

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1978

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly from Bonavista, Mayor Frank Little and Town Manager Calvin Rose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Also present in the Legislature this afternoon are a group from the St. John's Junior Chamber of Commerce. I know hon. members join me in welcoming them also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a matter of personal privilege, and indeed, Sir, I believe a breach of the privilege of this hon. House. I should like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to page 102 and 103 of Beauchesne, the last paragraph of 114. I will quote the section of the paragraph that I think is pertinent, Sir, to my point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier, Sir, is in the habit of making statements outside this House that the hon. gentleman cannot make in the House because they are unparliamentary. Last night and this morning, Sir, the hon. the Premier made unparliamentary statements outside the House which imputed base motives to me, inasmuch as the hon. Premier stated that I was deliberately delaying the business of the House, that I was deliberately obstructing the business of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, in no way is this true. It is not true and the hon. the Premier could not say it in the House. The hon. the Premier continues making these statements outside the House. The actual fact of the matter is, Sir, that the Premier has lost control of his side of the House and in trying

MR. NEARY: to defend the administration, the government, the Premier lets go a vicious personal attack on me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to the last part of section 114 of Beauchesne. "In a just sense, any offence committed by a member relating to the Parliament, though done out of the House, is termed an offence in Parliament." I would submit, Your Honour, that the Premier be brought to task for this misdemeanor. I am not going to move a motion, Sir, that the hon. gentleman be suspended from the House for breaking the rules of Parliament of the Legislature. I am prepared to move a motion, Sir, that the Premier be reprimanded -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - for making these vicious, vile, personal attacks on me and other members of the Opposition outside the House. The Premier cannot make these statements in the House, and while the legislature is sitting, Sir, these statements cannot be made outside the House.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it will be very difficult for you, I suppose, to get the tapes on that one. But the fact is, Sir, that being in politics in this Province it is most unusual that personalities have never been mentioned.

I would suggest, Sir, that anything said outside this House that there is a procedure for the individual so offended to follow and that is the normal procedure, if he feels that chagrined, to go to the courts, and that is the logical place to go with it.

2494

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

MR. PECKFORD: To that point, Mr. Speaker.
There is nothing in the section quoted by the hon.
gentleman across the way making his privilege which
impinges upon things that occurred between the hon.
member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the Premier which
would impinge directly upon matters within the walls
of this Legislature.

The hon. House Leader for
the opposite side, the member for LaPoile, has not
demonstrated by evidence the words that the Premier
said which impinge upon or have some dealings with
things that went on within the walls of this Legislature.
And as the hon. Premier has therefore pointed out, if
some hon. gentleman outside the walls of this
Legislature says statements which offend or in some
way seem to offend another hon. gentleman who is a
member of this House, then the normal practices apply
and that is through the courts of this land.

I submit, Your Honour,
that the hon. member for LaPoile has not made a case
for privilege in this instance. He has not even
produced the statements in his opening remarks which
in any way - he has produced no statements that the
Premier made, he just said that the Premier made
statements. Now I would suggest that if the hon. member
for LaPoile is really serious about bringing a point of
privilege, personal or otherwise, before this Legislature
he has to demonstrate with evidence to prove his point.
He has not done so. He has just made a general statement
that the privileges of the House, or

MR. PECKFORD: personal privilege have been violated, about something which he does not say anything about, about something that the hon. the Premier said outside of the House about the hon. member. Now that does not constitute a point of privilege in any way, shape or form, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not even know the last member who was talking, what he was talking about, Sir. And I am sure he does not. But I will deal with what the hon. the Premier had to say, Sir.

The reason my hon. colleague rose now, and does not have the tapes, or the manuscript or anything to present, is as anybody who knows the rules of the House must know, Sir, that you are duty bound to raise your point of privilege at the earliest possible opportunity. And if you do not do so then you have lost your opportunity to raise your point of privilege, number one. The hon. minister should probably take a few notes, Sir.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has to indicate to Your Honour a prima facie case of the breach of privileges of this House. And he has indicated the words which the Premier spoke on the air, which we all heard, and which we can get the tapes of and the transcript of. I heard them myself with my own ears and they related to members of this House wasting the taxpayers' money. So that is the imputation of a base motive -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - to my colleague and to the rest of us on this side of the House, something which, Sir, if he had said in the House, Your Honour of your own volition, or if somebody raised a point of order, a point of privilege, the hon. the Premier would have to withdraw and apologize to the House for. But he made the statement outside the House and my friend has referred to the citation there in Beauchesne which says that anything said outside the House is deemed in effect to be said inside the House if in fact it is a breach of the

MR. W.N. ROWE: order and privileges of the House.

He has raised it at the earliest possible opportunity. He has raised it to let Your Honour be cognizant of the fact and make a decision as to whether there is a prima facie case, a breach of privilege. If Your Honour decides that, then a motion has to be made by somebody in the House and, as my hon. colleague has said, he is prepared to make a motion that the Premier be reprimanded.

Now, Sir, what I suggest, if Your Honour thinks that there is any merit to what my colleague has said, and Sir, we urge upon you that there is merit to what he has said, we get the tapes, get the transcript and so on, and Sir, a prima facie case can be ruled upon by Your Honour and a motion made to reprimand the Premier for imputing the basest kind of motives to his colleagues in this House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: I have noted the point made and the argument submitted and will give a decision on it at the earliest possible opportunity.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, again I have to draw to Your Honour's attention that the petition came from the community of Grand Bruit, and the prayer of the petition is not exactly the format that the Clerk, or somebody in Your Honour's office, was good enough to let us have some time ago. I doubt very much if the format has reached Grand Bruit yet, Sir, but this is a follow up on a petition that was presented earlier.

It is signed by thirteen residents in the community of Grand Bruit on the Southwest Coast of this Province, a fishing community, Your Honour. Thirteen signatures, of which twelve are Billards, twelve Billards and one Mr. MacDonald, and the prayer of the petition is that, "We, the fishermen of Grand Bruit met with the representatives from the Department of Fisheries

MR. NEARY: on April 4th. As far as we are concerned, we did not agree with what they had to say. All of the fishermen still want the reinstatement of the normal season opening, or failing that, compensation of \$1,000 per man for the five days lost.

"If this is not met we are going to put our nets out on the 15th. of May regardless. Also we would like to know how many guardians will be patrolling the rivers this year. We want an immediate action on this matter."

Now I realize, Sir, this is a federal matter but I am going to table the petition, if you can call it that, Sir, and ask the Minister of Fisheries if he would take this matter up with his counterpart in Ottawa. It is a very serious matter along the Southwest Coast, and on the Southwest corner of this Province. The salmon fishermen are going to lose five good days of salmon fishing this season and they claim that they should be compensated \$1,000 for the loss of these five days. And in the community of Grand Bruit, I might point out, Sir, that the salmon fishery is big. It is probably the biggest part of the income of the fishermen in that community.

So I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I commend it to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. I hope that the hon. gentleman will make strong - or the Premier, or the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs - will make strong representation to the Government of Canada

MR. S. NEARY: to have these people paid for the five days that they-I know it is a conservation matter, Sir, but the fisherman are the ones who should not have to pay the price they should be compensated for the five days that they are going to lose. So I would ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House, Sir, and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: In support of that petition-I am not sure if it is an order something that is under federal jurisdiction to be presented in this House or not-but certainly the principle of the late opening of the salmon season is of concern not to just the fishermen, I think, but to others, and equally the same could be said for quotas and other species of fish and certainly, Sir, anything we can do to try to alleviate that situation will be done. I am just saying in closing, Sir, that I am very surprised that the member for LaPoile did not see it fit to give it to his good friend, Mr. Jamieson, who could do something about it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

PREMIER MOORES: - since they get along so well together.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish sometimes the Premier would address some subject seriously. Mr. Speaker, there is obviously a quota on the Premier's time in the House he spends so little of it here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by my colleague, the member for LaPoile. His district and mine, the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, are adjacent districts and his, like mine, is being adversely affected by this decision to have not only a late opening, by the way, an opening delayed by five days, but a season that is abbreviated on the tail end by another five days. Now it is the five days up front that is the most serious because that, I understand, is the main part of the salmon run, so that it is affecting them at that point very seriously but also on the tail end of the season in July there is a cut-off which is

MR. SIMMONS: five days earlier. So there is a total of ten days being taken out of the salmon season, the commercial salmon fishing season. I talked to some federal fisheries people about this and I am told that their figures, their projections, indicate that this abbreviation of the salmon season will represent approximately 15 per cent, a 15 per cent cut back in the income that the salmon fishermen would get from salmon fishing, this income this year as a result of this decision, they project - these are the federal figures - will be cut back by about 15 per cent. Now that is a substantial amount of money in dollars.

The case that has been made in the petition, and by the member for LaPoile, for compensation in lieu of a change is a good case. There is precedent for it. I realize again we are dealing with a federal issue and my real purpose in reinforcing this matter is to impress upon the Premier, who has just demonstrated that he intends to do nothing about it only make political remarks -

MR. S. NEARY: Personal remarks.

MR. SIMMONS: - but I appeal to the good sense of the Minister of Fisheries to take this matter of compensation up with the federal people. I have pretty well come to the conclusion that the federal people are hard and fast on the subject of the length of the season and they say they have their conservation reasons for that decision. If that be the case, then there are all kinds of precedents and I refer in particular to the compensation to western farmers. There are all kinds of precedence in the federal ambit for compensating in this kind of circumstance. And I would appeal to the minister to make this a matter of priority. It affects a lot of people and I have representation, not in the form of a petition but in a form of letters and telegrams from, I believe, every salmon fisherman in Ramea, Burgeo, Grey, River and Francois, about seventy to eighty salmon fishermen in those four communities alone who were affected,

Mr. Simmons and I repeat are affected, will be affected to the degree of 15 per cent of their last year's income through the salmon fishery alone. Now we are talking a lot of dollars here at a time when they cannot afford to be without these dollars. They are going to be without them through no fault of their own. They have the same cash outlay, Mr. Speaker, the same equipment outlay for this abbreviated season as if the season were of its length of last year and previous years. And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe, a very strong case exists for the compensation that has been mentioned. And I would hope that the Minister of Fisheries will see fit to put that case or perhaps indicate to the House now whether indeed he has already put the case on behalf of the salmon fishermen of the Southwest Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I naturally support the prayer of the petition presented by my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). But certainly the matter of licencing is a very serious problem in the Province, not only with respect to salmon licences but other species as well, herring, crab, shrimp, of course, and other areas of fisheries, too. I am glad to see that the hon. members opposite are prepared to support the government in our representation to Ottawa to maybe have a second look at the whole business of licencing because I do not suppose there is a day in my life that I do not get three or four or five letters from fishermen around the Province begging me, almost, pleading with me to make representation to Ottawa in their behalf. While I recognize the need for proper controls of the resource, the need for licencing, proper management, where necessary conservation, I do believe that in some cases there should be more flexibility in the matter of the issuance of licences to fishermen, and I believe that the case presented today by the member for the district in fact speaks for itself in that, with respect to the salmon fishery on the coast to which he has referred there is need, I believe, for somebody to have a second look at the whole business of licences.

Mr. W. Carter: And it might be an idea, Mr. Speaker, before this Assembly closes its doors in the Summer or late Spring, that maybe a resolution should be put to the House, maybe we should make representation to Ottawa, as a Legislature, requesting that certain changes be made in the licencing policies of the federal government, and that maybe the provinces should be given a chance to have some input into the decision making process with respect to the licencing of fishermen to harvest these very important fish.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 34 is the only one that I have been asked so far from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Does the Government of Newfoundland provide a motor vehicle for the use of the hon. the Premier and, if so, what is the make and model of the car of the said motor vehicle, when was the motor vehicle purchased etc.? The answer is, yes. A 1976 Lincoln four door sedan purchased December 19, 1975. The vehicle was purchased from Elm Mercury Sales (1976) Limited, Kenmount Road, at a cost of \$9,188.90.

During the financial year that commenced April 1, 1977, what was the cost of operating such a vehicle? The cost of operating it is gasoline and oil \$427.000; mobile telephone at \$486.00; tires and parts \$1,016.47; and the salary of the driver from the carpool, who I use when that is necessary, \$9,455.

MR. NEARY: A permanent driver?

PREMIER MOORES: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: A permanent driver?

PREMIER MOORES: He is with me a lot, but he does other work as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 56 in the name of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). He asked the number of dental students in training as of

MR. H. COLLINS:

January 1, 1978 and the name of the dental school the students are attending. The answer is a total of nine students, eight at Dalhousie and one at McGill.

