



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 40

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**Thursday, March 29, 1973**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met 11:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, before the presenting petitions. For some time I have been considering the methods of placing further emphasize on the troublesome area of sentencing in our courts. With this in mind I met with the Newfoundland Magistrates' Association who share my concern. It has been decided that the magistrates will hold four seminars on sentencing in the magistrates courts which are to take place during the first two weeks of April.

These seminars will involve all magistrates in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I recognize as do the magistrates the task of sentencing by the magistrate is one of his most difficult and demanding duties. Uniform sentencing is a very elusive although highly desirable aspect of the enforcement of law and order. It has been stated that there cannot be absolute uniformity of sentencing for given offences since this would require that all offenders be uniform and that all offences that they commit be uniform. This we all know is not and will not be the case.

While we probably cannot attain uniform sentencing we can strive to attain uniform principles of sentencing, the direct result of which might reduce to some degree at least disparity in sentencing that may occur at present. The many variables that a magistrate faces in arriving at the most appropriate sentence for any given offence include inter alia, the nature of the offence itself, the age and health of the offender, his or her previous record, his or her attitude at the time of trial with respect to rehabilitation, and also, the prevailing attitudes of society towards the given offence at a given point in time.

Our provincial magistrates are very much aware of this need to make every effort to reduce any undesirable disparities in sentencing. I have asked that they study on a continuing basis the

whole area of sentencing. I am pleased therefore to advise this House that plans have been completed for the convening of four seminars on sentencing to be held throughout the province during the month of April. These four seminars will take place in Corner Brook, Grand Falls, St. John's and Clarenville. All magistrates in Newfoundland will participate in one of the seminars. The President of the Newfoundland Magistrates Association will attend all four to provide continuing liaison from one seminar to the other. It is worthy of note that this is the first time magistrates in Newfoundland have embarked on a programme of regional meetings and seminars in smaller groups.

I thank the Newfoundland Magistrates Association for their splendid co-operation in preparing for these seminars.

#### NOTICE OF MOTIONS

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Energy, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

#### ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which was directed to me from the honourable member for St. Barbe North concerning the rental control board, probably it should be direct to the Minister of Provincial Affairs, it concerns the rental control board. What is the procedure, Mr. Speaker? Can we turn over the question to the Minister of Provincial Affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Premier because the Premier is not in his seat. Are the reports that we are hearing on radio and in the newspaper and on television that the government have muzzled ERCO in this recent spill of phosphorous that is running out in Long Harbour and out into Placentia Bay and that the government are now going to do the

public relations work for ERCO?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker,

MR. COLLINS: Rumours.

MR. HICKMAN: Or the rumours, but if they have been made, let me assure this House that they are rumours and nothing more.

MR. NEARY: Thank you.

HON. G. DAWE (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave of the House at this time to make a short statement.

HON. E. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): No, not if the minister were not here at 11:00 o'clock.

MR. DAWE: That is right. Okay.

MR. P.S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture I would like to direct a question to the Acting Premier. Could the Acting Premier inform this House as to when the Cook Report is to be tabled to this House? There is quite a concern in the poultry industry within the province at the present time and the minister has had this report in his hands for over six weeks.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice. As the House is aware, the honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture is presently confined to hospital. I would not presume to act on his behalf, but I will take it as notice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not certain but I do not believe there is. I think he is doing some work. I am saying that I will take it as notice. While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the honourable Minister of Industrial Relations was absent from the House because he has been at an important meeting and I am wondering if the House would consent, would grant him leave to -

AN HON. MEMBER: He can make it any time I think.

MR. HICKMAN: he is gone. Oh well, carry on!



HON. DR. T. FARRELL (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS):

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to table Highway Traffic Regulations.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion of the honourable Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Telegraph Tax Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Highways, a bill, "An Act To Revise Existing Legislation Respect All-Terrain Vehicles," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Government (Elections) Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Education and Youth, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Trustee Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Security Assessment Act, 1972, The Act No. 56 Of 1972," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between Newfoundland & Labrador Edison Company Limited With Shaheen Natural Resources Company, Inc. As Intervenor And To Make Provision Respecting Other Matters Concerned With The Agreement," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Indenture Made Between The Government, Newfoundland Forest Products Limited, Bowaters Canadian Corporation Limited, Bowaters Newfoundland Limited And Lundrigans Limited And An Agreement Between Government And Bowaters Newfoundland Limited And To Make Provision Respecting Matters Connected Therewith," read a third, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt A Supplemental Agreement Made Between The Government, Newfoundland Refining Company Limited And Other Companies," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

HON. T.A. HICKMAN(MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, the debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned by Your Honour and Your Honour has asked me to indicate to the House that you will not be participating

in the debate.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Well, Mr. Speaker, that means that I shall have to rise to my feet and have a few words to say on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I must say, Mr. Speaker, at 11:30 A.M. it is pretty hard to get the old adrenalin up and lash out at this crowd. At least I thought that was the way I would feel when I first came in but once you get in the House and look across at them and their arrogant, supercilious faces on them, Mr. Speaker, the old adrenalin starts moving again and you find yourself quite capable of lashing out left, right and center at the present administration.

Where is the House Leader by the way, Mr. Speaker? He so blithely calls everyone together before dawn in the morning but he does not show up himself. What is he, down practicing law somewhere?

MR. ROBERTS: He is probably down advising the Bank of Montreal.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Yes, advising the Bank of Montreal on what they should do in the circumstances.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): I was delayed, Mr. Speaker. I was down there turning out the money, Mr. Speaker, but do not tell my hon. colleague from Bell Island.

Well, Mr. Speaker, may I begin my few remarks by saying something which I suppose is fairly obvious but I think, Sir, sincerely it should be stated every now and then in order for this province to see what it has been doing and what it is doing and what it hopes to do in the future as far as bettering the standard and quality of life of our citizens is concerned. Now, Sir, it has always been my firm belief ever since I got in this House and became a member of the government that there are really only two ways that Newfoundland and Labrador are going to surge ahead economically and

socially, only two ways, two obvious ways. One is by our own efforts as a province and as a government and the other way is by taking shameless advantage of the fact that we do happen to belong to the Canadian Union of Provinces. Only two ways that occur to me that we are going to ever make this province really viable economically; By our own efforts whereby we as a government or as businessmen or as labour leaders or as employees or workmen, workers, take advantage of our own sense, I suppose, of near desperation in many, many cases and to use that not as an attitude of defeat, as the Minister of Finance has expressed in this House on one or two occasions, not to give us a defeatist attitude as to how, if this province is ever going to be able to pull itself up by its boot straps, not for that, Mr. Speaker, but to take advantage, everyone in this province to take advantage of our own sense of near desperation, which has always been the feeling in Newfoundland ever since it first became an entity, near desperation as to whether we really are going to be able to pull this province over the hump or not.

That to me, Sir, and to people with whom I associate, that to me is a challenge for the future. It does not turn us into defeatists. It does not make us stand in the House of Assembly and say, "Well, sometimes it seems to me we are never going to be able to make it." We might as well lie down and die, curl up in a corner, Mr. Speaker, and pass away. We should use that to make sure that in this province we take advantage of the best talent there is to govern us, to make sure that the best talent is involved in leadership capacity to try to pull this province along, to make us surge ahead economically by virtue of our own efforts. Point number one.

Point number two, Sir, is that we should use the same demonic feeling of pushing our province ahead to take shameful, as I say, shameful advantage, complete advantage of the fact that we are a part of Canada, the richest, perhaps the richest actually and

potentially the richest country on the face of the earth today for the population which it has, just over 20 million people. We should take complete advantage of that, Mr. Speaker, because it is my feeling that to pursue neither of these avenues open to us, that is our own efforts in this province itself, to develop our resources, to develop all the advantages we have, to develop our manpower, to try to get jobs here in Newfoundland, to get industrialization based on resources and manufacturing industry, unless we do that to our fullest extent, pursue that avenue to its fullest extent and unless we make sure that we also take advantage of our union with Canada to its fullest extent, then I think that we are in for a disaster. To pursue neither of these avenues fully would be disastrous. To pursue only one of these avenues and to neglect the other, Mr. Speaker, I think would be equally disastrous.

I think that if we were to get the idea into our minds, that sort of the heck with

Canada, as again the Minister of Finance has almost expressed in those words in this House. Every chance he gets and the other members of this government they lash out at the Government of Canada giving a firm impression that they are doing nothing not to ingratiate themselves with the Government of Canada but to co-operate with the Government of Canada to make sure that we get the best possible deal from Canada in various programmes. If we try to rely only on our own efforts, as great as they might be, and do not take advantage of what Canada has to offer, I think that would be only slightly less disastrous rather than trying to pursue or making sure we pursue both avenues at once.

Also, Sir, if we neglect in this province to do what we can do as Newfoundlanders and try to rely only on Canada, what Canada can dish out to us or pass out to us on a silver platter, I think that will also be disastrous for this province as well.

Certainly we have as a result of our union with Canada things like equalization grants, shared cost programmes and industrial development grants from DREE and grants and loans from DREE for public services but, Sir, to rely only on these programmes and not to make sure that we pull our own selves up by our boot straps as well would mean that we forever in this province will merely be sort of tagging along, tugged along at the end of what might be called a long rat tail of Canada, just pulled along. Wherever the beast goes we go to, but a very long way behind, Mr. Speaker, unless we concentrate our efforts on what we can do ourselves as well.

What is the good of share-cost programmes, for example, from Canada if we do not have the resources or if we have not provided for resources to make sure that these shared-cost programmes are kept at a good minimum level.

What is the sense of industrial development grants from DREE, for example, if nobody in this province or if people in this province are discouraged from being aggressive and getting involved in industry which can take advantage of these grants.



What is the sense of lots of money from DREE, capital grants from DREE and loans from DREE, Mr. Speaker, if we in this province do not have enough money to operate the so-called infrastructure at a good level. For example schools. Every dollar of capital grants from DREE for the development of schools, the building of schools, means we have to find more money in this province to run these schools at an acceptable level. That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, it is no good for us to rely solely on Canada. Not only is it morally wrong and a sort of sluggish and slothful idea in itself to just try and hang on and accept dole from Canada but it will also mean that we in Newfoundland will never rise to the average across Canada. We will merely be tugged along at the end of the rat tail of Canada and the bigger that beast gets, the further we get away from the center. We go generally in the same direction all the time but pulled along woefully far behind the main stream in Canada.

That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that these two ways are parallel. Although what I have said is really obvious - it is obvious, nothing new or novel about it - it seems to me that we have to state it every now and then to see if we are in fact in this province making best efforts on our own, our Newfoundland Government to develop what we have here as a bunch of Newfoundlanders and also to see if we are taking best advantage of what the Government of Canada and the Nation of Canada has to offer to us as an integral part of that great union. Obvious, Mr. Speaker, but I believe necessary to state. Otherwise we really do not know where we are going.

As far as our first twenty-three years of union with Canada were concerned, I think we did not do too bad a job at all. I was only involved in it for the last two and a-half years of that twenty-three years and I think a pretty good job was done by the government of that day. History will judge, Mr. Speaker, as to whether those years, the years of the Smallwood Administration were good, bad or indifferent as far as the growth of this province was concerned. I do believe



myself that not only did we take advantage of our own efforts of what we had to offer here to ourselves in Newfoundland but we also took great advantage of the Government of Canada and what Canada itself had to offer.

Now, Sir, I want to look for a moment at what this present administration has done in the year and a quarter that they have formed the Government of this province, over a year and several months since they came into power here, to see what they have done as far as following those parallel routes are concerned. How have they done as far as taking advantage of help from Canada is concerned and as far as moving Newfoundland along as a result of their own efforts and the efforts of our Newfoundland people? How have they done?

Let us look at the assistance from Canada first, Mr. Speaker, and see how this government measures up over the past year and a quarter. There are many programmes which this province participates in which are sponsored by the Government of Canada. They apply equally to all provinces on various formulas, various basis are laid down for them and of course these are on-going and continuing programmes. There is one programme, the DREE Programme, which is an entirely new concept and was an entirely new concept as far as dominion provincial relations are concerned. The stated aim of the DREE Programme when it was set up - the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was set up some three years ago - was to overcome inequalities and disparities and unfair treatment in various parts of Canada, particularly the Atlantic Seaboard, for example, including Newfoundland, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. That is why it was set up and there was no formula as such whereby it was stated that Newfoundland is entitled to a certain amount per capita or Quebec is entitled to a certain amount per capita or anything like that. It was supposed to be based on the plans produced by the Provincial Government, the arguments produced by the Provincial Government to show the disparities and how far they had to go, ideas as to how the disparities could be gotten

rid of, how plans for bringing a province, whether it be Newfoundland or Nova Scotia, further ahead economically and by way of putting in public services. That is what it is based on. It is not based on any rigid formula, Mr. Speaker.

So, what I would like to do is look for a moment at what this present administration has been able to get out of DREE in the year and a quarter or so that they have been in power. When we had the privilege of forming the administration, we managed within an eighteen month period, call it a two year period, we managed to get two DREE Agreements signed. One was a Special Areas Agreement and one a Highways Agreement. Well, actually there were two Special Areas Agreements and two Highways Agreements but they were all lumped together so we will call them two agreements. Those two agreements brought into this province a commitment not in cash completely because some of the projects were a long time getting under way but they brought into this province a commitment from the federal government for more than \$130,000,000 in loans and grants for public services such as schools, water and sewer systems, highways construction, upgrading and paving of various highways, industrial parks. I believe the actual figure in the two agreements was \$132,000,000 in loans and grants. Well, it is for whatever the deadline might be in each of the agreements.

The first agreement had certain deadlines. In other words, projects would be started now and it might take them two years to complete or however long it takes to spend the money, but that is not the point. The point is that there was supposed to be other agreements as time went on, as well taking other projects into consideration, as I will show, Mr. Speaker, over \$130,000,000 in grants and loans from Canada committed to this province in the first two agreements.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of studies commissioned by the second agreement which were supposed to lead to new money from Ottawa

in the ensuing years, over the five year period which the first DREE segment was supposed to last. The whole programme was supposed to last fifteen years in total but there was a five year period first of all to see how that would go. There were supposed to be a number of agreements signed during that period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the idea was as announced by myself as minister at the time and by Mr. Marchand who was the minister at the time, The idea was to try to get new DREE agreements signed every year, if at all possible, during the five year period, the initial five year period that DREE was set up to operate in. Mr. Marchand and I made statements both officially and unofficially to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, we saw brought into this House the other day an announcement made by Mr. Jamieson and the Premier, I believe, or the Minister of Industrial Development, an announcement whereby there was an amendment to the second agreement and this province was to get under that amendment \$25 million extra, as I understand it, \$25 million. An amendment, Mr. Speaker, a year and a-half after the second DREE agreement was signed, all we have presented by this present administration after negotiating with Ottawa is a measly amendment to the second agreement with \$25 million added to this province. Nobody would say that \$25 million is not a considerable sum of money but relatively speaking, Mr. Speaker, compared to the average which we were able to get from DREE in the first two years of the operation of that department, it is a small amount of money. We were able to get commitments from DREE of up to an average of \$65 million per year, over the first two years, the first two agreements. This administration has been able to get, after a year and a-half, more than a year and a-half since the last agreement was signed, going on for a year and three-quarters now since the second agreement was signed, this administration is able to come in here with an amendment to the second agreement and that is all.

The third agreement which was supposed to have been signed or the

idea was that it should have been signed about a year or so after the second agreement. In other words, last August, Mr. Speaker, last August, August of 1972, the third agreement, which should have been signed then, there is no sign of at all. It is somewhere in the misty fogbound future to listen to the Minister of Industrial Development when he answered my question in the House the other day. It may come up, who knows when it will come up, it may be a matter of months yet before that third agreement is signed.

There may be another amendment to the highway's agreement which will probably bring in, I do not know, I do not try to get Mr. Jamieson to give away any confidences or anything nor any member of his staff, I do not even ask Mr. Jamieson about it, but I would imagine that a highway's agreement would only bring in another \$10 million at most. I would be very surprised if there is \$10 million extra money in the new highway's amendment, the second highway's agreement, which would mean that this government has been able to get out of Ottawa, nearly two years after the second agreement was signed, about \$35 million, say just over half of what we were able to get from Ottawa in each of the first two agreements which we signed with them. This, Mr. Speaker, is an indication of the planning that this administration said it was going to do, an indication of how effective restructuring is, for example.

I had my own misgivings when it was announced that the Department of Community and Social Development which heaven knows was in need of some kind of restructuring, because it had grown up like "Topsy" but when I heard that right in the middle of crucial negotiations with Ottawa, presumably, that department was wiped out of existence and the negotiations with the DREE programme was sort of left hanging up in the air, I said to myself then that this government is going to fail miserably, Mr. Speaker, in taking adequate advantage of that massive and vast programme which should be so helpful to this province, the DREE programme. This is the result of their planning

and their restructuring to date. An agreement delayed by nearly a year in getting signed and then not even a new agreement, merely an amendment and for only half the average which we were able to get under the first two DREE agreements, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the money is available. I know the money from DREE is available. If for no other reason, the presence of Quebec in this Union of Canada would ensure that. The efforts which have been made in the past, not only by the Liberal Government but by Progressive Conservative Government as well, to accommodate Quebec within the federal union, usually guarantees to provinces like Newfoundland that they are going to get a fairly good slice of federal money because the federal government cannot just lash it into Quebec and neglect other have-not provinces. The money is available, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about that whatsoever.

If we were able to get from a government and a minister, Mr. Marchand, from Quebec, if we were able to get an average of \$65 million from DREE committed in the first two agreements, then this government should be able to get from Mr. Jamieson, who is own native Newfoundlander, heading up DREE, they should at least be able to get an equal amount of money, Mr. Speaker, in the DREE agreement and they should at least be able to negotiate an agreement quickly and get money into this province. They have not done that, Sir, and I in no way blame Mr. Jamieson, because I know from unofficial and informal talks I have had with him that he is anxious and eager to help out his own native province as far as DREE is concerned, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

It is not his fault, but the initiative in planning for the DREE programme has to come from the provincial government. How much did we hear about planning, Mr. Speaker, in the past two or three years from the members of this administration? How much did we hear about planning? "The Government of Newfoundland do no planning" they used to say, No planning? No, Mr. Speaker, no planning, just enough planning to get more money out of Ottawa in the DREE programme alone than any



other province in Canada was able to get per capita and absolutely, with the exception of P.E.I. which was under the original FRED programme. More money out of DREE in absolute terms for infrastructure and public services, more money out of DREE per capita, per head of this population and absolutely, with the exception of P.E.I. than any other province in Canada, that is what we were able to get. That was the lack of planning, Mr. Speaker, This crowd with their emphasis and stress on planning, restructuring, subcommittees and task forces and thirty-six or thirty-seven thousand dollar a year special assistants is able to come up with a measly half of what we were able to get under the original DREE agreement and then a year later than it should have been received in any event.

When the money is available and we are there in Ottawa with a minister who is anxious and eager, I would almost say if I did not know Mr. Jamieson was an extremely responsible politician, I would say that he was anxious and eager to lash it out to Newfoundland with both hands. He is not, of course. He has to put out money to this province on the basis of plans submitted by this government and by this province. He cannot impose his will on the province and say: "Why does not the province do this or why does not the province do that?" because, constitutionally, Mr. Speaker, they do not have any rights or responsibilities in those areas. All they can do is review the plans which have been submitted to them by St. John's, by the province, here in Newfoundland, and look at it and say whether this seems to be sensible or not, whether this seems to be viable or not, whether there seems to be any great need for this sort of thing or not - and they give their approval or their veto as the case might be.

The initiative has to come from this province and we have seen what has been the result of the provincial initiative, Mr. Speaker, a trifling amount of money comparatively speaking, a lot of money to your average person, \$25 million, a lot of money to any person but a

trifling amount compared to what this government could have gotten if they had gone about it in the right way, if they had put the stress on really trying to take advantage of the money and the programme which Ottawa is willing to offer to this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which money? Which programmes?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member who just chimed in, the member for Grand Falls, came out, Mr. Speaker, in December and said that he was hoping to see a new agreement signed...

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sure.

MR. SENIOR: Which money and which programmes are being referred to?

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am referring, Mr. Speaker, I went to some length I thought to try to talk about the special areas agreement and the highway's agreement. That is what I am talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Vague generalities are what you are talking about.

