

PRELIMINARY
UNCREDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

MONDAY, AUGUST 6, 1979

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I should like

to address a question or two to the Premier with regard to the operation of the committee system, for clarification purposes and also so that we can continue with the commitment that we have made to try our very best to make the system work. I have two questions, the first, in connection with the Department of Transportation and Communications. I understand that the minister in committee has declined to give a comprehensive and total list of work actually underway throughout the Province during the current construction year, the explanation being that we can look through the tender lists or we can through a variety of ways find out what is happening. It seems to me that this is a very, not only burdensome, but quite unreasonable position to take, that it is a matter of public record just what work is being done, and I ask the hon. the Premier whether he will in fact, either himself or through his minister provide this comprehensive list of just exactly what is being done. I emphasize that certainly construction is not something you can carry on in secret. There should not be any reason why we cannot have it in some comprehensive form rather than have to search through every tender call that has been made.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, was there a

second part to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question?

MR. JAMIESON:

I was going to have it

as a supplementary.

August 6, 1979

Tape No. 546

AH-2

PREMIER PECKFORD: I see. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for - I hope he does advise me soon that to his right is his spokesman also when other people over here rise to their feet.

MR. S. NEARY: Do no be nasty! Do not be nasty!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the Leader of the Opposition's question, I shall take the matter under advisement and give the Leader of the Opposition tomorrow.

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

MR. JAMIESON: The second issue has to do with the matter of whether or not officials will be permitted, on the instructions of their minister, and can be permitted in committee, to answer questions. It is my understanding that in at least two of the committees this has been done, has worked very well, very effectively, and that in a third committee, the committee I believe headed by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), that despite the willingness of the minister to have his officials answer specific questions - not on policy, I emphasize; we understand that it has to be at the authorization of the minister - but will the Premier tell me if his understanding is the same as mine, that

MR. JAMIESON: if an official is present and the minister is prepared to let him answer a question which is within his competence, if it is his understanding that that is how the committee system should work and does, indeed, work in most jurisdictions?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, not knowing that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was going to ask a question dealing with the rules of the committees, I am not in a position right now to give him a detailed answer. I can express opinions all I like, I do not know what the rule says there on that a committee may not question public servants except through the minister and may not call witnesses. Now I do not know how one needs to interpret that, but let me say to the Leader of the Opposition that on this point, as well, I will take it under advisement and give the Leader of the Opposition an answer tomorrow.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Premier. I was not unaware of, nor am I arguing the fundamental Standing Order. What I am saying is that it has proved to be quite effective and in, I believe, most cases ministers have agreed that it makes some sense in technical issues and the like, with their authorization, for individuals to answer. And I suggest to the hon. the Premier and perhaps to the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that in fact, since it has worked in two committees and since the ministers, themselves, appear to be willing, that there seems to be no good reason why we should not arrive at that kind of an understanding in the interests of making the committee system work.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of understanding, and I did not know when the Leader of the Opposition spoke first, because he did not preface his remarks by saying that the rules notwithstanding that some agreement between both sides outside the rules as they now exist should be made, and I am willing to entertain that. And as I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition, I will give him an answer tomorrow.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

LaPoile.

A supplementary, the hon. the member for

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier undertake also to find out if the refusal on the part of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) to table a list of names of people who received loans from the Rural Development Authority is in order and in keeping with the proper procedures of this hon. House?

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order on this.

MR. SPEAKER:

of the Council.

A point of order, the hon. the President

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I can appreciate the questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition as they were immediate, but I would suggest that the question that is now being asked by the member for LaPoile is really asking the hon. the Premier for an interpretation, really, of the rules themselves, and we do have provision in the rules for concurrence debates at which time any matter that was in the committee that was not dealt with to the satisfaction of members can be drawn before the House itself at the time. But I do not think it is—and I think that that could appropriately be brought up before the House at that particular time. But the question that we have before the House in the present instance is one really, asking the hon. the Premier for,

PREMIER PECKFORD: relates to certain things, well, then I am only too happy to do it.

MR. S. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seems to be awfully touchy today for some reason or other. What I am asking the hon. gentleman is, is this House -he does not have to ask anybody; the hon. gentleman is the Premier - is this House going to get a list of all the secret loans made to people, and the names of the people they were made to, as the House is entitled to have? For every dollar of public money that is spent, the House is entitled to know how, where and who it was spent on. And that is what I am asking the hon. gentleman. Are we going to get a list of names of the Rural Development loans? And the hon. gentleman need not be so nasty and rude.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question has been asked. The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will take the question under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question directed to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. J. Goudie) in his role as Minister of Agriculture, I guess. I received a call from the sunny area of Bonavista North and they indicate that the blueberry crop, which is very important to that area, is going to be ready for picking much earlier than may be in other parts of the province. They

MR. L. STIRLING:

are concerned that a lot of the berries may rot on the vine if the season is not opened earlier. Would the minister indicate whether or not consideration has been given or is being given to opening the picking season earlier?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, consideration is being given presently to that suggestion that the blueberry season open a little earlier. The bakeapple season opened on the 3rd. of August and I understand that some of the berries on the stems were quite mature and quite ripe at the opening of the season, so they could have been picked a little bit earlier. We are assuming because of the weather conditions this Summer that the same thing may apply to not only the blueberries but the partridge berry - or red berry, if you prefer - may be in the same kind of a position providing weather continues to be the same.

So the staff are looking at the possibility now and hopefully within a day or two we will have an answer or at least the information to determine whether or not we can open the season in advance, but it is being considered presently.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, would the minister care to give us an updating on what is happening in connection with the gold mine in Burnt Island Pond near Isle aux Morts in the district of LaPoile? As the hon. gentleman knows, there has been a company from Quebec drilling there now for the last three or four years, there has been a fair amount of exploration and sampling of the ore and so forth. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what is happening in connection with that discovery of gold down there now on the Southwest corner of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is a little too early to say or to refer to this discovery as a gold mine. We hope it will be a gold mine but there is a lot of work yet to be done before the mineral occurrence can be confirmed as of being of commercial significance. This work is being carried out by Rio-Canex which is a subsidiary of Rio-Algom. The discovery was made at Burnt Island Pond back in 1977. There was a considerable amount of exploration and drilling done last year which was encouraging to the extent that the company is back this year, again spending a considerable amount of money doing further exploration work.

We are not yet in receipt of information on this year's drilling programme. At the end of this Summer, or when they finish their drilling season, we will be supplied with information as to how successful or otherwise the season was and we hope that we will be in a better position to confirm at that time the hon. member's label which he used in the course of the question.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Well, do I understand correctly from the hon. gentleman that this may be the last year of drilling and analyzing the ore and sending the samples to Daniel's Harbour, in Ontario, or wherever they send them, and at the end of this contract, this drilling season, there will be a definite decision made on whether or not the mine will go ahead? Will that be made this year? Is that what I understood from the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. BARRY: As the hon. member can appreciate, this is a decision of the private sector. The company will be deciding based on the information it finds during this drilling season as to whether any further drilling is necessary. It is our understanding, however, that at the end of this drilling season the company should have a good indication as to whether or not it is likely to be a commercial discovery. I cannot be any more definite than that. I cannot say that they will not need another season or part of another season, but in all probability by the end of this year we will know whether we can see the development of a mine in this deposit.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Finance. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether or not the Province has entered into any actual agreement with the federal government to take over, in concert with other provinces, undoubtedly, the Loto Canada operation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the simple answer to that is no, there is no formal agreement. There have been ongoing discussions with the representatives of the federal government over the matter of what should happen to Loto Canada. I understand that Loto Canada operates under an act which extends to the end of this year and there

DR. J. COLLINS: will have to be some decision made before the end of this year what will continue after that. But to date there has been no agreement.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Could he indicate to the House whether the Province has any particular position on the matter? Is the Province courting the possibility of such a takeover by the provinces or could the minister very briefly outline this Province's position in respect to the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, some time ago now I think all the provinces have indicated to the federal government that they feel the lottery field should be

Dr. Collins: one that should be solely within Provincial jurisdiction. At the present time, I think Canada is somewhat unique in this respect that both levels of government can operate in this area, and I believe there has been unanimity of opinion amongst the provinces that this should revert solely to the Province.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Province, of course, gets some return now I believe in respect to the Loto Canada proceedings or their revenue generates. I am wondering if the minister is in a position to indicate to the House what a proposed takeover by the provinces of Loto Canada would mean in financial terms? Would the Province of Newfoundland be in a better position in terms of receipts from Loto Canada than it is at present? Or have the discussions got to the point where they dealt or dwelt in that kind of detail yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the return to the Province is related to two things; firstly, it is related to the number of tickets sold in a particular province, and secondly, it is related to the formula whereby the total amount is split up amongst the provinces. I believe last year the Province of Newfoundland received something like \$100,000, something in that area. So it was a fairly small sum. The anticipation, I think it is a fair statement to say that the anticipation would be that if the provinces took over this there would possibly not be a greater number of sales in the province, but there would be a difference in the split. And I think it is a fair statement to say that the anticipation would be that Newfoundland would get more out of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains is about to stand, I believe.

The hon. member.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). I understand on Friday the gravel pit at North West River was closed at a request from the Montagnais-Naskaupi Innu Association. Could the minister advise us if that gravel pit has been reopened or if there are some other alternatives arranged?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe that comes under the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). I am aware of the fact that there was a group who wanted the gravel pit closed. I was not, in fact, aware that it had been closed because I was on the West Coast all Friday afternoon, so therefore I am not aware if it is open again or not. I do not know if the problem still exists.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary. The hon. member for Tornqat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the question of the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy? But it is a gravel pit used to put gravel on a highway, so I presumed I was asking the question to the right channel, but if the Minister of Mines and Energy can answer, by all means.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, although it is gravel for the highway it is necessary to have a quarry permit obtained. We understand that although a request was made for a quarry permit, that in fact the permit had not been issued at the time that work had commenced in the quarry, and I have asked the officials of the department to investigate just what took place at the site. Normally the procedure is to check with the various town councils involved to determine if there is any objection on the part of the town council or councils to having the work proceed. As I understand it, there is no objection placed by the town council so in all probability a permit will issue but this has not yet been confirmed.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. member for Tornqat Mountains and then the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, although the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) said there was no disagreement from the town council, I believe there is some concern expressed by the Montagnais Inuit Association because as you know the town council of Northwest River presently only comprises the North side, not the South side, and the gravel pit is located on the South side. So there is some confusion there, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we are getting into the territory of another minister, the Minister of Municipal Affairs,

MR. BARRY:

(Mr.N.Windsor). It was

my understanding that the town council presently covers both sides but that there is some objection on the part of the native people to being included within the town. But as it stands right now my understanding, subject to correction, is that they are still covered by the town council.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member for

Windsor- Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, to the

Minister of Tourism, (Mr.Power). I am wondering about his position with regards to the announcement over the weekend that the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr.McGrath) has reduced the quota for the inland sports salmon fishery from four to two. I am wondering if the minister realizes that may well have some adverse affects on the tourism situation in this Province? I am wondering if the minister had any input into that particular decision and as to whether he agrees with the reduction from four to two, from four salmon to two, in a given day?

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

MR. C. POWER: We were in full consultation with the Federal Minister of Fisheries on cutting back of the sports salmon fishing. Obviously we, as a Department of Tourism, are not overly happy with the idea of cutting the salmon from an average of four per day to two allowable catch, but we do also fully concur with the Federal Minister of Fisheries that if something is not done to preserve the Atlantic salmon then it might be possible next year that there will be no sports salmon fishing at all. So we, I suppose, take it for what it is worth and we say it is better to have two catch allowed per day than none at all.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: I wonder if the minister has prepared, or has he decided, on the legal definition of a grilse? Now we are told that the limit from now on will be two grilse per day, grilse being small salmon. Depending on the interpretation, is the minister prepared to give a legal description or definition of a grilse as to whether it is a four and a half pound fish, a five pound fish, a three and a half pound fish?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. POWER: It is my understanding that the definition of a grilse is a small salmon that weighs less than six pounds.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Will the minister then undertake, as Minister of Tourism, to indicate to the sport fishery and sports fishermen in this province that a grilse is any fish less than six pounds? And then as an aside, Mr. Speaker, would the minister also indicate to the people interested in the sports salmon fishery that having been unlucky enough—lucky enough up to this point in time but unlucky enough as of today, or as of Saturday—to hook a ten or twelve or fifteen pound salmon, play it for forty-five minutes when he can finally get it off the hook, realizing that it is dead anyway, will he advise him as to whether he is going to throw it back or keep it as a result of having been unlucky enough to hook it?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what to do with the fellow who had a ten or twelve pound salmon. I will certainly undertake to confer with the Federal Minister of Fisheries. Now, as you are aware, the jurisdiction for salmon fishing is a little bit unusual in Newfoundland where the provincial government has control over licencing but the federal government really has jurisdiction over enforcing it. We will certainly get our officials to confer with federal officials as to the definition of what constitutes a small salmon or grilse, whether it is six pounds or five pounds, and I am fairly certain that nobody has been prosecuted over the weekend for catching a twelve pound salmon.