Question No. 59, in the name of the same hon. member, a statement showing the capital cost of the Twillingate hospital and the original estimated cost. The total project cost is \$8,100,000 and the original estimated cost was \$5,500,000.

A statement of new vehicles purchased in the current fiscal year to date - that is to ask the hon. minister to lay upon the table of the House the following information: Statement of new vehicles purchased in the current fiscal year to date, the cost of purchase of new vehicles, type of vehicles, purpose for which they are used, number of public tenders called. And the answer is none were bought and the other questions are non-applicable.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: A question for the hon. the Premier, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Premier's commitments made outside the building today to the 2,000 or 3,000 students who were demonstrating against the cuts in education, in view of the Premier's commitments to those students to reconsider these cuts, these savage cuts in education, the layoff of teachers, the increases in student loans, the cut to the university, the diminishing of the quality of education generally in this Province by these cuts, would the Premier indicate to the House whether he is now in a position, Sir, to tell us that there is a freeze on these cuts, that a freeze will be implemented as far as teacher

MR. W. N. ROWE: layoffs are concerned, that the student loan provisions brought in increasing the burden on students will not in fact be implemented? Is the Premier in a position to tell us that now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as I said outside the House to the students that were here today, first of all I thought - this may sound surprising - that it was good to see a protest at the university again after a while of missing it, and basically -

AN HON. MEMBER: Change.

PREMIER MOORES: No, I think it is very healthy to see that, I really do. As I said to the students at that time, Sir, we are prepared to meet with the committee from their group, as well as from the teachers, as well as from any faculty or any other groups that may be concerned about the quality of education in this Province, and certainly, any discussions we have with them will take that under consideration.

I was also impressed, Sir, by the students' acumen by their shouts for certain people to arrive, because I think they as well are not sure who the Leader of the Opposition is yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Do not be always getting personal.

MR. W. N. ROWE: For a man, Sir, who has lost complete control of his Caucus and cannot even get a minister's salary through the House, that is quite a statement!

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. First of all, let me preface it by saying, Sir, that anybody who was in front of the building today and saw

2509

MR. W. N. ROWE: the students demonstrating, could only be impressed at the orderly, civilized and sensible manner in which they presented their demands to the government. Sir, they came out in force as promised, well-organized, and a very civilized and sensible demonstration, Sir, a great way to dramatize the needs of the students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Will the Premier indicate to the House, by way of a supplementary, Sir, if he is indeed willing to make concessions in this matter? It is no good to sit down and waste people's time, Mr. Speaker, talking about the needs of education and so on, unless the Premier is prepared to give a commitment here now which can be transmitted to the students and their representatives that he is, in fact, willing to make sure that the student loan provisions are not raised, that the teacher layoffs will not take place, and that there will be additional money provided to Memorial University so that the tuition fees would not have to be raised and the university can carry on with its usual functions unimpaired. Can he give a commitment to this House, Sir,

2510

MR. W. ROWE:

that he is prepared to in fact take those kind of steps or is he going to sit down and have a general philosophical discussion with the students representatives when they come in?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, we have already established a committee which is meeting with the university to review their Budget and see exactly what they can live with rationally and reasonably without effecting the university itself. That is being done. And as I say the quality of education is something that concerns us, where money will allow, for us to do what can be done.

As regards to the opening remarks by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I totally agree that not only was it well controlled and well conducted, the students today. I was very particularly impressed with one comment that was made about that they are the leaders for tomorrow, and that they will be. And hopefully some of them will end up, and I know some of them will, in this House of Assembly and certainly, hopefully, Sir, they will put on a better performance than some of the members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. W. ROWE: The Premier is a friendly type of fellow. You do not like to get personal with him.

MR. NEARY: But he is a smear artist and a character assassin.

MR. W. ROWE: But, Sir, he cannot sit down in his seat without making a personal jibe at somebody, usually one of his own colleagues when they are up speaking giving a Ministerial Statement. Sometimes he takes it out on one of us. But he has this psychological quirk, Sir, and he cannot resist a personal comment.

A supplementary, Sir.

2511

MR. NEARY: A smear artist.

MR. W. ROWE: He did not answer the question, Sir. By way of supplementary, may I ask the Premier is the Budget a budget or not, Mr. Speaker? The Budget and the estimates going through this House, do they represent the government's policy as to expenditures this year, or is the Premier saying to groups in this Province that they can come and visit the government and re-negotiate the different matters with the government and get increased spending as a result of coming and visiting him? For example, when he goes out and sees the people in Grand Falls concerning the lack of hospital development this year, after a commitment has been made for six years now, is there any point in their meeting with the Premier, will they get a commitment from him to start this year or again will it be just a philosophical discussion? Is the Budget a solid document which the provincial government intends to live up to, or is there room for re-negotiation by groups in this Province with regard to education, with regard to hospital development, with regard to road construction and so on and so forth? Will the Premier make a categorical statement? Does the Budget stand as it is or is there room for re-negotiation upwards of expenditure on various public services in this Province?

MR. NEARY: Government by pressure, by pressure.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, people who are sensitive today seem to be much more sensitive on the other side of the House than we are over here. I am not the least bit sensitive today. But talking about personal smear, because you are sensitive does not mean to say you are smeared.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the question, yes, we are going to stick with the Budget this year, that is the intent. We are discussing the quality of education with all interested groups and unlike some of the past performances, Sir, in this Province

PREMIER MOORES: of the past administration, we believe in planning for next year and we do not believe in just going from day to day. Of course we will discuss with people what can be done to improve the quality of education, We will talk to them this year. We may have a Fall Budget that we are reflecting, we may have a Budget next Spring, Whenever a Budget is necessary, Sir, to do what has to be done for the fiscal and the other well-being of the Province, it will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the Leader of the Opposition for a supplementary, I would draw the attention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. the Premier, and of hon. colleagues on both sides of the House as well, to all hon. members: Number one, with respect to questions, Beauchesne page 147: "In putting a question a member must confine himself to the narrowest limits. In making a question, observations which might lead to debate cannot be regarded as coming within the proper limits of a question. The purpose of a question is to obtain information and not to supply it." And there are other dicta to the effect of argumentative material and material which is not necessary for the understanding of the question.

With respect to answers, Beauchesne page 153:

"Questions must necessarily be answered briefly and distinctly, and be limited to the necessary explanations, though a certain latitude is permitted to Ministers of the Crown whenever they find it necessary to extend their remarks with the view of clearly explaining the matter in question." I think that latter qualification obviously might arise in some cases but does not strictly speaking now. So the operative part here is that questions must be answered briefly and be limited to the necessary explanation. So I point out to both hon. gentleman and to their colleagues on both sides that both with respect to questions and answers, they are not to be argumentative. There was no motion before the Chair, it was not a period of debate but of asking for and giving information.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Thank you very much, Sir, for that ruling and I hope the Premier is properly reprimanded, Sir.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Along this general idea of our economy and the need for education to increase the economy, get people employed in our economy and so on, Sir, would the Premier indicate what his administration - not the Government of Canada, not the Government of St. John's or Corner Brook - what his administration, the Government of Newfoundland intend to do, what special measures he intends to take to combat the fact that there are 35,000 people unemployed in this Province, or more, at this very moment, and that this unemployment rate is 20 per cent of the labour force, Sir, an all-time record in this Province, perhaps even since the depression. Would the Premier indicate to the House what measures, specific and concrete, he and his administration are going to take to combat this dismal fact?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all, in the area of the fisheries we, in the Budget, and we will be introducing many programmes both in the inshore and the offshore fishery.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Again?

PREMIER MOORES: These programmes will consist of such things as a development corporation to take the part of equity in certain conditions, of stimulating and co-ordinating training for various people, of implementing the incentives for fish plants that will create further productivity. Equally, they will be responsible for co-ordinating distribution ports in the Province, distribution ports that will ensure that seasonal plants are looked after during the

PREMIER MOORES: off season, also during the glut period. We have announced a programme of cold storage construction which will allow, once again, the fisherman to get rid of all his fish and, equally, for the shore workers to get more employment.

Sir, you could go on with the fisheries in many areas, but because we only have a half hour to answer this question I will now turn to the area of Mines and Energy.

We have, Sir, in the area of mining, opened up the staking for mineral claims. We have some sixty groups in this Province exploring now as opposed to just three or four a few years ago. These people, hopefully, will be successful and we will see more mines like the Daniel's Harbour mine, and hopefully the development of the Kitts - Michelin mine, and, hopefully, the development of the gold mine back of LaPoile and the other various signs that happened.

Then, Sir, in the area of Hinds Lake, where we are also building and employing upwards of 1,000 people this year, we will also be bringing on - do you want the answer to the question or not?

MR. FLIGHT: No.

PREMIER MOORES: We will be bringing on, Sir, hydro for the benefit of the people. We are negotiating, and it is an 'if', of course, with the offshore oil and gas companies to ensure that Newfoundland gets the best result as they carry on their exploration and development, and eventually, and hopefully finding oil and gas and bringing it to this Province.

Sir, in the area of forestry we are trying to help in rural development, particularly. We want to help the small operator, the small entrepreneur in this Province, and that is probably the biggest

PREMIER MOORES: opportunity of all is through government programmes, making people available to them, making them easily accessible to them in the area, Sir, of sawmills, in the area of, whether it be handicrafts, whether it be helping with fisheries loans to get people established in fishing boats, wherever the case may be, Sir.

In the field of Industrial Development we equally want to help people and bring in tax schemes, which was mentioned in the budget, or for that matter sit down and negotiate with people to encourage them to come to this Province to give employment.

Equally, Sir, in the area of Tourism we have to provide the training for people so that we encourage more tourists to come in here, which in itself creates more employment. In that field, equally, we are very interested in trying to get something to get the economy going and to employ the people.

Now, Sir, when we talk about employing 38,000 people, I might mention that the 38,000 people we talk about, the fishery alone, as was shown in that blueprint for development - and I have not heard anyone say those figures were wrong with any facts to back them up yet - but it shows that there are 25,000 people alone who can be employed in the fishery by 1981. And this is one of the things - whether we are talking about the university, or trade school or wherever - one of the things is that we are going to have to train the people for the jobs that are available and certainly for jobs they themselves would want.

Also, Sir, in the area of encouraging the private industry, which in the end analysis has to provide most of the backup for

Premier Moores: job creation, we want to encourage private industry, whether it be from offshore, whether it be from Central Canada or whether it be our own people. But the main thing is, Sir, that through the assistance for small businesses through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, through the RDA, the Rural Development Authority, through these various agencies, Sir, this government is active and well and alive as far as creating employment is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear a supplementary from the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary - well the key word in the Premier's answer there was 'hopefully', everything was hopefully. Hopefully this, hopefully that. Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. the Premier - obviously nothing is going to be done. So I am going to ask the hon. gentleman if it is correct - I believe it was the Minister of Mines and Energy that I heard last night or this morning on radio, or the Minister of Manpower, I am not sure which - is it correct that the government have now finally taking the initiative to try to get some of the millions of dollars that is on the Ottawa plate for job creation in this Province, and the one I am thinking about is to cut the site of the Lower Churchill, has this government now finally made representation to the Government of Canada to take them up on their offer of a job creation project in this Province of the magnitude of cutting the site of the Lower Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I might say that the answer to that is, yes, we have taken them up on their offer, but we have also requested more. As was spelled out to this House, it was some \$4 million offered on a \$14 million cost to do that job. That we did not feel was enough, we have had conversations with senior federal ministers to try to get that amount increased, and we will be doing everything possible to try to get it going.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary from the hon. gentleman for LaPoile, and then a supplementary from the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier indicate if the Government of Canada does not agree to putting more money into the job creation project on cutting the site of the Lower Churchill if the government then will look into possibility of getting this Ottawa money for some other job creation project in the Province that will not cost quite as much? In other words, will the government take advantage in this fiscal year of the offer by the Government of Canada to create jobs in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all that is being negotiated now, and the answer is we are very anxious to get this project going because as we have said, Sir, this project is one that helps develop a resource which has ongoing benefit for the Province, and not just a Winter Works or a capital works programme or a Canada Works programme which seems to appeal to the hon. the member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Minister of Rural Development, the new Minister of Rural Development. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not he has had the opportunity since he has been the new minister to get the Rural Development Department back in shape? I wonder if he could confirm whether or not, because of the absence of the former minister at the ice and so on, whether the new minister has had the opportunity to get the Rural Development Authority meeting again, because it is my understanding they did not meet for over four or five weeks, and I wonder if the minister could tell us that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural Development.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in response to that question there have been two meetings of the Rural Development Authority in the last two

MR. PECKFORD: weeks, and all the applications that were outstanding have either been approved or rejected or deferred. Applicants therefore will be hearing, and have been hearing in the last week, on all applications put before it.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary on this line from the hon. member for Lewisporte. Then I will recognize the hon. gentleman for Stephenville.