MR. SENIOR: Right.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Vague generalities? I am talking, Mr. Speaker,



MR. WM. ROWE: about money which is available from DREE and I know whereof I speak.

MR. SENIOR: Qualify your statements.

MR. WM. ROWE: For what reasons?

MR. SENIOR: Because the public want to know what you are talking about.

MR. ROWE: I will tell the public what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, what I have been talking about for the last half hour, that there are vast sums of money available in the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion for special areas programmes and for highways agreements in this province, that is what I am talking about.

The honourable member who could not even hang onto a Cabinet seat, Mr. Speaker, should be very loathe to get up in this House and try to pretend he knows anything about it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must give him credit, He did come out in November or December of last year and say that he hoped to see a new agreement signed with Ottawa in January. He hoped to see a new agreement signed with Ottawa in January, January past. Now January went passed, February went passed and March went almost passed and we saw not a new agreement but an amendment to the second agreement.

The honourable member for Grand Falls at the same time said, when he was ignominiously taken by the scruff of the neck and the slack of the pants and "hove" out, he said, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason he can figure out for why he was thrown out is that the attitude that he had taken, namely that this province should be (and I am paraphrasing; undoubtedly when he speaks in this debate he might have something to say about it himself) that he himself personally was very eager and wanted to get money out of the DREE programme but he was being stymied by officials, I think, and officialdom and bureaucrats and what not, and I can believe him and I can sympathize with him completely, Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with him.

MR. WM. ROWE: I know what a problem it is, not only in the provincial government but in the Canadian Government, trying to come to grips with the bureaucrats and officials who are, to say the least, foot draggers when it comes to aggressive action and trying to get money committed for this province or for any other province. I sympathize with him.

What I could not understand was why the Premier would take a man who was obviously, if he had that attitude, such a valuable part of the administration, this is what I could not understand, and relieve him of his position in the Cabinet. The last thing any Premier should be doing is tossing out fellows who are willing to take on, Mr. Speaker, officialdom and really get cracking at what the real action is after all, getting the money committed to the province, pushing, in some cases even overriding the bureaucratic attitude in order to get commitments from the Government of Canada which will be to the benefit of this province. That is why I could not understand, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's attitude when he threw out this honourable member, because I think he had the right attitude. He was doing what was necessary and I think he was very concerned that this province was going to lose its place in getting money out of DREE and for some reason or other he found himself out in the cold, which was a shame. I was sorry to see it because unofficially I talked to other people - you meet an official of the department in the elevator for example, you say, "How are things going?" They say, "Good." "How is your minister?" I would say. "Good he is really getting after the job, he is trying to do the job."

That was the attitude of the department, Mr. Speaker. They knew they had an aggressive man and a man who was eager and anxious to try to do the best for this province and what do we find, a man like that who is a good man thrown out and the DREE programme I would say, suffered needlessly as a result and the result has been

seen, vast millions of dollars available to this province and we get one half of what we have been averaging over the past two or three years from DREE.

MR. CROSBIE: Twaddle.

MR. WM. ROWE: Another policy statement from the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker - twaddle.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that this prime source of revenue to this province has been sorely neglected and I do hope for the sake of this province that this present Progressive Conservative Administration does pull up its socks in that regard and go after the Government of Canada with well thought out plans and ideas and try to get more money into this province, because God knows, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to it. We are entitled to more money. We are entitled to a greater share of the vast wealth of the Canadian Nation. We are entitled to that, merely and purely and solely by reason of being a member of that union and no other reason. We are entitled to a better share and a fair share.

I am sure that the honourable Mr. Jamieson in Ottawa will see to it that we are not neglected in that regard; as a matter of fact the absolute reverse of that would be true. He would see to it that we are looked after in that regard. Although, Mr. Speaker, you have to admit that both his patience and the patience of every other minister in the Government of Canada must be sorely strained on occasion when they hear a report that the Minister of Finance here, supposedly a responsible person, or the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation I believe is also in on the act, and the Minister of Education and one or two other ministers, standing up in this House and lashing out at the Government of Canada for some piece of pettiness or other, Mr. Speaker, lashing out at them.

The Minister of Finance does not lose sight of an opportunity

to lash out at them, not that he should be down on his knees grovelling to the Government of Canada, he should not be doing that. He should not even be begging, asking for handouts or anything else. The Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada should meet each other face to face and eye to eye, Mr. Speaker. But how does he expect the co-operation that he promised prior to the last election, how does he expect the co-operation from the Government of Canada when every opportunity and his colleagues at every opportunity lash out at them and give them the worst possible name that they can in the eyes of this province and in the eyes of Canada?

Mr. Speaker, the whole way that this administration has handled their negotiations with Ottawa, their talks with Ottawa, their efforts to get more assistance from Ottawa, has been disastrous, as far as I am concerned, we have seen the result of it.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the \$24 million.

MR. WM. ROWE: \$24 million, yes, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Well who cares, (John) has got special rules, did you not know that? Everyone else adheres to the rules, Mr. Speaker, he has special rules. He speaks from outside.

MR. MORGAN: Do not use names now.

MR. WM. ROWE: Oh listen to the great expert on the rules over there now. The Chancellor from McGill, Mr. Speaker, will give us a dissertation on parliamentary procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It has already been stated to the House that the order of debate would tend to generate comment. I would ask honourable gentlemen to speak only when they have the floor.

MR. WM. ROWE: In any event, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, he says, "What about the \$24 million?" The day before this manna fell from heaven, he was up here saying, "Blame John Turner, Mr.

Speaker, blame him for Newfoundland's difficulties." The next day \$24 million drops into his lap like manna from heaven, saved his skin this year, Mr. Speaker. It may not next year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a fact?

MR. WM. ROWE: It is a promise, saved his neck, saved his skin, Mr. Speaker, otherwise he would have lashed - he would have put on the taxes and the people of Newfoundland are already taxed enough. But he was saved this year.

The very man who he vilified the day before, drops \$24 million into his lap. He had no more idea about it, Mr. Speaker, no more idea, can take no more credit for it, was no more involved in it than a two year old child. It came directly from Ottawa and this administration were more surprised than anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that there has not been a motion of no-confidence moved in this House since this administration came to power, there has not been. We did not last year because it is senseless to be moving any votes of no-confidence in the first year of a government's tenure of office. It makes no point at all. Let us see what they can do. Give them a track record, see how they measure up against previous governments and other governments of Canada. If ever there was a reason, Mr. Speaker, now after a year and a quarter in office, if ever there was a reason for this House to vote no-confidence in this administration, their handling of the DREE programme and the monies available under the DREE programme, Mr. Speaker, is that reason. They are shamefully neglecting, instead of shamefully taking advantage they are shamefully neglecting that prime source of revenue.

If ever there were a reason for no-confidence, it is that. It is so self-evident, Mr. Speaker, everybody can see, everybody can compare. There is no need to even stimulate or provoke a debate on it because it is self-evident, it is manifested by the results which they had in their negotiations with Ottawa. There is no intention on my part to move any motions of no-confidence on those grounds, although there is adequate reason to do so. It is so self-evident it is not even necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning from the shambles of a job which this administration have done in trying to get money out of Ottawa which was one of the avenues, I said, that this government should take, one of the routes it should take in trying to build up this province, turning from that shambles and that neglect, that incompetence, Mr. Speaker, I am going to have a look now at the last year and one-quarter and see how this government have done as far as its own sphere of jurisdiction is concerned, as far as matters which are purely and simply under their own power and control and jurisdiction, to see how they have done in trying to move this province ahead, to try and get development going, to try to get us to surge ahead as I have said, economically. Again, Mr. Speaker, as I hope to show and as other honourable members in this House have already shown and will show, again with one exception which we talked about the last day, a couple of days ago on the new refinery, with one exception (we will talk about that again later) this government have fallen down again, Mr. Speaker, on the job of trying to move this province ahead, either economically, industrially, producing jobs or supplying much needed public services to our people and thereby bettering the standard and quality of life of our people. I will give some examples of what I mean by that but first, Mr. Speaker, let us ask one simple question: Why have this government fallen down so badly on that job of trying to push Newfoundland ahead? Why? I think there is no person in Newfoundland, no voter in Newfoundland, no member of the media and certainly no member of this House who does not know the answer to this question.



Ever since they got into power, Mr. Speaker, in January, a year and one-quarter ago, this administration and the head of this administration, the Premier, have shown absolutely no leadership to this province. The Premier himself has shown no leadership to his cabinet. The cabinet itself has shown no leadership nor solidarity nor pulling together as the great team they were supposed to be, has shown none of that, Mr. Speaker, to the people of this province. The record of leadership, Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out by some pretty good editorials or comments in the media over the past days and months; the record of leadership in this province by the Premier himself is abysmal. There is no leadership. There is no leadership shown by that honourable gentleman. As a result his cabinet is in complete disarray. There are conflicting statements left, right and centre. There is no feeling to the Newfoundland people that they are pulling together, a disjointed array, Mr. Speaker. This cabinet is almost like the analogy the former Premier used to use, Premier Smallwood. He used to say that one danger you have to be on guard against when you are in a cabinet is that each cabinet minister does not turn into a petty duke, responsible only for his own little bailiwick and not concerned about the broad general problems facing the province. That is what this government, Mr. Speaker, have given the impression of being in the past year and one-half - a disjointed array of petty dukes who gather together every now and then to probably harrass the king or to try and root something out of the king but concerned merely or at least this is the impression, concerned generally speaking with their own little bailiwicks with no broad principles of policy being enunciated by the government. There seems to be a positive joy, Mr. Speaker, in this government and the ministers of it showing how independent they are from one another. This is the impression you get from listening to them. It is not like the bad old days when there was one-man rule, they say. We are all independent men. We are all doing our own thing.

The concept of cabinet government, Mr. Speaker, has escaped the Premier and his colleagues. I remember the Premier saying one time,



my hon. friend from Bell Island will remember this - a question was asked: "What contracts do the government have with George McLean?" The Premier of the Province, supposedly a sensible and intelligent man, comes out and says, "The government have no contracts with Mr. McLean." Then he went a little bit further and said, "However, the Department of Highways has a contract with him. The Department of Fisheries has a contract with him. This department has a contract with him." What, Mr. Speaker, a complete show of lack of understanding of what the cabinet system of government is all about as if one department is one little bailiwick here and another department is a duke here and here is the prince of this and here is that. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker! Departments of government are nothing more nor less than convenient divisions for more or less bureaucratic purposes of the general government control and power and jurisdiction. Every minister of the government, Mr. Speaker, is as politically responsible for all other acts of his colleagues as those ministers themselves. What is simpler than that? Cabinet solidarity, that is what the whole system of government which we are living under is based on, Mr. Speaker, grown up over a period of 200 or 300 years.

The Premier does not even know that, apparently. Positive joy, Sir, in saying, well I do not know the answer to that, A broad question, important, overriding question is raised by one of my colleagues in the House and the Premier has not even heard about it. Half the time the minister, the man responsible, has not even heard about it. Nobody seems to be getting tabs on anybody else. Nobody seems to be providing any guidance. No one's hand is on the tiller, as the "Evening Telegram" said there some days ago. The Premier does not seem to be aware of the big problems going on in the province or the possible solutions to them. A question is asked and he will say, "Well, let me see now, my minister as he says, my colleague will deal with that." He does not seem to be aware of it. He is satisfied not to provide any leadership or having any

overall control which a premier in a government should provide. Everyone is going around higgledy-piggledy, Mr. Speaker. That is one of the reasons why this government have fallen down on the job of trying to pull this province up by its own efforts. Other reasons, Mr. Speaker: The number of conflicting statements, erroneous statements made by ministers and contradicted by the Premier and contradicted by another minister since this government came into power a short, scant year and one-quarter ago, the number, Mr. Speaker, boggles the mind.

I remember, Sir, there about towards the end of last year, the Come-by-Chance refinery was then in a little bit of trouble, more money was needed by the project. The Premier comes out one days and says, "Mr. Shaheen has found all the money for the project for the first refinery. He has found all the extra overruns needed." The very next day or maybe it was the day before his Minister of Finance was on the air saying, "No, he has not found the money. He has not found the money." It is a completely diametrically opposed statement by two ministers of the government who obviously, Mr. Speaker, had not even been in communication with each other on the point. We will come to one or two other examples. They had not even been in communication with each other on the point. What kind of confidence is given to the Newfoundland people, Mr. Speaker, with conflicting statements of that kind?

As my honourable colleagues says, late last summer the Minister of Finance, an admirable gentleman, as I have said repeatedly in this House, comes out and says, "Ames and Company are doing a good job in this province as the fiscal agents of the province. They are doing a good job." I think he intimated or indicated at the time that there was no intention of flinging them out, getting rid of them. He might have maintained that up to the very day, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure. He can mention that himself, when he speaks.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: I have heard the honourable gentleman say that about two or three times.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I am going to say it a few more times, too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Just a minute now. I would like the honourable gentleman to be good enough to produce the proof of that statement. I never said at any time whether we were continuing with Ames or not. I did say that they were doing a good job and they did. The rest of your statement is not correct.

MR. W. N. ROWE: At the time, Mr. Speaker, I am relying on a press release I made at the time, which I hope was based on something. I usually try to base it on something. I will try to dig it up

for the hon. minister. I will dig it up, Mr. Speaker, and try to see what I based it on but my firm impression and the impression of my colleagues here and of other people I have talked to in the media, I remember the very day when Burns Brother and Denton were announced. I believe CJON were the first to pick it up. They broke the news. How shocked. I happened to be up there at the time doing some sort of a programme, how shocked one or two of the newsmen were because as they said to me, "Sir, the Minister of Finance (and they called him by name) was saying the other day that Ames Brothers were good, great fellows." Well, the impression, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, given was one of again opposite statements made by two ministers, the Premier and the Minister of Finance. I would have accepted the Premier - I mean Ames and Company always took me as being sensible. The Minister of Finance's statement was probably the correct one yet he was overruled publicly or apparently publicly and Burns Brother and Denton, for obvious reasons, we have already canvassed that question in this House, Burns Brothers and Denton were put in as agents in this province.

Early last fall, Mr. Speaker, again the Premier announced the government was taking over the Marystown shipyard although it was already a crown corporation. Presumably what he meant was that the Israeli company was not going to be the operators any longer and that a new operator was going to take over. The Premier announced that, Mr. Speaker, the take over of the Marystown shipyard by the government. The Minister of Economic Development at the time, the member for Fortune Bay, when asked about it would not confirm it even. He was the Minister of Economic Development and as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, to this day the Marystown shipyard is still being run by this Israeli company, six or seven months later. The minister went to Israel and found out what a great group of people they were,

As a matter of fact "Time Magazine" which is not the gospel or authority on these matters, had a picture -

MR. EARLE: I would like to ask the hon. member if he sees any fault in an operation which has made progress since that day and is now operating at full capacity and employing a major number of men? This is the result of the negotiations with the Israelis.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted. The hon. minister seems to forget perhaps because he cannot keep track of what government he is in on various days, he is back and forth so often, he seems to forget that it was the previous Liberal Smallwood Administration which put this Israeli group in there for just that purpose, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARLE: And they did not accomplish it, that is why -

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Well, who is running it now?

MR. EARLE: The government and it is doing well.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): And who is down - A Mr. Rennie who was put in there by the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Oh, he is working for you now.

MR. EARLE: And three hundred odd men.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): When was the Israeli company put out of it?

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible). They are not out of it yet, as far as we know

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that is right.

Mr. Rennie used to be with the fellow who built the Queen Elizabeth II who was the backbone and guts of the Israeli operation down in Marystown and is still there, as far as I know, working for us.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): He is a good man and we put him in there, Mr. Speaker, and we knew that this kind of result would come from it. But the point I am trying to make is that the Premier would make a statement, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. Minister of Economic Development at the

time when asked will not even confirm it and probably was not even aware of what was going on. What I am trying to say, Sir, is that there is a disjointed public attitude portrayed by this administration.

MR. EARLE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): They did not.

MR. EARLE: The government provided all of this.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Well, okay, Mr. Rennie seems to be a good fellow but he was the operator of it for the Israelis as he is for the government. He is a good fellow. He is the heart and soul of the operation down there, I understand. He is a good man, I understand he is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! While hon. members may agree with one another to carry on a banter or answer questions, one to ask the other to answer questions, hon. members are only permitted to debate in this House when having the floor and until the member for White Bay South yields the floor no other member is to be permitted to ask him questions nor is he, technically speaking, to answer them.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Okay, Mr. Speaker, great. Then we had the same thing again. I remember there back in last year again the biggest kind of a squabble developed ostensibly between the Government in Ottawa as to who should be appointed first, the president or the Board of Directors of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, A big squabble developed between this government and the Government of Canada but it turns out from the announcement made by Mr. Jamieson's office that apparently the whole reason for the difficulty, as far as I can make out, was that the hon. Minister of Economic Development of that day had said one thing and the Premier's office had said something else and this had led the Government of Canada astray and led everybody down the garden path. We saw the unseemly spectacle of about two or three weeks going by with no effort being made to get that Newfoundland Development



Corporation going, not going to this moment, functionally, as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, we saw no effort, all we saw was an unseemly squabble as to whom should be appointed first, a president or a Board of Directors. Who comes first, the chicken or the egg? This is what they were preoccupied with during those halcyon days.

Mr. Speaker, another example -

MR. EARLE: To a point of order. The statements which the hon. gentleman is making at present are completely false and I shall refute them.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Go ahead and refute them, Mr. Speaker. I do not care. He can refute them till the cows come home but I am giving my impression of what transpired during those days and I am going by what came out of - Mr. Jamieson, I believe, made a statement, my colleagues might be able to remember it as well, made a statement that he had understood from the Premier's office that such and such was the case which was diametrically opposed to the Minister of Economic Development's statement, and this public squabble going on, Mr. Speaker, a public squabble over a development corporation which should have been one of the saviours of the economy of the province here. That is what I am talking about and how this government ever expects to have any confidence from the Newfoundland public in these matters.

Last year again, Mr. Speaker, when the bad scandal came to the fore the hon. the president now hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs apparently was involved in some way there, I am not accusing him of anything because I do not think he probably did anything, He was involved with Babb Construction Company with regard to the building of a home for the aged. The next thing we know the Premier comes bouncing back from one of his trips down South and cut the legs completely from under the hon. minister on that occasion and said



that he knew nothing about it and he was personally going to investigate it. I mean is that how the events transpired? Cut the legs out from under one of his own colleagues, Mr. Speaker, right out from under him and his colleague then is made to look like something less than well, at least something less than intelligent in the whole effort, whatever else might be read into it.

The same thing, Mr. Speaker, the same thing again when the hon. Minister of Justice was approached following the RCMP raid on homes and businesses last December, the Minister of Justice who first of all said that he knew nothing about it and then second of all said that he knew all about it. The Minister of Justice also had his legs cut out from under him when the Premier bounces back again from one of his myriad journeys out of this province and comes in as the saviour once more, Mr. Speaker, what he is going to do is talk to the RCMP or try to negotiate certain documents back from the court into some of the firms who were suffering because the documents had been taken from them. He made his Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, look like a man who had no idea of what he was doing, pulled the rug right out from under him, the man who apparently had been, if he had not directed these raids had at least been consulted on them as Minister of Justice and who was, I suppose according to his lights and his conscience, was doing a good thing, suddenly had the rug pulled out from under him once more by the Premier of this province who shoved, elbowed him to one side and says, "I am taking over here now and I (the saviour of mankind) am going to make sure that nobody suffers here, and here are your documents." Parsons and Landrigan, I think, the brokerage firm was involved in that particular case and obviously was suffering some inconvenience because of these documents having been taken from them and the Premier steps in, elbows the Minister

of Justice out of the way and passes over the documents ,  
apparently got the documents released and the court case in any  
event stopped at that point.