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

MR. JAMIESON: If the House will permit I hope that also it will be, this may very well prove to be a restraint on the kind of line that goes on, about this number and size of salmon that people catch. But my real question is for the hon. the Premier, because it involved a number of departments. Over the weekend I had another meeting with regard to the future of the Come By Chance oil refinery and there is a genuine confusion which I hope can be cleared up, I do not know by whom and perhaps it may well be a statement that may be necessary. Earlier last week I asked the Minister of Finance if the only thing that was standing in the way was the environmental study and I not have Sansard in front of me but I believe he said that that was the case. Now on Friday the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked a question about whether a contract existed

MR. JAMIESON: for the supply of this crude oil which is going to create the environmental problem. At that stage, again if I got the reports correctly, the hon. the Premier indicated that he was not aware of such a contract. My question is this: Has, in fact, everything been put in place? That is, do we know that the First Arabian Corporation has the oil and if it is acceptable from an environmental standpoint the project can go ahead? There is a very genuine amount of confusion on this point and I hope it can be cleared up.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) or myself over the last number of weeks have tried to leave the impression that there only two things and everything was firm and fast. What we are saying is that there are two major things left to be ironed out. We have had extensive negotiations with First Arabian Corporation and Ashland Oil as it relates to a lot of the other factors and we are relatively assured that all of these factors can be ironed out. Now when we get down to crossing the 't's and dotting the 'i's, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, there might be other questions to come up on a lot of these points. As of this point in time, the financing and the environment are the two major problems that the government is addressing and why we charged an independent environmental study, that we feel relatively sure that the crude oil can be secured by First Arabian Corporation. Now I went on to say on Friday that before we would sign, and cross the 't's and dot the 'i's, we would make sure that that was so. But we are relatively assured, relatively confident, that First Arabian can deliver crude oil to Come By Chance and that the two major areas that we are exploring at some depth were the environment and the whole question of financing as that related to the pay back to the Province of Newfoundland on the outstanding money now owed.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. the Premier that the issue is so important that I am not asking it in any

MR. JAMIESON: argumentative way at all, but there is a genuine confusion. And I apologize for not having the direct quote in front of me, but I would ask members to recall that I believe the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) made it fairly clear, as again the Premier has today, that the Premier is reasonably satisfied that the supply of oil is available. What I am asking- because there is a genuine sense of concern in the area.- whether it is justified or not, I am not in a position to say- that in fact First Arabian is a long way from having just a crossed 't' or a dotted 'i' with regard to this supply, that the whole question has been thrown into some jeopardy by recent events in the Middle East and the like and that in fact we may be spending a lot of money on the environmental studies - this is the argument I am getting - without really knowing whether, in fact, that high sulphur content oil is going to be available even if it can be proven to be environmentally satisfactory. That is the basis of the worry.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, to that, all I can say to the Leader of the Opposition is that to our knowledge, there is no problem with crude oil supply.

Premier Peckford:

Now, you know, I do not where that rumour is coming from, that suddenly now there is a problem in the Middle East and therefore the crude oil supply is not as readily available as it would otherwise be and so on. I mean, I am not free to sort of comment on that. All I can say is as of this date to my knowledge the crude oil supply is secure as it was when we initially began negotiations with the First Arabian Corporation, and that was fairly secure, and that the two major problems are the financing and the environment.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Once again, in a search for clarity here. I wonder if in a very simple, straightforward way whether it would be possible, in fact, to indicate that a contract has been shown to the Government of Newfoundland, or to one of its ministers, which confirms this? I should emphasize by the way, that I can assure the hon. the Premier that my sources are good in this regard. They are in the oil industry and, well, very comprehensive that a lot of things have been thrown into jeopardy in the last three or four months. So it is quite simple, is there a contract, a piece of paper which First Arabian is able to show to the government or to the trustees or whoever which says, in fact, yes here is an assurance that this oil is going to be available, or is it something less specific than that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no piece of paper which Ashland Oil or the First Arabian Corporation has shown the government. Ashland Oil has -

MR. JAMIESON: That is it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - extensive interest in the Middle East and are negotiating for oil purchases every day. But there is no sheet of paper up to this point in time. We have been assured of a crude oil supply, and that is what led to my comment of the other day,

Premier Peckford: because there was no sheet of paper that before we would sign finally cross the 't' s and dot the 'i' s , be satisfied with the financial arrangement, be satisfied with the environmental arrangement, that some of the other things dealing with FIRA, dealing with municipal taxation, dealing with the wharf, dealing with the land acquisition down the road for expansion which are all issues that we think can be resolved easily, that we will have to go through all of those again just to assure ourselves that we are on safe ground, and that is where the crude oil supply lies, in that kind of area. But if the hon. Leader of the Opposition has additional information which he thinks the government should have from oil interests, I would be very appreciative if he could provide me with the information because, you know, we would like to know about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, a question Friday from the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), a series of questions relating to a study, fluorides in the Long Harbour area. I have some information, but I am not able to give the specific answers that were requested.

First of all I want to make a couple of points: one is that the Task Force ruled out any detrimental affect to human health caused by fluoride emissions into the environment. That was the first thing, I think, that they found from there. And that was the major reason why the Task Force was

MR. W. HOUSE: and that was the major reason why the Task Force was put into effect.

On the broader aspect of Occupational Environment issues, the Task Force made a number of recommendations which were alluded to, I believe it was thirty-odd recommendations. The majority of the recommendations were the in-plant conditions which potentially could affect the health of the people working in the plant, that was the majority of the recommendations.

And, of course, the last part of the question asked if the company was living up to their obligations. The company has responded in a positive manner but the follow-up to these recommendations, of course, is to ensure ERCO's compliance is the responsibility of the Occupational Health and Safety that comes under the Department of Labour and Manpower. And similarly, the other recommendations relating to the ongoing monitoring in the air and water, that comes under the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment. As far as we were concerned we were responsible for getting the study going and helping to monitor and it is our understanding that recommendations are being implemented according to a schedule which is acceptable to the department's concerned.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, there is a question on the Order Paper today, Question No. 33 and I am at a loss to know why it is there because I am sure the people of Little Harbour East have been aware for quite some time now that the contract for the upgrading and paving of the Little Harbour East Road has been let to Viking Construction, the road is already re-constructed and hopefully the pavement will be done before the end of September.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. C. BRETT: Yes, we gave it to them out of tender.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. member for Fortune -
Hermitage.

MR. D. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 300 residents of Terrenceville and surrounding communities. The prayer of the petition reads as follows, "We, the undersigned residents of Terrenceville and the surrounding communities make strong recommendations to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador that they will give immediate action to the Terrenceville road. This road, completed in 1940, is the oldest road on the Burin Peninsula and for the past thirty-nine years has received little or no attention. This road also acts as a very important transportation link for the Fortune - Hermitage district in that 75 per cent of the people travelling to St. John's from Seal Cove, Fortune Bay to Terrenceville, thirteen communities, travel by CN Coastal to Terrenceville and then by road to St. John's." I would like for this petition to be placed on the Table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I want with all of the vehemence that I can command to support this petition. I think it is an absolute disgrace that this government has over the years so totally neglected that road from the Burin Peninsula Highway down to Terrenceville. Furthermore, it is, if I may say so, it is in large measure, too, a breach of faith because there was a clear-cut understanding, about which I am more familiar than anyone in this House, that when the Burin Peninsula Highway was completed that the access roads from the Burin Peninsula Highway would be dealt with expeditiously by the Government of Newfoundland. That was done, in fact, I believe it would be possible to find it in writing in an understanding between the Federal and the Provincial Governments.

August 6, 1979

Tape No. 556

DW - 3

MR. D. JAMIESON: Now, this is not just another piece of highway. We are all aware that there are a lot of gravel roads in Newfoundland that need desperately to be upgraded and we will be talking more about that later, but Terrenceville is also the main access point for the whole of the Southcoast much of which continues to need boat transportation to join up and link with this road at Terrenceville and it is not only hazardous but apart altogether from that it is a most uncomfortable drive. I have made it dozens, literally hundreds of times myself and

MR. D. JAMIESON: I fail to understand why it is so low on the government's list of priorities that year after year after year the same kinds of petitions are presented and no action whatever results on this particular piece of highway, so I am quite delighted to support this petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order 3.
Committee of Ways and Means. The
Budget debate.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. Premier is in his seat today to hear what I am going to say in connection with the Budget that was brought down last week in this hon. House or the week before last. I hope the hon. gentleman does not get up and leave now before I get started because I have a few things to say to the hon. gentleman in connection with the Budget and various and sundry other matters because, Mr. Speaker, this debate so far, the Budget debate, seems more like a Throne Speech debate than it does a Budget debate. A lot of new members have taken advantage of the Budget debate, in view of the fact that the House may close down shortly, to make their maiden speeches in the House with very little reference to the Budget, reference to just about everything under the sun and that is the way it should be. There is nothing wrong with that. The Budget debate is a very wide-ranging debate and hon. members who participate in the debate can range far afield. They can almost please themselves. They can talk about everything under the sun providing it is within the rules of this hon. House. And I congratulate all those fine gentlemen who have made their maiden speeches and talked about just about everything under the sun except

MR. S. NEARY: the Budget. The hon. gentleman, I noticed, from Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. N. Doyle) had something to say about the abortion laws in this Province. Well, the hon. gentleman made a very good point and I believe the hon. gentleman, though, would be very well advised if he would take up the matter with his colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House), who seems to have turned a blind eye to abortion in this Province. The whole government, this government has turned a blind eye to abortion in this Province. We have in Newfoundland abortion on demand in case the hon. gentleman is not aware of it, something that we have raised, at least. I have raised in this House for the last two or three years and these committees that were set up in the hospitals are a complete farce. Do not let anybody try and fool the hon. gentleman, he is onto a good thing. But the hon. gentleman is supporting a government that is turning a blind eye to abortion in this Province. And perhaps the hon. gentleman might care to have a few words with his colleagues, the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) about this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about the Budget itself. The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) tried to leave the impression that this was a hold-the-line Budget, a hold-the-line Budget. Well, it is not a hold-the-line Budget, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman should not have tried to delude us into thinking that this is a hold-the-line Budget. The Budget has gone up by somewhere between \$200 and \$300 million this year. The Budget now of this Province, revenue and expenditure, amounts to \$1.4 billion. It is a record. Every year now we are establishing a new record of spending in this Province. This year we will be spending in the vicinity of \$1.4 billion. And that is a record, a new record for Newfoundland. Only three or four years ago the Minister of Finance boasted about the fact that we had our first billion dollar budget in Newfoundland. And three or four years later we are up to \$1.4 billion, we are going to spend

MR. NEARY: this year \$300 million more than we did last year, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) calls it a 'hold-the-line' Budget. I do not know how the hon. gentleman arrived at that conclusion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last seven years in this Province the provincial debt in Newfoundland has trebled. The provincial debt at the moment, according to the minister's own figures in the Estimates, is \$2.6 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to remind hon. gentlemen although we are so lovey-dovey in the House these days, Mr. Speaker, that we are all so interested in co-operation and the like, that you are not allowed to refer to the past; everything in the past, that seven years that we had Mr. Frank Moores Premier of this Province, that seven years has to be blotted out, blotted off the record of Newfoundland. But during that seven years, Mr. Speaker - and the hon. the Premier who now occupies the Premier's chair, when he was a senior minister in the Moores administration, during that period that they want us to forget about, that they want us not to remember, blot it out of your mind, forget about it, sweep it under the rug - that seven years our provincial debt trebled.

When the Tories took over in this Province in 1972 on January 18th - which in my opinion was a sorry day for Newfoundland - on January 18, 1972, the provincial debt in this Province was \$700 million, total, direct and indirect debt owing by the people of this Province. And I remember Crosbie, who is now Finance Minister up in Ottawa, ranting and raving and bellyaching and preaching his doom and gloom that the Province was bankrupt. I remember the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who is now President of the Council, telling us in this Chamber - those of us who were here then - that the Province was bankrupt, there was no way we could survive; Smallwood was gone mad, gone crazy, gone on a spending spree, was spending it like a drunken sailor. And I want to remind hon. gentlemen that the debt at that time was \$700 million - \$700 million total debt. Seven years later under a Tory regime the debt of the Province is \$2.6 billion, three times more than it was in 1972, and we do not have one thing to show for it, nothing. All we have is a long list of failures, mismanagement

MR. NEARY: and the most corrupt government in the whole of Newfoundland and probably in the whole of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is what we have to show for it. And that is what they want us to forget. We are supposed to push that out of our minds. We are not supposed to bring that up. What we are supposed to do now is to come in and co-operate, and if we keep that up, Mr. Speaker, what we will be doing shortly, as I told a newsmen over the weekend, we will hear the Strauss waltz music coming in through the loudspeaker of Confederation Building right here in the Chamber, and we will all go over and grab somebody on the other side and we will all waltz around the floor of the Chamber to the Strauss waltz music. It will probably be the last tango. And they are all so pleased about this. No wonder -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Save the last waltz for me.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is what we will be hearing, 'Save the last dance for me.' I do not know who is going to have the last dance.