MR. WHITE: My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the Action Group. I am wondering if the minister could tell the House whether or not it is the intention of the ministry to increase the staff at Rural Development offices around the Province in view of the fact that many of the inquiries being made separate from the Action Group are now going unattended to because the regional offices are being told to give priority to the Action Group calls?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural Development.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have fully investigated this very point in the last seven days and I find that there has been a tremendous increase in the number of applications due to the Action Group. As a matter of fact, I also saw a statistic as it related to the Department of Fisheries and the Fisheries Loan Board. The applications are up 200 or 300 per cent. These are good applications, the other ones have been screened before they got that far. So there has been a tremendous increase in the number of legitimate applications to various provincial agencies, RDA included. As a result of that the government has undertaken to beef up its staff to ensure that all applications that come before it get equal priority.

As a matter of fact, yesterday in the Rural Development meeting I asked which applications came from the Action Group, and which did not. And it is interesting to find that it is about 50-50, and that we are still getting just as many applications that are coming legitimately through the process, because that applicant happened to know the process. as we are from the

MR. PECKFORD: Action Group, where applicants did not know the process. So I think we are able to balance it out and I can undertake, and assure the hon. member, that every action will be taken in the next couple of weeks to ensure that every single application that comes in will be dealt with immediately, quickly and efficiently so that answers are given to people who want to create jobs in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville, followed by the hon. members for Windsor - Buchans, Port au Port, Terra Nova, Baie Verte - White Bay, time permitting.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. Could the Premier indicate to the House why Labrador Linerboard personnel are installing a new boiler in the plant when they have their main boiler still in good operating condition? What is the main reason behind this new installation which is going to cost in excess of over \$200,000?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. DOODY: The reason for the installation of the boiler at Labrador Linerboard Limited's plant in Stephenville, Sir, is for the sake of economies. The installation of a \$200,000 boiler will allow us to heat, operate and maintain the plant at a level which is necessary without having to operate the more expensive machinery which is already installed and will be maintained in preparation for the re-use and revitalization of the plant at a later date. In other words, it will cost us less to install the new smaller boiler and maintain it than it would be to operate the entire system because obviously the entire system is not needed when the plant is not in operation.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary only.

MR. MCNEIL: Does this action not indicate that your government believes that the Stephenville plant will be down a long time to warrant this new installation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. DOODY: I think it has been indicated, Sir, that even with the best efforts and the best intentions, if an agreement were signed tomorrow, and that is extremely unlikely, but if an agreement were signed even in the very near future, there would still be considerable construction and re-equipping redesigned installation of new and different equipment that would have to be done so that even if the plant, as I say, were to find a new owner or a new operator in the immediate future, the actual production of a product would not take place for a considerable length of time and so it is necessary to maintain the plant during that process.

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I was wondering if the Minister of Fisheries could give us some idea if he knows what the prospects are for lobster prices this year? I have heard some talk in the media about a new company coming into the Province who were paying fairly good prices, although I have not had any indication in the Port au Port area that the prices would be that high. Could the minister enlighten us on this, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there is a company here offering \$1.80 a pound, which of course is about seventy cents, I believe, sixty-five or seventy cents, higher than last year. The price, I understand, has been negotiated by the union with that particular company.

MR. J. HODDER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MR. J. HODDER: In light of the fact that the minister made a statement last year that either companies would justify their prices or else they would lose their licences, we have not heard of any justification of lobster prices or any licences being taken. Will the minister proceed on that tack this year and penalize companies that are paying below the average price?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, last year I did raise the matter and took issue with certain companies that were paying what I thought to be too low a price for lobster in the Province. As the hon. member knows, we did then change The Fisheries Act, making it compulsory for all of these companies to apply for and get a licence before they could purchase lobster in the Province. That is now the law. Certainly in cases where we believe that companies are gouging fishermen, are not paying a fair, satisfactory price to them, we will certainly do what we can to ensure that that practice will not continue. But I submit that maybe, because of the outcry last year on the part of the Department of Fisheries and others, the union and fishermen, it might well be that the new price being paid by this company is a direct result of that outcry. I am hoping the other companies, in fact I suppose it will follow that if they want to buy lobsters in the Province, as indeed I suppose they do, then they will have to match that price or they will not get any lobsters.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, I had indicated I would recognize.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and alludes back to his ministerial statement regarding the spray programme yesterday. Would the minister comment on recent reports that Matacil, or Aminocarb, the insecticide that we are going to use in the spray programme, has not been registered or licenced in the United States for commercial use, that it has been licenced for further experimental purposes only, and not at this point approved for a commercial application in a spray programme or for other such purposes?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: I am told, Mr. Speaker, that Matacil or Aminocarb has not been registered for use, or released for use by the Food and Drug Administration in the United States. However, I will advise the hon. member that in Canada Matacil has been used experimentally since 1965. The full registration was given in Canada in 1976 on the basis of twelve years of information and research. The information that was supplied to the Canada Department of Agriculture met the requirements of eight federal acts, The Pest Control Products Act, The Food And Drug Act, The Environmental Contaminants Act, The Fisheries Act, The Migratory Birds Convention Act, The Ocean Dumping Control Act, The Canada Water Act, The Northern Inland Waters Act, and The Waters Pollution Prevention Act. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, since the chemical has met the requirements of all these acts that I would consider it fairly safe for use in Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister comment on this particularly: Is it not a fact that Aminocarb, or Matacil, was chosen as the insecticide to be used in this Province because of two major factors not necessarily

MR. FLIGHT: tied to investigation or testing? That, one, it was cheaper to buy, it cost the Province less; and number two, it was easier to formulate, and that indeed is the basis on which Aminocarb was selected.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Aminocarb was chosen in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons, not the least of which was that our environmental control people in the Department of Provincial Affairs and the Environment, which did fairly extensive research on this matter, had suggested that Matacil was the safest of the safer chemicals to be used in aerial applications.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I would recognize the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay after, and then Terra Nova. I will take note of the other hon. gentlemen but it may well be that time will not permit.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Yesterday the minister indicated that he had been in touch with some representatives, whoever they were, of Advocate Mines Limited in Baie Verte, and he had been informed that they had no intentions of starting to produce at that operation by using staff personnel. I wonder if the minister could tell the House from what authority he gets such a word? Is it just a lawyer on behalf of the company? Is it the company management in Baie Verte or is it the JM people on the Mainland? On what authority has the minister got this confirmation so we can be sure that the thoughts of the local management are represented in whatever word was given to the minister.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I used the word very carefully yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question, I said a representative, and the representative was the legal counsel who conducted negotiations on behalf of Advocate Mines. I talked to him again this morning because I had a meeting with

MR. ROUSSEAU: him, and he again reiterated it. Now I think the problem may arise, and it is not a point of argument because I do not know as to what - I have been told that there is no intention to resume production. There may be some companies doing some odd jobs around, I do not know. But the definition of what constitutes full production is one that we have to - as I understand it, the company has no intention to go back into production of asbestos. I further understand that the warehouses are full out there anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the minister undertook under previous questioning from me that he would consult with his colleague, the Minister of Justice, and other ministers to see what could be done should the company intend to carry out the much publicized threat that it has made in Baie Verte that they would attempt to produce asbestos ore. I wonder if the minister could tell us whether he has had a chance to do that? And what the consequences are? Or what the government can do should this come to pass?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not done that mainly because, probably being peculiar, when a union tells me something I believe them, and when a company or its representative tells me something I believe them. So I am told, and I hold the company representative responsible on behalf of the company, that no production would start up at the mine. And I would doubt very much if a company or an union would lie to the Minister of Labour, whoever he may be. I am going to assume they have not, and I am going to assume that they do not intend to resume production. So I have no intention of trying to point further until I feel that the information I have is not accurate.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and he has now gone. I am going to start my question anyway, and he is probably in the corridor and will probably come and answer my question. If not, I will direct it to the Premier. It is in relation to an article that was in The Daily News a couple of days ago with the dramatic headlines: 'Farmers fear a Yahoo could be their minister.' But the question that I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, is in relation to the fact that the Newfoundland Federation of Agriculture is rather concerned about present legislation which allows the appointment of other than producers to commodity marketing boards. And their other concern is that the minister, any minister for that matter, has the power to make these appointments. And I am wondering if on the basis of this condemnation of this particular piece of legislation by the Newfoundland Federation of Agriculture, and in the interest of promoting farming and, certainly, promoting marketing or assisting farmers with the marketing of their vegetables, whether the minister intends to change this legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture is now here.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the matter with the Federation of Agriculture. I realize the fact they are not happy with the legislation as it is presently written, because in their opinion they should have all producer boards, producer marketing boards similar to the egg marketing board that now exists under our legislation pertaining to that particular commodity, and similar to the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency. However, over the past few

MR. MAYNARD: years since the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency has been formed there has been a considerable amount of controversy that it is a monopoly and that other sectors of society, such as consumers, have not had the proper input into decisions relating to the price of products and how they are distributed. Consequently, the federal people have changed their legislation within the last couple of years and most provinces have now changed their legislation to provide for a situation where there would not be totally producer oriented marketing boards, that all boards would have some consumer and public-at-large input into them. Our legislation follows the trend in Canada and I have advised the Federation that, in my opinion, I would doubt very much whether or not they will ever see a situation in Canada again where legislation will enable the appointment of all producer marketing boards. The situation where the board is appointed by the minister is a very normal one and I suggest that there are hundreds of statutes in this Province and in others where the minister has the option of appointing the board.

o o o

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Member's Day -

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

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Before you call that particular motion, Sir, I would like with leave of the House - I will preamble it with a very brief statement - to make a motion that the House can reject or consider as it sees fit. Sir, in view of the fact that we have had several Private Member's Days on the Labrador resolution, which is very important, and a consensus in the House has been shown, and in view of

MR. W. N. ROWE: the timeliness because of the demonstration we had today and the concern in the Province regarding education, Sir, I would like to move - needing unanimous consent of the House to do so - but I would like to move with the unanimous consent of the House, that Your Honour call Motion 15, which stands in the name of my hon. colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), which deals with all aspects of education and the appointment of a select committee to determine overall goals for education and acceptable levels of schooling in our schools in this Province. Sir, I think it is very timely that we commence discussion of that particular motion and have a full-fledged debate on education in the Province, and therefore, Sir, I move, with the unanimous consent of the House, that we go to Motion 15 and that Your Honour call that motion.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have unanimous consent?

MR. PECKFORD: I would like to speak for our side of the House, Mr. Speaker, if I can. Very often when we get into discussions, and I am sure some

MR. PECKFORD:

of the members from Labrador will bear me out on this, and we get into a fairly good discussion on Labrador, then it suddenly has to take second place to something that is current and today. And albeit, although we realize ^{on} this side of the House the demonstration today, the great concern of the students had, there are mechanisms now in place to try to arrest that kind of situation, and we are very eager and have done a fair amount of work over the past week to be prepared for today's debate on Labrador, and we do not want Labrador to be jeopardized in this particular case because we recognize that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. PECKFORD:

as well.

- is an important issue in the Province

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

consent, therefore I will call motion 5.

I understand there is not unanimous

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

debate is not here. What I am endeavouring to recall is who spoke before that? It was an hon. gentleman to my left so on the basic premise of when both hon. gentleman rise at the same time of a reasonable rotation from right to left, I will recognize the hon. gentleman to my right.

The hon. member who adjourned the

MR. PECKFORD:

Hear, Hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

You can appeal the Speaker's ruling.

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I want to -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

a point of order, I am not sure.

I believe the hon. gentleman has

MR. PECKFORD:

stood your ruling correctly, you had indicated that because there had been some speech from the other side last day and the adjournment that therefore you would rotate to the other side of the House.

My point of order was, if I under-

MR. SPEAKER:

What in fact I said was actually the debate was adjourned by an hon. gentleman to my right who is not here. If he were he automatically

April 12, 1978

Tape 904

DW - 2

MR. SPEAKER: would be recognized. Then both the hon. gentlemen to my right and to my left for all practical purposes at the same time.

MR. PECKFORD: Should not the hon. gentleman sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman does have a point. I would ask the hon. member to take his seat. So the hon. gentleman to my right adjourned the debate. He obviously was not here. Both the hon. member for LaPoile and the hon. minister to the best of my knowledge rose at the same time. It is not like a photo finish in a horse race. For all practical purposes they got up the same time and both said 'Mr. Speaker.' What I then had to make a recollection on was when that happens, and the House is reasonably apportioned, then the general principle of going from side to the other to alternate in debate is the general principle the Chair uses - when people from both sides get up. And if they do not get up then it is inapplicable.