Above, Mr. Speaker, are only some of the examples, only  
some of the hundreds of examples I suppose by this time, certainly  
scores of examples, that anybody in this House had paid any attention  
at all to what has gone on in the province in the past year and a  
quarter, hundreds of examples of this lack of solidarity by members  
of this present administration, conflicting statements between  
ministers and between a minister and the Premier, the Premier  
pulling the rug out from under and cutting the legs out from under  
his ministers. All of these things, Mr. Speaker, which have been  
going on and which have undermined, in a terrible fashion have  
undermined any possible, any remaining remanent of

confidence which the people of Newfoundland still might have in this administration. Mr. Speaker, the Premier himself has been guilty of some very strange doings in the past several months at least. One example which was incredible and greeted by everybody as an incredible situation was when he came out and blasted, as my colleagues have already mentioned, the "Evening Telegram" for their treatment of him and his poor old colleagues. There treatment of himself, the criticism that he had been getting from them, from independent writers in the paper and from the columnists and the newsmen and from the editorials, blasted, lambasted the "Telegram" in a most of unheard of fashion. I never heard tell of it before. A complete over reaction, Mr. Speaker, to what had in fact gone on. Then a couple of days later or a week or two later, he goes on CJON television, I think "Issues and Answers" or one of them and when being asked by a reporter says: Yes, if he had his time back he would not have done that, Mr. Speaker, he would not have done if he had his time back. He was sorry for it and that he wish that he had not said it, but it was one of his bad days. The Premier had one of his bad days. Who has ever heard the like, Mr. Speaker, from a Premier of this province? Imagine a Premier not sitting down and trying to figure out in a logical, thoughtful fashion what if any action he should take regarding this kind of a situation. Instead he over-reacts, spur of the moment, spontaneously calls a press conference and lambasts one of the leading members of the media in this province. One of his bad days.

Mr. Speaker, I must say we appreciate very much especially on this side of the House we do appreciate the Premier telling us that he is subjected to bad days. We wish he had told us before he became Premier. We wish he had told the people of Newfoundland that he had his bad days. It is a little like getting aboard a plane, Mr. Speaker, and the pilot takes you off the ground, you are up about 4,000 feet and the pilot says, 'Well, by the way, I have these bad days

you know, every now and then I sort of collapse over the controls." We appreciate the pilot telling us, Mr. Speaker, so that you can keep an eye on him while you are a-half a mile up in the air, but you do wish that he told you before you ever got in the plane at all, do you not? You do wish he had done that as you would not be up there sweating bug juice, wondering what is going to come out of him next or what is going to happen next. The same situation with the Premier. Why did he not tell us before that he was subject to these bad days, these spur of the moment, spontaneous attacks on people? The same kind of thing on the Leader of the Opposition the other day, "I read the press release. A clear press release concerning the Gros Morne Park, Mr. Speaker." The Premier obviously had not even read it, he probably got fired up hearing it on the radio and comes into the House and makes another fool of himself, lambasted the Leader of the Opposition. After hearing the news that night, when they read the two statements, the Premier's statement and the Leader of the Opposition's statement, there was no doubt in anybody's mind as to who had fooled it up. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, another one of his bad days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Maybe we will get to that too. How long am I speaking now, Mr. Speaker? Do you have any idea?

MR. SPEAKER: One hour.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Twenty minutes remaining, I better forge ahead, Mr. Speaker. I better get going.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Premier's credibility on that score -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, if I can keep the honourable Minister of Finance in his seat. He must be doing something, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Speaker, I hope you are deducting all these interruptions from my time because I have a few more things to say and I may not be able to complete it in the ninety minutes.

Mr. Speaker, other examples of this government which have kept them from applying themselves to what they should have been doing, developing this province, other examples of a do-nothing government. All of these examples in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, would warrant a no-confidence motion. They would warrant it. But again, as I have said, they are so self-evident that there is no real need to try and stimulate debate on them.

But take an example from the Department of Justice, I am glad to see the minister is here to hear what I have to say. Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see the administration of justice in the past year or so, as I said in a public release outside of this House and I will say again inside of the House, as far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, the administration of justice in this province has consisted of strong-arm and sneaky methods on the one hand and no action whatsoever on the other hand, as far as I can see. I will give some examples to back it up.

We all remember the spectacle, I do not blame the minister for this, he was vacationing in P.E.I. at the time, it was last summer, I believe, we all remember the spectacle, for the first time in our history, if I remember correctly, a bunch of picketing mothers who were sick and tired of eating dust from their highway, sick and tired of it, a bunch of picketing mothers were set upon by the police who were following the instructions of the Department of Justice, set upon by the police, piled aboard cars, brought tens or scores of miles over the road to Gander, with their children you know tagging behind at home, left home there, brought to Gander, charged, Mr. Speaker, at tremendous inconvenience to themselves, taken back again, as far as I can make out, and subsequently all charges against them dropped. Perhaps the minister saw to it that these charges were dropped because he realized the iddocy and the foolishness

of that kind of an action. As far as I can understand unprecedented strong-arm method, Mr. Speaker, when what was needed really was I suppose some understanding and some consultation and talking it over with the women, a political solution in the best sense of the word rather than a legal solution, Mr. Speaker, that kind of a method by the administrators of justice.

But where was the Department of Justice? Where was the Minister of Justice, when under the directions I suppose of the Minister of Finance, our now leading member of the civil service, the chief returning officer or electoral officer whatever he is, called Harvey Cole, went down and ransack the offices of the, illegally ransacked the offices of the previous Premier of this province. This is what I am talking about, strong-arm and sneaky on the one hand and lack of action, Mr. Speaker, on the other. Police raids on the homes and businesses concerning Javelin that were talked about as another strong arm method. But where was the minister when the Premier, on another one of his bad days, has a reporter or two thrown out of a public part of this building, illegally in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, unless there was adequate notice given to the public at large that from now on this public part of the building was going to be a private part. Throw him out! Where was the Department of Justice or the Minister of Justice in that case, Mr. Speaker? Do nothing in that particular case. Do nothing when Harvey Cole ransacks a private office. But do everything, Mr. Speaker, when a bunch of mothers are picketing or when some witch hunt is needed to be done in respect of the Javelin situation.

The O'Dea Royal Commission, the Premier, Mr. Speaker, while crying crocodile tears and mealy-mouth says "this is the worst day of my life" as he waves the royal commission around here everywhere. Calls a-half a dozen press conferences, does this, that and the other thing to make sure the message gets across while he is crying crocodile tears, the saddest day of his life, waves it



around, besmirches a number of reputations in this province, smears the reputation as a result of that royal commission, which remember is not a court of law, Mr. Speaker, it was evidence taken in camera with as I understand very little opportunity for cross-examination or to confront your accusers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Oh, no, it is not true, Mr. Speaker.

In any event, Sir, the Premier comes out like a bolt out of the blue and what does he say without giving any reason for it or giving any reasons for it or giving any basis for it or anything, any rationality for it? The Royal Trust Company is exonerated by fiat, The Premier comes out; the Royal Trust Company which was involved in the royal commission and got some very harsh words from the royal commissioner is exonerated, Mr. Speaker.

No reason given. No rationale given for it whatsoever. Exonerated. What kind of justice is that, Mr. Speaker? A half a dozen other men are still going around under a cloud with their reputations besmirched, the Royal Trust Company carries on. So those examples, Mr. Speaker, from the administration

of justice, in my estimation again would merit and warrant a no-confidence motion in this House against this government, but again it is too self-evident, everybody knows about it, there is no need of really debating it, a stimulating debate on it.

Mr. Speaker, these have been the preoccupations of the government during the past year, this and the idiotic restructuring scheme which has done nothing but provide an obstacle and a big rock, bolder, in the way of progress in this province, nothing, Mr. Speaker. The province has been preoccupied with this kind of thing, the provincial government, Sir, nothing has been done, with one exception, as I have mentioned, nothing has been done concerning the development of this province.

In the field of mining, Mr. Speaker, is there anything going ahead that was not going ahead? All we were able to get from the minister the other day during supplementary or interim supply, I do not know which, all we were able to get from the minister was that: "Well some things are carrying on under the old policy but we have no new policy or no regulations" - something, I do not know, I did not quite understand it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nearly gave away the province.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Nearly gave away the province, that kind of thing, that kind of policy, Mr. Speaker, the past administration. Nothing going ahead as far as I can understand, nothing in the way of progress.

The forestry; the minister is not here so I should not say too much about it but the forestry industry, what is going on there? We were working towards getting some exchanges from Bowaters, hopefully in return for setting up a public corporation and getting money into the companies for access roads and all of that kind of thing, trying to get control of the forestry under the provincial government. Is there anything going ahead in that direction? Not a word heard, Mr. Speaker. People in the district, in my district, the Baie Verte Peninsula, dying for a bit of land to put a sawmill on, unless they got it within the last few days. They have been waiting for months now for the minister to

effect some kind of an exchange on the Bowater's limits as compared with Crown limits, waiting for days, I do not know if it is...

AN HON. MEMBER: Waiting for years.

MP. W.N. ROWE: Waiting for years, Mr. Speaker. We used to see to it whenever we could that there would be exchanges effected. I remember Gid Sacrey and A.T. White down on the Baie Verte Peninsula I am not sure White, but Gid Sacrey had an operation going on down there. We were able to effect an exchange. It is all stopped now. I do not know if they have been able to do anything since.

The Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, nothing going ahead there except the minister getting up and saying; "We are not going to give the Province away any more". So says the minister of Finance, "Not going to do it." What is going on there? No development there as far as I can understand. By this time, after a year and a-half, if there has been no good progress made towards negotiating the Lower Churchill Development, then the minister should think in terms of the government doing it. How much longer are we going to wait, Mr. Speaker?

Offshore oil is another example. No action except for the minister giving pep talks to service groups and tilting at windmills in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. So far I can see no real action being taken there to see that Newfoundland gets the maximum advantage, not only in regard of ownership, Mr. Speaker, because that is one of the least important matters. Who gets the economic advantage is what counts. Ownership is important of course but who gets the economic advantage, job opportunities in constructing and servicing that industry? This government has been in power for a year plus several months, there are not even regulations yet and the government does not foresee any regulations within the next year or so.

We have two examples in the States, Mr. Speaker, of Alaska on the one hand with offshore oil and Louisiana on the other hand with offshore oil. Alaska has the highest per capita income in the United States or one of the highest per capita incomes and one of the highest rates of growth. Louisiana has one of the lowest per capita incomes and one of the lowest rates of growth. They should be on a par, they should be on

a par, Mr. Speaker, but because I suppose, of the different directions taken by the various governments concerned, one is rich and one is poor. What I am afraid of in this province is that unless some drastic action, less talk, Mr. Speaker, and more action is taken with regard to the offshore rights, some regulations, some assertion of where we stand, some making sure that servicing is done here and construction and things like that, jobs are done here, if people are going to go offshore and explore off our Coasts. That is what should be done, otherwise, we will go the route, the way of Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, instead of the way of Alaska, I am very much afraid.

Mr. Speaker, these are some examples of the lack of action I believe on the part of this government and the reasons why there has been a lack of action both as far as pulling

itself up by the boot straps are concerned. As far as trying to get money out of Ottawa is concerned, this government in my estimation has been a dismal failure on both counts. I do not think they have taken advantage of what Canada has to offer. I do not think they have taken advantage or done what should be done under their own jurisdiction and their own sphere of control and interest. The only exception, Sir, to this do-nothing attitude we have seen is the second refinery. We have debated that at length in this honourable House. We have debated it at some length and I do not intend to get involved in that now except to say that we are delighted, very delighted that the government did go ahead with that deal. We are pleased about that, Mr. Speaker.

We have made some comparisons between the first and second refinery which I believe to be valid. Other men have other opinions. Reasonable men can differ on these points. I believe that. We have made some comparisons. What we did not get into, Sir, in any way is the way in which this present administration has let down the people of Newfoundland as far as their publicly stated policy was concerned. They have let them down. We have already mentioned words like hypocrisy and callous cynicism in the House, Mr. Speaker. This government are now pushing ahead with something which they went out of their way over a period of years to universally condemn and absolutely condemn in this province, Mr. Speaker. They are now doing what they condemned to a man. As far as I am concerned, Sir - I mentioned this before and I had strong feelings on it, what should be a party's position in respect of their publicly committed policy to the electorate - as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, this administration did mislead the public of this province. I do not know if it is parliamentary to say that they deliberately misled the public of this province. I am not talking about anything that went on in this House. I am talking about outside when elections and things were on and leading up to elections, but they did mislead

the public of this province. This present administration, Mr. Speaker, who have gained power did gain power largely on the stand that they took with regard to the Shaheen Refinery. They did, Mr. Speaker. I know that. Not so much because they proposed a new policy, not so much, Mr. Speaker because they said, "This is what we are going to do instead" but because they over a period of two or three years, went out of their way to make it look in the eyes of the Newfoundland people that the previous administration, the Smallwood Administration had gotten themselves sucked into a lousy deal and was throwing money down the drain, burning the people's dollars, Mr. Speaker, a bunch of idiots, a bunch of morons getting involved in deals with Shaheen and his likes, a crook, a renegade rogue like Shaheen was the way he was painted, Mr. Speaker.

The people of Newfoundland as a result of that lost a lot of confidence in what was going on in the province. They put this crowd in not - I do not believe - not because they thought that this crowd were going to do anything great but they thought that they would get rid of the crowd who had been painted so badly and so poorly by this administration and the members of the party to which this administration belongs. That is how they gained power or substantially how they gained power in this province, Mr. Speaker, on that stand, on economic development policy and now they have reversed that policy utterly and completely and it is a stab in the back and a misleading of the Newfoundland people. I have had strong feelings about it.

They enlisted, Mr. Speaker, media support. The "Evening Telegram" for example has always had a strong, I believe editorial policy against deals like the Shaheen deal in Come By Chance. I think they have and they have good reasons for it. They have their own reasons for it. I do not happen to agree with their policy but I understand their point of view. This party, Mr. Speaker, fostered and pushed and took advantage of that kind of an editorial policy.



They enlisted the support of articulate groups at the university and other articulate groups in this province to use their support to get rid of the previous administration. I am delighted that we are in opposition for a few years, Mr. Speaker, but I am talking about the callous misleading of the people of Newfoundland. Then they come back within a year after they are in office, Mr. Speaker, and can make a complete face about, a complete turn around, a complete stab in the back of all those people who supported them on that issue, and a substantial number of people did have strong feelings on the Shaheen Company, Mr. Shaheen himself, the Come By Chance Refinery and they put their faith, Mr. Speaker, in this administration. This administration has now shown that they were not to be trusted on their publicly committed policy to these people.

Callousness and treachery, Mr. Speaker, to their supporters and to the voters who voted for them because of that. The whole situation as far as I am concerned is far more important, this about face, this misleading is far more important and should be debated in this House, Mr. Speaker, must be debated. That is why, Sir, on these grounds rather than on the other grounds which I mentioned earlier, I will move in this House a motion of no-confidence in this government, a motion of no-confidence, Mr. Speaker, based on the about-face, treachery, misleading of the public of this province. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the

MR. WM. ROWE: Address in Reply, moved by myself and seconded by my honourable colleague, the member for Labrador North, that the Address in Reply be amended by adding thereto after the words which Your Honour has addressed to this House," the following words: while this House has welcomed plans to build a new oil refinery at Come By Chance as a continuation of the policy of the Smallwood Administration, this House records its lack of confidence in the present administration because by this complete reversal of their publicly stated and oft repeated policy against association with Mr. Shaheen and developments in which he was involved, the present administration have now admitted that by their earlier public statements they had utterly misled the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and had totally misrepresented to the public what their position would be on such industrial projects and the developers connected with them.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the motion of no confidence which I move by way of amendment to the Speech from the Throne.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there a copy available?

MR. WM. ROWE: I have dozens of copies there. He has waved his hand by signifying.

MR. CROSBIE: He is only waving is he?

MR. WM. ROWE: He tipped his hat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I go into this because I expect to speak at some length on the subject, a motion of no confidence, Mr. Speaker, the mover of a motion of no confidence has unlimited time.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not going to cross the House, if he wants it he can come that far and get it or the page will take it for him.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a motion of no confidence, before I get involved - What is going on?

MR. ROBERTS: We are having a little by-play here now.

MR. WM. ROWE: Well why do you not sit down or leave or something

MR. WM. ROWE: you know?

I got no confidence in anyone today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: I guess that is what your wife said this morning.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, before I do launch out now in this harangue, I would like to remind Your Honour that I do have unlimited time, according to the precedents and traditions of this House and Beausheue, to speak on a motion of no confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: This must be read into the record as well. It is moved by Mr. William N. Rowe, M.H.A. of White Bay South and seconded by Mr. M. Woodward, M.H.A., Labrador North, that the Address in Reply be amended by adding thereto after the words, "which Your Honour has addressed to this House," the following words: "While this House has welcomed plans to build a new

oil refinery at Come-by-Chance as a continuation of the policy of the Smallwood Administration, this House records its lack of confidence in the present administration because by this complete reversal of their publicly stated and oft repeated policy against the association with Mr. Shaheen and developments in which he was involved, the present administration have now admitted that by their earlier public statements they had utterly misled the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and had totally misrepresented to the public what their position would be on such industrial projects and the developers connected with them."

It has been moved by the hon. member for White Bay South. He has unlimited time in which to make his points on this matter.

MR. CROSBIE: You have ruled already that he has not a minimum time to speak on his motion.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Well my time is up anyway so he has to rule on it now.

MR. SPEAKER: While the precedent may not be one that is particularly welcome to the House but in other words the precedent has been set and the honourable member does have unlimited time. I am sure that the honourable member on this recent matter will not delay the House unnecessarily.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention on speaking on this for more than two or three days.

MR. ROBERTS: It has to touch the ground once.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right. Skip from high point to high point, Mr. Speaker. Two or three days should cover it.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the amendment and Your Honour has read the amendment and I do believe strongly and firmly that this government have reversed itself utterly. Mr. Speaker, even if we do not agree that the second oil refinery and the first oil refinery should be compared on the same basis, even if we do not agree with that, even if he assume for the sake of argument, which I do not admit, that the first refinery had the government on the hook for \$160 million and the second one only has the government on the hook for \$80 million, even if we assume

that for the sake of argument, which I do not admit as I say, even then, Mr. Speaker, the government's attitude in totally reversing its policy and ideas, publicly stated and repeated hundreds of times against people like Mr. Shaheen, against the type of development found in Come-by-Chance, against promoters and developers coming in and so-called skimming off the cream in this province, it has totally reversed itself, Mr. Speaker, totally reversed itself. There has been some attempt made by members opposite, ministers opposite to indicate that really in the past they were not against Mr. Shaheen or the oil refinery in Come-by-Chance. It is for that reason, Sir, that I feel obligated to do something which the Minister of Finance does not like. He does not like it, Mr. Speaker. He does not like anyone to go back into the last two or three years of what he would prefer to consider ancient history, best forgotten maybe except by a bunch of archaeologists and grey-haired historians, forget about it, Mr. Speaker, he would like for us to do. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance is not the only one. If it were the hon. Minister of Finance, I probably would not say anything because I thought his whole role and the part he played in the past two or three years, I was filled with admiration for him. I could not help but be filled with admiration, even though I might have disagreed with him. This latter about-face and humiliation of him by his now present, erstwhile temporary colleagues might not be so good. I do not like that so much. I do admire the honourable minister.

I do feel constrained, Sir, to go back for two or three years and to read into the record of this House and to point out to the media and the people of this province the rank hypocrisy, the deception and dissembling that went on, Mr. Speaker, by members of this present administration, the falsification of the facts in order to win cheap political points, the insincerity and the cant that we heard from them, leading up to various

elections, leading up to the year or two before an election, for purely political purpose to try to discredit the previous administration and to try and discredit Mr. Shaheen and developers and promoters like him in order to get in power



on their backs so that after an opportune time came they could reverse utterly and completely their publicly stated policy in that field. It should be read into the record, Mr. Speaker.

The first indication that we got was on December 6, I believe (I am referring to a note here, it is not a press clipping or anything, it is just a note that I made for myself) in which I said to the press outside this House, I said; "Surely the Premier and the Minister of Justice must be two of the most hypocritical men ever to grace Newfoundland politics, and that is saying a lot. These two men could not find enough bad things to say about Mr. Shaheen a year or two ago, they wanted him booted out of Newfoundland forever. Now that the Premier and the Minister of Justice are in government their attitude is apparently suddenly changed. According to news reports, they are using Mr. Shaheen's chartered jet for a frolic down to Cape Kennedy and worse still" Mr. Speaker, I said at that time; "They are trying to make Newfoundlanders believe that the plane belongs to Vice-President Agnew. That is what we heard. Well what next? I would take Shaheen over Agnew any day as it happens, because obviously, the Minister of Justice has bad taste.