MR. MORGAN: The heat is getting to you.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not the heat that is getting to me. I will tell you what is getting to me, it is what this crowd are getting away with - that is what is getting to me - while we sit here and preach co-operation and everybody is going to be lovey-dovey. And I must say, it is the first time in my life I ever had to agree with Mr. Wick Collins when he came out and said, 'The Opposition today are too soft.' And the Opposition are getting too soft, Sir, with all due respect to my colleagues - not all of them, but there are a few who are getting too soft.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you can argue all you like about 'Maybe it is too early; maybe we should give the government a chance; maybe we should give the new Premier a chance.' You can use the argument, 'Well, a year or two from now or maybe a year before the election it is time to talk about Mount Scio House, it is time to talk about mismanagement,

August 6, 1979

Tape 558

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:

it is time to talk about corruption.'

Well, I say to that, Mr. Speaker, balderdash! When you are talking about extravagance and waste and mismanagement and failures

MR. NEARY: and mistakes that are costing the people of this Province a small fortune, YOU deal with it now. You do not wait until a year or so before an election, or you do not wait to give everybody a chance and then bring it up. Because right now we are in the middle of Summer and there is no election on, and it is going to be three or four years before we have another election, SO you have to sweep it all under the rug. Well, Mr. Speaker, there may be those who subscribe to that philosophy but from what I have said hon. gentlemen may realize that I am not one of these people, I think these situations have to be dealt with now. I think, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the party is over. The party is over and one of the great problems facing this Province is our provincial debt which is now \$2.6 billion, trebled in the last seven years and that is not funny. And money is going to be harder to get and with the devaluation of the American dollar, Mr. Speaker, we are paying through the nose for the money that we are borrowing and we cannot keep it up much longer. We are told now that there is likely to be a major recession in the United States, one of the major sources of our money when we float a bond issue. One of the major sources of money is the millionaires, the ~~moneybags~~ down in the United States. But now we are told there is going to be a recession in the United States and it is going to have devastating effects in Canada, because Mr. Speaker, any ignoramous at all in this world knows that the steel industry are the leaders, that the steel industry sets the pace in the United States and in Canada. Because what happens in the United States overflows into Canada.

Now there is a slump in the automotive industry and Chrysler are talking about shutting down. Why it is enough to frighten you, Mr. Speaker. Chrysler are talking about shutting down and Ford are laying off 500 or 600 people and Quebec is trying to make a bid to get the Chrysler Corporation to move into the Province of Quebec. And the things that are happening, Mr. Speaker, are very demoralizing and that recession is going to have its effect right here in this Province and that is why I say, Sir, the party is over. The party is over as far

MR. NEARY: as living high off the hog is concerned and what we are going to have to do in this Province, Sir, we are going to have to keep a sharp eye on our Provincial debt. It is too high now. Newfoundlanders are paying the highest taxes in the whole of Canada. We have record unemployment. We have very slow growth. This year I think the Minister of Finance forecast that we would have about a 3 per cent increase in our Gross Provincial Product and I doubt very much if we will have that. I believe 3.5 per cent the hon. gentleman forecast, and I doubt very much if we will have that.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to stay on this wild hinge that the Tories have been on for the last six or seven years and who used to condemn Joey Smallwood for driving the Provincial debt up to \$700 million and I do not have to remind hon. gentlemen that when Mr. Smallwood did it it was shortly after Confederation when we needed hospitals and schools and roads and industry in this Province and I could go on with a whole list the length of this Chamber, Sir. All the schools that were built in Newfoundland, new schools, the university was built by the Liberal Party, the schools, every hospital in Newfoundland was either started or built by a Liberal Administration. The Trans-Canada Highway was built by a Liberal Administration. Every fish plant, Sir, every fish plant - and we hear the criticism -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) go on, every fine hall.

AN HON. MEMBER: Big fire halls.

MR. NEARY: - every fish plant in Newfoundland was built by a Liberal Administration, every fish plant, and in the mid sixties twenty-six of them, twenty-six fish plants in this Province were on the verge of bankruptcy, they were bankrupt and the government had to bail them out. So every industry, every mine, every paper mill, just about every school, every hospital, the university the Trans-Canada Highway, the Cement mill, Labrador City, Wabush, you can go on, blah, blah.

August 6, 1979

Tape No. 559

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: blah, forever, you can go on about
the list of accomplishments of the Liberal Party and the Liberal
government in this Province. But after spending \$2.6 billion and ~~trebling~~
our Provincial debt in seven years, the Tories do not have one thing,
Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: they do not have one item they can point their finger to and say, "Look, this has been a success."

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) pave any roads, no schools (inaudible) no water systems (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: All they did, Mr. Speaker, in case chaw-mouth wants to know, Sir, all they did was continue building on a foundation that the Liberals had passed over to them. That is what they did, Sir. Did they pave any roads? They paved the roads that were on the drawing boards, that were going to be paved anyway. They finished the Carbonear Hospital. They finished the hospital in Twillingate. They finished the Health Sciences Complex that we had started, that the Liberals had started. So they do not have one item that they can point their finger to. No new mines, no new fish plants, no new paper mills. They have not even been able to keep the industries going that were started and the oil refinery is a good example of that. And in case the hon. the Premier, who is in a rather fousty mood today, in case he is interested, the oil agreement that he is talking about with the First Arabian Corporation, the oil supply he is talking about is an oil supply that will come from only two places in the world. It is a crude oil that has a high sulphur content. And in order for the Premier, who thinks that he is the Premier of the First Arabian Corporation, that he will deal with nobody else but the First Arabian Corporation, that he will deal with nobody else who has a better deal for Newfoundland, that he is going to stick with the First Arabian Corporation through thick and thin, no matter what happens he is going to stick with the First Arabian Corporation even if it means spending extra money down in Boston to have an environmental study done because the only crude they can get is of a high sulphur content. And that is why the hon. gentleman is spending that money, the taxpayers' money, and there is no need of it because there is another proposal where they

MR. NEARY: have a firm contract for a supply of sweet crude. And the only thing that this crude the hon. gentleman is referring to in answering questions in the House this afternoon, that crude only comes from two small countries in the world and most of the oil refineries will not buy it. You will choke if they use it in Come By Chances. You will choke. It is only used throughout the world as a flux to sweeten up oil that comes from the Opec countries. And this high sulphur oil, crude oil the hon. gentleman is talking about is not coming from the Opec countries, it is coming from a little place right in between Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, a little dot on the map, you can hardly see it, that cannot sell oil throughout the world. They cannot sell it because it is of such a high sulphur content. Yet, the Premier of this Province who thinks he is married to Mr. Tamraz and thinks he is Premier of the First Arabian Corporation, refuses to deal with anybody else. That hon. gentleman has now hired a firm down in Boston to do an environmental study just so he can enter into an agreement with his buddies. "To hell with the people of the Province, that is what the hon. gentleman is saying, I do not care who got a better deal. We are not going to deal with that old Shaheen, that rotten, corrupt individual who was brought in here by Mr. Smallwood. We are not going to have anything to do with him. He may have the best deal in the interest of the people of this Province. He may have a crude oil contract"- and the hon. gentleman screws up his face. The hon. gentleman better read the two proposals. He better read the two of them as I did. There is no comparison, no comparison at all in this world and the crude oil contract is there. But the Hon. gentleman who thinks that he is not - beg your pardon!

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about the \$600

million?

MR. NEARY:

Yes. What about it? Mr.

Speaker, I have gone through that exercise in this House. That \$600 million, by the way - and the hon. gentlemen who were here when

MR. NEARY: the debates took place will remember that when Ataka came into this Province they were dealing with this government, the \$300 million credit that they gave Mr. Shaheen and the oil refinery was on account. It was for future work in this Province. If they were investing in the future of Newfoundland and in the future development of this Province, they were promised the iron ore in case the hon. gentleman does not know it, they were promised the iron ore down at Julianne Lake and that is why they did not mind throwing \$300 million of unsecured money into the oil refinery, providing the shipping and the crude oil. That is why they did not mind doing it, because they were promised by the Premier of this Province who is now gone, who left his dogs up in Mount Scio House before he got kicked out and they did so much damage up there that it is now going to cost

Mr. Neary: the taxpayers of this Province thousands of dollars to replace the carpet, and the things that were torn up in that house, when dogs were left there for three weeks going mad in the house, and when they went over to go into the house you could hardly get in with the stink. That is the gentleman who promised Ataka that he was going to give them the iron ore deposit in Julianne Lake, and that is why they were investing in Newfoundland.

But coming back to the crude oil again, Sir, the only place crude oil is available to the First Arabian Corporation and the hon. gentleman has such a skinful of hate that he does not want to see or hear tell of Mr. Shaheen, even though he may have a better proposal, it may be better for the unsecured creditors, it may be better for the Newfoundland people, it may be better for the Newfoundland economy but they are such a skinful of hate, some of the ministers, they do not want to see this individual, they want to deal with this bankrupt First Arabian Corporation who run a chain of hotels and that is about all they have. And Ashland Oil that the hon. gentleman refers to in his answering questions this afternoon, Ashland Oil are cutting back their own refineries because they have no crude. Why do not hon. gentlemen do a little research, do a little homework and find these things out? It only takes a few phone calls or a few messages around the world, a few telegrams to find out. And then the hon. gentleman would have the facts and they would not be able to look over at me and say, the hon. member for LaPoile is being partisan, this is all politics.

It is not politics, Mr. Speaker. It is not politics. It is a matter of public record in case the hon. gentleman does not know it. All is required is a little research on the part of the hon. gentleman, and then maybe he would not support that government. He would hop over here like a little bunny and sit on this side of the House or maybe one of our co-operative members would go over when the waltz music comes in and they could have a little

Mr. Neary: tango across the floor.

AN HON. MEMBER: The last tango.

MR. NEARY: The last tango. That is right. I do not know who is going to have the last tango.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the biggest burden to the people of this Province is the Provincial debt, \$2.6 billion, \$2,600,000, 000. Are we bankrupt now, Mr. Speaker? Is Newfoundland bankrupt now, Your Honour? She was bankrupt when the hon. gentleman in 1971, when the hon. gentleman was sitting down there, three or four or five of them sitting over there, the Province was bankrupt. Well we have gone from \$700 million to \$2.6 billion. Are we bankrupt now? What does the hon. gentleman have to say about it now?

As I say, Sir, the party is over. I hope it is not, but I am afraid this recession that is setting in in the United States is going to have very grave and serious repercussions in Canada and in Newfoundland. And unless, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to come into this hon. House and debate and discuss items and matters that affect the ordinary people of this Province like the development of industry, the creation of new jobs, lowering the taxes, unless we are prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker, then I am afraid that we will have failed not only this generation in Newfoundland but we will have failed our children and their children.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a half an hour is not very long, Sir. I can hardly get in high gear in a half an hour in this House. This is another thing they have done, Sir, with the estimates this time. As I said the other day on radio, yesterday I think it was, they have taken the power out of the House of Assembly and they have put it out in the Board Rooms and some other out-of-the-way places, and this is all designed, Sir, a deliberate attempt on the part of the government to give the government a free ride on their estimates, so that there will be no chance for the Opposition to thoroughly analyze the item by item expenditures under the various

Mr. Neary: subheads in the Budget. And that is why they have done that, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that nobody is naive and stupid enough to think otherwise. The hon. gentleman who is the godfather of this new scheme in his cunning way has managed to get the power of the purse sloughed off

MR. NEARY: to the boardrooms and to the various committee rooms around various buildings in different parts of the city where you have three meetings going on sometimes at the same time and the press cannot even cover the session of the House of Assembly let alone cover three meetings. So the hon. gentleman, the godfather of these rules and regulations now hopes that most of this stuff will not surface, that the people will not be able to get the facts.

I raised one little item today during the Oral Question Period, Sir, about something that went on in one of these committees when the Minister of Rural Development, who is spending about \$4 million or \$5 million of taxpayers' money, was so generous and so kind as to give the Committee a list showing the description of the project, where the project was taking place and the amount of the project, but refused to give the Committee the names of those who were given secret loans. The hon. gentleman refused to give the names and the hon. gentleman can look at me now all he wants. Mr. Speaker, this House is entitled to know how every penny of tax money is spent. We are entitled to know it, including the names of those who received that money. Why that is so basic and so common throughout the British Empire, and we are under the British Parliamentary system, that is so basic that I should not even have to mention it.

