-of-way programs is to leave a ground cover of grasses to minimize erosion. Of course, I have to realize too that the problem associated with almost any herbicide application is brownout, and I think this is what the hon. member is referring to. It is the unsightly dead brush which remains after the herbicide has killed the brush. Such dead brush, it might, it could perhaps, constitute a fire hazard, particularly along the sides of roads, but the agencies involved in brush treatment do not appear to be worried about this, so their experience, we would think, does indicate that the hazard must be small. Now, the requirements attached to utility approvals for right-of-way treatment with Tordin are: number one, public notice of areas to be treated; number two, submission of daily spray log showing areas treated, amount of chemical used, and the type of vegetation present; and number three, no chemical application within 25 meters of an active water body; and no chemical treatment within any park or within 100 meters of a resident without the owner's permission; and number five, the proper disposal of contaminated containers and application equipment and, of course, in view of the recent

MRS. NEWHOOK:

theft along the Trans-Canada we will also be including a stipulation regarding chemical security. Of course, under the act and regulations a licensed applicator must always be present to personally supervise operations. Now, I am advised that if this chemical is applied in the Fall it is not very effective because there is little growth during this time of year. So early Spring seems to be the best time. The users are not required to cleanup the brownout which eventually follows such applications. I have to agree that there is no stipulation that they must do this.

I was talking with my Deputy Minister and he said that some years ago our department stipulated that a green screen be left between the right of ways and the highway but this was not always possible and it was costly and the hydro and utilities companies complained because of the cost and it was abandoned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Perhaps I just might inform the House that tonight at the Colonial Building at seven thirty the Social Services Committee will be meeting and they will be considering the estimates of the Department of Social Services and the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: I have not been informed as to where I think the

~~hon. members have decided that they will resume again on Monday and~~

I will give the -

PREMER PECKFORD: No sitting tomorrow, tomorrow's Committee.

On motion, the House at its rising
do now stand adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.

VOL. 1

NO. 14

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

AUGUST 2, 1979

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

- (1) Since January, 1972, what lawyers or law firms within the Province of Newfoundland have been engaged to carry on legal work for the Workmen's Compensation Board of Newfoundland, showing the amount paid during the said period to each lawyer or law firm and the nature of the legal work carried out by each?
- (2) Similar information as in (1) above for the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation; Department of Finance; Linerboard Mill; Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation (Western Newfoundland); Medical Care Commission.

Workmen's Compensation Board

1972 - Thomas E. Williams, Consultation with Safety Officers, drafting summons and attendance at Court.	\$ 157.00
Thomas E. Williams, Drafting Amendments to Workmen's Compensation Act	100.00
Thomas E. Williams, Consultations, written opinions and drafting letters on various matters.	245.00
Thomas E. Williams, Third Party cases, drafting summons, opinions and attendance at Court.	340.50
Thomas E. Williams, Consultations, Third Party claim and safety writs for construction projects.	220.00
Williams & Williams, Drafting Sub-lease of rental space	760.00
Williams & Williams, Attendance at Workmen's Compensation Board Inquiry - Sept. to December	<u>4,125.00</u>
	<u>\$5,947.50</u>

Workmen's Compensation Board

1973 - Stirling, Ryan, Goodridge, Caule, Gushue & Goodridge, representing Mr. Leonard Hughes, Commissioner at Workmen's Compensation Board Inquiry .	\$ 175.00
Williams & Williams, Consultation and Research.	337.50
Williams & Williams, Consultation, Travelling, serving of summons and attendance at Court in respect of Construction Projects Limited.	1,101.96
Williams & Williams, Meetings with Board, drafting opinion and research.	160.00
Williams & Williams, Research, drafting and legal opinion.	325.00
Williams & Williams, Legal opinions and consultations.	159.00
Williams & Williams, Legal opinion Conflict of Interest Act. Consultation on two claims.	285.00
Williams & Williams, Legal opinions, prosecutions, Third Party case, drafting of letters.	580.00
	<u>580.00</u>
	<u>\$3,123.46</u>