MR. HICKMAN: Agnew is a very fine fellow.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Is he? It is too bad that he is a Fascist. He might be all right if he were not a Fascist. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I asked at the same time a rhetorical question; "I wonder how Mr. Crosbie (the Minister of Finance now) feels now about two of his own government colleagues accepting" (well I said favours, that is a strong word for the sake of effect) "sort of pleasantries from Mr. Shaheen?" That was the first inkling, Mr. Speaker. Less than a year after this crowd, this government got into power, the first inkling that perhaps we were going to see some very fancy but unskillful manoeuvring by this government in a policy about-face, turn around and a stab in the back to many of their supporters.

Let us go back a couple of years, we will all be interested in these I think. Come by Chance file, dated; January 26, 1970, the paper, "The Daily News." "Marshall disturbed over decision." "The president of the Progressive Conservative Association William Marshall," (this is who is making this public utterance now) and he says, Mr. Speaker, "Does the hesitation of the federal government relate to failure of performance of the Shaheen Interests and how has the Newfoundland Refining Company met"(that is the Shaheen Company)"its obligations since the enabling legislation was passed by the House of Assembly?" Not very serious an allegation, Mr. Speaker, merely asking questions but giving the impression, giving the firm impression that there is something desperately wrong with Shaheen and the Shaheen group of companies. That was away back in January of 1970, when they really just started to make their various charges and accusations.

Come by Chance. February 4, 1970, "The Evening Telegram." Headline; "Crosbie wants select committee to investigate proposed refinery." Investigate it. A select committee. "There are a number of questions that have to be answered," said Mr. Crosbie.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I will not table these because I have notes on them but I can get copies made off this and table them in the House if anybody wants them.

"A select committee could report on a number of things," said Mr. Crosbie, "Such as what agreements have been entered into, whether or not the Shaheen interests have met all the conditions set out in the legislation, what happened to the \$5 million interim financing that had been advanced in connection with the project." Reasonable questions. "Mr. Crosbie wondered who the bridge financing had been paid out to and what it had been paid out for?" What confidence, Mr. Speaker, in his present friend and buddy. He asked; "Has all the money been spent on facilities down in Come by Chance or has a lot of it been spent to cover overhead of the Shaheen Companies?" What has

happened to it?" he says. On the face of it, reasonable questions until you start to realize, Mr. Speaker, that over the period of months and years that this sort of thing was going on, you see that there was a deliberate attempt to make it look like the Shaheen Companies, the Come by Chance deal were irresponsible, that the Shaheen Companies were probably going to skip off to Uruguay with the \$5 million. This is the impression you got, Mr. Speaker, and this is only the mildest of the stuff. We will build up to a deafening crescendo as time goes on.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Pardon!

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the Leader of the Liberal Party there?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well they are all here but you can make them if you want to.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Wells. Mr. Clyde Wells.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Wells?

MR. WM. ROWE: I am not interested either in the former leader of the party, Mr. Smallwood, I am not going to quote him. You know he is out of politics, Mr. Wells is out of politics as well. I would assume if the honourable minister ever gets out of politics he would like to not be hauled into political acrimony. But if the minister wants to say anything about Mr. Wells, Mr. Smallwood or anyone else -

MR. ROBERTS: Clyde Wells has not joined his administration, in fact he retained his integrity.

MR. WM. ROWE: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, Come By Chance February 24, 1970 of "The Evening Telegram," "Crosbie Calls For A Committee To Probe The Proposed Refinery," says the headline. February 26, in "The Evening Telegram," "Refinery Investigation Proposal Is Defeated." The former administration had the sense to defeat it.

"In a six hour long," Mr. Speaker, and this was the honourable minister who was complaining about a couple of hours of speech on my part the other day, "In a six hour Private Members' Day debate, John Crosbie, Liberal Independent, St. John's West, demanded that the committee be appointed to determine the present status of the project." Those were the demands in those days, Mr. Speaker, no select committee now on Come By Chance or on McLean or on Stephenville, no select committees now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: The information is public.

MR. WM. ROWE: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, it is all public now.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, yes, it is all public, is it not?

MR. WM. ROWE: Come By Chance - February 26, 1970, "The Daily News," "Crosbie - J.R.S. Jewel On Come By Chance," "We Get All The Risks But Not The Gravey Cries Crosbie, Mr. Crosbie told the House that he would go briefly into the history of the oil refinery. He said that the project was first advanced by Mr. Shaheen in the winter of

1967 and at my suggestion"(the minister's suggestion)"a committee of Cabinet composed of the President of the Council, Mr. Curtis, T. Alex Hickman, Clyde Wells and Mr. Crosbie was appointed to go into the matter. He said that the committee met with Mr. Shaheen and his associates and it was agreed," the committee agreed, can you believe this, "the committee agreed that a crown corporation would be established to handle the project." The committee headed up by the honourable Minister of Finance who the other day, Mr. Speaker, was condemning crown corporations and all that kind of thing. "Stupid, foolish," he said.

"This was the inducement - relief from federal taxation," Mr. Crosbie said. Mr. Crosbie said, "There was quite a difference," quotes in the paper here, "Quite a difference between dealing with John C. Doyle and John Shaheen." This is what I said the other day, it is summarized here. He said, "When you deal with Mr. Doyle you know where you stand. He is a sharp bargainer but will let you know where you and he stand." I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I am sure he always let the honourable minister know exactly where he stood.

"However dealing with John Shaheen is a different quintal of fish," he did not elaborate. Well he has been elaborating over the past few days. It is a different quintal of fish, you see, although John C. Doyle was a good fellow, obviously what the minister at that time meant to say was that John Shaheen was even a better fellow. Right? Or did he mean that John Shaheen was not such a good fellow? I do not know.

"He said that he and his fellow committee members had drafted a new agreement by January 19, 1968 which he, the minister, reluctantly accepted." Reluctantly accepted, He accepted it, Mr. Speaker. To hear the minister talk the other day, he had no more to do with the Shaheen deal now - Mr. Smallwood

MR. WM. ROWE: had all to do with the Shaheen deal. The Minister of Finance had no more to do with the Shaheen deal than the man in the moon to hear him talk.

"The St. John's West member concluded his ninety minute speech with, 'We have much to lose if this venture is unsuccessful. Shaheen has little to lose even if it is unsuccessful.'" Well, Mr. Speaker, that argument may be right but it certainly applies as much to the second refinery as to the first.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to call it one o'clock?

MR. CROSBIE: We would not interrupt.

MR. WM. ROWE: Yes, I would like to do that, but unfortunately I have to go and put my remarks here on tape see, to make sure that as many people hear about it as possible. They are interested, Mr. Speaker. The honourable minister is not interested but the public are interested. They are sick of the hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, sick of it.

Listen now, we will hear the great saviour -

MR. SPEAKER: It now being one o'clock, I do leave the Chair until three o'clock this afternoon.



The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Speaker, I had just gotten into some supporting evidence for the amendment which I moved earlier today, seconded by my colleague the member for Labrador North, an amendment to the Address in Reply which for clarity I think I should read again as I think there might have been some misunderstanding over it. "While this House has welcomed plans to build a new oil refinery at Come by Chance as a continuation of the policy of the Smallwood administration this House records its lack of confidence in the present administration because by this complete reversal of their publicly stated and oft repeated policy against association with Mr. Shaheen and developments in which he was involved the present administration have now admitted that by their earlier public statements they had utterly mislead the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and had totally misrepresented to the public what their position would be on such industrial projects and the developers connected with them."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a point of order with respect to the amendment which is in order at this time and I am not completely sure how well it is taken although I think it is well-founded. Beauchesne on page 143, paragraph 175, states that, "Members should be extremely careful in moving their amendments on the Address in Reply because otherwise the House having given its judgement on the various points that are brought forward then, if later other amendments are moved which touch these very points which have already been decided upon any similar amendments, they should be declared to be out of order." Then again I also refer to Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, to the effect that it is order and on page 130, paragraph 155, "(1) It will be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for the prompt

interference. They may be classified as follows:"paragraph (2) says, "The misrepresentation of the language of another and the accusation of misrepresentation." Now there are two points I draw to Your Honour's attention, number one the matter of the second oil refinery at Come by Chance and the involvement of Mr. Shaheen have already been matters which have been decided by this House, they have already been voted upon and I might state, voted upon unanimously, So that I would contend that this is perhaps a matter which has already been decided upon by the House itself and as such should be declared out of order. That is the first point.

The second point is that it is out of order, certainly very much out of order, Mr. Speaker, to use language which would include certainly the amendment itself which accuses or makes a statement, it contains an accusation of misrepresentation. Now as I have heard the amendment by the hon. member for White Bay South that has been proposed, he has used such words certainly as "mislead" and maybe "misrepresentation." I am not quite sure. I do not think I caught the word "misrepresentation" but certainly mislead has been used. To accuse someone of misleading is also to accuse somebody of misrepresentation. So on these two points, Mr. Speaker, I draw them to the attention of the House and wonder whether the amendment itself really is in order.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): May I speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker? The two points made by the hon. Government House Leader, point number one, a motion is only out of order, Mr. Speaker, if it revives something which has already been decided upon. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with the merit or demerits of the bill which came before this House. This amendment, Sir, this motion now before the House has to do with something which is extraneous to it. It might be indirectly related to it, extraneous to that. We voted in favour of the bill that came before this

House and we spoke on it. The principle of that bill was as to whether money would be guaranteed and money lent to a Shaheen operation in order to put a second oil refinery in Come by Chance.

This motion here, Sir, merely draws to the attention of the House and asks for a vote of no-confidence to the House on the basis of the switch around in policy of this present administration. It has nothing to do with the merits or substance of the bill which was before this House.

Point number two, Sir, the rule against statements made in this House about a member misleading or misrepresenting are in respect of statements, as I understand it, made in this House. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about on this amendment, it is in the past tense that this present administration, not in this House, Mr. Speaker, but this administration in the past had by the statements outside of the House or inside of the House in another session but certainly not during this session, had utterly misled the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and had totally misrepresented to the public what the position would be on such industrial projects and the developers connected with them.

So, Sir, there is no question about me saying that any member of this hon. House has by statements in this House during this present session or since this new government came into power have misled the House, Mr. Speaker. It refers to things in the distant past, two or three years ago, that members of this administration have made. In any event, Sir, the Minister of Finance has said on one or two occasions in this House that something was misleading or something was deceiving

as long as the imputation is not that somebody deliberately set out with malice aforethought to mislead, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the parliamentary rule, the language of misleading or misrepresentation, is in order.

HON. W. MARSHALL: (MINISTER OF PORTFOLIO): Let me point out finally, Mr. Speaker, on this point of order that the words misled and totally misrepresented are part of the resolution. A resolution certainly constitutes an accusation against a member or against the government and as such is out of order. Also, as I say, I do contend with respect to the other matter that this is something that has already been debated by the House as such.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): I wonder if I may speak to the point of order there because the poor articulated clerk is looking at me there with malice aforethought.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that, as Your Honour will read the amendment, per se, the fifth line up from the bottom: "The present administration have now admitted, by their earlier public statements, they have utterly misled the people of Newfoundland." I suggest, Sir, that is an obvious, direct imputation of misleading. One cannot use the word misled or mislead in any tense without an accusation of misleading.

I would suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that the malice aforethought as suggested by the honourable mover of the amendment is not a requirement. There is no requirement in the rules of parliamentary procedure of malice aforethought. One is not thinking in areas of criminal law. One is speaking here of laws of parliamentary procedure and there is no mention in Beauchesne anywhere of malice aforethought and I would suggest, Sir, that that is not a necessary requirement. Misrepresentation or misleading is the central point and not the malice aforethought element.

HON. E. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to say a word or two on this point, because I think that it is an important point. I will deal first of all with the honourable gentleman, the articulated clerk from St. Mary's by way of Cambridge.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He is entitled to the - well then sins of the fathers, Mr. Speaker, shall truly visit upon the sons. He gave him leave to speak. Mr. Speaker, it is more to the point of the bench which would give him leave to apply for admission to the bar.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: There is at least one but the gentleman concerned was not a member of the House at that time. He was working night and day.

Mr. Speaker, to deal first with the matter raised by the member from St. Mary's, the Minister of Education. Beauchesne may or may not be silent on the point. Beauchesne is - Your Honour has told us on numerous occasions - is merely the authority to which one refers when our own rules, our own precedents are silent. Our own rules are silent on this as on so many other questions. When they are not silent they are confused but the precedents are clear.

Within the past two or three weeks the honourable gentleman from St. John's West, the Minister of Education, has accused me in the House of misleading -

MR. W. ROWE: The Minister of Finance you mean.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. It is just coming events casting their shadows again. I do apologize to the Minister of Education and the education community at large for that slip.

The Minister of Finance accused me of misleading and I got up and said that it was unparliamentary and he was good enough to withdraw it and say that the honourable gentleman from White Bay North did not deliberately mislead and that he was allowed to say one was unintentionally misleading. That was allowed to stand. Your Honour confirmed it in Hansard. Your Honour I do not think was in the Chair at the point. The clerk I am sure will confirm that that is what happened. So, our precedents are clear.

My friend from White Bay South, our own House Leader, has not in his motion said that the House was misled. He merely points



out that the people of Newfoundland were misled. Furthermore Mr. Speaker, if this sort of motion is quite in order one could find precedents in Ottawa. One could even, I suggest, although I have not researched them, find precedents in Newfoundland. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that this motion has been accepted by Your Honour, has been read from the Chair and is under debate. No point of order was taken at the time and even if there is a point of order - I do not think there is - I submit that the honourable gentlemen on the other side have let their rights lapse. This motion came on at a quarter to one o'clock Your Honour was given a copy in advance, not very long in advance. Your Honour read the motion and allowed debate on it to proceed without any objection from any gentleman opposite. I realize that the House Leader was not here but if he wants to go practice law and not attend upon the business of the House, that is his problem. So, I submit, Sir, that even if there was a valid point of order - and there is not in my opinion - the honourable gentleman has lost his right to raise it.

AN HONOURABLE GENTLEMAN: A separate matter altogether.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a separate matter altogether.

Now, further to his other point on the subject matter of this conflicting with the subject matter of a bill which was disposed of by this House: There is no similarity, Sir. We may be referring to some of the same events but the bill was clearly, as my friend from White Bay South has said, a bill to authorize the government of this province to enter into an agreement with certain interests, the agreement being part of the bill. The motion was debated. It was disposed of. As it so happened every member in the House voted for it with exception of the gentleman from Labrador South who again was not here for the vote. He took no part in the debate. So, we do not know where he stood. Every other honourable member who was present stood and voted for it. That was disposed of. We are not attempting to revive it. We are instead referring to an entirely different subject, namely that certain gentlemen misled the people of Newfoundland, totally and utterly. It is the point of



the motion. I submit that it is in order and that the debate should be allowed to go ahead.

HON. L. BARRY: (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief comment. The first part of the amendment I will not comment on. I think that argument has already been exhausted on it.

With respect to the later part where it states that the present administration had now admitted by their earlier public statements that they had utterly misled the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and had totally misrepresented to the public what their position would be on such industrial projects and the developers connected with them:

Now, whatever this misled or misleading term may imply I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the reference too had totally misrepresented, to note, something that is done intentionally. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that to permit the honourable member to present it is to permit the honourable member to question the honour of members on this side of the House and this is clearly contrary to parliamentary procedure as set out in Beauchesne on page 131, section 155(3), "No member can be allowed to attribute any intention to insult others or, secondly, to question the honour of one." I submit that to permit this term to be used in the resolution is to permit the honourable member to question the honour of members of this honourable House and such is out of order.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be the last one to speak on this since it most directly affects my motion. There is one matter which has not been raised at all in the argument, Mr. Speaker, and that is that all these references in Beauchesne refer to statements made in the House, statements made impugning someone's honour or deliberately misleading. Mr. Speaker, it is a clear parliamentary rule, as I am sure Your Honour realizes, that anything in the House is parliamentary if it is done by motion. For example, it is unparliamentary

to refer to Her Majesty's judges in the Supreme Court. You are not permitted to refer to them unless you make a motion to some effect affecting Her Majesty's judges. Then you are permitted to refer to them. It is unparliamentary for me to call the House Leader, for example, a man who is guilty of some infamous crime. It is unparliamentary for me to do that. It is parliamentary for me to make a motion to the effect that he be censured because he is guilty of some crime or something else like that.

So, what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, what the honourable members on the other side are trying to do by their point of order is trying to destroy the very basis of parliamentary government, namely that anything can be brought up by way of motion. We may not be able to say that so and so is a scoundrel or a thief but if in fact a member wants to make a motion to that effect and prove it and have the vote of his peers in the House on that matter, that is in fact parliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: This being a matter of great substance and the whole point of this debate hinging upon it, it be incumbent upon me to take five minutes to research the subject with my officials.

With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. House Leader, I refer honourable gentleman to page 132, article 156 of Beuchesne which reads as follows: "The proper time for interference is when the offensive expressions are uttered and not afterwards. It may take place either on the Speaker's voluntary motion or on the call to order of the member assailed or by some other member or the general call of the House." The time that the motion was made by the hon. House Leader for the Opposition no point of order was raised and while under article 154, sub (3) of Beuchesne: "The Chair could have at that time voluntarily intervened," it did not. For these reasons we find there is no point of order and that the hon. the House Leader will be allowed to proceed.

AN HON. MEMBER: The better half.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Government House Leader must be getting bowed and bloody by the buffeting he is taking in this House, especially from Your Honour.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: He does not know how to adjourn the House, Mr. Speaker. He has not learned that yet. He does not know how to make a point of order and sustain it because he is wrong usually. I am sure, Sir, that that is irrelevant to this debate so I will not pursue it. He must becoming very, very humble, judging from his track record in this House on points of order, procedure and adjournments.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would permit, the Chair is not going to allow the honourable member to launch a tirade on the merits or demerits of the debating ability of the Minister without Portfolio. The honourable member has been allowed to carry on with his argument on the matter that is supposed to be under discussion and I direct him to do so.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Your Honour is absolutely right. Nobody can carry on a long debate on the ability of the House Leader. It has to be short.

Mr. Speaker, I was giving some supporting evidence as to why we think that this administration, before it became the administration, the members thereof, the party which they now represent in this House, utterly misled and totally misrepresented to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador as to what their position would be with regard to men like Mr. Shaheen, like the Come-by-Chance project and like developers and promoters who come into this province or are already in this province and become associated with that type of a project. They utterly misled them, Sir, and I gave one or two examples I believe this afternoon or this morning on why we thought that the motion was a good one. I do not know what is wrong with my watch here, Mr. Speaker. All I can say is that I hope the Minister of Finance has better luck with his Japanese loan than I am having with this Japanese watch. It will not stay on at all.

Mr. Speaker, I have some clippings, Sir, concerning the period of time that we were mentioning earlier. I have a clipping here from the "Evening Telegram," February 26, 1970 concerning Come-by-Chance. "House Defeats Bid For Committee To Probe Refinery Project." I believe that bid was made by the hon. Minister of Finance when he was then in the opposition, a Liberal Reform Member of the Opposition. March 12, 1970, the "Evening Telegram" again, the headline: "Oil Refinery Cost Questioned By M.H.A." It goes on to say: "T. Alex Hickman, P.C., Burin, charged in the Legislature Tuesday that the proposed 100,000 barrel a day Come-by-Chance Oil Refinery will cost \$130 million while a refinery of the same size is being built in the Province of Quebec for \$70 million. The only real difference in the two oil refineries," said Mr. Hickman, "is that the Come-by-Chance refinery has to install catalytic cracking devices for the production of jet fuel." Even in those days, Sir, when the honourable minister was casting aspersions and gloom on every aspect of the Come-by-Chance Oil Refinery, he was showing himself to be such an expert, Mr. Speaker, in the oil refinery business. There he was casting doom and gloom around in respect of the first one.

My honourable colleague has just given me a photograph from the "Evening Telegram." I do not see the date on it. It shows the hon. Minister of Justice back in 1968 placidly and complacently sitting back in his seat, when he was a Liberal minister of the government, listening to the debate on the oil refinery of that day.

MR. ROBERTS: That was the night of a no-confidence motion as a result of -

MR. W.N. ROWE: The moving over of -

MR. ROBERTS: One of his trips across the floor.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That was his first trip I think, when he and Mr. Wells left the then administration and moved across and the hon. Minister of Justice stayed where he was, The strong-principled gentleman stayed where he was, Mr. Speaker. He would not move on that particular one.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a very handsome picture.