Mr. Speaker, why would the hon. gentleman refuse to give us the names of all those people who received tax money? We are not running a bank. It is not a bank. The hon. gentleman can get up all he wants and say, "Well, the bank does not give out the names." Well, the bank does not give out tax money. This is the taxpayers' money and if I was not a member of this House, as an ordinary taxpayer in this Province, every taxpayer is entitled to know how the money was spent, where it was spent, when it was spent, and who received it. That is so basic, Sir, that you should not even have to bring it up. And the hon. gentleman refuses to give the Committee, and these committees are supposed to be so powerful and so effective. And this is supposed to

MR. NEARY: be accepted. Oh the minister has gone a little step further than his predecessor, he is going to give us a list without names. The other fellow would not even give us a list. Now, the hon. gentleman thinks that this is great for the taxpayers of the Province, and we have seventy-five hours in which to debate the estimates. There are eight thousand, four hundred and some odd hours in a year and the government have been so generous as to give us seventy-five hours to talk about a \$1.4 billion budget. Seventy-five hours out of eight thousand, four hundred and some odd in a year, seventy-five hours. And now they have further reduced that. They have taken the power of the purse out of the Legislature and put it out in the board rooms and the other out-of-the-way places hoping that the people of this Province will not be able to see what they are doing with their money.

MR. J. CARTER: Your Party agreed with it.

MR. NEARY: I did not agree with it. I did not agree with it, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I would agree -

MR. J. CARTER: Your Party did.

MR. NEARY: - well, Sir, this is a part of this co-operation, this is a part of the tango I am talking about. This is the part of the sweetheart stuff that goes on, and as I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder - when that was being agreed on it is a wonder there was not a little violin music in the Chamber.

MR. MORGAN: You are not very close to your Party anymore.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is one thing about the Liberal Party, you can have your disagreements.

MR. MORGAN: You are not that close anymore.

MR. NEARY: Under the British Parliamentary system, Sir, the British Parliamentary system was built around the individual, and I would submit now, Sir, the hon. chaw-mouth over there from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), I would bet you, Sir, in a year or two from now they will be crawling back on their hands and knees in this

MR. NEARY: Chamber and saying, "Oh, let us get back, let us get back, bring the Estimates back to the House of Assembly, bring the Estimates back to the House". If there were committees where they had unlimited time and they could go on and meet all year round, it would be fine, but they have to conform to very rigid regulations and very rigid procedures. What happened is that now even the 75 hours has been further cut down and moved out of the House of Assembly, and here we are discussing a \$1.4 billion budget in the middle of the Summer, the committees will all have to report, I suppose, before the week is over, and the people of this Province are the ones who are going to suffer, Mr. Speaker, because those of us who feel that they would like to do a good job in this House, those of us who would like to do their homework and do some research and dig up a bit of dirt and talk about Labrador Linerboard and try to get an inquiry into the greatest scandal in Canadian history, and I had something here by the way, I do not have time to read it now, but I had something here I had from Hamburg, Germany, today in connection with this Schofield Company that I cannot get any information on from the government. Well, I wrote the company and now I am getting all the information I want, providing, providing, Mr. Speaker, providing that Mr. Frank Ryan who is the Chairman of the Board of Abitibi but who was also the liquidator

MR. S. NEARY: for Labrador linerboard and if there is a conflict of interest, my God, there is a case, who is also liquidating the winding up of Labrador linerboard at the same time he was Chairman of the Board of Abitibi. if Mr. Ryan says, yes, I can have the contract and I can have the information from Schofield. then I will get it. But I have not been able to get it from this government and this is supposed to be the born-again government, but I will get it, I guarantee you, supposing I have to go to Hamburg myself to get it. But in the meantime, Sir, as I say, a half an hour is not very long. Look, Mr. Speaker, I have not even taken one item off the top of this file that I have here, things in connection with the Budget and my time is up. and I have to draw my few remarks to an end. But I do hope, Sir, that I have, if I have done nothing else, that I have twigged that gentleman's conscience on the other side and that they will see how foolish and how ridiculous this system is of these new reforms that they brought in. Sure, have your committee, sure, fling the estimates out to the committee, sure, have standing committees of the House, I am all for it but give us a little time to do it and give the press a little chance to report it.

MR. J. DINN: Why do you boycott them?

MR. S. NEARY: I am boycotting them.

MR. J. DINN: Why?

MR. S. NEARY: Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, I was elected to serve in this House. And I was elected to do the best job that I can for the people of this Province in this House and not in the dungeons of Confederation Building or in the old Colonial Building. And so, Sir, I wish I had more time to deal with the provincial debt but I am sure it is something we are going to hear more about in the future, Mr. Speaker, and I can only, at this point in time, issue a warning to the government of this Province that the day of reckoning is not too far away. And as I said a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, the party is over.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. L. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, I remember attending a session in the old Colonial Building on one occasion and the late Peter Cashin spoke two and one half hours. and he was just as forceful as the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary). I suppose he feels he has a mission to perform and one can only congratulate him but I would certainly have to disagree with him when he says that nothing was done since 1971 since this administration took over. He forgets the water and sewer projects that took place, the schools, the new hospitals, the fish plants, the junior college and you can go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, since this has been my first opportunity to speak in the House since the start of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Speaker (Mr. L. Simms) and to you, the Deputy Speaker and to the Chairman of Committees (Mr. J. Butt). I would also say, Mr. Speaker, it is the first opportunity I had to publicly congratulate the Premier since the June 18th election. I would like to say that it was his dynamic personality, sincerity, honesty and determination to put the Province on a good financial basis, all of these things and many more are the key to his success. And I can only hope that in such trying times that we are going through with talks of recession, not only, in fact, in Canada but in the United States as well and in every other country, I only hope that his health will last and Divine Providence will be with him for many years to come.

I would also like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson), he is not in his seat at the moment but he is probably

MR. WOODROW: probably within listening someplace, on his success on winning his seat on May 22nd and also on June 18th. These are certainly outstanding dates in his life. I would like to say that I have known him for many years and all Newfoundlanders have admired and always will admire his qualifications. In fact, to me, he has gained the title of 'the golden tongued orator', and the beauty of his oratory can be compared to the late Sir Wilfred Laurier and the late Bishop Fallon of London, Ontario. I feel some day he may become the Governor General of Canada.

I would also like to congratulate all the new members on both sides of the House and say to them that if they work hard for their constituents their re-election is assured. And I would also like to assure them that this is the people's House and perhaps they are going to be a little bit jittery in the beginning, but they have been sent here by the people and they should not have any fear in trying to work here in this House of Assembly, in their offices and any other place for the good of their constituents because the people of Newfoundland deserve a lot more than we can give them.

Speaking of the government members, I notice that they have made our offices a beehive of activity, and I feel that, no doubt, this is true for both sides of the House and it will continue.

I would also like to say a special word of congratulations to my two colleagues from Humber East (Ms. Verge) and Humber West (Mr. Baird). We are working there together for that particular area. In fact, the three districts in the Bay of Islands are confined to Humber East, Humber West and the Bay of Islands, and I hope to have good working relations with them over the next four or five years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to divorce the Throne Speech from the Budget Speech. But I have to refer at the present time to the Throne Speech, and I would like to say that the Throne Speech is a continuation of the P.C. policies over the past eight years, and I know under the new administration it will continue. It is easy to say that the Throne Speech from year to year has said the same

MR. WOODROW: thing. In fact, that is true, and I think that is going to continue for a long time. It is very difficult not to repeat matters from year to year in the Throne Speech as industries like fishing, paper mills, hydro, boat building, forestry and others must continue; in fact, it took eleven years to get the paper mill going in Corner Brook and that must have been spoken about ten or eleven years in the Throne Speech. Other services to our people must continue, like building roads, better social services and municipal improvement like water-sewer is needed for the first time in many places and in some communities it is being continued or improved on.

Now I would just like to refer

MR. L. WOODROW: to the five year plan in the Throne Speech which, I think, is certainly something worth boasting about. The five year plan will seek federal co-operation with regards to, first of all fisheries development including the Primary Landing and Distribution Centre at Harbour Grace. This is certainly going to be an excellent means of providing employment to the people of the East Coast and there must be a lot of work and study to do on such a great programme as this.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, Labrador Resource Development, including the Lower Churchill Power Development, a new forestry development plan, a new and expanded Marine Research and Development Programme and an improved technical training programme, these matters referred to, Mr. Speaker, have no doubt occupied a lot of the government's time since they got in power and no doubt will continue to occupy a lot more of their time.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, just to continue on, the proposed transportation plan will center around three very important projects: The continuation and expansion of the Labrador Resource Development Transportation plan which will be aim at the creation of a year-round port in Labrador together with highway into Western Labrador by way of Churchill Falls. Number two, the re-negotiation of present financial arrangements relating to the upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway. I would like, Mr. Speaker, just to stop here and say that on Friday evening I drove from Stephenville to Corner Brook and the road in that area is going to be completely changed altogether. And I also had the opportunity recently, to drive from Corner Brook out to St. John's and there is quite a lot of work going on so I hope that this work will continue and that the government will be able to re-negotiate, hopefully, maybe a 75/25 or even a 90/10 agreement with the Government of Canada. The commitment by the Government of Canada to the continued operation of the railway and to its significant upgrading over time: Now, of course the hon. Premier mentioned this

MR. L. WOODROW: during the campaign and I am sure he meant what he said. He spoke about a permanent railway for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and I think that we, just the same as any other Province, the Province of Quebec or the Province of Ontario or the Province of Alberta, are entitled to a railway otherwise, we are, perhaps, being looked upon as a second-class or a third-class province.

Mr. Speaker, speaking now of the needs of the district of the Bay of Islands, much has been done in the field of water and sewerage in the rural areas but a lot remains to be done. Certainly, just about every home, at least I think so, in the urban part of the district has water and sewerage facilities and this is being improved on from year to year. But a lot has been done in the other communities but still a lot remains to be done. For example, in the communities of Summerside and Irishtown a permanent water and sewer system is needed and this would cost today about \$1 million or perhaps it would run into a couple million dollars. But I understand that engineering is being done on

Mr. Woodrow: this water and sewer system, and hopefully something can be done on it next year. I have been informed by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor) there is nothing in the Budget for this year. I am disappointed, but hopefully something will be done next year.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we are continuing the water and sewer systems in the communities of Cox's Cove, McIver's, Gillams and Meadows. And on the South shore of the Bay of Islands, water and sewer systems are needed, and especially sewerage systems are needed. In fact, there is certainly danger of pollution in these places and I hope that in time, I hope in the next year or so, the Department of Municipal Affairs will see fit to look at these communities also.

It is going to take millions of dollars and I understand that there are only so many dollars to go around. I further understand that there are now fifty-two districts in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and every member in the House has needs in his district and they are all, as we say, crying out and they have a right to cry out to get more work done. But it is all a matter, I think, of dollars and cents and we must be reasonable and not, as we say, act childish on these matters. In fact, I would not want to be the one who has to make the plans and to decide where monies are going to be spent, I can assure you.

Mr. Speaker, there are two more communities in the Bay of Islands district, the communities of York Harbour and Lark Harbour, and these communities are growing communities. Over the past two or three years about twenty-five new homes have been built in these communities, and they are continuing to grow. In fact, people are leaving the cities, they are leaving Corner Brook, and they are moving out to both sides of the Bay of Islands and this is going to present, as I said, problems with such things as water and sewerage and problems of pollution and the like.

MR. WOODROW: I am glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that we have been afford approximately \$250,000 in the Budget to build a spanking new bridge in the community of Lark Harbour. And over the weekend I had the pleasure of looking over the project, and it is going on at a relatively good pace.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed about one thing regarding this bridge and that is to say that the contractor has not hired local labour. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that the labour should be hired from the area, instead of that he has gone outside of the community. And not only has he done that, but he has hired men, in fact, men who were able to tie up their longliners and go to work on this bridge. I think this is very unfair. Whilst I do not feel there is any written law for the contractor to hire local people I certainly think that it would show a lot of good will in the community, and there is danger, in fact, of this bridge being picketed unless the contractor decides to hire on some local labour.

Mr. Speaker, I am also happy to know that the NIP or the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme in the Curling area, the urban part of my district, will be completed this year. And on that programme some \$4.4 million will be spent.

MR. WOODROW:

This was, of course - there is an old friend up in the galleries now, the former member who ran over in the federal district. I am really delighted to see him up there.

This has, of course, been a federal, provincial and municipal programme and it is certainly changing the whole face of the Curling area. And at the present time, also, there is an apartment building being put up there for subsidized housing and this really is going to help people over there who need apartments and the like.