And what I was endeavouring to recall was a week ago on which side the immediately preceeding speaker had been. And in fact he had been to my left, the hon. member for St. John's East. It is on that general application of the rule that I was recalling and for that reason I recognize the hon. gentleman to my right.

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much, Your Honour. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House feel that the amendment to my colleague's motion on the Order Paper in connection with the development of Labrador is rather silly and partisan, Sir, and just goes to show how bigoted and prejudiced the hon. member for St. John's East is, Sir, in these matters.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman in his speech has a great deal of latitude, but I doubt very much whether that extends, Mr. Speaker, to the words 'bigoted' and 'prejudiced' to describe the hon. member. Any hon. member in this House. It is contrary to the rules in Beauchesne and I ask Mr. Speaker that the hon. member be asked to

MR. MARSHALL: retract and withdraw that remark because this is the type of remark he is making from time to time that causes debate to go awry.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour knows that my remarks were not unparliamentary. My remarks were in keeping with a parliamentary debate, referring to the hon. gentleman as being a political bigot, partisan, and therefore I would submit that my remarks are in order and that the hon. gentleman is just trying to interrupt my speech and I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to restrain himself in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: What I have to consider is whether the terms bigoted and prejudiced are unparliamentary. Now obviously May gives lists but May also indicates that no list is definitive and matters have to be judged in their context. Any terms which are of such a nature as to bring heat into debate or

MR. SPEAKER:

likely to lead to disorder are generally unparliamentary and also terms which refer derisively to another member. I so consider the terms 'bigoted' and 'prejudice' unparliamentary even if prefixed with political.

The terms 'bigoted' and 'prejudiced' are of such a nature I would regard them as derisive and I would ask the hon. gentleman to retract them and then continue.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I will retract them. But, Mr. Speaker, they are silly and the hon. gentleman, Sir, is equally as silly to put forward such a foolish motion. Just because the hon. gentleman wants the words taken out of the motion, Sir, out of the preamble. Whereas the recent National Convention of the Liberal Party from which the federal government of Canada is now formed there was unanimous support for a resolution presented by the Newfoundland and Labrador delegation advancing the idea of developing and processing within Labrador of its hydro energy and other natural resources for the benefit of Labrador and the rest of the Province rather than exploiting the hydro power and other resources as raw materials for the use of industries elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, that preamble to the resolution is perfectly in order, Sir, it is a statement of fact that a delegation from this Province did go up to Ottawa, they did persuade the National Convention of the Liberal Party, a policy conference held recently in Ottawa, to adopt this resolution and to include it as a part of the policy and the platform of the federal Liberal Party of Canada. Mr. Speaker, there is too much noise, Sir, I am afraid that I cannot speak while there are other meetings going on and I would like for Your Honour to restore a little order to the House. It is not a bear pit; the members are not down in the Killick now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:

Your speech.

MR. NEARY:

Well, if the hon. gentleman does not want

MR. NEARY: to hear me, the hon. gentleman know what he can do; go back on his savory farm, back in the savory patch.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see Your Honour occupying the Chair, I do not know if it is the first time that the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) has occupied the Chair, I do not know if the Deputy Speaker or the Chairman has been defrocked. The hon. gentleman is sitting in the House; that is most unusual, somewhat of an unusual precedent for the hon. member to be occupying the Chair of the Deputy Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! For the benefit of the House the Deputy Speaker is on call and therefore I am taking the Chair.

MR. NEARY: But I would think Your Honour, without making an issue of it, I would think that if the Deputy Speaker is in the House the Deputy Speaker would occupy the Chair, unless the hon. gentleman is not feeling well, is ill or has been defrocked certainly I think we would have some knowledge of that.

MR. MORGAN: What has this got to do with Labrador?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. NEARY: Oh there is the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh sit down.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: I have to rise to my feet because if this keeps on it is going to get completely out of order. The hon. gentleman is referring to the Deputy Speaker of this House, and he is referring to the Deputy Speaker of this House in a derogatory manner, that he has been defrocked or dethroned and making allusions to the competency and the reason for the Deputy Speaker assuming his seat in this House as he is when he is not occupying the Chair, he is a member of this House. It is completely out of order. We have

MR. MARSHALL: already had a ruling a few moments ago that it is out of order to use derogatory language with respect to a member. And I say, Mr. Speaker, by the rules of this House which ingrain respect for the Chair of this House and for the House itself, it is doubly out of order to make remarks of that nature alluding to a person who occupies the Chair and the office of Speaker from time to time.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the type of statement that has been made by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) from time to time and is one that calls for the prompt intervention of the Chair and the clear and immediate retraction by the hon. member without any qualification or equivocation whatsoever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour knows, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a point of order, that is merely a difference of opinion between two members and the hon. walking breakdown is wrong again, Your Honour.

I would ask Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: On the point of order, Sir, on the point of order. How can I continue with my remarks if I am going to have spurious points of order raised by the hon. gentleman,

MR. NEARY:

interruptions from the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall)-

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - and I ask the protection of the Chair and ask the hon. gentleman to restrain himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I feel I can rule on that point of order. I indicated to the hon. member before the reason why I was in the Chair. The Speaker, before he left the Chair, indicated to me that he wanted me to go in the Chair, and as Deputy Speaker I have every right when I am indicated by the Speaker as the Deputy Speaker. I will ask the hon. member if he will refrain from referring to the Deputy Speaker in future.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour for Your Honour's explanation. That is all I was looking for, Your Honour. And in accordance with the rules of the House, I would ask Your Honour for the protection of the Chair, because obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Caucus that was held yesterday was so savage, and the hon. gentlemen are up so tight and they are so irritable that they appear all to be on the brink of a breakdown of some kind, and I ask Your Honour for protection, to restrain the hon. gentlemen. And I would ask the Premier to give some leadership in the House to try to keep his members under control so they will not lower the decorum of this hon. House.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the hon. the member for LaPoile is now supposed to be addressing himself to the motion that is on the Order Paper dealing with Labrador development and the amendment put by the hon. the member for St. John's East, so his ongoing

MR. PECKFORD: remarks as they relate to the status, condition or otherwise of this side of the House have very little relevance to the motion itself, and, therefore, I say that the hon. member is out of order in his speech right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. NEARY: There are the hon. seals again, Sir. I asked Your Honour for protection, and I was stating a prima facie case, I was stating my reasons for asking Your Honour for protection under the rules of this House, and I think Your Honour has to give a ruling now. The hon. gentleman is completely out of order by raising these spurious points of order. It is merely a device and a technique to interrupt me as they know they are going to get the blast.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask hon. members both on my right and left if they will obey the rules of the House when a member is speaking so that he will be heard in silence.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Now, Your Honour, this is a political motivated amendment and I can understand the feelings of the hon. gentlemen - it is obviously Tories versus Liberals - and I regret very much that the resolution has developed into a partisan resolution. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend made the original motion in good faith and the preamble to the motion is a statement of fact, that a delegation did go up to Ottawa from this Province. Unlike the administration, the government, we went up - unfortunately, I was not a part of that delegation, but I endorsed the

MR. NEARY: resolution before the delegation left our shores - went up and fought for this Province, fought for the development of the hydro potential of this Province and fought for the development of Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased because for weeks now in this hon. House, as Your Honour knows, I have been raising matters of how millions and millions of dollars are being left on the Ottawa plate, are being left in Ottawa because of the laziness of some of the ministers of this Province in not taking the initiative and taking the Government of Canada up on their offer to create job creation projects in this Province. And one, Mr. Speaker, has to do with Labrador, the one I raised during the Oral Question Period today and finally got an admission from the hon. the Premier that negotiations are indeed and finally being carried on with the Government of Canada. It is several months ago, Sir, that the hon. Mr. Gillespie, the federal Minister of Mines and Energy, made an offer to this Province to share on a 50/50 basis the cost of every man that would be employed cutting the wood on the Lower Churchill, clearing the site.

MR. PECKFORD: Lies!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour to ask the gentleman to withdraw that.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. minister to withdraw that.

MR. PECKFORD: I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The remark has been withdrawn.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. That is the sort of thing that lowers the decorum of this House. I wish the hon. the Premier would get the members under control on that side, Sir.

April 12, 1978

Tape 906

IB-4

MR. W. ROWE: He wants to be leader! Imagine!
That wants to be leader!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, my usual reliable source of
information in Ottawa, Sir, tells me that this offer was
made and no response from the Province.

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

MR. NEARY: Wait now, Mr. Speaker, let me speak my -

MR. SPEAKER (MF. YOUNG): A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. A point of order. The information now being given by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is completely erroneous, completely untrue, and the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa at no time, at no time presented that offer to the Province of Newfoundland directly, indirectly, written or verbal.

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Sir, I rise to speak to this point of order although it should be a point of privilege, Sir, affecting the privileges of this House. That hon. minister knows or should know - and if he does not know, he should leave the House, Mr. Speaker - he knows that what is going on here is a dispute of opinion, a question of fact, that there is plenty of room and opportunity for a debate on the matter, and that he should not abuse the privileges of this House by rising on a point of order, interrupting speeches left, right and centre, Sir, in order to make points of debate, in order to give his opinion, or in order to try to correct fact as he sees it. Sir, I would ask Your Honour to warn the hon. member that he should not abuse the privileges of this House, and they should not use the time-hallowed point of order method to abuse this House and to abuse the members of this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I feel it is just a matter of difference of opinion or a way of explanation, and I would ask the hon. the member for LaPoile to continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much, Your Honour, I hope I can continue, Sir, uninterrupted, Your Honour. How can one make a speech in this House when members on the opposite side are abusing the rules of this House, Your Honour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I ask Your Honour again for protection, the Chair for protection in continuing with my speech, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - my humble, few remarks, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member has requested that he be heard in silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): And I ask members on both sides of the House to refrain.

MR. NEARY: Now I am told, Sir, my usual reliable Ottawa sources advise me that an offer was made, either orally or in writing, to the Provincial Government here by the federal Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. Mr. Gillespie, that the Government of Canada were prepared to pick up 50 per cent of the cost of every job that was created in cutting the site of the Lower Churchill. Now the hon. gentleman will have a chance to answer me shortly. Let me say, Sir, I do not know whether this is true or not. I have been pressing the government for some information on this matter and only today in this House I had confirmation from the hon. the Premier that negotiations had finally started, after several weeks or several months of delay, unnecessary delay, that negotiations had finally started with the Government of Canada. The Minister of Mines and Energy says it was not true. Well, how come the Premier mentioned the figure of \$4 million? Where did that come from? Did the Premier pick that out of the air?

MR. PECKFORD: I told you that two weeks ago.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker! And the hon. gentleman, Sir, just stood, just called me a liar, and had to withdraw his statement. So, Mr. Speaker, it is either true or not true. I would submit it is true, Sir, along with all of the other millions of dollars that are left on the Ottawa table, on the Ottawa plate. that have not been taken advantage of by this Province. We find now this very important job creation project cutting the site of

Mr. Neary: the Lower Churchill. And, Sir, -

MR. PECKFORD: \$4 million is not \$14 million.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. PECKFORD: \$4 million is not \$14 million, I am sorry,
the hon. member -

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour to ask the gentleman
to restraint himself.

And so, Sir, as a result of the unnecessary delays
and as a result of this government being too lazy to take the,
initiative, ministers sitting back on their haunches, and too
lazy to take the initiative and go to Ottawa and say, "Look is this
true? Can we have these millions of dollars to get this job
creation project going to create work for our unemployed Newfoundlanders,
and at the same time do something for our Province by cutting the
site of the Lower Churchill, cutting the timber on the site?
Is this true, and if it is true, how much are you prepared to give
us? Is it negotiable?" And I understand it is, Sir. The original
offer was made. The minister was flexible, I am talking about the
minister up in Ottawa was flexible, but the Government of this
Province did not go back to the minister. And so as a result, Sir,
it is very unlikely that we can now get this project off the ground
in this fiscal year. Shame on the government and the Minister of
Mines and Energy, I would say, Sir, shame on them!

Here they had within their grasp a gigantic job
creation project for this Province, and they let it slip through
their fingers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense!

MR. NEARY: They did, Sir. They let it slip through their
fingers. And the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy should be
ashamed of himself. And when the hon. gentleman goes down in his
district and meets so many people who are unemployed that could be
down cutting the timber this Summer and this Fall, down at the site
of the Lower Churchill, I hope the hon. gentleman will explain to them
why they are unemployed.