MR. W. N. ROWE: It is a good picture. It shows the minister, Sir, half asleep in his seat.

March 26, 1970, Mr. Speaker, "Daily News," the headline: "Reaction Skeptical To Come-by-Chance Announcement." It is a beautiful picture, Mr. Speaker. It shows the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Social Assistance, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Public Works, all of them then, Mr. Speaker, skeptical to the Come-by-Chance announcement. "Cheers And Jeers For Smallwood," Sir, in this headline. Here is a beaut, Mr. Speaker, April 7, 1970 of the "Evening Telegram," which states: "Future Of Province Depends On Come-by-Chance Project. 'No tomorrow if mistake made,' said Hickman. T. Alex Hickman suggested Monday in the Legislature that the refinery proposed for Come-by-Chance will not be an oil refinery for production of jet fuel but a \$150 million depot or farm for Middle East crude oil. 'Come-by-Chance will be competitive with other established North American oil refineries only if promoter John Shaheen can come up with some great new schemes of refining jet fuel that none of the other major companies are aware of,' said Mr. Hickman who was speaking in the Throne Speech debate. 'For sometime now,' he said, 'there has not been a word about Come-by-Chance from the major oil companies because

they know it cannot happen and they just cannot be bothered wasting their time commenting on it,' says Mr. Hickman, P. C., member for Burin.

" According to Mr. Hickman there never has been a proposed industrial development that has so aroused the concern of every Newfoundlander as the proposed oil refinery at Come-by-Chance."

That is a true statement. Mr. Speaker, it has aroused the concern of every Newfoundlander because he and his colleagues of the day were busily going about this province sticking in the needles, sticking in the knife wherever they could and turning it, trying to undermine that project at every opportunity. He goes on to say, "Markets will have to be in North America." He pointed out, the United States have recently imposed a quota on petroleum products coming into the States and this had adversely affected present oil fields in Canada. 'What is going to happen in a year or two,' he said, 'when the oil refinery comes into production? Will the United States increase its quota?' Premier Smallwood interjected to say that the American embargo on Canadian oil is crude oil not jet oil, which was absolutely right."

The honourable minister, Sir, was even then pervading information which was not even factually correct, in his effort to undermine the confidence of the Newfoundland people in the first oil refinery. "If anything goes wrong in Come-by-Chance," said the honourable minister at that time, "what you may see there at tremendous cost is not an oil refinery but a crude oil depot for Middle East crude, a tank farm that will not yield a nickel other than the cost of constructing it." There it is, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Minister of Justice in the "Daily News," of April 7, 1970, headline: "Hickman Wants Feasibility Study On Come-by-Chance Oil Refinery," which was already in the works. He said, "Some industrial proposals have come to development, some not." He felt that if the Come-by-Chance prophecies come to fruition, okay. If the oil refinery which is to cost \$130 million or \$150 million will only supply 300 or 400 jobs, it will be by far too expensive a proposition.



Here he is now a part of an administration which brought in a bill which is going to cost over \$300 million, \$80 million of which is the provincial government's money, which is going to supply 600 jobs as against 300 or 400 jobs in the first one, and he does not think, Mr. Speaker, that he was inconsistent or that this administration has reversed itself utterly and completely on the announced policy to the people of Newfoundland up to a year and one-half ago. Mr. Hickman said that it is the whole policy surrounding the refinery proposal which will decide if Newfoundland has to petition for insolvency." Now, Mr. Speaker, "petition for insolvency," that is the kind of comment, Mr. Speaker, we had to put up with over a period of two or three years in this House and outside.

The "Daily News" of April 22, 1970, the headline which is all I will read on it "MHAs Grill Refinery Officials On Pollution, Employment And Financing." In the "News" of April 22 of the same year, "Enormous Handout To Shaheen, says Carter. John Carter, Progressive Conservative Leadership Hopeful." How time flies by, Mr. Speaker, to think that honourable member was ever a leadership hopeful. I am startled, Mr. Speaker. "John Carter, Progressive Conservative Leadership Hopeful and past President of the P.C. Association said Tuesday that two things have become crystal clear as a result of the appearance of John Shaheen in the Newfoundland Legislature."

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is he now?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Canary Islands. Calling the meeting, the staging of an elaborate drama, "Mr. Carter said the two things were: first, the relatively small amount of work done on the site of the Refinery at Come by Chance in return for the \$5 million invested by the Government of Newfoundland. The second, he said, was that Mr. Shaheen was getting an enormous handout from the provincial government, a handout for which he was putting up precious little." The past President of the P.C. Association and a leadership hopeful who was narrowly beaten out by the present Premier.

The "Telegram", Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well the honourable Minister of Finance says that in his particular leadership try, 1100 to 400 was it not? It was a narrow win.

AN HON. MEMBER: His first try.

MR. ROWE, W.N. a narrow victory for the previous Premier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look how all this appeared in that day to Mr. Shaheen himself. The honourable Minister of Finance, and others and the Minister of Justice protested virtuously at the time that no they were not prosecuting or persecuting Mr. Shaheen. What did Mr. Shaheen say himself at that time? Headline in the "Telegram" April 23, 1970 "Shaheen irked over treatment by MHAs." The story says "Charges in the House of Assembly Wednesday Night, that the opposition attempted to slander and treat like criminals U.S. Industrialist John Shaheen and his associates possibly brought to an end the questioning of the Come by Chance Oil Refinery officials. The charge by Mr. Shaheen shortly before the House adjourned at 11:00 P.M. that the opposition was attempting to slander and impugn them was quickly denied, naturally enough, by the Independent Liberal member John C. Crosbie, St. John's West.

"Mr. Smallwood that day said that John Crosbie took on the role of a prosecuting attorney and treated the officials not as visitors but as criminals.

"Speaker, George Clarke," Mr. Speaker, of the time, "Speaker George Clarke interjected to say that questions should be asked in a proper manner. Courteously, he said. We have not got witnesses, referring to witnesses in court, under cross-examination. We have not got witnesses here, we have guests." That is how the Speaker of the day treated it, Mr. Speaker. And the honourable members generally speaking are trying to pretend to the people of Newfoundland that they have not reversed themselves utterly from their original position in this whole matter.

The "Daily News", May 29, 1970, "Refinery chief counters threat with threat." That was the atmosphere at the time, Mr. Speaker.

Counters threat with threat: "In a statement today Homer White President of Newfoundland Refining Company Limited said, 'recently there have been a number of public statements by individuals who are outside of the government and opposed to it,' (I suppose he is talking about the opposition)' calling for the renegotiation of the Come by Chance Refinery contract to obtain greater alleged benefits for the government than the law, Bill 86, provides. There have been some irresponsible stories proposing that the plant be nationalized or to use a more explicit term, expropriate it." That is the atmosphere of the day, Mr. Speaker, and this government now says it has not reversed its policy or its public position.

The "Telegram", June 17, 1970, Headline "Collins skeptical about legislation." Even the Minister of Municipal Affairs was poking into it, Mr. Speaker. "Harold Collins, P.C. Gander says he is skeptical that all points of legislation concerning the Come by Chance Oil Refinery Group have been fulfilled by the Shaheen Group." A vote of confidence in Mr. Shaheen by the honourable now Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker. "He is skeptical that Mr. Shaheen has lived up to the legislation."

July 10, 1970, the "Daily News", Headlines "'Should be a fifty-fifty deal, says Crosbie.' Mr. Crosbie says, 'the concessions that Mr. Smallwood now announces, that was the renegotiated deal by my colleague and myself and the Premier of the day, 'the concessions that Mr. Smallwood now announces are not good enough, in fact they have been forced on him by the Government of Canada and by Mr. Wells and myself in our opposition of the last two years. They have been forced on him, these concessions, says Mr. Crosbie. They are not good enough. I feel that the Come by Chance arrangement should be a fifty-fifty proposition because we are putting up our credit and taking the risk and we should share at least fifty per cent of the profit of this deal with Mr. Shaheen and his group. It

should be fifty-fifty,' said Mr. Crosbie. 'That is the only sensible concession that should now be made, he added.' Mr. Crosbie said, 'the original negotiation of the agreement with Mr. Shaheen in 1967, 1968 was conducted by Mr. Smallwood, that is why Clyde Wells and I resigned from the cabinet. We were just legal draftsmen, on every occasion when we insisted on some concessions for the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Shaheen would go behind our backs to Mr. Smallwood,' " So said the now Minister of Finance who has put his support behind the new refinery with the same gentleman, the same companies, Mr. Speaker. A man who would go behind our back, now he is a man (as we have always believed) he is an honourable gentleman, Mr. Shaheen and his crowd. But what a reversal for this government, Mr. Speaker.

July 10, 1970, the "Daily News". "Lots of unanswered questions says Moores, The Leader of the P.C. Party of Newfoundland, Frank Moores, says that there are still too many unanswered questions regarding the Come by Chance project, despite today's announcement by Premier Smallwood. Mr. Moores also added that the risks involved for the government and people of Newfoundland are still too great for the return involved. Concerning the announced returns to the government, Mr. Moores wants to know if the five per cent is the same five per cent the Federal Government insisted on. And he wondered if in eight years time when the Shaheen people buy the refinery for \$10 million, will the money come from Shaheen or from profits of the company?" In other words, will the Shaheen Group be buying a refinery from the Newfoundland people using the Newfoundland people's money?

Now, Mr. Speaker, he and his colleagues come into this House with exactly the same deal in that respect, five percent of the profits, the adjusted gross profits off the top, and five percent of the adjusted net profits up to a limit of \$10 million. But at that time, Mr. Speaker, there was no doubt in anybody's mind as to the position of the now leader of

the administration on the question. He thought there was something wrong with it and he stated his policy and position publicly and they have reversed their policy and their public position on it completely, Mr. Speaker. A complete turn around.

The "Telegram" June 10, the headline "Refinery deal renegotiated in province's favour." The story reads, "However reaction to the announcement by Mr. Smallwood was not all favourable. Provincial Progressive Conservative Leader Frank Moores says there are still too many unanswered questions regarding the project despite Thursday's announcement by Mr. Smallwood. Mr. Moores who was recently elected Leader of the P.C. Party said the risks involved for the government and the people of Newfoundland are still too great. Regarding the Premier's statement\* (that was Premier Smallwood's statement)\* that four government directors would sit on the board of the managing company, Mr. Moores said, this is still too small a number and will service only political purposes. The government should have a majority on the board as long as the \$10 million remains unpaid."

Now, Mr. Speaker, "the government should have a majority on the board of the crown corporation," yet this government goes even further and negotiates a deal with a private company - I believe I am correct, am I not? - when they have very little, if any control over this private company.

AN HON. MEMBER: One or two directors that is all.

MR. ROWE, W.N. One or two? Two directors, we had four on this company and it was not enough. Now two is suddenly enough, Mr. Speaker. Two



MR. WM. ROWE: suddenly enough, what a reversal in policy. The story continues through that same paper, "Mr. Shaheen and other associates were interrogated for two consecutive days in the House of Assembly last April and a televised questioning led to one of the most nasty debates of the session." That is what the reporter got the impression of Mr. Speaker at the time, the man who was writing this story, the most nasty debates.

"Shaheen and his associates appeared before the House April 22, 23 to answer questions concerning progress toward the construction of the refinery but the questioning ended abruptly when Mr. Shaheen accused the opposition of attempting to slander and impugn officials of his company."

July 6, 1970 in "The Daily News," "Collins Wants Answers On Refinery Agreement." July 17 in "The Evening Telegram," "The House Was Denied Full Consent To Introduce The Refinery Bill The provincial government anxious to pass a new Come By Chance oil refinery had the House recalled Thursday but the sitting ended abruptly after forty-five minutes when the opposition refused to give the required unanimous consent to have the legislation introduced. Unanimous consent was necessary because the required twenty-four hours advanced notice of motion was not given.

"In a prepared statement to the press prior to the opening of the House, Opposition Leader Murphy"(those were the good old healthy days, Mr. Speaker, we had one leadership hopeful and another who was an opposition leader) "Opposition Leader Murphy said, 'We are not going to let this very terrible piece of legislation be rammed down the throats of Newfoundlanders.'" He is referring, Mr. Speaker, to the improved deal, eighty or ninety per cent of which is now included in the deal for a new refinery which is presently before this House, having gone through second and third reading.



MR. MURPHY: Hogwash.

MR. WM. ROWE: Hogwash, Mr. Speaker, "hogwash," he says. What a reversal.

MR. ROBERTS: What the honourable gentleman said in that newspaper clipping was hogwash.

MR. WM. ROWE: July 20, in "The Evening Telegram," "Hickman Says Agreement Now Approved By The People," that great Messiah of the people.

"Mr. Hickman said that the promoter John Shaheen, whom he referred to as the government's silent partner"(whatever that means)"in a project would not make one dollar from the proposed refinery without the credit of the province behind him." He said, 'the government which is taking all the risks is getting only five per cent of the profits,' which was an absolute falsehood at that time. It was five per cent of the gross profits and five per cent of the net up to \$10 million, exactly the same as this new deal presently before the House.

He said, "the government could still make the offer attractive for Mr. Shaheen by going ahead on a fifty-fifty profit sharing basis," this honourable minister agreed that there should be a fifty-fifty profit sharing basis. "Mr. Hickman also said Friday that if Shell Oil, which he said is spending some \$220 million on oil exploration on the East Coast of the province over a number of years, if Shell Oil discovers oil on the Grand Banks it will be the death knell of the Come by Chance oil refinery

"'Nonsense,' interjected Mr. Smallwood," and as usual Sir, he summed it up in a word, "Oil companies are not in the habit of selling oil to their competitors before it is refined," He said, 'I do not know who said that.'

"Mr. Hickman said he could not support the legislation which does not have the backing of the people of Newfoundland." Mr. Speaker, if Shell Oil discovering oil on the banks of this

MR. WM. ROWE: province would be the death knell to the first refinery, then it would be equally the death knell to the second refinery. The honourable Minister of Justice at that time either did not know what he was talking about or he deliberately at that time created a wrong impression for the public of Newfoundland, for purely political purposes.

July 21, "The Evening Telegram," "Better Terms Needed For Come By Chance Deal - Crosbie Wants Complete Renegotiation Of Project - An amendment to the Come By Chance oil refinery legislation, which would require complete renegotiation and possible abandonment of the project was introduced in the House by Liberal Reform Chief, John Crosbie, Monday but it was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker, Nathaniel Noel." We must have a more liberal Speaker or something these days, Mr. Speaker.

"The proposed amendment said the government should not proceed with the refinery agreement on the Come By Chance oil refinery until such times as better terms are secured from Shaheen Natural Resources. The better terms would include a provision that the refinery be participated in by the Newfoundland Government as a joint venture with the government having at least fifty per cent equity interest and collecting at least fifty per cent of the anticipated profits.

"Mr. Crosbie repeated the contention made July 17, that there was no guarantee that Newfoundland will get anything from the promised five per cent off the top after the initial mortgage has been paid off. He said this is contingent on a refinery making a profit and Mr. Shaheen"(listen to this, Mr. Speaker)"is in a position to manipulate the company so that it does not make a profit.

"The five per cent is supposed to come off the adjusted gross profit'but the trouble here,' says Mr. Crosbie, 'is that the gross profit will be determined by Shaheen. The five.

MR. WM. ROWE: per cent of the gross will be what Shaheen says it will be.' He says, 'anyone who knows business realizes how easily Mr. Shaheen can siphon off the profits so that Newfoundland's share would be insignificant.'"

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, who came into this House and supported an exactly identical deal as far as the profits off the top are concerned for a second refinery.

"'He could put up the cost,' referring to Shaheen, 'put up the cost of crude oil to the plant or take a certain amount of profits for depreciation. There are a hundred ways Mr. Shaheen can take us to the cleaners here.' Mr. Crosbie agreed with Mr. Wells contention that Shaheen could do Newfoundland out of a portion of its five per cent here by selling the oil to Can-Carrib at cost, eliminating the profit to refinery and of course eliminating Newfoundland's five per cent. Can-Carrib could then make the profit when it resells the product and the profit would be Shaheen's to keep."

Exactly the same thing could happen now, Mr. Speaker. We never believed for one moment that it would happen but it could happen now, yet the Minister of Finance is very agreeable, indeed articulate and eloquent in his support of this new refinery.

"Mr. Crosbie said, 'the deal should be renegotiated and if Mr. Shaheen is not willing to agree to share the hundreds of millions with Newfoundland, if he is not willing to give Newfoundland a break, we should do it ourselves or get someone else to do it.' He said, 'Mr. Shaheen has had the Premier and the government hypnotized since the start of the project.'"

Now what strange spell has he worked on the honourable minister's colleagues in respect of the second refinery, Mr. Speaker?

"The Evening Telegram," of July 20, 1970, "New Refinery Deal Takes a Pasting - In his maiden speech yesterday, Mr. Marshall, from relative obscurity has come romping into this House, tilting

at every windmill he could see. In his maiden speech yesterday, Mr. Marshall said, 'the viability of the one hundred thousand barrel a day refinery depends entirely on establishments of a petro chemical complex at Come By Chance as an adjunct to the refinery. But we have no guarantee that such a complex will follow.'

"He said, 'those who vote \$150 million for an oil refinery that would provide 450 jobs, perhaps half of which will go to Newfoundlanders will be damned by generations of unborn Newfoundlanders.'" That is what he said, Mr. Speaker, as quoted. Is the Speaker getting sick by any chance or is he hearing all this? If he wants to adjourn for five minutes, Mr. Speaker, because it is kind of sickening, Mr. Speaker. It is sickening to see this complete and utter callous reversal by members of this administration from a position they took publicly a year or two ago.

Guess who else is into the act, Mr. Speaker? "Tom Hickey, Progressive Conservative St. John's West" they have here, but St. John's East Extern," Tom Hickey also opposed the amendments, charging that the people had been led astray by propoganda about the project. 'The money,' Mr. Hickey said, 'could be put to better use.'"

July 21, in "The Daily News," "Amendment To Give Province Half Of the Profits Defeated."

MR. CROSBIE: You would not go for it, would you?

MR. WM. ROWE: No, will we go for it now? Would you like to bring in a motion now?

MR. CROSBIE: We would not bring in such a motion as that because you defeated the last one.

MR. WM. ROWE: The Premier rose in the House to try to ridicule us over here for suggesting that we do get twenty-five per cent of the profits. He started to try to compare the twenty-five per cent equity -

MR. CROSBIE: Why did you not do it in 1970 when you had the chance?

MR. ROBERTS: Why did you not do it in 1973 when you had the chance?

MR. WM. ROWE: He had no chance. Do not rub it into the poor fellow.

He had no chance. He either had to stay or go, and he had to compromise his principles and stay. Otherwise he would be,

because he would be out in left field again, in limbo again, Mr. Speaker, hanging from the lights this time, probably.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh, Mr. Speaker, again he is scaring me. I had better go into my act now, Mr. Speaker, and say what an admirable man he is and how much I admire him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now

MR. ROBERTS: Are you scared of him?

MR. W.N. ROWE: He makes me scared, yes. At least I do not have the flea-weight champion of the world threatening to punch me in the mouth, the Minister of External Affairs, responsible for Malawi, now conferring on Malawi with the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask that we get back to the motion that is supposed to be under debate.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, Mr. Shaheen has no resources to even pay salaries. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, "Mr. Crosbie told the House that he was definitely against the legislation and he would not support it." Remember the scenario now, Mr. Speaker. In 1968 when we had one of the lousiest deals ever entered into by a government of a province based on a committee report of which the honourable Minister of Finance was a member, he would not vote against it in this House. In 1968, he abstained. he did not want to go on record as voting against it. In 1970, after horrendous negotiations and everything else with Mr. Shaheen, we finally improved the deal, he votes definitely against it. Now, Mr. Speaker, a couple of years later he comes into the House with a more or less identical deal and votes for it.

MR. ROBERTS: And boasts about it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: And boasts about it. Mr. Speaker, if you can see any consistency or principles adhered to there in those strange meanderings and wanderings, I would wish Your Honour might indicate them to me.



because I cannot see it.

"Mr. Crosbie told the House he was definitely against the legislation and he would not support it. 'That is why I resigned from the cabinet.' Mr. Crosbie in his attack on the government and the Shaheen Group, said that he was astonished to see how the people of Newfoundland are putting up the money and the government are allowing someone from outside the province (he was an xenophobe in those days too, Mr. Speaker)" to get all the profits. He described the Shaheen Group as one-sided, Mr. Speaker, and money-mad. The Liberal Reform Leader wondered what faith the people of Newfoundland were to have in a company that uses the assets of the province yet cannot pay their employees' wages.