Mr. Speaker, I am also happy to note in the Budget and in the Throne Speech as well that the government have introduced a programme to help first time home builders. And I know it has probably been difficult - it has been difficult for me, even, to put the right interpretation on this, but I hope that if there are any problems to be cleared up they will be cleared up as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Community Development project sponsored by the Department of Social Services, again is going to give employment and is also going to mean that money will have to be put aside for this as well in the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, also there are some problems over there with what we call the RRAP programme. I understand that this programme has been approved for all over the Province, but apparently, the federal government have not come up with the necessary funding to let people go ahead and get their homes - in fact, there are some repairs badly needed to be done on homes not only in the Bay of Islands but throughout the whole Province as well.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of recreation a lot has been done as well. I would like to speak about - I have mentioned this before - the provincial parks in the Bay of Islands district, for example, Blow Me Down Park at Lark Harbour, which can compare with any park, in fact, it is probably far beyond any other park in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador - and also in Cox's Cove. The Stag Lake Park is in my district and that is also a very beautiful park, in fact, I have been out in it during the Summer. Work, I understand, is still going on in this park and I suppose it should be officially opened either later on

MR. WOODROW:

this year or early next year.

Mr. Speaker, the next thing I have to mention, I hope that the Budget will be good to the Bay of Islands district, I refer to the Marshall Moores Arena in the community of Cox's Cove, which at the present time looks after all the North Shore of the Bay of Islands. At the present time there is no ice plant in it and it can only be utilized not more than a month or six weeks during a year. So I am hoping that we can in some way over the next five or six years raise \$120,000 to pay for the plant and interest on it as well.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think there has been a lot of co-operation since this hon. House started and it is very difficult these days because we all like the heat

MR. WOODROW:

but sometimes it is inclined to get inside of us and perhaps dampen our spirits. But I do hope that this spirit of co-operation will continue because after all we are here, in fact, to my mind not to hinder but to try to help the people in our Province. And I suppose it would be safe to say that it is about time for us to bury the past and try to look, in fact, to the future and hope that good things can happen to our Province in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I also received an overwhelming vote of confidence from the people of Bay of Islands and I feel that I will never be able to thank them enough for the confidence they have placed in me. I can only pledge that I shall do my best because after all that is all any man or woman can do.

Mr. Speaker, we are also having problems with community councils. For example, in the rural district council of Halfway Point, Benoit's Cove, John's Beach, Frenchman's Cove, the whole council resigned about a month ago. The council in Cox's Cove, all of them but a couple, resigned and this means that the work that they should be doing cannot be done now because they have no councillors. That is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, I brought up in the committee—when we had the Municipal Affairs committee, I thought that we should give some consideration to paying councillors. I do not know how it could be done but I think if we want to continue the work that is being done I think that people; in one way or another, have to be given some small contribution for the work that they are doing.

I will finally end up, Mr. Speaker, by talking about the abortion issue. I must congratulate my colleague from Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) for bringing this matter up in the House. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I stand and I do not have to apologize to any man or any woman on this

MR. WOODROW:

matter, I feel that life begins at conception. You can interpret it whatever way you like. And you, Mr. Speaker, would not allow your born child to be killed. In fact, you would be furious over it. And I would say that an unborn child is also living and is as just as much alive as we are here today. What is going to happen next if this continues? If this slaughter house continues, the next thing we will have euthanasia and we will be, in fact, probably getting down to what was done in Nazi Germany and other countries over in Europe and the like. So I feel that it is about time that this matter was brought to the floor of this House of Assembly. I think it will be brought here also by other members, and the general public are getting, certainly, more conscious of this matter as well.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could go on and on but I would like to thank all the hon. members for listening and I also want to wish them well. I mentioned in the beginning the new members but the former members who are here, as well, are back here because they worked for their districts.

Mr. Woodrow: But I hope that we can all continue to work, not primarily for our district because I do not think that is the right idea, I hope we can all continue to work primarily for the good of this Province, and then for the good of our districts, bearing in mind that dollars can only go so far. And if we keep that in mind, I do not think we will ever have an unhappy moment in the House of Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, what this Budget clearly does is that it indicates that this is not a new government, but merely a continuation of the same old, tired and weary government that we have been watching for the past seven or eight years. This Budget still, like all other Budgets, leaves the people of this Province disappointed, discouraged.

What this Budget does, Mr. Speaker, clearly is two things: one, it indicates that this is the same old, tired administration that we have been subjected to for the past seven or eight years; and secondly, it tells us what is wrong with government and politics in this Province. and I hope to illustrate that by referring to some of the statements made in the Throne Speech.

But this Budget, Mr. Speaker, also becomes a little bit difficult to talk about because again this government has the ability to talk in futuristic terms, and if we knew when the future was coming, when they were going to produce on all of this, well then, we could be happy, the people of this Province could be happy. But we never know when the future is going to commence, five years, and then another five years. Just as an example, in 1978 we get the Budget, the big blueprint for development, promising to the people of this Province 40,000 jobs. A year later that is scuttled and we get another 40,000 jobs. So it becomes very difficult to believe

Mr. Lush: what this government is saying. But again, if we could believe what they are saying then the plans are good.

But I have suggested that the Budget does two things, one to show that this is just a continuation of the same old, tired administration that we have had for the past seven or eight years, and secondly, it clearly demonstrates what is wrong with government in this Province, what is wrong with politics in this Province.

The government in its Throne Speech tried to identify why it was that this Province was not developing to the extent that we all know that this Province can develop, why it is not developed to its maximum potential, why we have not put this Province on a sound economic base. And there are three or four reasons why this was deemed to be so in the Throne Speech. One was because of the behaviour of politicians that has been a tradition with us. And the Premier identified the Amulree Report which told of the kind of political situation that was in existence in that particular day, but it just identified individual politicians. It was more or less talking about the decorum of the House and then made reference to the political system, the democratic system as we know it today, how it is that people get elected. So the Throne Speech offered cures for these two ills; one, of course, was through the new rules and regulations for the House of Assembly, and then the Elections Act which we are about to see. So that is supposed, hopefully, to cure the economic ills of this Province.

But I want to tell this hon. House now that none of the rules and regulations that we have brought in is going to put this Province on a sound economic base. It is certainly going to make the House, I think, a better place in which to operate, but it is not going to put this Province on a sound economic base. Neither will the Elections act. It will clean up some of the skulduggery that probably goes on with respect to

MR. LUSH: elections, but will do nothing to develop this Province. I think the Premier was on to something though when he was talking about the political problems in this Province because I want to say here and now that the problems with this Province and the problems that we have been facing for a number of years are political problems and not economic problems, but the Premier did not go far enough. It is not sufficient just to change the rules of this House. It is not sufficient just to bring in an Elections Act. What we have to do, and it was mentioned in the first, in the first Throne Speech delivered by this particular government, and I think this is what is at the root of the problems which face this Province, this is why we have not developed the way we should, and this Throne Speech indicated that this government pledges itself to a philosophy of inter-regional equity. That, Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the other items mentioned by the, or enunciated in the Throne Speech, the necessity for individual responsibility on the part of all politicians, certainly a necessity for an Election Act, but then the government must produce. These rules and regulations will do nothing, but the government must develop a policy, a policy based on inter-regional equity. That is one problem.

The second problem, Mr. Speaker, is the way we get ourselves elected. I am not talking in terms of finances that we get from anybody, but the responsible way in which we go to the people, the kinds of goodies we hand out to the people, the kinds of promises that we make to the people, and, Mr. Speaker, it has been a tradition of our Newfoundland history to hold promises to our people, to say that tomorrow is going to be the day when we are going to develop; tomorrow is the day when we are going to get around the corner; tomorrow is the day when we are going to arrive at the new Jerusalem, and this particular government is no different from other governments. Indeed, it carried on the specialty of its predecessors in taking the people of this Province to the mountain during the elections, taking them to the mountain and showing them all of the prosperity, depended on certain things.

MR. LUSH: In 1972 it was to develop our natural resources and that went on and went on and this particular time around, with this new administration, again in the election they took us to the mountain, they took us to the mountain and the carrot that was held out, Mr. Speaker, was 'Elect a P.C. government so that we can go along with the federal P.C. government and then we will see this Province develop, then we will see this Province develop', so, Mr. Speaker, that is the salvation held out, 'Step forward - the new era. Step forward into the new era'. Well, Mr. Speaker, this budget is not much in keeping with the 'step forward'; this go-nowhere, this do-nothing, this abeyancy budget. But, Mr. Speaker, again I suppose it is not fair because this is just, as I said before, an abeyancy budget, await while we are getting the plans into operation, while we are working out with our P.C. federal counterparts, while we are working the plans to develop this Province. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest again - this might not be an error, we will wait and see - but I have said what is wrong with politics in this Province is the way politicians get themselves elected, holding out this promise, and this is the big promise now held out and the people of this Province are looking to Ottawa, they are looking to the federal government, they are looking, and I can assure hon. members on the other side if they do not produce that they have done a grave injustice to the political system in this Province. They have done a grave injustice to it, because our people are looking forward. They are looking forward to the step forward movement. They are looking forward to the new era, but when is it going to be? In the Throne Speech we talk about a five-year plan, a five-year plan, strategies and a five-year development. The activity that undergirds all of this five-year plan is going to be the creation of 40,000 jobs, 40,000 jobs over the next five years. Well, Mr. Speaker, when will the five years begin? When will they begin?

MR. LUSH: When will they begin? It is going to be near the end of the year before the plan is submitted to the federal government, so that is a year gone. Are we now talking about six years? So, Mr. Speaker, this again illustrates that this is still the same old, tired, weary government, the same old, tired, weary government making promises to our people. And I would suggest that I have identified some of the things that are wrong with politics in this Province today, the promises, the hopes that are held out to our people and then comes the Throne Speech and what has happened? - the government have fallen flat on their faces, nothing for the people to look forward to.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of a thing that is going to erode our political system, not the rules and regulations in this House, not the Elections Act, but the kind of hope and the kind of promises that are held out to the people of this Province and then to let them down. Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened and this budget is certainly not much in keeping, as I have said, with the 'step forward', it is a go-nowhere, do-nothing budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, probably my words are words of advice, because it is the first Throne Speech. But as I have said before, the people of this Province will be looking forward to this cosy deal with Ottawa to see if we are going to solve the unemployment problems in this Province. Because this is what government is all about. All of these strategies and all of these plans in the Throne Speech will be nought, futile, if we do not do something with the unemployment problem in this Province. So the people of this Province will be looking towards Ottawa to see if things will change and we will be keeping the government accountable for the promises that they have made, for the commitments that they have made to the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is only fair that we have to accept this abeyancy budget, just to wait and see while the government are getting their plans together. But, as I have

MR. LUSH: said before, we can only look at what is here and it is certainly proof positive that this is the same old, tired, weary government, not much like a government that proposes to be innovative, creative and to get this Province moving again. And it demonstrates, as I have said before, what is wrong with politics in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the problems that the Premier indicated and identified in the Throne Speech, the problems of trying to make the House a better place in which to operate and to make elections cleaner, more efficient and more effective, I would hope that they would carry on this policy that was articulated so well by the government in 1972, Mr. Speaker, the pledge by the government to operate on the philosophy of inter-regional equity. Again, what has happened in this Province when the people have heard the campaign promises of this particular government and the Throne Speeches and then got the stark reality through the Budget - found out that these people were not recognized. ~~If we are going to develop this Province, we are~~

MR. T. LUSH: If we are going to develop this Province, we are going to have to spend the public dollars wisely, spend them based on the philosophy of inter-regional equity. Mr. Speaker, if the government would follow that policy in addition to its plan, spending the public dollars of this Province on a basis of inter-regional equity, spending the dollars wisely, spending them equally, providing services, public services, water and sewer and transportation based on an equal basis, based on an equity basis, then I think this government is on the right foot.

Mr. Speaker, sad to say there is nothing in this Budget which indicates any change of direction. There is nothing in this Budget which indicates any change in direction along these lines. There is no question about it, the Premier identified the problem in politics in Newfoundland today as the political excessiveness that we find in politics in Newfoundland but he did not identify the one that the government can best look after and that is in the development of this Province and in the expenditure of public dollars. If the government are willing to address themselves to that problem of spending the dollars of this Province on an inter-regional equity basis, then I think we will be able to say that certainly this government has changed course, that this government is onto a new policy, that this government is onto a new way of developing this Province. The people of this Province will be looking forward to that. The day has gone when we can keep up this old traditional way of spending money based on a political basis. I am hoping, as I said before, that this is going to change.