MR. PECKFORD: I told you, because they do not like you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is pretty close to being
unparliamentary. Pretty close, Sir! Pretty close! You cannot
say indirectly, Sir, you cannot accuse a member indirectly

MR. NEARY:

what you cannot accuse him of directly. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would say shame on the Minister of Mines and Energy, the gentleman who aspires to be leader of the great Tory party of this province, the gentleman who is providing the competition for the hon. member for Grand Falls who resigned, hoped to provoke a coup and take over from the hon. the Premier this Fall. The hon. gentleman should be ashamed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I had indicated previously that the hon. member wants to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: So I would request both sides of the House to please adhere to that request.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the same thing applies, by the way, to Port Labrador. The hon. gentleman stood in this House a week or two ago, I believe it was the week before last, and unveiled a great programme that my hon. friend had unveiled a week before that, the Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. gentleman was uptight, could not wait to spring to his feet, could not wait to get up to say, "Oh, well! We had all these plans and the Government of Canada has all these plans," when in actual fact, Sir, a little checking with the Government of Canada indicates that they knew nothing about Port Labrador from the government, only what my hon. friend told them at the national convention of the Liberal party. And the Prime Minister in a private meeting that my hon. friend had with the Prime Minister of Canada learned that there was nothing in writing from this province, nothing in writing from this province on the development of Labrador, Port Labrador, cutting the site of the Lower Churchill. They had nothing from the minister. The minister was too busy trying to get his phisog on television, too lazy to sit down and make a proposal to the Government of Canada, and millions of dollars laying on the table in Ottawa and the minister, who aspires to becoming Premier of this province, leader of the great Tory party, Sir, has let his people down, has let the government down.

MR. PECKFORD: I will prove you wrong on both counts.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentleman will prove me wrong on both counts. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, Sir, has been gross negligent in his responsibilities and in his duties. The hon. gentleman, Sir, had a golden opportunity on both counts to get the co-operation and the assistance of the Government of Canada on these matters, these very important matters in connection with Labrador. And a year ago, Mr. Speaker, I have to point out that the very same hon. gentleman, when the hon. Mr. Gillespie offered the Province of Newfoundland to set up a Crown Corporation to join with the province in developing the Lower Churchill, that my hon. friend practically insulted the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy in Ottawa, his counterpart, the hon. Mr. Gillespie. The hon. gentleman practically hurled insults at the hon. gentleman both inside and outside of this House. It is a wonder the hon. gentleman can get any co-operation at all from the Government of Canada. It is a wonder the Premier does not have to go back up again and open up some doors for the hon. gentleman and the various other ministers who are continuously insulting ministers in the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has led us all down, Sir, led us down the garden path. He has had the opportunity to do something and has let it slip through his fingers and the hon. gentleman should be strongly condemned by not only members of this House and members of his own party, his own colleagues, but by the people of this province. He practically hurled insults at the Minister of Mines and Energy in Ottawa when the minister made the offer to set up a crown corporation and a year later, after one year's delay, Sir, it seems to take a whole year, sometimes two or three or four years before things

MR. NEARY:

filter through to the nerve system of the government to get through the bureaucracy and get into the eighth floor. A year later the minister comes out and says, "Yes, we accept the offer of the Government of Canada to set up a Crown corporation to join with us in the development of the Lower Churchill." And then the very same gentleman who moved this political motion, amendment that we have here, the very same gentleman then takes it upon himself not to consult with his colleagues, not to sit down with the Premier or the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) but so that he can get a little mileage for himself, he writes an article and submits it to the Evening Telegram and in that article viciously attacks the Government of Canada saying, "Oh, they are trying to get equity in this Crown corporation. They are trying to suck us in. If they get equity in the corporation that means they take some of the profit." And Mr. Gillespie the next day had to correct that and say, "We are not interested in taking any profit." Oh, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is also shaking his head. Do they know what they are doing at all, Mr. Speaker? Do they know what they are doing? Mr. Gillespie then stated that the Government of Canada are not interested in taking any profits from the Lower Churchill, the development of the Lower Churchill. My hon. friend was shot down in mid air. After making this great pitch, not with his colleagues, outside of the caucus, not in the caucus, not co-operating with his own party, a maverick, going off on his own, writes this sort of an editorial, I guess you could call it, Your Honour, a sort of an editorial, has it published in the Evening Telegram condemning the Government of Canada for trying to help in the development of the Lower Churchill. The member knows

MR. NEARY:

full well that the Government of Canada do not want any of the profits from the development of the Lower Churchill even though they are prepared to put literally millions of dollars into the development of that project.

So I hope we do not hear anymore of that silly nonsense from the hon. gentleman. I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: Get an opportunity - (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Get an opportunity and - I did not quite hear the rest of what the hon. gentleman said.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: That is the brains -

MR. NEARY: That is the theme. That is the tired old theme, Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: That is the brains behind the Public Tender Act you can drive a truck through.

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is right. But here is the theme, Mr. Speaker, 'we will not do what the former administration did.'

MR. SIMMONS: Ask his friend, A.B. Walsh, He will tell you all about it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent motion that was made by my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe), Sir, and I see no reason for changing it. It is not going to be changed. We are going to vote against this silly amendment that was brought in by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and we are going to vote in favour of the motion, Sir, not as amended as we are against the amendment. But we do hope, Mr. Speaker - and it was clearly indicated to us earlier, Sir, and it is a wonder it had not gone through. If the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) had not

MR. NEARY:

obstructed the progress of the motion by moving an amendment, it would have been adopted. Members on the opposite side indicated earlier in the debate, Sir, that they were going to vote in favour of this motion until we saw this foolish amendment introduced by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who hates anything associated with the Liberal Party. He just hates the Liberal Party, hates them, hates Liberals, cannot stand them. Mr. Speaker, if there is a Tory in this House, it is not the hon. the Premier, Sir, it is not the hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) who probably still has his Liberal card in his wallet, it is not the member for Labrador West, Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) -

MR. SIMMONS: Who, by the way, could not get himself elected president of the Green Bay Liberal Association.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member tried to get himself elected president of the Green Bay Liberal Association. It is not the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) who used to work down in

MR. NEARY:

the Premier's office one time, down with the former Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: If there is a Tory in this House, Sir, it is the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the original Tory, and they put him down by the rail, the Liberals on that side of the House snoved the hon. gentleman down by the rail. It is a wonder he did not get pushed out of the House altogether, a real, honest-to-goodness, full blooded Tory the hon. gentleman is. And so when he saw the word Liberal in this resolution he went berserk he could not control himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not got the guts.

MR. NEARY: Have not got the guts for what? What is this?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman talking to me?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: The member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) has just challenged me to run against him in Green Bay. I want him to know, and the House to know, and the public that I would very much like to do it but I have already made a commitment to the Premier to run against him if he will come to Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and, if he will not, I will consider going to Humber West.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) obviously wants to go to another district where they do not know him. I am asking him to come back home to where they all know him and run against me.

MR. SIMMONS: On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, They know the member in Green Bay and that is why they are looking for an alternative, and when I get a chance to speak I will table a letter that he wrote to his constituents because they did something he did not like.

MR. SIMMONS: They sent a petition to another hon. member and he dressed them down in style.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I feel it is only just a matter of a difference of opinion between two members and an explanation has been made and I ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to continue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think I have adequately dealt with the hon. gentleman and I have isolated him, put him out in left field by himself. Even the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) I would say is a Liberal compared to the hon. gentleman. The only real Tory in the House, Sir, and when he saw Liberal in this motion the hon. gentleman could hardly refrain himself, he nearly cracked up.

AN. HON. MEMBER: And what is more, they put him right next to the biggest Liberal in the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to get back to the intent of this motion. Mr. Speaker, I would like for a few moments draw attention to the situation in the Happy Valley- Goose Bay area where we have a sort of a disaster area, Sir, as a result of the Labrador Linerboard pulling out of that logging operation in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. We have massive unemployment, it is a disaster area and, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it was completely unnecessary. There are so many things that went wrong with that logging operation, Sir, that I would not know where to start to tell the House about it.

Mr. Speaker, the first thing that I have to say about that logging operation - and the wood in my opinion, Sir, can be harvested in Labrador, the wood can be delivered to the Linerboard mill at low cost. If we can export wood overseas to keep the mills in Europe going why could we not bring wood down from Happy Valley-Goose Bay Labrador down to Stephenville? Why could we not transport wood that short distance when we have sent wood overseas to keep the mills in Europe going? The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the mistake was made in the beginning when the government decided to run that logging operation themselves. Then, Sir, we saw too much political patronage, too much political hanky-panky going on. The government, so I am told, Sir, instructed the Labrador

MR. NEARY: Linerboard that they were to make this logging operation in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area labour intensive. Did my hon. friend from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) know that? That the government said, "We want a logging operation and it has to be labour intensive." So once they were given these guidelines there was no way they could produce a low cost wood. There was too much feather-bedding, too much padding of the payroll, there was too much political patronage involved.

One of the first things that happened, by the way, in connection with that logging operation at Goose Bay was that one of the former ministers who was on the Board of Directors of the company, one of his companies unloaded surplus equipment, unnecessary equipment onto the logging operation in Goose Bay - equipment that was never used, equipment that was left in the woods to rust, equipment that was cannibalized, equipment that was used, only the steel parts of it, to keep, maintain the other equipment. Mr. Speaker, I still contend there should be a major investigation into the Labrador Linerboard operation, a major investigation. It probably has the appearances of one of the greatest scandals in this Province. The equipment is still down there. I am sure every time my hon. friend drives by it he gets sick to his stomach to look at it, equipment that was sold to the Labrador Linerboard logging operation in Goose Bay that was never used. I want to know

MR. NEARY: why it was bought in the first place. My hon. colleague the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) has asked questions about it. Nobody has ever given us a satisfactory answer. Millions of dollars of taxpayers' money have been spent on buying this equipment, on purchasing this equipment and it was never used.

What the government should have done, Sir, they should have contracted out the logging in Goose Bay, contracted it out. If it had been contracted out you would have had a more efficient operation, you would not have any political appointments, you would not have any political graft and corruption involved, or the appearance of it, you would have contractors who would be competing with one another, who would produce the low cost wood that is necessary for the linerboard mill in Stephenville.

I am also told, Sir, that the dock down there, which I believe is under the control of either private enterprise or the Government of Canada, that the wood could not be stored on the dock in the Wintertime, it had to be put on ground away from the dock, so that meant that there was a cost involved of moving it twice. You had to load it, bring it down near the dock and then reload it again in the Spring when you started shipping it in to somewhere and put it on the dock.

Now my hon. friend screws up his face at that but, Sir, that is a fact because I saw the wood there. The other thing, Sir, in connection with the Labrador logging operation that should be investigated is the shipping contract. Mr. Crosbie, when he was Minister of Finance and member of the Board of Directors of the Labrador Linerboard - Bully Boy! -

MR. NEARY: cancelled the shipping contract and then a few weeks later went out and renegotiated a contract with the same company, the same ships for about double the amount.

CAPT. WINSOR: That is right!

MR. NEARY: And my hon. friend behind me says, 'That is right!', who is a captain. Who is a captain, a seagoing captain, says that is right. And it is right, Sir, and it should be investigated.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this hon. crowd, Sir, do not think that all this stuff is going to be swept under the carpet. I hope, Sir, that members on the government benches do not think for one minute that they are going to get away with this. A police investigation was started into the Linerboard mill in Stephenville, it is ongoing, it is ongoing and properly so, but it has nothing to do with the type of thing that I am talking about today. It is so narrow in its scope that it is only the tip of the iceberg and has nothing to do with what the hon. gentleman thinks it has to do with, Mr. Speaker. But there should be a police investigation into the logging operation.

MR. J. CARTER: Bring back John Doyle.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen are trying that and perhaps if the hon. gentleman came back then he might shock some members on the government benches. They might get the shock of their lives. And if the hon. gentleman wants to know why they will not bring him back, he should ask his Premier who met him in - let me see where it was, a summer resort there a year or two ago, met him in Claridges in London and met him at Grenada, I believe it was. So if the hon. gentleman wants any information he should ask his boss the Premier. And if the hon. the Premier cannot give it to him, he should ask his colleague

MR. NEARY: the number two man, the Minister of Industrial Development, who recently paid a visit to that gentleman. He might give the hon. gentleman the information that he needs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this relevant?