"Shaheen has no resources to even pay salaries. What kind of madness is this?"

MR. CROSBIE: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman just does not want to stop and I have a serious point of order. We have rules in this House, although we have permitted some laxity in this debate for the last hour or so, and this tiresome recitation. I really must draw the Chair's attention to the Standing Orders, page (39). "It is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they (d) refer to, comment on or deny anything said by a member." This whole tiresome progression of quotations and tired old extracts from newspapers is a clear violation of these Standing Orders. I would ask the Speaker to direct the honourable gentleman to get on with his speech and stop this violation.

MR. W.N. POWE: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, I am illustrating my remarks by reference to newspaper clippings which I have already said I will table in the House. As a matter of fact, if the Speaker demands it, I will go out of my way to try to find the original newspapers, if I could, down in the files of the "Evening Telegram" and the "Daily News" concerning matters said in this House. There is no Standing Order which refers to things said outside the House which requires the paper to be tabled or if is against the orders of this

House, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Finance in every speech that he ever made in this House, when he was in the opposition. referred to copious papers, notes and newspaper clippings, Mr. Speaker, and never once did anyone on the other side draw him to order, because it was too childish.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I will just refer again to this book which is supposed to guide us in debate and which is very, very clear, the words are set out here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is not a Standing Order, that is not a Standing Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: The green book here, the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, with the procedure set down that is to be used in the House and this has been observed in this House since 1949. It is quite clear that it is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they - and then on page (40)-(d), "refer to, comment on or deny anything said by a member.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, the honourable gentleman is not reading a Standing Order, he is reading...

MR. CROSBIE: I am reading the ruling.

MR. ROBERTS: What amounts to the comments of Mr. Speaker Sparkes, upon the Standing Orders which are interesting, but they happen to be irrelevant.

MR. W.N. ROWE: In any event...

MR. ROBERTS: In any event what do they say? The member may - it just says that it is out of order to read extracts in the debate. Extracts from what, Your Honour? It goes on to say that a member may read extracts from books etc. provided that in so doing he does not infringe upon any point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: I just made the point of order.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What point of order?

MR. CROSBIE: I just made it.

MR. ROBERTS: What is he talking about? These are not the Standing

Orders, Mr. Speaker, these are the commentaries on the Standing Orders.

MR. CROSBIE: May I refer to another section, Mr. Speaker? On page (40) also; "It is out of order to refer to anything said out of the House on the subject of what is taking place in the House." Everything the honourable gentleman is quoting are things said outside the House on what happened inside the House.

MR. SPEAKER: If honourable members will permit. This again is a matter which goes right to the substance of the debate here and again we will have a five minute adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: With regard to the point of order raised by the Minister of Finance I refer hon. members to Beauchesne, page 133, article (4) where Beauchesne quotes - "Bourinot, says that a member may read extracts from documents, books, or other printed publications as part of his speech, provided in so doing he does not infringe upon any point of order." I find that the member for White Bay South did not infringe any point of order in reading the documents into the records and consequently he will be permitted to continue.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): What a blatant attempt, Mr. Speaker, to stifle debate in this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the hon. gentleman imputing the Speaker's ruling?

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention that the Minister of Finance seems to be not satisfied with Your Honour's ruling.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the hon. gentleman want to appeal it?

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Does he want to appeal the ruling, I wonder?

MR. CROSBIE: Do you want to make me be satisfied? I am not satisfied with it. What shall I do?

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Nothing. Sit there, Mr. Speaker, and be quiet. Everything they can dig up, Mr. Speaker, to cut off debate on this matter they will try this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. members had many liberties and the Chair has been very lenient in its rulings and the hon. member should reciprocate in speaking to the motion and being relevant at all times. The Chair will not tolerate abuse from the hon. member as it will not tolerate the hon. member being abused.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Speaker, I will continue to be relevant. Mr. Speaker, the St. John's West member said, as quoted in the "Daily News" of July 21, 1970 that he was sick and tired of hearing

his name along with the member for Humber East, Clyde Wells, as being in on the original agreement and that it was their idea as well as other members of the Cabinet. Mr. Crosbie said that it was a deliberate attempt to deceive. That is what he said in the House, Mr. Speaker. "It turns your stomach and makes you want to throw. Mr. Crosbie said that we were against this from the start. I just cited something about an hour ago, Mr. Speaker, in which the hon. minister of that day mentioned how he set up this Cabinet Committee, how he reluctantly accepted the agreement which the government entered into as a result of this Cabinet Committee recommendation. Now he says that we were against it from the start and thank God, he says, that we are getting another chance to vote against it. "I made a mistake in 1968 when I did not vote against it. I should have voted against it then and now we have a chance to redeem ourselves." He had another chance to redeem himself, Mr. Speaker, a day or two ago when he voted for a bill which was essentially the same.

"The Liberal Reform Leader said that he will be willing to go to the people of St. John's West in a by-election to prove to the government that they were making a big mistake in this project. He said that he was all for industry for Newfoundland but he added, 'The province wants promoters, not the type that uses Newfoundland as a doormat to squeeze every cent out of it,' referring to Mr. Shaheen and his group of companies. During his more than ninety minute address Mr. Crosbie moved an amendment to the second reading of the bill." That is, as I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, about the fifty-fifty deal that he wanted to enter into. It is interesting to note that the amendment was seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, Ank Murphy, the Leader of the Opposition of that day.

July 21, 1970 "Daily News," "House bluffed by Shaheen

says Hickey." "Not ten per cent behind the project, says Murphy."  
"Mr. Murphy described the Come by Chance project as the biggest giveaway programme in the history of Newfoundland and claimed that we will only get a few piddling jobs out of it." Yes, Mr. Speaker, about half the number of jobs that will be coming out of the new refinery which is costing this province \$80 million rather than \$30 million. "Another conservative to register his protest against the oil refinery project was Tom Hickey, P.C., St. John's East Extern who told the House he could no longer support the scheme 'because I have been led astray.' Mr. Hickey said that he is convinced the province can get a much better deal than the one it has with Mr. Shaheen. He said that he would like to know where the New York promoter could go and get half the deal he has at the present with this government."

Well, the answer to that is obvious, Mr. Speaker. Come back to this government, the government of this province. "He was highly critical of Mr. Shaheen and his associates' appearance before the legislature in April which he described as a fiasco. 'We were bluffed from the minute they walked in to the minute when they left,' Mr. Hickey charged, 'and the government was an accomplice because they permitted it.' He said that many of the pertinent questions asked by the opposition members were not even answered and that a lot of the information that was given was dishonest." That is how the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, the Minister of Provincial Affairs in the Progressive Conservative Administration, Mr. Speaker, that is what he thought of Mr. Shaheen a couple of years ago.

The "Evening Telegram" July 22, 1970, "It is all one-sided, it is a piece of Shaheenery, charged Mr. Crosbie." That was his attitude, Mr. Speaker. July 23, 1970, the "Daily News" "Getting a raw deal on refinery - Moores.' Mr. Moores said that



he felt that the primary resources should come before anything else. Mr. Moores said that there was no mention in the deal about the \$1 million power subsidy for the refinery and the only thing the people have is just the word from Mr. Shaheen and Mr. Smallwood, just the word of Mr. Shaheen who he is now in association with and Mr. Smallwood the Premier of the day." The Premier the other day had the audacity to take me to task, Mr. Speaker, because he had tabled in this House an agreement which did not even bear signatures, and I ask him if it had been signed. He said, "Oh, you are doubting the word of me, the Premier of the province." A couple of years ago that same hon. member, that same Premier, was saying that all we have is just the word from Mr. Shaheen and Mr. Smallwood.

He goes on to say, "At the present time an oil company, Shell of Canada, is going to spend \$225 million in oil exploration in Canada and the bulk of this is going to be spent on the East Coast. He said that that is a lot of money to spend by one company and if they strike oil off the Continental Shelf then the Come by Chance Oil Refinery would just become a recreational area." That was the attitude expressed by the present Premier in those days, Mr. Speaker, casting doom and gloom again, prophesying disaster and defeat and everything else as a blatant political ploy, Mr. Speaker, which they have now reversed their stand on absolutely and completely.

The "Daily News" July 24, 1970, "Shaheen has government by the throat, says Crosbie." There is the hon. member. That was the ideas he had in those days, Mr. Speaker. July 21, 1970, the "Daily News," "Government is playing economic Russian Roulette, says Marshall, in maiden speech." That is the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, who should spend more time trying to learn how to adjourn the House than trying to learn about oil refineries. "The people's confidence is shaken," Mr. Marshall said as he described the Come by Chance deal with the Shaheen companies

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Marshall said, 'there is nothing in the agreement to prevent the Shaheen people from pulling out during that period.' That is when they are paying back the money. 'He also felt that they could pull out at any time during the first ten years of the project. Pull the profits from the dummy company and place them in Shaheen Natural Resources.'

The honourable House Leader, Mr. Speaker, who has supported this new deal with Mr. Shaheen, said then, a couple of years ago, that at any time during the first ten years of the first project, Mr. Shaheen could pull the profits from the dummy corporation and place them in Shaheen Natural Resources. "The possibility is there that Shaheen and his group can get out before ten years and laugh all the way to the bank at the Newfoundland Government.

"Mr. Marshall said the Conservative Opposition opposed the legislation. 'This is the most specific example of the government playing Russian roulette with the future of generations to come.'" That was his attitude then, Mr. Speaker, and he gets up in this House and tries to, on a specious point of order, tries to get this resolution that I made ruled out of order, when it is obvious to everybody concerned that there has been a complete about face, a complete and absolute cynicism shown by this administration throughout this whole piece.

Mr. Earle emerges on the scene and says, "The project has been in the nature of a cloak and dagger operation right from the start. 'It just does not add up,' continued the Conservative M.H.A. 'If the project is as good as it is supposed to be, several of the major oil companies would be looking at it with an eye to coming into the province.'"

MR. ROBERTS: That is after voting for it, by the way, over here.

MR. WM. ROWE: He voted for it and then he did not vote for it. I do not know what he was doing.

But if it were any good, Mr. Speaker, in those days if it were

any good the major oil companies would be involved in the deal. Yet he comes in here and sanctimoniously votes his support for a second deal with the same man and the same companies that he was party to savagely impugning a couple of years ago, Mr. Speaker.

"The Evening Telegram," July 27, 1970, "The entire opposition voted against the oil refinery and supported Mr. Crosbie's motion that the government not proceed with the project until better terms are secured from Shaheen Natural Resources.

"Mr. Crosbie had suggested that the government have at least a fifty per cent equity in the project so that at least fifty per cent of the anticipated profits accrue to the people of Newfoundland, whose credit, he said, was making the project possible."

The entire opposition agreed with him on the stand, Mr. Speaker, and now they are entering into a deal where they are getting five per cent of the gross profits, and \$10 million to be paid by five per cent of the net profits. At that time; it should have been a fifty-fifty deal. The entire opposition agreed with the honourable Minister of Finance of that day, Mr. Speaker. If that is not a turn-around, I would like to know what is.

August 19, 1970, "The Daily News," "Refinery project in trouble, says Collins, the member for Gander," trying to spread a little of his poison and doom and gloom himself.

"The Daily News," August 31, 1970, "Signing Termed A Big Show As Scheme Meaning Nothing - Premier J. R. Smallwood did not impress opposition members in the House of Assembly Sunday with the signing of the construction contract for Come By Chance Oil Refinery.

"Mr. Hickman described the 'alleged signing,' as he put it, 'as another step in the unorthodox scheming to indicate the building of an oil refinery at Come By Chance for John Shaheen of New York.'"

MR. CROSBIE: Was that the one the honourable Leader of the Opposition made?

MR. WM. ROWE: That was the one he slept in on, but he got there just in time to pass over the \$5 million cheque. "The Burin M.H.A. told, "The Daily News," that on the basis of press reports concerning Sunday's signing, the construction contract is obviously not relevant but rather an attempt at clever propoganda, aiming at fooling Newfoundlanders. "Fortunately," he continued, " as a result of the Shaheen hearings in the House of Assembly, there will be no Newfoundlander fooled by these antics. " That is what he said, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Justice who knows when the political winds are blowing, one way or another, a man who always seizes an opportunity to stand on principle, to make sure that he is consistent in his policy and his public position, never has an ear to the ground just merely to see if the political climate happens to be changing just a little bit so he can jump on the bandwagon. That is what he was uttering two or three years ago, Mr. Speaker.

"The Daily News," May 14, 1971, it is almost a years later now, headline -"Lewis Comes To The Defence Of Shaheen" (Mr. P.J. Lewis) "Mr. Crosbie disagreed with Mr. Lewis' defence. He said that they were a disgrace last year in the House. It was a disgrace with Mr. Shaheen. He said, 'They were a disgrace because of Mr. Shaheen's refusal to give information and answer questions put to him.' He said, 'The hearings opened the eyes of the Newfoundland people as to the type of man the government is dealing with, as to the type of man,'" referring to Mr. Shaheen whom he now clasps to his bosom. Mr. Speaker, as a great saviour of the province, he and his cohorts and colleagues.

June 11, 1970, "John Crosbie says that a Progressive Conservative Government in Newfoundland would provide permanent jobs, plan the province's financing in five year periods, establish a means of eradicating disparities within the province, foster better federal-provincial relations," That is right, foster better federal-provincial relations by standing in this House and slander Ottawa at every possible

MR. WM. ROWE: opportunity.

"Bring back democracy to the province and the House of Assembly and reintroduce decency - "

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

The matter under discussion is the motion put forward by the member for White Bay South and I do believe that while he has been permitted to read into the record extracts from newspapers, that these are irrelevant.

MR. WM. ROWE: Well I was leading up to something actually, Mr. Speaker. I realize that I had - well I was leading up to something.

I was reading up to the fact when this latter, "we introduced decency to Newfoundland politics," the point I was leading up to Sir, is that he and his cohorts and others who savagely attacked the Shaheen deal and Premier Smallwood of the day and the government of the day and the project in Come By Chance, they were the ones, Mr. Speaker, who undermined that, caused all kinds of provocation in this province, unnecessarily belittled and slandered people coming into this province and other members in politics, members in government and members who happened to be in favour of the Shaheen deal. There was the indecency and it is even more indecent now, Mr. Speaker, to see his colleagues come in here and jump on that same bandwagon that they were so adamantly against a couple of years ago.

Mr. Crosbie was speaking at the third pre-election briefing organized by the Newfoundland and Labrador press club in St. John's, in the St. John's headquarters. Mr. Crosbie said that Premier Smallwood had been a miserable failure in creating permanent jobs, blasted the government for wasting millions of dollars of public money on such projects as the refinery. Leading up to an election, Mr. Speaker, which took place two or three months later, they blasted the government for wasting millions of dollars of public money on such projects as the refinery (Here is another deal

MR. WM. ROWE: before this House, a year and a half after that election) and suggested that the government might pay more attention to such industry as the province already has, including the pulp and paper mill at Grand Falls and Corner Brook.

He said he is prepared to resign from a cabinet again if the matter were important enough but then he says, "I have committed political suicide at least five times. I was buried eighteen feet under in 1969." The year he contested the leadership of the Liberal Party against Mr. Smallwood.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time to resign from a Cabinet on an important matter, I would submit, Sir, respectfully, that this is it, where he has been humiliated beyond belief and his other colleagues as well, the erstwhile Liberal, the Minister of Justice, who came across here and used the Shaheen Refinery as some kind of a vindication of his blatantly political move across this House.

If ever there was a reason, Sir, for members of a Cabinet who have now had this thing forced down their throats to resign, this is the time; a complete reversal. I am not talking about members who had nothing to say about this. The member for Labrador West or several other members, I do not think the Minister of Mines and Energy had anything to say. He probably had no strong feelings which he articulated. He might have had strong feelings, he did not articulate them publicly as other members of the government, Mr. Speaker, concerning this oil refinery. But I am referring to the senior ministers of this government, the Premier himself, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Finance; the erstwhile Leader of the Opposition,



now the Minister of Social Assistance. These people, Mr. Speaker, who pulled the wool over the eyes of the people of Newfoundland and, to use a colloquialism, sucked them in, Mr. Speaker, with their position on things like the oil refinery and dealing with people like Shaheen, developers, promoters coming into this province; these are the people, if they had any principle, Mr. Speaker, would resign from this honourable House.

The "Evening Telegram," August 18, 1971: "Money trouble looming for refinery, said Moores." On the eve of general election casting doom, gloom and disaster being prophesied left, right and centre - cheap, partisan; political marks only, Mr. Speaker, being sought, say or do anything to get into power, do anything, say anything in their grab for the government of this province. "Mr. Moores told a press conference yesterday, the refinery deal like the deal at Stephenville appeared to be in a precarious financial condition and that last month a New York firm had begun a civil action in the Newfoundland Supreme Court to collect \$258,000 from Newfoundland Refinery Shaheen Company for engineering services carried out for the refinery project. Newfoundland Refining is a subsidiary of Shaheen Natural Resources of New York, promoters of the refinery and managing agents for the provincially backed and owned refinery. Frederick R. Harris Incorporated is the New York firm which is seeking payment for services performed during 1968-1969. Mr. Moores said it is the government's responsibility to explain to the people of Newfoundland why Newfoundland Refining apparently is not meeting its financial obligations as they became due." That is what he said, Mr. Speaker. He would not even stop at not referring to a case which was before the courts of this province, in his attempt to make some political moves and some political points leading up to a general election, a very specious claim. Maybe the hon. Minister of Justice would have some comment on that?

This claim made against Shaheen at that time was a specious one. It had no substance, I do not believe - yet the hon. the Premier and

others with him did not mind the fact that it was before the courts of this province. They used it. It was not even decided before the courts of this province at the time, if it ever were. They used it in order to try and undermine Shaheen and the Shaheen development at Come-by-Chance and the government which had sponsored it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if their public policy on that sort of a development was not clear and clearly stated, then nothing has ever been clearly stated in this province, and now they have reversed themselves utterly.

Listen to this: "Mr. Moores confirmed that he had had unofficial discussions with representatives for major oil industries who he felt might be interested in taking over the refinery if the Shaheen group falters." He was trying to make it look like the Shaheen Company was going down the drain and with it Newfoundland Government money, Mr. Speaker. There was no basis for making that statement. There was no evidence to support it, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever. It was just said right on the eve of a general election - a blatant grab for power, heedless of what came out in the public media. "It was John Crosbie a former Smallwood Administration cabinet minister who assisted in the initial negotiations for the oil refinery and Opposition Leader, A. J. Murphy attended the press conference with the Premier when he made those statements."

The "Daily News," August 8, 1971, leading up to a general election, the same thing reported by them. "Come-by-Chance in financial difficulty. Moores calls for full report." What kind of political activity is that, Mr. Speaker? Then finally, Sir, in the "Daily News," August 2, 1971, "Frank Moores, Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, says the refinery at Come-by-Chance has reached a new degree of stagnation and uncertainty." It is based on nothing, Mr. Speaker. Grabbed out of the air to fool the people of this province into thinking that the former administration had passed over uncountable

sums of money to a rogue from New York and that he was probably going to take off with it. "Another question that needs to be asked, says Mr. Moores, is why thousands of dollars are being spent in entertaining officers of the Shaheen Organization? He said it was reported that one bill alone, \$2,100, had been paid to the Woodstock Colonial Inn to ensure that Mr. Home White and others ate well during their stay in Newfoundland." That is the level, Mr. Speaker, to which the hon. the Premier and his colleagues lowered themselves during those trying times. I know they were trying because I was part of the administration that was involved in them. Although I cannot take credit nor blame for the twenty-three years nor anything that was done during the twenty-three years of the Smallwood Administration, I do take credit, and blame if necessary, for the last two and one-half years or so of that administration. It was then that I was involved in it as a cabinet minister, as a member of the government. I remember, Mr. Speaker, (The Minister of Finance has a conveniently short memory as have the other members who were involved at that time) the level to which debate descended in this House. I remember the level to which debate descended in the public forum outside, leading up to a provincial election - say and do anything. This administration put itself on the line completely, Mr. Speaker, as being irrevocably against Mr. Shaheen, as being against the Come-by-Chance Refinery, as being against that type of development. "Concentrate your efforts on rural development, cottage industry," that sort of thing.