Now, Mr. Speaker, looking at this Budget and in comparing it with the previous administration and this we have to do, this we have to do, we can not all of a sudden just take this Budget in isolation and say, from here this is a new day. We have to compare it with what this government has done over the past six or seven years, we would have to take that as a

MR. T. LUSH: point of reference. But we are willing to wait, in the meantime, we are willing to wait to see if this government will produce some of the plans that it submitted to us, to see if this cosy arrangement with Ottawa is really going to be our salvation, to see if it is really going to be the new Jerusalem. That is what we are going to be waiting for, Mr. Speaker, and all of the people in this Province are eagerly and enthusiastically awaiting this new Jerusalem, awaiting for the development of this Province that is going to take place. Maybe it is going to start at the next budget, we do not know, but we are waiting for it to start and as I have said before, never in our history, never in our history will there be such focus by the people of this Province on Ottawa as there is today and as there is going to be in the next two or three years. We have

MR. LUSH: placed a tremendous responsibility, hon. members have placed a tremendous responsibility on their federal counterparts and we hope that they will produce, Mr. Speaker. We hope that this will be the salvation, we hope that this will be the new Jerusalem. But, Mr. Speaker, looking at the performance of this government over the past six or seven years and looking at this Budget, the future does not look bright. Just look at unemployment, Mr. Speaker, and that is something that we do not talk about enough in this House. It seems as though we have almost become psychologically conditioned to the fact that we must continually have the highest rate of unemployment in Canada. And as long as I am a member in this hon. House, I am going to be talking about unemployment. I am going to be talking about it because that certainly must be the major role of any government, and that is to create employment, to create jobs for our people. It must be the major role and it must become a part, Mr. Speaker, of the public conscience. We cannot allow our people to accept the fact that we must have the highest level of unemployment in this Province. The high level of unemployment in this Province must be attacked, it must be solved. And, Mr. Speaker, looking at the record, 1977 was the year that unemployment in this Province really began to skyrocket. In 1976 they had an unemployment rate of somewhere in the vicinity of 11 per cent. Today it is 14.3 per cent. So in three years we have come from 11 per cent up to 14.3 per cent. Right up to this point in time - I am not talking about the yearly average, comparing apples with apples - and in the past three years, 1977, 1978 and 1979, there has been very little change in the unemployment rate. As a matter of fact, I think last year the unemployment rate was 15.5 per cent and today it is 14.3 per cent, a change of eight-tenths of a per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. If we are going to lower the unemployment rate by one per cent a year, well, it is going to take us quite a while to arrive at a decent level of employment.

And, Mr. Speaker, the other point that must be pointed out is that our labour force grew in 1977 and 1978 by

MR. LUSH: 9,000. The year before that it grew by 4,000, and the year after that it grew by 6,000 - 20,000 in three years, 20,000, so this means that our labour force is growing at the rate of almost 7,000 a year. Now, Mr. Speaker, the government is going to lick that unemployment problem by the creation of 40,000 jobs, 40,000 jobs, which means that if our labour force continues to grow by 7,000 in five years time that we are going to have 35,000 people, 35,000 new people over the five-year period, which means that we will have 5,000 plus, and keeping that unto our 32,000 who are now unemployed we are still going to have 27,000 people unemployed which is still going to make our unemployment rate just about where it is now, just about where it is now. So, Mr. Speaker, that does not seem like a very optimistic figure, it does not seem like a very optimistic objective to create 40,000 new jobs, but, Mr. Speaker, that is the record with respect to unemployment or with respect to creating jobs for our people. That is the record of this particular government. Now, Mr. Speaker, one could carry on talking about the dreadful state of unemployment in this Province, the disgracefully high level of unemployment in this Province, and we must, we cannot for one moment let that get off our minds and the tragedy that goes with people being unemployed, the misery and the anxiety that has been experienced by our people throughout the Province who cannot find a job. They want a job, Mr. Speaker, but they cannot find one, they cannot find one. Then on top of that is the plight of our young people, people coming out of trades schools, people coming out of vocational schools, people coming out of university with training invested in their future, spent a lot of money and cannot find a job. That, Mr. Speaker, has to be the crucial issue facing this government today and any government, and this Budget here does not indicate, Mr. Speaker, much of a break. This Budget here does not give much optimism to our unemployed people. It does not give much optimism to our young people.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, what we have done in this Budget in attempting to maintain the status quo of staying where we are is that the government again has unwittingly raised the cost of living. The government has unwittingly raised the cost of living to the people of this Province by the imposition of a media tax. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the best that this government could come up with, in terms of raising a few dollars for the Province, a few paltry dollars. \$750,000 was the imposition of a media tax and that I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is another commitment by this government that is broken, because it was the commitment by this government that they would freeze any increases in the Retail Sales Tax and I say this is a roundabout way of increasing the taxes to the people of this Province because invariably the increase or the imposition of this media tax, the burden of this is going to fall on the consumers of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I say that is really scraping the bottom of the barrel, that is really scraping the bottom of the barrel when we have to dig up this kind of a tax, this media tax, to punish the business people of this Province for the jobs that they are creating, only the second province in Canada to administer this kind of tax, and with that to double that of the other province. I think Quebec's media sales tax is 2 per cent and ours being 4, and, Mr. Speaker, whacking it to the consumers of this Province again, trying to put up the cost of living again to people already paying the highest taxes in Canada

MR. LUSH: and with the highest level of unemployment. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we have done, taken them to the mountain. We took them up to the mountain during the election and with the Throne Speech and now we have let them slide down again into despair. Mr. Speaker, that is what is wrong with politics in this Province, raising the aspirations of our people, raising the expectations of our people. Always with the Budget comes the stark reality of it. And these hon. members opposite, the hon. crowd opposite are not about to take our people anywhere if they can use the record of the past six or seven years. Mr. Speaker, we await, we await the new Jerusalem, we await the new future and the bright future that is around the corner, we await this cozy deal, we await the development of this Province from the new Federal government, from the PC government. We are waiting for this eagerly and enthusiastically. And, Mr. Speaker, if it does not come, if it does not come it will be an unforgiveable sin by members opposite on the people of this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, we on this side hope that it will come. We have given our indication over here of our co-operativeness to the government hoping for a change in policy, hoping for a change in direction, hoping for the development of this Province, the development of this Province on an inter-regional equity basis, the spending of the public dollars of this Province on an equitable basis so that the people of this Province, all of the people of this Province can get the kinds of public services that they deserve and can get the kind of opportunities that are extended to all people throughout Canada and to every region in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, we will be looking forward, we will be awaiting these developments and I am sure that all the people of Newfoundland are awaiting these developments in the hope that they come in the near future, that we do not have to wait too long, that we do not get another five-year plan loaded on top of this one, that we do not get next year another policy, another programme promising

MR. LUSH:

to create 40,000

jobs. We hope that they will come and we hope that next year the government will be able to come into this hon. House and tell us what rate, what proportion of the 40,000 jobs have been created up to this point in time whether it is eight thousand, ten thousand and whether next year we are going to be able to get the sixteen thousand. If they can do this then, of course, we will see that there is some activity. But, Mr. Speaker, that remains to be seen but again we give the government the benefit of the doubt and hope that these things will come to pass.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms)

The hon. Minister of

Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all

this being the first time that I have had an opportunity to say a few words in debate, may I first of all congratulate you on your election to your high office and also the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) and the Deputy Chairman of Committees the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) on his election and also may I welcome all the new members to the House of Assembly and hope as the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) said, that we are all here to learn and maybe to impart some knowledge on hon. members in the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I sat here for the past few days and I have listened to hon. members opposite and hon. members on this side of the House and it is indeed refreshing to hear some of the newer members impart some of their ideas into the House of Assembly. And also, I think, we have had two kinds of speeches in the House, one by the members for their districts speaking about basically their district problems and other members who are possibly

August 6, 1979

Tape No. 575

AH-3

MR. DINN:

chief spokesman for the

Opposition or ministers on this side of the House

Budget as a whole.

MR. DINN: In listening to hon. members opposite, I must say, some hon. members - the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) the other day spoke glowingly about his great historic district of Grand Bank and talked about fish as the future for this Province, and I am delighted to see that he agrees with our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) and with most of the things that we are attempting to do in this Province with respect to development, with respect to developing the resources of this Province. He talked about social services.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) talked about his district and the concerns of the people of Labrador, and so on down through the bit and piece.

In listening to what I would call the chief spokesman for the Opposition, it was very difficult to get a general theme, to get more or less a caucus strategy. It seemed to me that we had some members getting up talking about spending too much money, other members getting up saying that we did not spend enough money and other members getting up saying, to quote the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) 'a go-nowhere, do-nothing type of Budget'. The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) got up, Mr. Speaker, and he talked about, we are not spending any money in rural development, in developing our resources and that he did not see any increases and did not think we were putting emphasis on our resources. And, Mr. Speaker, he started off by talking about the picture on the front, and, Mr. Speaker, to indicate just exactly what the hon. member did with respect to reading the Budget, he did not read the first page which said that indeed, the picture on the cover of the Budget is a sunrise, the dawn of a new era.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And that basically, Mr. Speaker, is what we are talking about here in the new Budget. We are not going to take \$1 billion, \$400 million or \$300 million and go to resources because we do have other concerns in this Province; we have our social services that

MR. DINN: we have to provide, the services that the people of this Province need; we have to provide the water and sewer systems and the schools and we have to keep teachers teaching and educating our young so that the future of Newfoundland is assured.

But, Mr. Speaker, just to address myself to the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) when he talked about no money in Resources, I look at all the Heads of resources in the Budget and find that not only did the hon. member not open the cover of the book and read the first page indicating that this is a new dawn, that the picture on the cover is a sunrise and not a sunset -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - every Head in the Budget with respect to resources has increased. - Mines and Energy, last year \$35,517,000, this year \$44,155,000, not a huge increase, but an increase. And, Mr. Speaker, one would have to be blind if he could not take just page 26, which indicates the expenditure summary and go down through that and indicate that new dollars and more dollars are going into our resources and these resources will expand over the years so that we can support the social services that we have to provide also to the people of this Province. If you look at Lands and Forests - \$21,619,000 this year, last year \$17 million - and there is no increase. I say that is an increase. It is not a \$500 million increase, but it is an increase. It is the kind of thing that this Province can afford. It is the kind of thing that this Province has to proceed along in that manner, so that it is not a huge junk, it is not jobs, jobs, jobs for the sake of just creating jobs, it is creating jobs, improving our resources so that this will develop a financial base for the Province and we can afford the other services that we need to provide for the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. DINN: If we look at Fisheries - this year \$30,466,000 -

MR. POWER: Gross.

MR. DINN: - gross, that is correct - last year in Fisheries, \$23 million. That would indicate to hon. members opposite

MR. DINN:

that it is not an increase.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I said when I started, there did not seem to be a general theme. The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) got up and he spoke about 'nothing'. He said there was no increase in Resources. And it is there in black and white, it is clear for anybody to read that there is an increase in the dollars applied to our resources -

MR. POWER:

Right.

MR. DINN:

- so that, as I said, they can provide a broader financial base so that we can afford the social services that we need to provide for our people, the water

MR. DINN: and sewer systems down on the Burin Peninsula and the Northern Peninsula and in Labrador. We may make some mistakes as we go along. The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) or one of the other hon. members for Labrador -

MR. WHITE: Eagle River.

MR. DINN: - Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), I believe it was Torngat Mountains, talked about the water system that they put in Makkovik and I would have to admit and agree with the hon. member when he said that that was a complete disgrace when you talk \$3.5 million for a water system in Makkovik, and up to a year and a half ago that water system did nothing but destroy the water in the nursing station in Makkovik. I was up there and had a look at it firsthand and, Mr. Speaker, something had to be done, and I believe what happened was that Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development in conjunction with some engineering people in Municipal Affairs and Housing got it back on the rail. Getting it back on the rail is another thing that we are going to address ourselves to in this government in the next four or five years, that the rail will become an integral part of the transportation system in this Province, that other items, not just the resources but what the resources need in order to expand, will be looked after, and as the hon. the Premier said in one or two of his speeches in this House of Assembly, you just cannot stand back and look and say, "Okay let us put our money in fisheries", because fisheries is not the only thing. It is the most important thing, in my opinion, but it is not the only thing that we have to develop in this Province. We have hydro potential on the Island that has to be developed, and we cannot wait for the Lower Churchill or for Muskrat Falls to come on. These things will be ongoing. These studies will continue until we can get a handle on that, and as we wait and while we wait for these things to come about, we have to look at the things on Island that we need to do and the Hinds Lake thing, the possibility of the Upper Salmon which may have to be approved this year or next year, but these things have to be ongoing, so that if industry decides that they want to move

MR. DINN: in here, they have the power to do it, and they have the transportation network, and they have the facilities that I believe is the responsibility of government to provide. Government does not go out and just hire and provide jobs for the sake of providing jobs. I think that has been one of the mistakes in the past. The Upper Churchill went ahead because of the jobs, jobs, jobs, and as a result we have no jobs now and we have a giveaway of our resources in this Province. In my opinion, one of the greatest disasters that has come about in this Province was the giveaway of that resource to the Province of Quebec for nothing.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) today, that is the past, past, past administration.