MR. NEARY: Why, I am answering the hon. gentleman. And there are two, the Premier, the headman, the boss in this Province, and the number two man have met with the hon. gentleman the hon. member is referring to. Number one and number two - number two is the Minister of Industrial Development - and so if the hon. gentleman wants to know why, then he should ask the Premier, who rendezvoused with this gentleman in Europe in recent times, and the Minister of Industrial Development who rendezvoused in the warmer climates recently, the hon. Minister of Industrial Development only recently, and I would like to know why he rendezvoused? What was the purpose of the visit? But I will find that out in due course.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have other matters that I want to raise in relation to that and they will come up in due course but -

MR. J. CARTER: Let us talk about -

MR. NEARY: Well, ask the Premier. The Premier discussed it with the gentleman in Europe. I mean I cannot answer it but I am sure the hon. Premier would be very happy to give the hon. gentleman the information after their meeting at Claridges in London. So if the hon. gentleman would just refresh the hon. Premier's memory and say, "Look, could you tell us the score on this," I am sure the hon. gentleman would get all the information he wants.

So, Sir, I think there should be a police investigation into the Labrador - after the government took it over. Does the hon. Speaker realize that the scandal in connection with the Linerboard mill happened after the government took it over, the logging operation?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And if they think for one minute, Sir, that it is going to be swept under the rug, that the taxpayers of this Province are going to be fleeced, involving millions of dollars, I am got news for them. That situation is going to see the light of day sooner or later, so I would say the sooner the better, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I personally think, Sir, that it is feasible and practical and economical to ship wood from Labrador to Stephenville providing the wood is contracted out, and a good shipping contract, not the one that Crosbie negotiated, first cancelled, a good shipping contract that was negotiated by the original owners and then re-negotiated within a few weeks for twice the cost the same contract, the same ships, the same bottoms. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if there is a middle man in there somewhere,

MR. NEARY:

not in this House, Your Honour, but these things are always done for a purpose, always, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have an agent, local agents.

MR. NEARY: They have local agents and I would like to know who is jammed in the middle of that one. That is why it was cancelled, Sir, and renegotiated again, the same contract for double the cost. And the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) still has the gall to sit over there and support that government. The hon. gentleman knows it is corrupt to its very foundation, not only on Labrador Linerboard but on various and sundry other matters that will come up in this House in due course. China will not be far enough for the half of this crowd to go before this session is over. And the hon. gentleman still supports that government.

I thought the hon. gentleman was going to come across the House and get behind the people of this Province. I thought the hon. gentleman, if I heard the hon. gentleman correctly when the hon. member resigned, he said, "Yes, I am going to go out and I am going to tell all." Well the hon. gentleman has not told us anything yet. And I only wish the hon. gentleman would come over. I am not asking the hon. member to break his oath of secrecy as a Cabinet minister, even I cannot do that. I was once a Cabinet minister. But the hon. gentleman can word it in his own way so that we can get honest government in this Province, so that we can get rid of the political patronage and the appearance of corruption that we are hearing so much about in this Province that would make your hair stand on end.

So if hon. members think - and the hon. gentleman was going to say, tell us. The hon. gentleman will be told in due course. The hon. gentleman will be told on

MR. NEARY:

my terms and when I want to tell him, not when the hon. gentleman wants. I know the hon. gentleman is bursting for a bit of gossip. The hon. gentleman will get all the gossip he wants in due course.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members think that this matter, this very serious matter of extravagance and waste and political patronage in connection with the Labrador Linerboard Mill is going to be swept under the rug, they had better think again, Sir. The dragnet is closing in and in due course, Sir -

MR. MORGAN: What are you talking about?

MR. NEARY: We are talking about the Labrador logging operation, if my hon. friend was in his

MR. NEARY:

seat. And so I think it could be viable. I think that wood can be supplied from Happy Valley-Goose Bay to the Labrador Linerboard Mill in Stephenville. I am sure it can, Sir. I have discussed this with experts. And when this government, Mr. Speaker, goes about the world telling the international business world that the linerboard mill is defunct, that we would give it away for a dollar, that we are prepared to subsidize it, they are doing this province a grave injustice because, as I have indicated so often, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with that linerboard mill. It is ideally located, and any mill anywhere in Newfoundland is ideally located, and all we have to do is to get our wood cost down, to get our wood cost in order and that can become a viable operation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not process it in Goose Bay?

MR. NEARY: Why not process what in Goose Bay, the wood?

MR. MORGAN: Your friend John E - (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well you better ask your boss, the hon. Premier because he rendezvoused at Claridges and at Granada with that particular gentleman in recent times. And if the hon. Premier cannot the minister the information as I told the member for St. John's North then he should ask his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development, who rendezvoused only last fall with the same gentleman and perhaps he can give the hon. gentleman the information.

MR. MORGAN: Well, now!

MR. NEARY: Well, no. I mean that is what I say, you have to get information from this side of the House. I was hoping the member for Grand Falls would come over and give the hon. gentlemen, especially the innocent ones, the ones who are not a part of the inner circle, give them some information because they have now to get it from us and the information is not easy to come by, as my hon. friend is aware.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is a good motion, Sir, and I congratulate my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, for bringing in this very fine motion. We do not intend to vote for the

MR. NEARY: amendment. I am sure when my colleague winds up the debate he will have a few more things to say about the development of Labrador which is very dear to our hearts and very dear to my colleague's heart. My colleague was down there only last weekend and spoke to one of the biggest fund raising dinner and dances, political dinner and dances ever held in that district.

MR. MORGAN: In Nain?

MR. NEARY: No, in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

MR. MORGAN: Did he not go to Coastal Labrador?

MR. NEARY: No, my hon. friend was there before because, in case the hon. minister wants to know about that, I was in Nain overnight at one time and my hon. friend came in on the plane that came in to pick me up the next day. I was on my way out and my hon. friend was on his way in. I am not sure who paid for the plane.

But anyway, Sir, it is a darn good resolution, Sir, and I hope that members on both sides of this House will vote in favour of the resolution and that they will vote down the silly amendment that was brought in by the member for St. John's East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Exploits.

DR. TWOMEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to participate in this debate now that the legend and the myth of Labrador has been laid to rest. I remember first hearing about it, about the Mighty Churchill. I heard there was enough power potential in the waters to light the dark ages. However, although this might not be true, I think we are all conscious of what this power is capable of. In fact the Labrador is one of new and rising expectations of Canada. I think one could call it a natural crucible because in it you have hydro power, minerals, fishing, hunting, tourist potential, possibly offshore oils and gas. You also have a population there that can develop the industry and so make it a vital part of our province, vital in so far that we can respect its natural resources and leave in that part of our province as much as possible. I think it is vital that we encourage the growth of industry

April 12, 1978

Tape No. 913

JM - 3

DR. TWOMEY: and above all the processing of the minerals in that province and that where humanly possible we reserve for Newfoundlanders the right to process these minerals whether it is in the form of processing the raw ore or

2559

DR. TWOMEY:

in steel plants or any other type of manufacturing that can bring improved economy to the area. I realize that the wood potential has not yet been tapped and I presume it will be in future generations before we can realize the wealth that lies within our forests in that area.

Also I am cognizant that other minerals lie under the soil, minerals that I believe are now being explored and the core product, the core samples prove apparently that they will be rich and rewarding in the future. I think it is very fine to have all these things but one of the most important things in the development of any country is communications. If we look at our own nation, Canada, it did not develop until we got the railway across the Continent.

Likewise, we cast our minds back through the ages. Many hon. members in this House can do it and realize what Newfoundland was twenty to twenty-five years ago before communications were as they are today. The radio and the T.V. have been able to bring knowledge but I think it was the meeting of individuals in this Province that has made it come ahead so rapidly and jump into the twentieth century as few other provinces, as few other countries have ever done in the history of this world.

Today we have the precedent in Russia, that they are building a railway, true it is also for defense, but I think that the development of the interior of Siberia is of importance to the Russian economy. I believe it is called Ryhol - Amul Railway. They also have in this project, a port. This has been discussed here previously, the Port of Labrador. I think in the building of this railway it is of utmost importance that we not alone have communication with Quebec,

DR. TWOMEY:

but that a junction in this railway will be designated to a point where we hope that a tunnel will sometime and somewhere come across the Straits.

I agree with my colleague here next to me when he said that this tunnel should be used for dual purposes. One, to transport the power and the other to transport the mineral resources and the other products of Labrador. Likewise, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) mentioned air transportation. I think that this is vital at this time because it is almost immediate. I too support his concept that this should in some way have a grant or subsidy from government. The road is of importance but I think it is secondary to the railway and to air transportation. Likewise the port comes at an early stage in this future development. Because without communications it is impossible for a people of a part of our Province or the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to come together. It is a known fact of both the animal kingdom and that of the human that without communications we are nowhere.

It is called in medicine a deprivation syndrome and I think this will exist until we have improved communications. And these are the communications that I have already spoken about and that other members have likewise spoken about. Without these communications I feel that we will lose a lot of the relationships that exist between Labrador and the Province of Newfoundland. We are divided from that part of our Province as Newfoundland is divided from the mainland in Canada. We here feel deprived at times.

Dr. Twomey: There are two great cultures in Canada. One is the Newfoundland and Labrador culture, and the other is the Quebec; both are distinctive, both have offered a lot to this Nation, and I think both are recognized. It would appear at the moment that the French culture is insidiously gaining some foothold into Labrador because of the land communications, rather than any other aspect of the arts, of the sciences.

I know at the moment it is looked upon with a certain degree of fear and apprehension, fear because we want to keep our attachment with Labrador and they with us. But I feel that it is being slowly eroded, eroded to the extent maybe in one generation we might have a political problem that can involve us in a conflict of interest about the waters off the Labrador and about its mineral reserves.

Patriotism no one can doubt at the moment, but in a few generation when people are subject to propaganda and communications with another culture, I think we can lose some of our dedication to this Province and to Labrador itself.

In all these changes I think that one thing is of vital importance and that is the native population. I believe there are 35,000. All societies have to change, but a rapid change has lasting and deleterious effects to that particular population. And the member for Nasakupi (Mr. Goudie) had put emphasis on that when he spoke on this particular subject, if you take people from their natural habitat and the way of life that they have grown up and been a part of for centuries past, give them some employment for a few years, teach them or indoctrinate them with a few of our habits and customs that are not suited to their type of culture, I feel that we can do them great and irreparable damage.

I feel that in our debate here tonight we have something that is very important to the people of Labrador, whether

Dr. Twomey: they are native born or new Labradorians, and that is in our debate that we try and solve their problems, and that we do not fail. It is vital to their expectations that we do the best for both the Mainland of Labrador, which is ours, and the Island of Newfoundland.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Before I

recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, it gives me great pleasure on behalf of all members of the House of Assembly to welcome to our galleries a delegation from the Town of Harbour Grace, Major McNamara, Councillor Walsh, and Councillor Wicks. I hope that your stay will be an enjoyable one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition,

MR. W. ROWE: It is very fitting, Sir, that Your Honour was in the Chair and had the opportunity to welcome the delegation. I too would like to say a word of welcome, Sir, to the delegation from Harbour Grace district. I had written a letter to the Council and several other councils in the Province to offer any assistance that we on this side of the House might be able to avail ourselves of, and had the courtesy of a conversation with Mayor McNamara who conveyed the best wishes of his Council as well, Sir. So I would like to join Your Honour in welcoming them to this House.

I would also like to say, Sir, what a pleasure it was to listen to the sane, sensible, low-keyed comments of the member for Exploits district (Dr. Twomey) in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: A man to whom partisan politics obviously hold no great joys, but who seizes an opportunity to rise to his feet and give the House the benefit of his wisdom and experience and profound thinking on these matters, and it was a pleasure to sit back and to listen to what he had to say. It is far different, Sir, from this amendment presently before the House which I am now speaking to.

MR. W. ROWE:

I do not propose to take up too much time of the House, I spoke for a couple of hours on the main motion when I introduced it and I will be winding up the debate when the main motion-or just prior to the main motion being put to the House once more, but I did want to say a word about this amendment and to draw the painful contrast between the sensible, non-partisan remarks of the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) and the attitude expressed and manifested by his colleagues, or some of them, in this House, Mr. Speaker.

This resolution, Sir, was introduced into this hon. House in good faith. It was a resolution which has a preamble to it, a factual preamble which states that whereas the Labrador portion of our Province contains the vast hydro-electrical resources together with an immense treasure house of other natural resources, a statement of fact. And then, Sir, I went on to say that the Government of Canada, the Liberal Government of Canada put in by the people of Canada had a national convention in Ottawa some weeks ago and that this very resolution or substantially this resolution was put to that convention and passed unanimously by the party from which the present Federal Government of Canada is drawn.

AN HON. MEMBER: And the next.