Workmen's Compensation Board

1974 - Williams & Williams, Consultation and opinion on claim.	\$ 50.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Consultation and opinion on claim.	20.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Researching, drafting and legal opinion.	160.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Legal research and legal opinion on claim.	340.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Prosecutions, attendance at Court.	350.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Prosecutions, attendance at Court, legal opinion and acquiring Commissioner of Oaths.	565.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Legal opinion research and prosecutions.	541.40
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Third Party case.	40.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Registry Search and legal opinion.	75.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Report and legal opinion.	350.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Legal fees, travelling expenses, prosecution at Harbour Grace.	845.25
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Prosecutions 1973 and 1974.	<u>1,471.50</u>
	<u><u>\$4,808.15</u></u>

Workmen's Compensation Board

1975 - Williams, Williams & Coombs, Professional advice on claim.	\$ 60.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Retainer fee April 1975 to April 1976.	5,000.00
Williams, Williams & Coombs; Prosecutions and attendance at Court.	158.50
Williams, Williams & Coombs, preparation and issuance of writ. Obtaining of default judgement.	100.45
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Prosecution and attendance at Court - Fatal claim.	1,247.74
Williams, Williams & Coombs, Drafting of Agreement in connection with a claim.	75.00
	<u>75.00</u>
	<u>\$6,641.69</u>

Workmen's Compensation Board

1977 - Williams, Williams & Buffett - Collection of an employer's unpaid assessment, including Registry search, preparation of Writ, consultation, attendance at Sheriff's office re execution of Writ.	\$1,960.50
Williams, Williams & Buffett - letters written to employers who neglected to file accident reports with the Board.	105.00
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Retainer fee March 31, 1977 to March 31, 1978.	5,000.00
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Collection of an unpaid assessment, including preparation and issuance of Writ, Court attendance, instructions given to Sheriff re execution of Writ, fees paid to Court and Sheriff's office.	1,096.89
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Collection of an unpaid assessment, attendance at Court, Registry search, preparation of fifa, consultations.	84.50
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Collection of an unpaid assessment, fees paid to District Court and Sheriff's office re issuance and serving of fifa.	673.46
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Prosecutions, consultations, serving of summonses.	400.00
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Re Cape Royal Disaster - obtaining Presumption of Death Orders, Drawing petitions and Affidivats., Drawing Presumption of Death Orders, attendance before Chief Justice, consultations.	1,526.75
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Legal fees and transactions re purchase of property on Forest Road re new office building	5,092.22
	<u>\$15,939.32</u>

Workmen's Compensation Board

1978 - Williams, Williams & Buffett - Retainer fee March 31, 1978 to March 31, 1979	\$5,000.00
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Disbursements re obtaining documents on a claim	18.60
Williams, Williams & Buffett - letters written to employers who neglected to file accident reports with the Board.	75.00
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Drawing summons, affidavits, attendance on Judge for issuance of Mechanics Lien on Metalcraft Limited, attendance at Registry of Deeds, consultations.	122.00
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Filing Certificate with District Court in respect of an unpaid assessment in an attempt to collect.	30.00
Williams, Williams & Buffett - Collection of an unpaid assessment, filing of Certificate in District Court, Drafting Writ of fifa, attendance at Court, attendance at Sheriff's office re levying of fifa, fees paid for the issuance and serving of fifa.	234.28
	<hr/>
	\$5,479.88
	<hr/> <hr/>

SELKOFF RECOMMENDATIONS BALE VERIE

July 21/79.
The Lon -
? ? ? ? ?
Reply to questions

Analysis of present industrial hygiene practice: -

Since the first meeting July 7th, 1978 of the tripartite committee the fibre sampling by Company, Union and Government has improved. The mines inspection branch has developed a Code of Practice which includes standards of exposure to dust as acceptable in the asbestos industry. Dust levels are determined by methods to be followed by those monitoring. Company, Union and the Inspectorate are requested to meet periodically to discuss the Code and from these meetings the minister may adopt and publish changes or modification of the Code.