MR. DINN: The past, past, past administration, right. I can go back to the past, past, past if the hon. member wants, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, whilst I have a few minutes on my feet, I might impart a little bit of advice to him. I know he is out back listening intently to every word that I am saying and I would just like to caution him. I think he has a great group of individuals on the opposite side of the House right now, a great group of people that got elected in the last election. I sat back and I listened for days and listened to the hon. member, for example, for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) who has had some positive things to say in this House of Assembly, and I think that kind of thing should continue because I can assure the hon. member that we are listening to what he has to say because we think it is important. If the people think it is important enough to elect the hon. member to this House of Assembly, we think it is important enough to listen to him, and he should continue in that vein and I can assure him that we will listen and if he has some positive ideas, that we will take them into consideration and possibly they will be the next blueprint for development.

AN HON. MEMBER: As long as they do not criticize the other side.

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker - and criticize, yes, yes, we welcome criticism from the hon. members opposite. We would like to see a co-ordinated approach. We would like to see the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), everybody get together and get a concerted effort, get a co-ordinated approach so that you know that you have a base and you know what you are talking about, and you do not contradict yourselves. The hon. member for Lapoile got up today and he says we are going to be bankrupt. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir says we are not spending enough money on resources, and the hon. member for Terra Nova today got up and took kind of a middle of the road approach, sort of standing squarely on both sides of the fence, I suppose, if you want to consider the hon. member for Lapoile and the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir on either side. One would have to listen very intently to find out which side they are on at any particular time, because, as I see it, they are jumping back and forth at a fairly constant pace. Now, Mr. Speaker -

Hoisted on your own petard.

MR. DINN: - the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) brought up some very good subjects. He talked about the six communities in his district and the things that he needs. Although I went down there and visited Davis Inlet, Postville, Hopedale, Makkovik, Nain, and all the communities along the Labrador about a year and half ago, there is no way that I as a member of this House can know really what the needs are of the communities down on the Labrador coast with a visit down there. And there is no way I can spend four or five months of the year in that particular area so I am depending upon the hon. member for Torngat Mountains and the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and all hon. members to impart their little bit of knowledge to me; I am here to learn also. I do not see myself here as the be-all and end-all, that I know Newfoundland or I know Labrador, and I do not need input from hon. members opposite. I think it is a very important part of a member's duty to get up in this House of Assembly and make sure that all these points are driven home. The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) spoke about equity, regional development, and making sure that, for example, he knows how the funds are being expended. Well, I can remember being in Municipal Affairs and Housing for two years, and during one of my estimates hon. members asked me questions about what portion of money went to different districts in the Province. And I went through every district and found out the amount of money that was spent and found out to my surprise, because I had no idea really; I mean, I did not sit down and say, 'Well that is a Liberal district, therefore nothing happened.' I went down and found out that in that one year fifty-three million of the something over a hundred million dollars - fifty-three million was spent in Liberal districts and forty-eight million or something was spent in PC districts.-

MR. STAGG: Shame, shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - and it was kind of an eye opener to me.

August 6, 1979

Tape 578

RT-2

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) districts.

MR. DINN:

Now when I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird)

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

When I looked into it, when I found out about it, when I investigated and tried to rationalize how this kind of thing happens, or how -

MR. STAGG:

An oversight.

There was a little bit of oversight there, too, boy.

MR. DINN:

- this was broken down, I found that many of the members for St. John's, for example, did not have the water and sewer projects, that they were in another part of the Budget. We had the regional water system that cost quite a bit of money that was not included in the \$100,000,000 that I talked about so that really what I was talking about was what we were spending in rural Newfoundland and how that was broken down. And if you remove some of the St. John's members, the ones that do not include Portugal Cove and Torbay - if you removed the core of the city of St. John's I found that it was pretty evenly split.

The hon. member for Saie Verte, Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), rather, had a water system started in his and I believe there was one started in Old Perlican during my time in Municipal Affairs. And I did not look at it and say, 'It is Old Perlican, it is in the district of the hon. member for Bay de Verde, and therefore I should not do it.' I thought it was just as important that it be done as well as other water and sewer systems should be done.

MR. HODDER:

The Hon. member for Stephenville in 1975 drilled holes all over the Port au Port Peninsula to put pumps and well houses on and they are still out there.

MR. DINN:

Well, I do not know how many holes the hon. member for Stephenville drilled in Port au Port in 1975. As I understand it the hon. member did not run in 1975.

MR. STAGG: No, I did not, no.

MR. HODDER: No, but he was still the member during the election.

MR. DINN: He did not run in 1975 so I do not know what he would be doing drilling holes in the Port au Port Peninsula.

MR. HODDER: He was campaigning.

MR. DINN: I hope if he did not strike water he would strike something else.

MR. HODDER: If the Minister will allow me.

MR. DINN: Certainly.

MR. HODDER: He and the candidate were travelling around, and behind them was a well-know driller, well-known to the party, and as they found somebody who wanted a hole drilled in their backyard the hole was drilled. But they are still there.

MR. DINN: Well, I have permitted the hon. member to get up and say a few words but if the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) wants to defend himself, I will certainly yield the floor to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please! Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, this is completely out of order. Back in 1975 -

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Back in 1975 -

MR. FLIGHT: A point of order.

MR. STAGG: I have been given the floor here by the -

MR. FLIGHT: A point of order.

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

MR. STAGG: What it amounted to is that availing of the -

MR. FLIGHT: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

August 6, 1979

Tape 578

RT-4

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order.

MR. STAGG:

A point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird)

On a point of order.

MR. STAGG:

What point of order?

MR. F. ROWE:

Just sit down and shut up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. STAGG:

The floor has been given to me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for

Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who is a former deputy speaker should know differently

than to get up and interject in a debate like this.

MR. F. ROWE: get up and interject in a debate like this. It is quite normal, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: How did you get up?

MR. RIDEOUT: He is on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: It is quite normal, Mr. Speaker, for a minister by leave to allow an hon. member opposite to ask a question of him, and this exchange takes place quite often only by leave of the minister, but for hon. members to engage in a debate back and forth from one backbench to another is quite abnormal, Sir, and I would submit that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is quite out of order in answering and starting a debate. He will have his opportunity to speak in this debate if he wishes. He has already spoken, as a matter of fact, so he has not - he can get up on a point of order if he wishes, but he cannot get up and engage in debate back and forth across the floor.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Every member, of course, has the right to speak without interruption and every member may, as a courtesy, yield briefly to another hon. member. No hon. member can insist that he yield, but he may. It is not really by leave, it is by courtesy if an hon. member wishes. The hon. minister yielded to the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who made a comment and then the hon. minister yielded briefly to the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). I do not think that it is irregular. He yielded for a brief comment from the hon. the member for Stephenville, after which, presumably, the hon. minister is going to continue.

MR. DINN: There was no point of order.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the remarks just made by the hon. gentleman, the former Speaker of the House

MR. NEARY: (Mr. Ottenheimer) who was one of the finest Speakers in Canada, I suppose -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman knows full well, Mr. Speaker, that if another member stands and the gentleman who is speaking - and Your Honour can check this and check Hansard to see exactly what happened - if another member gets up and just takes over and starts speaking, then it is assumed, Your Honour, that the gentleman who is speaking who takes his seat can no longer carry on. He has spoken then in the debate, he has -

MR. DINN: By leave.

MR. NEARY: No, well, this was not by leave, this was a different situation.

MR. STAGG: By leave.

MR. NEARY: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) leapt to his feet, started to make remarks, the hon. gentleman stopped speaking and then we could only assume, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Stephenville had the floor and should be allowed to carry on with his speech because the hon. gentleman had finished.

MR. FLIGHT: Exactly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) On the point of order, if the minister wishes to yield to the hon. the member for Stephenville, he may proceed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the minister. The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has made some accusations here that are made somewhat in jest.

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. STAGG: I have the floor. The point of order has been disposed of. I am not going to yield to a spurious point of order.

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker - and it is only going to take me about another thirty seconds - is that the member for Port au Port obviously since 1975 was not able -

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please! On a point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is a point of clarification more than anything else. Is the hon. gentleman now speaking in the Budget Debate, Sir?

MR. STAGG: I have already spoken.

MR. DINN: The hon. minister yielded for the hon. member opposite.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman finished his speech now and the hon. the member for Stephenville is carrying on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member has cleared up the -

MR. STAGG: I will clear it up in the local media.

MR. DINN: - and if he has not cleared it up he will clear it up very shortly, he informs me.

MR. STAGG: Right.

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for LaPoile is back and obviously he does not like to see anybody speak in the House of Assembly. He wants to hog the House of Assembly for himself. Unfortunately, this time, we have some people on the opposite side of the House who are not going to let him rule the roost and he will take his place with all other hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And he will take his turn like all other hon. members in this House.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) got up and he said, 'Everybody has a right to speak in this House, and I intend to get up here today and call the people about my district,' and he did it. And the hon. the member for LaPoile sat and listened, and he had to and he should if he is going to learn about other parts of this Province. The hon. the member for LaPoile has an opportunity to speak in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and he will get that opportunity

August 6, 1979

Tape 579

EC - 4

MR. DINN:

Like all other hon. members, but no more

or no less.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

That is good labour relations. Everybody
should have a crack at labour relations.

MR. STAGG:

They were afraid to let Stagg speak.

MR. DINN:

And they were obviously afraid to let

Stagg speak.

Now the hon. the member for

MR. DINN: Lapoile (Mr. Neary) talked about the scandals and skulduggery and the Linerboard mill the other day and we look at the Linerboard mill and here we had an albatross that was slung at us in 1971-72. The hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) got up and spoke eloquently about the Linerboard and set the record straight with respect to the people of Stephenville. The Linerboard mill is in good hands. The Linerboard mill; we will get paid something like \$43.5 million for the Linerboard mill, the first \$6 million 15th of December 1978, the second \$10 million December 31st, 1979, and we will get \$6,875,000 for the next four years, '81, '82, '83, '84. And, Mr. Speaker, just in case there is some doubt in hon. members opposite, just in case there is some doubt in the mind of the hon. member for Lapoile -

MR. NEARY: Shares.

MR. DINN: - we will get \$3 million for ten years if they do not produce, and they say, "We will produce or we will pay you the \$3 million per year", which is another \$30 million, so they are guaranteeing -

MR. NEARY: Shares.

MR. DINN: - that they are going to -

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

The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence. Hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody listens to the hon. member for Lapoile anyway. As the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) said he is 'a spent force'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Come by Chance Refinery, the hon. member for Lapoile had great words of wisdom to impart about the Come by Chance Refinery, and the hon. the Premier and ministers of this government have indicated to him that that Come by Chance Refinery will go ahead if it is in the best interests of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, only if it is in the best interests of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We will not

MR. MARSHALL:

There is nothing to that Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing. The hon. gentleman was passing an observation as he perceives a certain situation and as the vast majority of other people around perceive a certain situation. Now, the hon. gentleman in this House today got up and referred to the hon. the Premier as not the Premier of the Province but the Premier for certain interests, the Premier for the First Arabian, so what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: In any event there is absolutely no substance whatsoever to that point of order. It is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! With respect to the point of order I would rule that a point of order does not exist. It is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) does not like to hear the truth. He is not good at hearing the truth. He does not like to sit back in his seat and listen like I have done on many occasions, to the hon. member, bay and scream and howl in this House of Assembly, make not much sense but I understand possibly what happened. Possibly what happened is that the former owners of the refinery explained to the hon. member in baby talk what their proposal was with respect to the refinery.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Your Honour knows full well, Sir, and members of the House know that you cannot attribute motive to hon. members of this House as the hon. gentleman is doing now. It is completely out of order, Sir. It flies in the face of the rules of this House and as I said to Your Honour there a few moments ago and as I repeat to members of this House again, I am beholding to nobody. I am not in a decision-making role. I do not discuss these matters with any former owners or any proposed new owners. I say what I think. I do my own research and I would submit to Your Honour that the hon. gentleman is attributing motive to my doing my job in this House and I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) To the point of order.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order here again. The hon. member is using up my time with his foolish and spurious points of order in this House and the fact of the matter is that he just takes offence to words like baby talk. I am only repeating what the hon. member said himself. The hon. member made no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

The ruling again will be the same as the last one. I do not see a point of order existing in this particular situation but again a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The Minister of Labour
and Manpower.