MR. W. ROWE: And the next without a doubt. And the factual statement I wanted to make in the preamble, Mr. Speaker, was that this government, this Federal Liberal government who may be anathema and despised and utterly deplored by the hon. members on the other side - I do not know they may be that small, but this government, Sir, the Prime Minister of this government sat down with me and agreed wholeheartedly with this concept of the development of Labrador as the last great frontier of energy and natural resources. And the party which supports the Prime Minister of Canada - it is not my doing the people of Canada and the party put the man in his office and his party expressed unanimous consent and agreement with this resolution when it was put to them. And the Government of Canada as it presently

MR. W. ROWE: is constituted now and after the next election is bound morally, if not legally, certainly bound morally by the resolution which was approved unanimously by the delegates up in Ottawa several weeks ago, that government, Sir, is bound by this resolution in a moral sense. And eighty per cent, statistically eighty per cent or more of the resolutions passed in Liberal conventions in Ottawa find their way, within the same term of office, find their way into the legislation of this country.

Now, Sir, that point had to be made, that this was a great step forward, that the Government of Canada, the Liberal Government of Canada agrees with this new concept for the development of Labrador. And it was not offered in a partisan way but as a factual statement of what that government had agreed to and what the party that forms that government had agreed to in Ottawa. Yet, Sir, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in his usual partisan way could not stand, as my colleague said, could not stand the mention of the word Liberal in this resolution. As factual as it was, as correct as it was in being mentioned in the preamble to the resolution, he could not stand the thought of it and therefore, Sir, had to move this amendment.

I blame him and I blame the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, who was the first one in this House to inject a note of partisan politics into this debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Coudie) got up and he made the usual sane, sensible, reasonable, intelligent speech which he makes on any subject that he wants to argue about or talk about in this hon. House, Sir, and he got up and he said that he agreed wholeheartedly with this resolution. And we asked at that time whether members on the other side generally were in favour of the resolution and, Sir, yes, the word came out, yes, they were going to support this resolution. The Premier indicated publically

April 12, 1978

Tape No. 916

AH-3

MR. W. FOWE: and privately that he was going to support this resolution. But yet, Sir, then the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy got up and started to get partisan. In an effort to cover up his own deficiencies

MR. W. ROWE:

as a minister, his own lack of activity in certain fields, his preoccupation with trying to give this glamorous idea that he is taking on the big oil companies and not doing a thing -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been made.

MR. NEARY: If the two hon. gentlemen, Sir, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) and the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) want to have a row, I wish they would go outside of the House and have it. I cannot hear my hon. colleague speaking.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, we realize -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I feel that is not a point of order. I will ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe) to continue.

MR. W. ROWE: We realize, Sir, that we are looking at the two, say, third and fourth runners in the upcoming Tory leadership and that they naturally do not like each other as a result, far from this party here where we can have open leadership conventions and then come together as a united team, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: And hear the very gracious remarks of my colleague, the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) last night condemning utterly the scurrilous activities as Premier - not personally, but as Premier - of the Premier, not resigned on a vote of no confidence but clinging to power and my other hon. colleagues here, Sir, who have joined with me in a united team, a team approach -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: - to Opposition and government in this Province. But it is no surprise, Sir, we have a party which really consists of the rag-tag malcontents of our Province rather than having any *raison d'etra* or any principle, any rationale for existence as the Liberal Party does, or a philosophy of existence, a philosophy of progressiveness, a philosophy of reform. The rag-tag malcontents of society, rejected Liberals, Mr. Speaker, rejected this, rejected that, all come together and managed to fluke into office there some years ago for the last time in this century. There they are over there. And now, Sir, we just saw a little public altercation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: - a little public altercation between the third and fourth runners in the upcoming leadership convention. I know, Sir, because later on in this hon. House when I have a chance, I have had some research done in the Province and I know how these gentlemen stand in the popular opinion as far as the populace of this country is concerned. I know where they stand, Sir, in popularity and I will tell the hon. gentleman because I am a believer in sharing facts and research that may be done. They do not stand very high, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what they themselves may think. Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty per cent.

MR. W. ROWE: No, not that high, not 30 per cent. Nowhere near it.

MR. SIMMONS: Thirty per cent of the tourists.

MR. W. ROWE: Thirty per cent of the tourists? Well, maybe. But, Mr. Speaker, these hon. gentlemen who want to run for the leadership as soon as they can oust the Premier, one of them in any event, one of them injected a note of partisan politics into this debate and I believe

MR. W. ROWE:

thereby encouraged his friend, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who got up immediately afterwards and more or less supported that hon. minister in the upcoming leadership by saying what a wonderful man he was and so on and so forth. He was encouraged into taking a partisan stand and injecting a partisan note into something which should not be party politics, should not be partisan politics.

MR. SIMMONS: Maybe Marshall is supporting Peckford.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, he gave every indication. But, Sir, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), the reasonable, intelligent, concerned member for Naskaupi was the man who set the tone in this debate and who supported this resolution and had every indication that it was going to be supported by all members on that side of the House only, Sir, once more to have the rug pulled out from under him by the political people, the partisan people with whom he has the misfortune to be associated with. And the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) encouraged in his partisanship, his needless and meaningless partisanship, says that we should reject one of the preambles to what is otherwise a good resolution as far as he is concerned.

Now, Sir, as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the Opposition House leader said, "We have to reject that amendment." It does not make that much different to the resolution. It is only a preamble. It does not affect the main motion in any way. All it does is indicate, Sir, the childishness, the smallness of certain minds in this House of Assembly, minds which are too narrow and too inflexible Sir, to think

MR. W.N. ROWE:

in terms of non-partisanship, of a resolution being accepted by both sides of this House. And so I think I have an idea why the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy got so upset at the introduction of this resolution by myself, and why the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who is the Tory par excellence in this House as was mentioned by my hon. colleague, why they got so upset. Because it suddenly became blindingly obvious to them and their colleagues that that government, Sir, and that party as represented by the government has no firm policy and had no firm policy with regard to the development of Labrador, which is the salvation of this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador if it is dealt with correctly and developed correctly. They had no policy, Sir. Was there any mention in the Throne Speech, I ask my hon. friend the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), any mention in the Throne Speech of Labrador?

MR. STRACHAN:

Churchill Falls. Churchill Falls.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Churchill Falls was mentioned in passing. This great blueprint for development designed to cover up an otherwise disgraceful budget, Mr. Speaker, was there any mention of the development of Labrador in this blueprint?

The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) knows there was not mention. If there was a mention it was casual and indirect and tokenism at best. So, Sir, we caught this hon. government without a policy for Labrador and the only defence available to certain hon. members was the defence of going on the attack. Go for the jugular. Try to pretend we had a policy. Try to blame the federal government in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. Say they are at fault, they are the problem when it comes to the cutting in the Gull Island reservoir

MR. W.N. ROWE: area, the Government of Canada is the problem. I went up and sat down with the Prime Minister and no man on the face of this earth welcomed these ideas more than he did. And I understand from talking with my colleagues that far from all kinds of proposals having been made by this government to Ottawa for developemnt of Labrador, nothing, Sir, or very little has, in fact, been done, especially at the political or policy-making level.

Sure, perhaps some civil servant, or public servant, or some clerk in some department, and I am not saying that in any derogatory manner, sure they might have sent something along to their counterpart in the Government of Canada, Sir. That might have happened. There might have been an exchange of letters on this, that and the other thing within the bureaucratic mold, but I am talking about people who were elected to do a job of work for the people of this Province, I am talking about the policy makers, the government, chosen from among the elected representatives of the people, and as far as I can ascertain, Sir, very little if anything has ever been done by the ministers in this government sitting down with their ministerial counterparts in Ottawa. Am I wrong in this? I am correct, Sir, because we did the research and we made the enquiries and we find out that very little if anything has been done by any of those who have the duty to formulate the policy and try to get an interchange of ideas and co-operation with the Government of Canada, their colleagues in the Government of Canada. Nothing if anything done because, Sir, certain ministers are preoccupied with other things.

One particular minister is preoccupied with giving the idea that he is David the

MR. W.N. ROWE: giant killer, slaying Goliath, going out around, Sir, taking on multi-billion dollar international companies and defeating them. If only that hon. minister knew what kind of regard he was held in - not by these oil companies, I do not expect them to like him, they should not like any of us here, they should hate us all because of the way we drive them into the ground and squeeze the last dollar out of them. That is okay, I can accept that - but if he only knew the regard in which he and a number of his colleagues were held by their counterparts in other governments of Canada, Sir, who sat around the table with them. The point is, Sir, that it is important to make regulations affecting offshore oil, and the hon. minister has the co-operation of us in that.

My friend from Eagle River has often said publicly, spurred on by myself, and I have said publicly as well, that we are in

MR. W.N. ROWE: complete approval and agreement with taking a firm stand with regard to regulations and negotiations with these multi-national oil companies. We are in agreement with that. He does not have to make Brownie points or political points on that, Mr. Speaker, but to use that kind of an idea or this kind of an activity of being the giant slayer and while doing so, while giving this impression that he and his colleagues are taking on these giant multi-national companies, and to neglect something which is more important at this point and time, more important, Sir, More important because we know that the resources of Labrador are there. It is not pie in the sky. We know that it is worth untold hundreds of millions of dollars to this province and we know, Sir, by my discussions with the Government of Canada, the Prime Minister, our minister in Ottawa, we know, Sir, that the Government of Canada is willing to do everything reasonably possible if only it had a government it could co-operate with. It is willing to do everything possible to make sure that this development takes place for the best interest of this province, Sir, not using Labrador as an economic colony of Canada or of Newfoundland, not using it like that, Sir. Not exploiting it for the sake of industry elsewhere or for people elsewhere in Canada or for us on this Island for that matter but exploiting it for the use of the people in Labrador and the people who would move to Labrador to industrialize and to use those resources and also of course sharing the wealth fairly and squarely among all parts of the province which would include Newfoundland, a back and forth, reciprocal relationship.

And, Sir, I mentioned when I opened this debate that it was my opinion that the economic centre of gravity of this province will move steadily Northward and the time will come within our lifetimes, I believe, and I am not visionary in this respect, in our lifetimes we will see a situation where Labrador is at the very least an equal entity or partnership within our province, at least that and very likely, Sir, other people I have talked to who know the development

MR. W.N. ROWE: as it may go ahead and my own thoughts as well lead me to believe that Labrador will become the fundamentally important single geographical area of this province as an entity in itself and not as the economic tail end of this country or this province but as a geographical entity with scores of thousands of people living there, getting their livelihood there and having all the benefits of life in that part of our province.

And, Sir, when that kind of a vision is presented to the hon. House and it is accepted by the member from Naskaupi and other members who have spoken, by the Premier himself to me, Sir, it is disgusting when, to cover up the government's inaction and neglect and incompetence and lack of policy regarding Labrador, hon. members opposite, a couple of the more political hon. members opposite, have to inject partisan politics to this debate. They should not do it, Mr. Speaker. They should stand up and say as they indicated they were going to do, that we will pass this motion without amendment. Everybody in this House should stand up and say something about the motion itself, their visions, their ideas about the future of Newfoundland and Labrador as far as the Labrador development is concerned. Every member should do that, Sir, and they should do it in a spirit of nonpartisanship such as was exhibited by my hon. friend from Exploits, my hon. friend from Naskaupi and I think, Sir, until the political points were injected by the Minister of Mines and Energy and the member for St. John's East, by every member of this House. The member for St. John's West rose in his place and gave, Sir, in quality what I consider to be one of the best speeches made in this House this session. It was not long, it was about ten or fifteen minutes long, but in quality, Sir, and in substance it was one of the best speeches made in this House, Sir, because it zeroed in on the situation regarding Labrador. He made the point that it is easy for people to stand in their place and give lip service to the idea of Labrador

MR. W. ROWE:

development. It is easy, Sir, for everybody to stand up and to devote themselves to another exercise in tokenism develop Labrador. And the point he made, Mr. Speaker, was that this is no joke, this is not tokenism, this is not a matter of rising in your place and going through the exercise and making the motion. This is something you either believe in or not, and if you are indifferent to it, Sir, if you are indifferent to it, you do not believe in it. And if you believe in the developments which are outlined here, Sir, then you have to realize the hard decisions that are going to have to be taken, very hard decisions, some decisions which are going to be unpopular among certain groups of people.