Control of dust from the tailings; several programs have been carried out but complete elimination of dust from this area has not yet been successful. Company is presently using an automatic sprinkler system which was about 60-70% effective. The Company and Government are studying all methods of dust control of the tailings.

RESPIRATORY PROGRAM: -

Both Company and Union have been educating the work force on the necessity of wearing masks especially in the dusty areas of the operation. The type of masks used has been studied and improvements recommended.

DUST EDUCATION PROGRAM: -

Both Company and Union have renewed their efforts in educating the workers of the hazards of asbestos and the necessity of good housekeeping and personal hygiene while on the job.

ACCEPTABLE DUST LEVELS: -

The standards for dust levels are these as set up by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (A.C.G.I.H.) namely 5 fibres per c.c. The Government Hygienists has indicated from his continuing studies that the actual levels obtained are lower than 5 fibres per c.c. i.e. 2 fibres per c.c. in most of this operation. This is due to the improved engineering efforts by the Company since the recommendations were made.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS: -

Road reconstruction has been started by Government and will be continuing during the 1979-80 period.

Dry Rock Storage Control Systems has been completed.

Car washing facilities completed and operating since June 1979.

Change house facilities has been started and is due for completion in October 1979.

CONTROL OF EMISSIONS FROM MINE AND MILL: -

Primary crusher modifications have been completed. Also dust control for the secondary crusher and dryer building has been completed reducing the amount of dust in the ambient air.

The Department of Consumer Affairs and the Environment, now that control of emissions has been completed by the Company intend to set up a monitoring program either late this year or early 1980. These figures will be compared to those obtained in 1974 and 1975 and indicate the effectiveness of emission control achieved by the Company. It is intended that all these figures will be submitted to the Union and the Company.

MEDICAL SURVEILLANCE: -

The annual miner's medical examinations continue. The physicians doing the examinations in Baie Verte intend to add to their examination, collection of sputum for cytology (cancer cells in sputum). These medical examinations of all dust exposed workers are mandatory under Regulations and a medical certificate is issued after each annual examination. These certificates are kept in file by the Company and are available for inspection by the inspection branch of the Occupational Health and Safety Division,

HOUSEHOLD MONITORING: -

Some supervisor's houses in Baie Verte have been monitored for fibre counts with negative results. The tripartite committee agreed that the existing equipment for monitoring in-plant counts was not suitable for households, so this recommendation would be left until a later date. As a result of this

decision the recommendation of a pilot study of household contacts would also be left until a later date.

REGISTER: -

The Company has on file the names of all workers who have been employed in the Advocate Operation since 1963. Files of 1600 workers which includes the present work force, are being processed so that a central register may be established in the Occupational Health and Safety Division. The names, medical certificate numbers and occupations held of all the workers will be stored with each individuals chest x-ray in a place to be designated in the new building in St. John's.

SPECIAL X-RAY EQUIPMENT: -

Dr. McLoughlan, Professor of Radiology, Memorial University Medical School, was requested to study this recommendation and suggested the following;

- (1) Existing X-Ray equipment is satisfactory.
- (2) Improvements would depend on type of film used.
- (3) Manner of developing X-Rays.
- (4) Use of screens.
- (5) Improvements in the quality of X-Rays noted with improved techniques.

EDUCATION PROGRAM: -

Efforts to inform the workforce on the hazards of asbestos handling has been accelerated both by Company and Union and Government inspectorate. Programs have been designed to help workers to cease smoking. The Company is considering banning all smoking in any areas of its operation.

The tripartite committee consisting of equal members from the Company, Union and Government was established in 1978 and held meetings in Baie Verte and St. John's on July 7th, 1978, November 15th, 1978, May 15th, 1979 and will meet again October or November 1979 in Baie Verte.

D.B. Colohan
Aug 2/79.