We heard it, Mr. Speaker a hundred times. I knew at the time that it was a fallacious statement. I knew at the time that the people of Newfoundland were being misled, deliberately or otherwise. Perhaps the government did believe what they were saying during those days, maybe they did, I do not know. I suspect that they did not but

maybe they did believe what they were saying, in which case they stand accused of taking a firm public stand on a matter of which they knew very little, had no real idea what it was all about, heedless and careless of the truth as far as the Newfoundland people were concerned. Tell them anything! Let us get elected! Let us boot out Joey! Let us boot out that crowd! I could not care less, Mr. Speaker, about the results of any of the elections. I am delighted to be over here. I am delighted to be given an opportunity now to spend some time thinking about the future of this province without being jostled from pillar to post trying to deal with and cope with crises that governments and cabinets are always confronted with. I am delighted to be over here and to conceptualize and to do some long-term planning myself.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is not the point, Sir. The point is that this administration misled the people of this province. They totally misrepresented to the people of this province what their position would be once they formed the administration, on industrial projects, on promoters and on developers like Mr. Shaheen. They have reversed themselves. They have turned themselves around. They have let down hundreds and thousands of people in this province, people who really thought that they meant what they said. They have, besides reversing their policy, to take blame historically for leading such an attack, blatant, political, partisan attack on a project which really had no basis at all to it as far as the facts that they were uttering all the time. Making that attack, Sir, on the government, the project, the developer and the promoter, to pull the wool over the people's eyes, to try to convince them what was so was not in fact so or what was not so was so, That is what they tried to do .  
Mr. Speaker.

The people of Newfoundland will not forget this. If there is

any danger that the people of Newfoundland will forget this, Mr. Speaker, then I and my colleagues and several thousand other Newfoundlanders will make sure that it is never forgotten, that this blatant piece of political chicanery will never be forgotten in the annals of politics in this province.

MR. CROSBIE: I for one, Mr. Speaker, certainly hope that the people of Newfoundland will not forget this or that they will not forget the last four or five years since 1968, when originally what was a small group of people started a campaign to change the government of this province from what it was, arrogant, corrupt, power-mad, delighting in the brute use of power to quell all opposition, refusing to give the people of Newfoundland the information on any project no matter how small or how large, unless they wished to do it. I for one am proud of my part in those four or five years and it is a bit amusing really to hear the honourable unctuous gentlemen opposite, that marvel of unctuousness opposite

to say how he, that hon. member, is delighted to be in the opposition, delighted to have the chance he says to conceptualize, delighted to have a chance to think of Newfoundland's future. What demonstration have we had of his conceptualizing in this House this session or in today's debate? What a sorry spectacle to see what he has been conceptualizing, for days apparently and weeks he has been going through the old newspaper files and the old clippings, burrowing his way through them, reading every statement made for the last four or five years to see if he can catch some phrase or some expression to embarrass somebody on the side of the government. That is conceptualizing, that is thinking of the future of the province for sure.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am not ashamed of any part I have taken in anything that I have done in the last five years including the bill that was supported here three days ago. For two days this House debated that bill, that legislation and now today for some unknown reason - Has the opposition no wit? Can they not find something to have non-confidence about other than this day long diatribe of tripe that we have had today, these statements made full of venom, venomous statements, hoping to wound and to hurt as there can be no other purpose for it, to drag up or try to drag up anything that looks inconsistent that I in particular or anybody else on this side said in the last three or four years about the Come by Chance debate? Is that all they can find non-confidence in? What kind of a silly motion is it? While the House welcome plans to build this new refinery at Come by Chance, the House records its lack of confidence because it is supposed to be a complete reversal of policy. If hon. gentlemen opposite were not completely hypocritical, which they obviously are, they would not have supported the bill two days ago.

This is complete and utter and rank hypocrisy to support



the bill that went through here two days ago to establish a new refinery and then to come into the House with a non-confidence motion against the government because we presented that bill. That is the silliest, that is the most hypocritical, that is the most tongue twisting, double dealing, double meaning non-confidence motion ever put before a parliament. In all the annals of the British Commonwealth you would never find such a hypocritical non-confidence motion as that. First we agreed with the bill, we agreed with the new refinery, we agreed with the term; second we have no confidence in you because you dared to bring it before the House. What kind of tripe? Then we have had to sit here and listen all day to the tiresome, and we will have other members opposite up reading their little clippings. Mr. Speaker, I could go through the papers for the last five years and I would have no difficulty finding sayings and expressions by hon. gentlemen opposite that would be embarrassing to them, that they would not want to hear repeated.

Now I have not minded hearing repeated one word that I have said in the last four or five years. I meant it when I said it and I stand by it now and I stand by what I am doing now.

Now let us just come to some of the points because I do not intend to speak too long. We are accused, Mr. Speaker, of misleading the people of Newfoundland. Well, what a source that accusation comes from, the people, and one of the ministers that from 1969 onward continually deceived day by day and month by month the people of this province about the linerboard mill, about the oil refinery. When the hon. gentleman referred to several comments made by the Premier in the summer of 1971 the Premier was dead on, the refinery was having financial troubles, we know that to be so. The linerboard mill, month after month refused to give the people of Newfoundland any information on how

the costs were going from \$53 million to \$60 million and then they went to \$80 million and \$90 million and before the election \$100 million and the government itself before the election remember, Mr. Speaker, advanced \$24 million without a word to the public. When asked the questions they deceived the public about that. These are the same people that accused us of misleading the public, Mr. Speaker, who from the election in October until January 18 kept in power the last administration, defeated by the popular will, kept them in power. The hon. member for White Bay South if he had once said, "I am resigning if the government does not go," they would have had to go. Yet he stayed in his place and allowed Mr. Smallwood to give an order in council to Mr. Doyle to go to Germany to get money that he was not properly entitled to without observing the conditions of the order in council and all the rest of it. That we know is, past history, and then he stands in his place over there and gets on with the kind of garbage we heard today.

The hon. gentleman is constituting himself as Dr. Goebbels, the Dr. Goebbels of the opposition. This government is not misleading the people of Newfoundland. It is this government, Mr. Speaker, who published for the first time the details on the first refinery and who published for the first time the details on the linerboard mill and who in this House a week ago have given full details on the linerboard and what it may cost. We are not trying to hide any of that. That is not our policy and we are not here to mislead. This party, as far as I know, the party never officially said at any time that they would not put up an oil refinery under proper terms and conditions. There was never a word uttered against an oil refinery per se, it was against the terms and conditions that were entered into with Mr. Shaheen on the first one.

What does the new agreement do? I will only mention it

briefly and not rehash it all again. The new agreement completely changes the first agreement so that our credit is not involved except for \$30 million. Hon. members opposite were not able to do that in 1970 or they did not try. So that by that one stroke alone the credit of this province and the whole original first deal is completely changed. That is one reason why I support it, the agreement on the second refinery. The hon. gentleman does not mention that. The hon. gentleman stood in this House this week, with his leader, squirming and trying to say that a crown corporation was not the responsibility of the province. Not very meaningfully. Nobody believes it. But to put the coup de grace to it, Mr. Smallwood himself returned yesterday and when he was asked about it he said what tripe it was. He said that naturally a government has to stand behind the crown corporations and that put the kibosh on the hon. gentleman. The man who signed the letters, the man who did the negotiation, their leader who they kept in until January 18, 1972, he repudiated their silly utterances yesterday when he said that of course the government must stand behind its crown corporations.

Now if this second deal goes ahead, the conditions precedent are met, we are taken off all that responsibility for \$188 million, and no words or squirmings of the opposition can change that. The hon. gentleman advised that this is the time that I should resign from the cabinet. The hon. gentleman is an expert on resignation. Nothing turned his stomach. It did not matter what happened in the two and a half years he was there, nothing that happened in that two and a half years caused him to resign and he now has the audacity and gall to ask me to resign. Where was he when we asked about the liquor leases? Why did he not resign then? Where was he when that stench come before the House in 1971? Where was he when we brought up Societe Transshipping and that queer arrangement and asked questions about it? He was in the Canaries or somewhere as he certainly did not

resign. So the hon. gentleman is certainly - Why did he not resign in December 1971 when contrary to an order in council the Premier of the day permitted Mr. Doyle to borrow \$30 million in Germany? Why did he not resign then? He has the gall to suggest to me or anyone else on this side of the House when they should or should not resign.

Mr. Speaker, I prove my bona fide - when I believe in something strongly enough or I am against something strongly enough I will certainly resign. I have proven that in the past and I would do it again if I had to but I do not need the advice of an hon. gentleman who stayed in the two and a-half years that he stayed in with the last government, permitting them to wreak the damage they did in this province. I was not going to discuss any of this in this session. I am not interested any longer in the record of the past administration. There were a few things we had to bring out last year about it to show why we were where we were. But the hon. gentlemen themselves now want to go burrowing into the past because they think they are on to something good. Pitiful.

I said, yes, Mr. Speaker, and I remember saying in 1971 we hoped to reintroduce decency into Newfoundland politics. I thought that when a certain individual was gone decency would be reintroduced in the Newfoundland politics but I see I was wrong. It has not been. The issues are not discussed. It is this kind of political chicanery and clap-trap that we are wasting day after day in this House discussing, not the future of Newfoundland, not the Come by Chance deal but going back through the newspapers like maggots trying to see what they can come up with. Deceit, slander - Well that is a matter for another debate, the slander in Ottawa. Just because we are not obsequious and Ottawa

lap dogs, just up with our paws out saying; "Drop us something and we will do whatever you say, Uncle Ottawa," just because we think we have a position to put forward which Ottawa has now accepted and we are \$24 million richer by.

The honourable gentleman says that we are slandering Ottawa. Who said a word, Mr. Speaker, against Ottawa? We said nothing against Ottawa. We and the other provinces are putting forward a reasoned case and they realize that.

This should be called the pelican debate, Mr. Speaker. The pelican regurgitates its food and the honourable gentleman has spent all day here regurgitating the things that we heard about, when was it? Only Monday and Tuesday of this week, except amplified with a few more newspaper clippings.

Mr. Speaker, just to repeat something I said the other day as apparently the honourable - well, we know the opposition is listening to nothing, they are trying to make some kind of a cheap point. There are three things that make a deal with Mr. Shaheen palatable now when it was not a year or a year and a-half ago. (1) of course, the deal itself is very much better than the original deal and it improves the first oil refinery agreement if it goes ahead, by taking us off any credit responsibility for it. Secondly; since January 18, 1972, as I said the other day, I am afraid I will have to repeat it, not another oil company has asked the government to help them or to encourage them to establish a refinery or any other development here, whether independent or regular or whatever. Not one. Thirdly; since we have been in office and since January 18, 1972, the Shaheen people have met the obligations that were in the agreements that they signed and we cannot change the first agreement without their consent. They only consented to the change of the first agreement because they were negotiating the second agreement.

In negotiating the second agreement, and this is something that has not been noticed, Mr. Speaker, we were also, with respect to the concessions we could get from the Shaheen Group, restricted by the



agreement they had gotten in Nova Scotia. We have a better deal than they got in Nova Scotia.

In Nova Scotia they are entitled to a royalty of five percent of the net profits after the first mortgage is repaid and they get that for twenty-five years. Here we have five percent of the net profits after both mortgages are paid off up to \$10 million and five percent of the gross forever, no time restriction. In that one aspect alone it is better than Nova Scotia but when we attempted to get more, such as equity and other concessions, Mr. Shaheen was able to say there is another place he can go where he is not required to give such onerous concessions, so we were also restricted by the Nova Scotia deal.

The T.V. debate with the Shaheen people I well remember. The trouble the Shaheen people had, Mr. Speaker, was they were dealing with a government who would not tell the truth. They were dealing with a government, before 1972, who would give the public no information. They were dealing with a government that would give the House of Assembly no information. They were dealing with a government that were deceiving the public and they had to co-operate with that and when they came before the House and they were asked questions, not harangued and not cross-examined, asked questions, and not permitted by Mr. Smallwood to answer them, they looked bad and the government looked bad and they should have looked bad. There are no questions that we are not prepared to give information about. In the budget tomorrow and the supplement to the budget, there will be complete information on the status of this first oil refinery, information never given by the previous administration.

I do not see any point, Mr. Speaker, in going on at any length about this. A lot of these newspaper clippings were demands by the opposition that a select committee get information or that an enquiry be made to get information because we could not get facts from the government. I am proud of them, it was right, it turned out to be right, there was much hidden. Much hidden! If we had gotten



the select committee on the linerboard mill in 1970, it would never have been the mess it was when this government came in. There is nothing wrong with anything said or done in those two or three years. If it appears to be inconsistent to support this new deal, that is because it is not thought through clearly by the people who say that. There is no inconsistency, this is a better deal, a different deal, it is a deal that can be supported. That is why I am supporting it and that is why I am staying in the government that have this deal.

I am not afraid to resign but I am not resigning, Mr. Speaker, for nothing. I am not resigning just because honourable gentlemen opposite might be able to quote statements I made a year or two or three ago and think that they are embarrassing me. I would resign, I would resign again if I think that something this government are doing is against the interest of this province but not, you know, you just do not do it lightly, in fact some people never do it at all.

One honourable gentleman opposite there, the other night, the Leader of the Opposition, with his usual little sneer, talked about loyalty. I have no loyalty, Mr. Speaker, to any government that are not doing what I consider to be the right thing for Newfoundland. When it is no longer doing that, I owe it no loyalty. You owe loyalty to the King or the Queen, you do not swear loyalty to any political leader and if you think they are wrong, you leave them. Then depending on how they treat you, you battle back. That is what happened in the last four or five years and I am not sorry for it. I am only sorry that we are wasting our time here today on a nonconfidence motion that is not worth debating, when honourable gentlemen could have brought something up perhaps serious, that we could get our teeth into, something to do with the future of Newfoundland, something conceptual, something that has to do with Newfoundland's future and not this childish, venomous - venomous it

is, childish it is, mischievous it is, time-wasting it is, cynical it is, Goebbelslike it is, It is a waste of the time and effort of this House. It is a real disappointment, Mr. Speaker, that after having discussed this whole thing for two days this week, we have to go through this today and I do not know, but it might be another day yet. I only say this; I am disappointed in the honourable gentleman opposite that he has gotten on as he has.

MR. SPEAKER: The member for St. John's South.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, at last I know what Shaheenery is, because I can speak about this, having not been involved either in the previous administration or the present administration. I have never met Mr. Shaheen, I do not think I have seen him in the flesh. I could not care less about him, Mr. Speaker, and if this has to go on and on and on, if these old battles have to be refought and refought, talk about resigning, it is enough to make one resign from the House. I do not know how honourable members can stand it, I do not know how the press can stand it, I do not know how the people in the gallery can stand it and if the civil servants down below somewhere in the building can hear it, I do not know how they can stand it. This has to come to an end somewhere, sometime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WELLS: Now to talk about the motion; my honourable and learned friend across there is a good speaker, he made a good speech today but I will tell him a little story if I may, Mr. Speaker, about Mark Twain, who told the story of how he went to hear a famous Evangelist. The man spoke and spoke about converting the heathen or doing something about him whatever it was but he spoke for ten or fifteen minutes and he was a magnificent speaker. Mark Twain remarked that he had in his pocket about seventy-five dollars and he was looking around the church to see from whom he could borrow more, but the man went on and he went on and he went on and on and on and on. In the end he stopped and Mark Twain said; "when the plate was passed round I stole ten cents out of it."

The honourable member made a good speech. If you took fifteen or twenty minutes out of it at any stage, he would have made his point. Perhaps the points were good, I do not know, but I cannot help but say, Mr. Speaker, that somewhere along the line we have to do something about the rules of this House. We have to do something, not to curtail debate but at least to limit members to, I do not know, half an hour, three quarters of an hour, to make debate last on a given subject for so many days. Because, we are going on and on and on in this House and I do not think the public of Newfoundland, who are paying the shot for it, are getting their moneys worth. I do not think words do anything as such for this province.

To come to this business of Shaheen and this nonconfidence motion: I well recall I was an ordinary member of the public when all this Shaheen business came up. I watched the debate on television and I thought that it was a wrong way to go

about developing the province. I said so when I started political campaigning. There is no question about that. When I heard that this government had concluded an arrangement or a deal with Shaheen, I was worried and I wondered if it would be good enough to support because if the worst came to the worst and I did not think it was good enough I would not support it and I would take the consequences that flowed from that.

This week we had a lot of talk about it and I listened, particularly to the honourable gentleman across there who made an excellent speech. I wondered if he were going to attack the principle of the bill because I had some strong thoughts, Mr. Speaker, about the principle of the bill. I wondered if we wanted another refinery in Come by Chance. I wondered if it were worth \$80 million for us to lend out for another refinery in Come by Chance. I wondered if the first 200,000 or 300,000 ton tanker or the second or the third or the twenty-third that came up to Placentia Bay would go on the rocks and there would be an oil spill. All these things worried me and they worried me very much and I would have admired the honourable gentleman on the other side more if they had talked about the principle of it. I wondered, since 100,000 barrel a day refinery was going to be producing there, if that would not be enough to attract petrochemicals, if they are ever going to come here, and whether 400,000 barrels a day of refined product or of crude product attracts petrochemicals more so than 100,000.

These things worried me and these things gave me a lot of qualms. The one thing that allowed me to support it, because I have no brief for Mr. Shaheen, I do not think I would walk out to say hello to the man, quite frankly, but the one thing that made it possible for me to support this measure and to support this bill was this, that according to the information which we had that refinery will pay and the refinery which is presently being constructed there apparently will pay, and the refineries which are being constructed in Nova

Scotia will pay.

Now Mr. Shaheen represents international business, he has correctly assessed the oil market of the future. He has correctly assessed and done his homework apparently on where he can get his crude oil. So that the one thing that has made it possible for me to support this, Mr. Speaker, is the knowledge in so far as I can find out that this is going to pay. So therefore we have to consider where the money is being spent and lend by the Government of Newfoundland. It is being spent in services all over the place. Where I think in my own district, for instance, Blackhead Road nearly \$8 million has been spent up there, when I think of what the cost of water and sewerage is, how much money must be spent. I looked then at the \$80 million and I conclude, I hope rightly, that money will be repaid to the Province of Newfoundland.

Now I would like to see a better deal. God knows we would all like to see a better deal! But what is a better deal? How good can a deal be? How far can you go, or if you want to turn the thing down altogether? Now this was the position which presumably our negotiators found themselves in. They came to the point where they said, this we think is the best deal we can get.

Now that would not satisfy me except I believe that Mr. Shaheen or his company will be able to repay this money. I do not think that necessarily he is a great good-hearted man who has the Province of Newfoundland and its best interest in his mind all of the time. I do not think that for a moment. But I happen to think that he is a shrewd enough businessman to be able to repay this money. For that reason I can say at last there is \$80 million of public money of Newfoundland that is lend with a good chance of its being repaid, in fact with an excellent chance of its being repaid and that there are certain other benefits that go with it.

Now I do not like very much the idea of oil refineries. I have some sympathy with the State of Delaware as we were told I think by the honourable Leader of the Opposition the other day, which has

prohibited refineries. I do not like the idea. I am not falling over backwards over Mr. Shaheen and never was. But still I laid these things to one side and I will go along with this refinery because it will provide a certain number of jobs in construction, a certain number of jobs when it is producing and I think the money will be repaid or I hope it will be repaid. For that reason and that reason only I go along with it. I did not come to this easily, I contemplated when I heard, after all that this party had said and after all that I had said, not in this House but in campaigning, after all I had said against that first deal, it took a lot of soul searching for me to get to the stage where I could say I would stand up in this House and vote for it. If I had not gotten to this stage, I would not have voted for it. Because I agree with the honourable Minister of Finance, I did not agree with him that it was necessary for him to refute all these charges, I did not agree at all. I think his record is clear and I think he is regarded by this House, whatever one might think of his judgment, by and large it is pretty good, but he is regarded in this House and I think by the public of Newfoundland as a man with some honour and some courage. I do not think it was necessary for him to try to refute it. I think he wasted his time but be that as it may.