MR. DINN: I only have a minute or so left. The hon. member has succeeded in wasting my time. He has wasted the time of the House on many occasions and he has succeeded in wasting some of my time but I will get another opportunity to speak in the Speech from the Throne debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member
for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: I really feel that I should yield to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) after his kind comments. Are there any points you would like to finish, Mr. Minister? I was enjoying your glowing speeches about the members on this side. Speaking in this Budget debate, Mr. Speaker, I intend to address my remarks, taking the Premier's lead, taking his comments in the Throne Speech, the two points that he made in the Throne Speech, one, that the government should be accountable and two, we should be concerned about the identity of Newfoundlanders. I was looking through the Budget to see where the Premier's imprint was coming out to start

MR. STIRLING: this year setting out that kind of future of the way we want to grow. I am a member of the Resource Policy Committee or the Estimates Committee and I must say that the ministers that we have seen so far - and I may be sorry for saying this tomorrow, but I must say that the ministers that we have seen so far on our committee have been very forthright and have given us the information that we asked for. I believe there were points on which the ministers would have liked to have gone further but it was not in accordance with either the policy of the former administration or the policy of the present administration. I honestly feel there were a number of points in which the ministers had not developed policy to the point where they could release the information. I do want to say that they were very

MR. STIRLING: co-operative. I would say that the Chairman of our Committee is doing a very good job and the Committee is working well as a committee. I did not have the advantage of sitting in the House before and going through various procedures, but at least to this point I would have to say that the ministers that we have seen thus far appear to be as helpful as they can be to the limit that they are authorized to go.

I would like to touch specifically on Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and the minister knows that I am very disappointed in the amount of money in the Rural Development loans, or RDA as the Premier calls it. The Premier in answering a question the other day headed, in what I believe, is the wrong direction, not in accordance with the campaign speeches, not in accordance with what we were hoping for in Rural Development. In the discussion at the Committee level, I had an indication from the minister that we were going to see that Rural Development Authority continue to be an authority that was not all tied up in red tape and would exercise some initiative, and I believe the minister almost wanted to do what the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) asked for, and that was to table all of the information. We discussed in the Committee that we should accept the fact in Newfoundland that in Rural Development you are going to have a high number of casualties. If we are going to try to go out into the rural parts of Newfoundland and try to encourage local business and try to encourage people to take a chance with their money, then you have to be prepared for some failures. When the Premier spoke the other day, he was talking about tightening up the regulations. He, I think, was minister of Rural Development for a period, and one of the things that I cannot understand is how you can take \$2.7 million of a budget last year - I believe when the Premier was minister - and spend that wisely, spend all \$2.7 million and then this year say you are going to be able to cut that back to \$2 million, this year it got a third less than last year, how you are going to cut \$2.7 million down to \$2 million, provide a step forward for the way we want to grow,

MR. STIRLING: with less money? In the Committee stage the minister used a good example of a handicrafts group that had borrowed \$5,000 and turned that money over and over and over and was really doing well with it. You know, when you look at the Budget, if you look through the Budget figures, it is not \$2 million of new money that the government is putting in this year, because they are expecting to get back \$1.5 million, so the government in the Rural Development Authority, in loans for Rural Development, the government is only putting in \$500,000 worth of new money. Now, I am glad to see that the money is coming back, but the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) asks what to me, as a new member, seems like a very reasonable question. He said, "If the people of Newfoundland" - the government has no money, it is the people of Newfoundland - the people of Newfoundland are loaning money, and the people of Newfoundland have the right to know who they are loaning the money to and they have the right to know whether or not they paid back the money. Now, I think that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development cannot say, but I think he would like to give us that information. He went as far as he could, he gave us more information that we ever had before, he gave us the location and the type, and he was really trying to be helpful.

AN HON. MEMBER: We hit that before.

MR. MORGAN: We gave that (inaudible three years ago and it was abused, names (inaudible) alive or dead.

MR. STIRLING: That is my opinion -

MR. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. STIRLING: - that I would hope that we will be able to get -

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) Order, please'
Hon. member.

MR. STIRLING: That you very much, Mr. Speaker. One of the things I did learn is that when the Speaker says "Order", everybody is supposed to be quiet and I am surprised that the former

August 6, 1979

Tape No. 582

GH-3

MR. STIRLING:

Deputy Speaker from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg)

persists in carrying on when the Speaker continues to call for order.

Leaving Rural Development,

MR. STIRLING: there are many opportunities that we have not touched on in this Budget and again I was looking for a stamp of where we got the transition from the Throne Speech of the way we wanted to grow to the Budget which was getting us into operation. The Throne Speech talked about having less dependence on Ottawa and through all the Estimates committees and through all the Budget we see that more and more and more of the capital expenditure - something in this Budget - eighty per cent of the capital expenditure comes from Ottawa and something in excess of fifty per cent of our total income comes from Ottawa, this year, this Budget.

I have the shadow for Industrial Development. Industrial Development looks to be a department that has been put on the shelf in the Budget. Industrial Development was given to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), and Mines and Energy is already enough to be two departments, and Industrial Development was given to him almost as if, 'Well, you had better hold on to this for the balance of this year,' because there is anything very much of an aggressive or an imaginative approach in Industrial Development.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) life.

MR. STIRLING: Next budget?

MR. BARRY: No, this year.

MR. STIRLING: Good. Well, you see, Mr. Speaker, I am only a new member and I can only go by what is in the Budget. Now the Minister of Industrial Development may have a lot of little goodies that he is going to let us know about later on.

MR. BARRY: You are looking in the wrong places, that is all.

MR. STIRLING: Well, thank you very much. We will have the opportunity in the committee, I presume, to get the Minister of Industrial Development to tell us which are the right places to look to.

One of the things I would hope the Minister of Industrial Development will tell us about when we look through those magic places is something about an economic development concept,

MR. STIRLING: something about a policy that people can tie into. For example, one of the things that a number of people on the opposite side who have some business experience, together with many of the members on this side, let you know that whether you are a small businessman or the largest corporation there are a number of things that you look for in development. One is a stable political climate. Another -

AN HON. MEMBER: We have it.

MR. STIRLING: We certainly have that. We have a guarantee - I have here - I am glad you gave me that 'in'. The Budget could almost be, 'Fill in the blanks.' This could be a 'guess who'. Guess who wrote this Budget now? Why does it sound familiar?

The Budget is the first by a Progressive Conservative government, and then it goes on to herald a new financial approach and commitment to the rationalizing of the Province's future. The same speech he just gave up in Ottawa after he took over from the Liberal government.

MR. NEARY: Blame it on the Liberals.

MR. STIRLING: Then the previous administration got blamed for everything. And as the Minister indicates here he is following the same thing, he is blaming the previous administration but being the one of Mr. Moores.

But let us get back to looking for something in this Budget to show us what this Budget offers for somebody either living in Newfoundland wanting to invest in Newfoundland, and I had mentioned, first of all, the political climate. The second thing is a resource, human or otherwise, and we have that in Newfoundland. The third thing that they want is some stability. And here is a government who - Take, for example, Mr. Minister, the Marystown shipyard. I am only a new member, I look up the estimates for 1978-79 and find out, Mr. Minister, you were not even anticipating a deficit in Marystown.

MR. NEARY: Speak to the Speaker.

MR. STIRLING: My colleague reminds me I should speak to the Speaker and not directly to the Minister. Thank you very much, the

August 6, 1979

Tape 583

RT-3

MR. STIRLING:

seasoned member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary).

The indication is that the government who are owners, who are the board of directors - the government was not even anticipating a deficit in 1978. Then they add an \$8,000,000 deficit last year, are anticipating a \$3,500,000 deficit this year, and then in a news report said, 'Well, maybe we can bring it down to two or three hundred thousand dollars.' Now, there is nobody in the business community that can take a look at those owners, that government, and say that there is anything rational about that approach because

MR. STIRLING:

you cannot operate in that manner.

You can come out -

MR. BARRY:

That is not the way it is done.

MR. STIRLING:

I am sure we will get the opportunity to hear how it is done.

You can take a look, for example, at the government and again the Premier said, this new government with our step forward type of approach 'We are not going to increase taxes.' That is what the average Newfoundlander heard, 'We are not going to increase taxes.' And now he said, Well, what he really meant is there are three or four sections of the Act in which he was not going to increase taxes. But he is going to increase taxes by \$6.5 million. It is an increase in taxes.

MR. BARRY:

It is an income tax (inaudible) the retail or (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING:

That is right, income taxes. And he is not going to go to the bathroom except on Sundays or something like that.

The thing is that the people of Newfoundland heard this new administration saying, 'We will not increase taxes.'

MR. BARRY:

Income taxes or retail sales taxes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) no tax increases.

MR. STIRLING:

And he is right, retail sales tax.

But he brings in a media tax. Now who is going to pay the media tax? What is the media tax if it is not a retail sales tax? The media tax - Was there any consultation with anyone about the media tax? In the two areas, the one area is consumer, the other area is the business community and the development community. And the people who look at a province like Newfoundland, who without consultation, without discussion, without warning, throw this completely new, unknown question mark 4 per cent - Are we going to tax Simpsons catalogue? - if you want to tax somebody from outside the Province. No, this is the 4 per cent media tax that has caused all kinds of great confusion on the Mainland. And it is not just the tax, it is this whole question of believability and credibility and Does this government know where they are going? - the question of stability.

MR. STIRLING: The same people who can be encouraged to bring money into Newfoundland and invest in Newfoundland or to look at this as a place of opportunity, these same people, what are they hearing in the headlines from the Canadian Advertisers Association and the various organizations that are all affected by this media tax? Is this bunch of people down in Newfoundland doing something else weird and different and unnerving and unsettling? It is a completely unpredictable kind of approach. The 4 per cent media tax is bad enough because it has many, many more questions than it answers.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: I see that the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has returned.

There should be a point of order on that.

MR. STIRLING: I notice that -

MR. RIDEOUT: In a (inaudible) way.

MR. STIRLING: No, I had better not say. I will leave it, because he is going to get his fingers rapped tomorrow as the chairman of the committee that is playing God and we will get our satisfaction when he gets put in line tomorrow. So I will not have any other comments about his interferences now.

Mr. Speaker, there is not going to be an increase in taxes and in brackets somebody says, 'retail taxes'.

To the average 'Joe' who goes in and buys a pack of cigarettes, what is that five cent increase?

AN HON. MEMBER: Luxury.

MR. STIRLING: Luxury, is it? Luxury tax.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) tax.

MR. STIRLING: Yes.

What do you call the 11 per cent insurance tax?

MR. NEARY: Shocking.

MR. STIRLING:

The 11 per cent insurance tax was not called a retail tax. It is the only province in Canada, Mr. Speaker, the only one - another unique thing for all of Canada. Only in Newfoundland do we have an 11 per cent tax on your insurance premiums that is consumer paid.

Now, something that may not be known to many members opposite is that you also pay the tax on the car repairs that makes up 50 per cent or 60 per cent of your premium.

MR. STIRLING: So, you are paying 11 per cent on your car repairs, that is paid for by insurance, and you pay 11 per cent tax on insurance. Those people advertise and they pay a 4 per cent tax, and there is an increase from 2 to 3 per cent. Who do you think pays all those insurance taxes, if it is not the consumer? You can add them all up.

MR. MORGAN: The companies should pay they make enough profits.

MR. STIRLING: See, Mr. Speaker, I just got through complimenting the minister on how much information he gave us in his area of expertise, the minister of Lands and Forests, but when he says that insurance companies should it pay it out of their profits, it shows how little he knows about that, because the total insurance profits in Newfoundland do not equal the 2 per cent. Total insurance profits if they gave them all back to the Minister of Lands and Forests would not equal 2 per cent, so the 11 per cent that the government collects is 500 times 500 per cent of what the insurance companies make. That is a separate question, I better not get into that one.

Time has just about run out and I do not want to run - I will wait for a nod from the House Leader to tell me when I should stop so that we do not have the clock stopped or what have you.

MR. NEARY: You are all right for another two or three minutes.

MR. STIRLING: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. member (inaudible) he can move the adjournment of the debate now.

MR. NEARY: Move the adjournment and we will all go home.

MR. STIRLING: I move we adjourn the debate.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Before moving the adjournment, Mr.

Speaker, I would like to inform the House that tomorrow we will be back into the Budget Speech until it runs its course, and when the Budget Speech runs its course, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation Bill will be considered. After that the present program is, although as hon. members opposite would realize it is very difficult to plan that far ahead, but the present plan is to have the concurrence debates if they are ready, if not, we will have the money bills, but we will be into finances pretty well the whole time.

For the information of the House, the Committee meetings, Government Services will meet this evening, or wait now, tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. in the Colonial Building, considering Finance, Labour and Manpower. The Resource Committee will meet this evening at 7:30 in the Colonial Building, will be considering Fisheries and Mines and Energy. Tomorrow morning at 9:30 the Resource Committee will be meeting in the Collective Bargaining Room with Mines and Energy estimates and tomorrow evening at 7:30 in the Collective Bargaining Room on Mines and Energy. Social Services will meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. in the Department of Health boardroom and will be considering the estimates of the Department of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I move the -

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not think this information has been totally updated and I want to let hon. members know that the Resource Committee will be considering Fisheries this evening and also tomorrow morning up until about 10:45 or so before we begin Mines and Energy. I think that is the agreement between the Chairman and myself.

August 6, 1979

Tape No. 585

GH-3

MR. MARSHALL:

I put the notation in the wrong spots,
so it is, the Chairman confirms it.

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

On motion, the House at its rising
do now stand adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3 o'clock.