So we come to this business of Shaheen and the motion of the honourable member or the amendment. You know it surprises me that the honourable members across the way or some of them who were so critical today, and we have only heard from one, so critically of this government's position. They of course welcomed the principle of the bill. "We go along with this, this is fine, we support it." I would have admired them more, Mr. Speaker, if they had talked about the chance of pollution in Placentia Bay, whether the \$80 million could have been better put to some other use, These are the things that really matter. We did not hear it at all. They went along with it because their great and glorious ex-Leader, Mr. Smallwood, had promoted this and they did not



have courage enough to say, well even at the time we may not have agreed with it. They did not have the courage to treat this on its own merits but rather went along and said, yes, we agree with it, fine, a great thing, we support it. Then backhandedly they try and come around at the closing, I do not know if it is closing or not, you wonder if the debate in this House ever closes, but they come around toward the end of the Throne Speech debate and, in a backhanded way, try to stick the knife in the government, that the government have done something improper.

Now I have very strong views, Mr. Speaker, about how a government should deal, representing the public, how it should deal with industrialists, great companies, and I believe that they should deal above all things at arms length. So I have only one request now to the Government of Newfoundland, this administration. They have concluded the agreement. The agreement has been ratified by this House, by an act. I have only one thing to ask of them now and I ask it from them individually and collectively that they deal with Mr. Shaheen and his companies at arms length, because I think this is the key to dealing with large corporations, especially when it comes to a poor little province like Newfoundland.

Let us face it, Mr. Shaheen does not have any special regard for Newfoundland. To Mr. Shaheen, obviously, Newfoundland is simply a piece of real estate well situated on the shipping lanes with plenty of room and land that costs only \$1000 an acre where he can site a refinery. Now that is all we mean to him. To me anybody who says we mean more to him than that is simply a fool. It is a place where he can come and site a refinery, where he can get a fairly good deal from his point of view and where he can refine products and ship them elsewhere. We mean

nothing to him, let us not kid ourselves. All I would say to our government is that we deal at arm's length with that man and his companies; that when the second mortgage is prepared that stringent conditions be put into it to protect this province inasmuch as it can be protected in the second mortgage; that when pollution matters are considered, either by the province alone or in conjunction with the federal government, that the most stringent regulations be instituted or urged by this province with regard to shipping in Placentia Bay so that we will not have a catastrophe; that the most stringent regulations be instituted so that if there is any noxious fumes or whatever they might be called from the refinery that they do not damage the homes and lives of people in this province.

These are the sort of things that I ask of this government and I ask it, as I say, individually and collectively.

If these things are not done and if they are not (I am speaking as myself now, as an individual member of this House) and I feel they are not done, I will have no hesitation in saying so. There is the point. The bill has been passed. It came before the House. Honourable members opposite as anywhere else in this House had an opportunity to speak on it. The House decided to be for it, without exception, without abstention, without a single dissenting voice. As I say, it took a bit of soul searching on my part to get to that position. I think I am right and I do not think I have betrayed the people who have elected me. Now I ask that arm's length dealings take place; that Mr. Shaheen be driven to the limit to meet every commitment that he has made to this province. That is what I ask.

Now to hear honourable gentlemen opposite who come in with a resolution of no-confidence in the government because the government have dealt with Mr. Shaheen in a bill that they can support, this makes no sense to me at all. It makes absolutely no sense. It seems to me, in

some way, and I do not pretend to be an expert on the rules but it seems to me in some way it is a silly abuse of this House and of the trust that has been placed in members in this House by the public of Newfoundland.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to every member in this House, over the way and over on this side, to cut short the debate and to put the resolution, if it must be put, and bring an end to this debate and let us get on with the business of the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does anybody else want to speak, on the other side?

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member who just spoke in the debate really got off the point altogether, Sir. The honourable member indicated that the members on this side of the House did not deal with the bill to set up a second oil refinery that we discussed a couple of days ago. Well, Sir, we did not focus attention on that bill because we approved of it. The whole purpose of this amendment to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is to focus attention on the hypocrisy of the Tory Administration in reversing their policy. They have done a complete summersault, Sir. Honourable members can say what they like, but they did con the Newfoundland people into voting Progressive Conservative in two provincial elections by using the oil refinery at Come-by-Chance as one of the gimmicks in these two elections.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, LSD that we heard so much about, a term I think which was manufactured by the present Minister of Finance, when he was Leader of the Liberal Reform Group on this side of the House - LSD - Lundrigan, Shaheen and Doyle, bandied around all over this province,

Now, Mr. Speaker, we could have brought in an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, dealing with all the appointments that have been made by the Tory Administration.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member is not permitted to digress any further on this line of thought. The topic under discussion is industrial development.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do the same rules apply to this side of the House? They have wandered all over the place over there. They talked about the Linerboard Mill. They talked about the rules of order.

MR. BARRY: Point of order!

MR. NEARY: Ah, sit down!

MR. BARRY: Point of order! What is this, sit down? I have a right to stand up to a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is speaking to a point of order and let him be quiet until my friend has spoken to the point of order.

MR. BARRY: The honourable gentleman did not speak to a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: He certainly was. He certainly was.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the point of order. Sit down! Sit down rooky!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bell Island does not have the floor. The Minister of Mines and Energy does. The Minister of Mines and Energy has given no indication that he has intended to yield the floor. Until he does so, the honourable member will remain seated.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there was no point of order mentioned until I raised my point of order. My point of order is purely and simply that if this side of the House has done something that is contrary to the rules of the House that has escaped Your Honour's attention, then the honourable members of the other side of the House have the right to get up and call, on a point of order, the matter to Your Honour's attention. This was not done, so what is all this malarkey that the honourable member is going on with?

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Any honourable gentleman may rise at any time and speak to a point of order. What is happening here obviously is that honourable gentlemen on this side are willing to allow the debate a little latitude. Your Honour has been very good in bringing honourable gentlemen to order when they have wandered a little beyond the subject. Honourable gentlemen on the other side are obviously intending to stifle debate. I can see it now for the next - well His Honour is due shortly. His Honour will come shortly but until then I can see a deliberate campaign of harrassment, a deliberate campaign of attempting to silence. I am speaking to the point of order Your Honour, if I may. Point of order, Sir. Thank you. We have seen a deliberate campaign of harrassment - all this with reference to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Placentia West, the Minister (designate ) of Mines and Energy. All of this, Sir, and this point of order he raises now is specious. The point of order is not a point of order, Sir. The honourable the Speaker has made a ruling. The ruling, of course, is sound and is accepted. There is no question there. My colleague was merely attempting to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that Your Honour has allowed latitude on both sides. We think that that is a good thing. Now the hon. gentleman from Placentia West launches himself on it. He is about to do it again I observe. I submit his point of order is quite specious. He is being very unfair. He is being quite malevolent. He is being quite one-sided. He is obviously, Sir, determined to head off any debate. They cannot take it.

MR. BARRY: Point of order!

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is not permitted to use unparliamentary language when speaking to a point of order and any member of the House is entitled to rise when deliberately

and malevolently such action is taken by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, which he just did. Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to my harrassment -

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, what is the point of order?

MR. BARRY: I am speaking to a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has gotten up and launched a vicious, personal attack on me. What is he talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Would both honourable gentleman be good enough to resume their places? The outbursts which arose as a result of the hon. member for Bell Island being cut short by the Chair, may be somewhat abruptly by the Chair. However, the hon. member for Bell Island in the past has shown a tendency, once given the opportunity, to wander far afield at some length. I was warning him at that time maybe somewhat too abruptly and maybe his answer was well taken. I am sure the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy was rising to the defence of the Chair. I believe that is what it was. It is quite possible that the Chair may have been a little too hasty in its interrupting of the hon. member for Bell Island. However, no apology is proffered.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am very, very grateful for Your Honour's ruling, Sir. I hope that there will be no more interruptions this afternoon while I am speaking in this debate. I have the right, Mr. Speaker, to be heard in silence in this honourable House,



heard in silence.

Now, Sir, what I started to say was that the member for White Bay South could have brought in an amendment to the Throne Speech dealing with all these appointments that we have been hearing so much about.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to bring it to the honourable members attention that he must direct himself to the motion that is being debated. This is a repetition of my earlier interruption of the honourable member and I will continue to interrupt the honourable member each time he proceeds in this particular way of speaking.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will try again.

Sir, in the winter of 1967 I think it was this proposal of building an oil refinery at Come By Chance was put before the government by Mr. Shaheen. At that time, Sir, I was not a member of the cabinet in the previous administration but I was a backbencher on the government side of the House. My understanding from the caucus meetings that we held in those days was that three ministers in the previous administration, namely the Minister of Justice who is now the Minister of Justice in the Tory administration; and the President of the Council; and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is now the present Minister of Finance, were appointed a committee of three to deal with Mr. Shaheen and to draw up the agreements for the construction of an oil refinery at Come By Chance.

Now, Sir, as a backbencher on that side of the House, on the government side of the House, I had complete confidence in this committee of three cabinet ministers to negotiate with Mr. Shaheen and to draw up the agreements for the oil refinery. I had complete faith in these honourable gentlemen, Sir, and I thought that they would bring the matter to satisfactory conclusion but I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the oil refinery ran into some very pretty stormy weather. There is a great deal that could be said, Sir, as my honourable colleague has pointed out, about the turbulence that resulted and the flak that came from the Tory Opposition of that day.

I think everybody agreed that it was a good concept, Mr. Speaker. It was a good concept if we were going to create employment in this province, if we were going to create jobs, badly needed jobs for our people. I do not think that anybody denied the fact that we had to create industry. The only people that seemed to be interested in coming to Newfoundland, Sir, were industrialists from outside this province. The Minister of Finance has confirmed that.

Sir, none of the minister's millionaire friends, his well-to-do buddies were prepared to invest their money in Newfoundland. Along came Mr. Shaheen - and Mr. Doyle was well established in the province at that time, Sir - and Mr. Shaheen came in, made this proposition. Now, we had the committee in negotiating with him. It looked like a good deal. So, everything was in "go" position, Mr. Speaker, but all of the sudden the great crusade started, which eventually led up to the October election, that Mr. Shaheen was a scoundrel, that Mr. Shaheen was a rogue. They did not come right out and say that he was a criminal but they almost identified Mr. Shaheen with the Mafia. Two members of the previous administration caved in under the strain. They caved in. They could not take it. They did not have the intestinal fortitude to carry these negotiations to a successful conclusion.

I remember the resignations of the two honourable gentleman well, Sir, the two casualties that we had in the previous administration. I happened to be in Premier Smallwood's office the day the two honourable gentlemen arrived to pass in their resignations. I spent about half an hour inside of the door. As a matter of fact, it was one of these days, Sir, when the Premier was most talkative because usually when you went to his office he was pretty busy and you had to rush in, do your business and get out as fast as you could, but this particular day he was most talkative and he wanted to discuss a couple of papers and a few books that he had on his desk. In the meantime, I saw these two honourable gentlemen standing outside the door waiting to come in. We had heard rumors, Sir, that

there was going to be resignations in the cabinet over this oil refinery development at Come By Chance. Sure enough, when I walked out they walked in. When they walked in one submitted his resignation and the other was given a letter that he was no longer to be a member of the cabinet. Well, Sir, I would say that set the oil refinery at Come By Chance back by at least one year if not two years, set the project back. The people of Newfoundland, the couple of thousand men that will be working down there, that are working down there now, lost about a year or two wages. Our gross provincial products suffered because of it. The jobs came about a year or two later than they should have come because these two honourable members resigned.

They tried to lead the people of this province to believe at the time, Mr. Speaker, that they were resigning on a matter of principle. There was some great debate inside this House and outside the House about honourable members resigning on principles. This was the only reason that a man could leave the cabinet, a matter of principle, something that was against his principle. But later we discovered the real reason, Mr. Speaker. Then followed this great debate, that my honourable colleague referred to this afternoon, outside the House.

Sir, the newspaper clippings that my honourable colleague quoted from this afternoon in this honourable House are only about one tenth of the clippings that are down here in the legislative library, Sir, about one tenth. He could have brought up reams and reams of paper. He could have brought up a whole truckload, Sir of papers and quoted from a lot of other newspapers of that time, Sir, that would have just shown the people of this province how they were conned by the Tory Party.

MR. HICKMAN: In consultation with the honourable Leader of the Opposition and as His Honour is to arrive approximately in fifteen minutes, there is a bill that I would ask the Leader of the House to be rescinded for

third reading and put through one amendment in committee. Would the honourable member prefer to adjourn it now or if he is five minutes away from finishing -

MR. NEARY: I adjourn the debate.

On motion third reading of a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between Newfoundland And Labrador Edison Company Limited With Shaheen Natural Resources Company, Inc. As Intervenor And To Make Provision Respecting Other Matters Concerned With The Agreement," rescinded.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between Newfoundland And Labrador Edison Company Limited With Shaheen Natural Resources Company, Inc. As Intervenor And To Make Provision Respecting Other Matters Concerned With The Agreement." Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the following amendment, actually two, clause number (10) will now become clause number (11) and that there be inserted a new clause (10) as follows:

"Every agreement or other contract entered into, executed and delivered under or pursuant to this act or to the agreement to which Her Majesty is a party shall be laid by the Minister of Finance before the Legislature within fifteen days after it has been so entered into, executed and delivered, if the Legislature is then in session and if not, then within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session."

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, does Your Honour wish to - or will we take it as having been read from the Chair, the amendment? It is in order in view of the regulations.

The Minister of Justice, as he has indicated, has done me the courtesy to consult me on the wording of the amendment and we sort of reached an agreement to disagree on the point.

I do not blame anybody for the situation in which we find ourselves or if I blame anybody I blame myself equally. This amendment is the result of the point which I made in the committee, at the earlier portion of the committee stage on this bill, where I asked the Premier if we could have an amendment along these lines to have certain documents to be tabled and he said yes.

The problem was that there was no amendment moved in so many words and there was no wording. Subsequently I waited upon the Clerk and invited the Clerk - I drew his attention to the fact that the Law Clerks had no wording to the amendment and it would be difficult to put the bill to his Honour for assent until it had been, especially since the House had given the amendments. The usual three meetings and it passed, the bill at third reading is amended. There has been a little work done on it since by the Law Clerks and the draftsmen, and this amendment results.

If the amendment had been moved in the words in which it has been moved, I should not have accepted it, because I do not think it goes far enough. I have told the Minister of Justice that I will not make a long argument on it and I shall not but I must say that there are two documents which in my opinion, are not caught by this amendment, two documents which, it will not be incumbent upon the government to table in this House, which I believe should be tabled.

Sir, these documents are first of all the main construction contract. Clause 4 (b) of the agreement appended to the bill and ratified by the bill provides that the government "shall" not "may," "the government shall participate with the guarantors and or lender or lenders the principal loan in reviewing and approving the plans and specifications for the plant and the contract to be entered into by Edison, the Shaheen Company, for the construction of the plant and for the supply and installation of machinery, equipment and service facilities of the plant with the prime contractor. It shall be satisfactory to the government."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the government, while they are not strictly speaking a party to that main construction agreement, and the specifications are in effect ratifying it, approving it and I submit, if ever there was any cuff-huffle over it, if every it came before the courts at any point, the government would be as effectively bound as if it had been executed by one of Her Majesty's Ministers under seal and all those things.

I think that contract should be tabled. I think the people of Newfoundland should know whether we are getting a refinery worth \$320 million or not. Because there is nothing to say the government could not approve a contract that would not give us an adequate refinery. You may say the government would not do that, but the fact remains that the government could do it and we should never know. The contract would be a secret document.



It will not be registered anywhere. It will be a secret document.  
I think it should be tabled.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the other document, as specified in clause 9 and subclause (8), found on page twenty-five of the printed bill. It says here, "The government shall retain independent advisers to report to the government on the feasibility of the project."

Now, Sir, that is not the feasibility study as we normally understand that term. That is not the commercial and economic viability. That is merely a report from independent advisers. There will be other reports, reports on which the lenders act. I think that the report in clause 9 subclause (8) should be tabled, otherwise we do not know that in fact the government have retained independent advisers and that they have reported favourably.

I may say there is no requirement in here that they do report and that the government act only when they have reported favourably.

I can finish at any moment if His Honour is due and perhaps we could,

Mr. Roberts:

because we have to give this bill third reading. All I want to do is register my objection. I do not think the amendment is adequate. I do not think it will make it mandatory for the government to provide the information which it should provide. I have named the two documents, the construction contract and the independent advisers report, neither of those would be acquired to be public. They will both be secret documents. They should be public and I am surprised and upset that the government will not agree to it but the fact remains that they will not. If I had known about this at the time the amendment was being put forward, I should have opposed it then on that ground. In any event, having said I am against it, I am against it and there is no point going over it again. I would like the matter recorded on a division.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested we did agree to disagree there. The view of the government is that these two other items that the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to fall within the category of commercial obligations and that we should not as a government make it obligatory that these be tabled.

On motion, amendments carried, on division.

Motion that the committee report having passed the bill with some amendments, carried.

On motion that the committee rise and report having passed Bill No. 60 with some amendments, and ask leave to sit again,

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

On motion committee ordered sit again presently.

On motion amendments read a first and second time.

On motion bill ordered read a third time now, by leave:

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between Newfoundland And Labrador Edison Company Limited With Shaheen Natural Resources Company, Inc. As Intervenor And To Make Provision Respecting Other Matters Concerned With The Agreement," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour The Lieutenant Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Admit His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal Subjects, Her Faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour bills for the appropriation of Supplementary Supply And Interim Supply granted in the Present Session.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Four And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service."

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Three And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service."

HIS HONOURABLE THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: In Her Majesty's name, I thank Her Loyal Subjects, I accept their benevolence, and assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its Present Session passed certain bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act Respecting Persons In An Intoxicated Condition In Public Places."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Wild Life Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Maintenance Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration of Deeds Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulations Of Collection Agencies."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Guaranteeing By The Crown Of Certain Bonds, Debentures And Loans And Respecting The Making Of Certain Loans By The Crown."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City Of St. John's Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Termination Of Employment Of Substantial Numbers Of Persons In Certain Industries."

A bill, "An Act Respecting Unsolicited Goods And Unsolicited Credit Cards."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulations Of Automobile Dealers And The Salesmen Of Such Dealers."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department Of Finance Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Municipal Affairs And Housing."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Manpower And Industrial Relations."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Tourism."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Mines And Energy."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Industrial Development."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Health Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Public Works And Services."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Fisheries."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Agreement Ratify, Confirm And Adopted By And Set Forth In The Schedule To The Leitch Gold Mines Limited(Agreement) Act, 1964 And To Make Certain Statutory Provisions Relating To That Agreement."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Crown Corporations (Local Taxation) Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Employment Of Children Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Forestry And Agriculture."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Rehabilitation And Recreation."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Transportation And Communications."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department Of Education And Youth Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Rural Development."



A bill, "An Act To Amend The Legislative Disabilities Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Northern Labrador (Social Services and Rehabilitation) Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Expropriation Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Forest Fires Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting Homes For Special Care."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Provincial Affairs And Environment."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation Act."

A bill, "An Act To Clarify The Manner In Which The Provisions Of The Statutes Amendment Act, 1971 And The Statutes Amendment Act, 1972 Are To Be Implemented."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Health And Public Welfare Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Agreement Ratified, Confirmed And Adopted By And Set Forth In The Schedule To The Commodore Mining Company Limited (Agreement) Act, 1968, And To Make Certain Statutory Provisions Relating To That Agreement."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act."

A bill, "An Act To Make Certain Provisions Respecting The Reorganization Of The Government And The Public Service Of The Province And Respecting Matters Connected Therewith Or Arising Therefrom."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Elevators Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972."

A bill, "An Act To Establish An Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission To Report Upon The Delimitation Of The Province Into Districts For Which Members Shall Be Returned To The House Of Assembly."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Stephenville Linerboard Mill (Agreement) Act, 1972."

A bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between The Government And Newfoundland & Labrador Edison Company Limited With Shaheen Natural Resources Company, Inc., As An Intervenor And To Make Provision Respecting Other Matters Connected With The Agreement."

A bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Indenture Made Between The Government, Newfoundland Forest Products Limited, Bowaters Canadian Corporation Limited, Bowaters Newfoundland Limited, And Lundrigans Limited And An Agreement Between Government And Bowaters Newfoundland Limited And To Make Provision Respecting Matters Connected Therewith."

A bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt A Supplemental Agreement Made Between The Government, Newfoundland Refining Company Limited And Other Companies."

HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: In Her Majesty's Name, I assent to these bills.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor left the Assembly Chamber.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, March 30, 1973, at 3:00 P.M., and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 30, 1973, at 3:00 P.M.