For example, Sir, when you talk in terms of developing Labrador's hydro resources primarily as a source of power for the industrial development of the Province, particularly Labrador, and the Province's domestic and commercial use, with any surplus power being made available to other provinces of Canada on a short-term recallable basis only, when you commit yourself to that concept, Mr. Speaker, you have to realize that you have yourself into a difficult situation; that it is going to be very much easier to negotiate a development of Labrador's hydro resources on the same old basis, of selling it all on long-term contract to New York State or through Quebec or to other provinces of Canada, that is going to be the easiest way out. And we in this House are going to be urged, Mr. Speaker, urged to sign up deals which do not benefit Labrador, which do not benefit the Island of Newfoundland, but which benefit Consolidated Edison down in the United States, which benefits the Province of Quebec, which benefits other people, but which does not benefit Labrador or this Island. And, Sir, whatever government is in power is going to have to have the guts, the courage, to say, ^{no} that is not the deal we want. It will be easy to take this deal. We may get a few more dollars from it, but that is not the deal we want. The deal we

Mr. W. Rowe: want is the development of the hydro resources in Labrador for use wherever possible in Labrador on short-term recallable contracts so that we can get the money on what we have to export, that we can renegotiate the value or the cost or the price we get for the power as the market goes up rather than being stuck for years with a low price. And it is going to be hard to get, Mr. Speaker.

 And I am sure that when some members of this House of Assembly rise to support this concept we are talking about here, they do not even know what they are committing themselves to, They are committing themselves to a difficult situation, a situation where a government may have to use far more energy, far more intelligence, do far more work, and exercise far more perservance than any government ever has in order to get the right deal for this Province with regard to the hydro electrical development in Labrador, that we cannot have any further sellouts, easy deals, deals which are merely acceptable to the financiers in Wall Street or to industrial corporations elsewhere outside of this Province, that we have to make sure that it is our best interest which are served by any hydro development.

 And that means, of course, that we may have to say no to the normal kind of mineral development in Labrador which we have grown use to, where the raw materials are taken out of the ground, basically - perhaps there may be some small amount of reprocessing or further processing - but basically the raw material is taken out of the ground and shipped elsewhere in order to be developed outside of this Province and reprocessed and the value added, and the jobs coming from the really value producing part of the activity as found in New York somewhere or Chicago or Quebec or Ontario, and not in our Province. And it is going to be easy to make deals

MR. W. ROWE:

with regard to the sale of hydro out of the Province. It is going to be easy to make deals with regards to hauling the minerals out of the earth and shipping them elsewhere. Those deals are easy to make. If there is a buck to be made by somebody that deal can be made tomorrow. The difficult deal, Mr. Speaker, the difficult deal to make is the deal which may be a little more economically marginal, the deal where the government may have to put in much more by way of equity investments, the deal whereby people are screaming something to the effect, well you are selling out private enterprise, or something along those lines, using that boogie man when we are trying to develop our Province ourselves.

So I urge members, as my hon. colleague, the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) did in his admirable speech, to think about what they are agreeing to; that they are agreeing to something which will not come easily, they are agreeing to something which will be difficult to produce. The last thing we should do, Mr. Speaker, is introduce into this a note of partisanship, purely political partisanship which was exhibited by at least two or three members opposite, this idea Sir, of developing a fully serviced, fully fledged port, called Port Labrador on the Labrador Coast in constructing a railway and a road from Port Labrador to Happy Valley-Goose Bay and on to Labrador City-Wabush and on to Central Canada.

It is easy to stand up, Mr. Speaker, and say, Oh, yes, we agree with that. But members opposite, as they were reminded by my friend from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), must remember that a commitment to this kind of a concept means there is going to be a further strain on the financial resources of the Province and priorities are

MR. W. ROWE:

going to have to be changed around and ordered a little differently and that it means that difficult choices and difficult decisions may have to be made in the future if we are going to try to implement this concept and make sure that the full development of Labrador does take place which we will all benefit from in the long run but which may for a short number of years put a crimp in government style when it comes to lashing out the goodies all over the Province.

Processing within Labrador of Labrador raw materials, including minerals, fish, forests and offshore oil and gas as discovered in commercial quantities. Now, Sir, I would like to hear from the Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Peckford), and anyone else who may be concerned about this, exactly what concrete steps have been taken to date to make sure that Labrador benefits from any commercial finds which are ultimately produced of offshore oil and gas. Does the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) know what is going to happen if in fact production does take place? Does he know what is going to happen with regards to jobs on the Labrador part of our Province? I doubt very much if there has been one iota of work done, Mr. Speaker, in order to make sure that once again with the offshore oil as with the other natural resources I have been talking about, that it is the people of this Province and particularly in Labrador that benefit from it. Because again hard decisions are going to have to be made. A government is going to hear arguments from the oil companies who are going to say, "Look, it is much easier for us to try and ship the crude, for example, down to the Coast, the Eastern Seaboard of the United States and do something there with it.

MR. W. ROWE:

Labrador does not have a very good climate,"they will say. "Winds and ice and tides and all this kind of thing would disrupt development. We would lose certain economies which we might have. Inconvenient, inefficient perhaps, cost money, our profits will not be so great or we may even lose money on it." You are going to hear all that kind of argument because the companies are going to do what is convenient to them and what is going to bring in then the greatest profit. And we have to make sure, Sir, that we benefit. So again these hard-nosed, difficult

MR.W.ROWE: decisions are going to have to be made and no indication from anybody on the government side of the House or in the government itself, Sir, that this kind of hard decision has in fact already been made.

MR.PECKFORD: You have not read the regulations obviously.

MR.W.ROWE: I have read the regulations, Sir, I have read them. A commitment, Sir, by this government to this kind of thing which I am talking about is something which the government has not made public except in a very token sort of way. I made a statement there the other day and asked the minister concerned and the Premier and other ministers what moves have been taken to date to make sure, Sir, that it is people from Newfoundland and Labrador who get the high paid skilled job if, as and when the Gull Island development goes ahead.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR.W.ROWE: And, Sir, what did I get in return? Lashing out at the former administration! Thank God, Mr. Speaker, after the next election it is going to be a new former administration! People are getting sick and tired of hearing insults cast at the old former administration. They want a new former administration they can get at and, thank God, that is going to happen, Sir, the sooner the better.

What do I get from the government, Mr. Speaker, when I ask that question? Nothing, Sir, nothing concrete, a little bit of wishy-washy meandering, a few grunts, a few attacks on the Government of Canada -

MR. NEARY: Personal attacks.

MR.W.ROWE: Personal attacks. The Premier got into what is his strongest personality trait, namely personal attack. Nothing, Sir, concrete, nothing specific, nothing about what this government is doing to make sure, Sir, that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are not stuck once more with all the low paying or labour jobs only - thank God for those, Mr. Speaker - but we are not

MR. W. ROWE: stuck with those only while in they come, Sir, the white-hats from Quebec, from Ontario, from Calgary, all the white-hats, in they come. Twenty-five, thirty, forty thousand dollars a year, and out they go again with our money simply because this government did not have the initiative or the foresight to try and get some kind of a training programme going now, now, Sir, to make sure that we have the skilled people, the skilled tradesmen.

He got and he said something to the effect, Well we have electricians in the Province, if I remember, and electricians can certainly use jobs, Sir, no doubt about that with the high unemployment. I suppose the highest unemployment rate in a skilled trade today is among electricians; they could certainly use the jobs. But I am talking about all manner of skilled personnel, Sir, on a very vast hydro development which may take place. And we hear nothing, Sir, by way of concrete suggestion or policies, nothing whatsoever.

And, Sir, the final point made in my resolution regards assurances that these developments will proceed only after full consideration of methods to protect the environment and after full consultation with the peoples living in all parts of Labrador.

Now, Sir, I would like to know on that point - maybe the member for Naskaupl (Mr Goudie) could enlighten me on this at some point if he speaks on this amendment - I would like to know when the last time was that any member of this administration sat down with residents on the coast of Labrador, in Central Labrador where my hon. friend hails from, or in Western Labrador and consulted them over what was going to be their future and their destiny when some of these developments take place? I would venture to say, Sir, that not one thought has ever been given since this administration came into office. I remember they went up one time, I remember one occasion when they went up to Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Sir, to talk about something to the people and the Premier made a few grunts and

MR. W. ROWE: groans and then somebody asked a question and the next thing you know they walked out, walked out and left everybody in the air. That was their idea of consultation with the people. What a laughingstock, Mr. Speaker! Whenever I visit that most wonderful, beautiful part of our Province, Happy Valley-Goose Bay, people are still talking about it, the time the great Premier of the Province followed by his minions in the Cabinet went up to Happy Valley-Goose Bay and sat down - there happened to be a live mike on at one point and the Premier was reported saying certain things that I am sure he would not have wanted reported publically.

MR. NEARY: Unparliamentary.

MR. W. ROWE: Very unparliamentary, Sir. And then when somebody raised a few objections to what was going on, the snow job, when people asked a few questions up they got, Sir, and marched out

MR. W.N. ROWE: and left everybody wondering what the government of this province was doing and whose hands the government was in. Get aboard the aircraft and come on back home again, Mr. Speaker. Now that is consultation? We have another example of consultation, I am sorry the minister is not in his seat, when some native people living in Northwest River whom I sat down with just last week, Sir, and talked over the native land claims, talked over the vision that the Indians in Northwest River have for themselves, and in Davies Inlet and other natives living in Newfoundland and Labrador and in Quebec, talked over what the future held for them, what part of the future they wanted to play, what role they wanted to play, talked it over with them, Sir, and I remember very well the Minister for Rehabilitation and Recreation insulting these native people, insulting, Sir. I was ashamed to be a Newfoundlander and Labradorian when I heard the public statements. He characterized them as childish at one point and ended up going back and apologizing to these decent, intelligent people, Sir, people, Sir, who have a culture which is the same as ours in some respects and different from ours in other respects and want to govern themselves as much as possible and want to retain their culture and want to be consulted. If a caribou herd is going to be wiped out through some development and they have been relying on a herd or a hunting ground many generations, they would like the courtesy, Sir, of consultation about what is going to go on here, something, Sir, which has been refused by this administration.

MR. NEARY: Confrontation consultation.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Confrontation consultation, that is what it is. Confrontation, Sir, and public abuse of a small, relatively defenseless portion of our population in Labrador. And the other consultation was when they could not take it and they had to walk out. They walked out, Sir, and got aboard their plane and came on back again. Has the Premier been in Happy Valley-Goose Bay since?

MR. NEARY: I do not believe he has.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I doubt very much, Sir.

MR. NEARY: He is afraid to go back.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I doubt very much. As a matter of fact, as I travel around the province, Mr. Speaker, people are wondering what has happened to the Premier. Has he fallen off the end of the earth? It is a flat earth here, Sir, and I ask him, has he fallen off the end of the world, gone off the edge. Where is he? He has not been in Corner Brook since last December sometime. When was that famous PC convention when the Premier was lambasted by his own group, in November or December? I doubt very much if he has ventured in his own district, Sir, since then. At least that is what they tell me in Corner Brook in the number of times that I have been there. My hon. colleague from Port au Port confirms it. He has not. When was the last time he was in Labrador, Mr. Speaker? I doubt if he has been in Bay St. George since the 1972 election.

MR. SIMMONS: He has had good reason not to go to Bay St. George.

MR. NEARY: When was he in Come by Chance last?

MR. W.N. ROWE: About a year and a half ago. Mr. Speaker, this is not a government, Sir.

MR. NEARY: He was invited to Come by Chance and to Stephenville and would not go.

MR. WHITE: He has been to Twillingate.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He went down to Twillingate, Sir. Oh, yes I am glad the hon. -

MR. WHITE: (Inaudible) three weeks

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, he and his government, all of them, Sir, camped in Twillingate district, Sir, let a roving band of confidence men expose their wares and their quack medicine to a gullible public, or so they thought, down in Twillingate district-and what, Sir? It was flung back in their teeth. "Get out of here with your tainted wares and your quack medicine!" That is what they were told, this wandering troop of confidence men, Mr. Speaker. That is what they were told and they have not been down since and left \$40 million worth of promises

MR. W.N. ROWE: behind but nobody has ventured to go down there since, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Wandering minstrels.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Wandering minstrels a troop of confidence men.

AN HON. MEMBER: Making promises wherever they went.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Promises, committments, Sir, nothing for the Premier, Sir, to take out his pen and the back of envelope and say, I hereby commit myself solemnly as Premier of this province to paving the road to Pike's Arm.

MR. NEARY: We were all afraid we were going to be drowned with the water systems.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The water systems, Mr. Speaker, and, Sir, the artisan wells. I had to warn the people in Durrell's Arm, Sir, against the possibility of subsidence into the sea, the place was going to be honeycombed. I said, watch it. It is a good thing you are on bedrock here otherwise, Sir, you would subside into the sea with this honeycomb of artisan wells which the Premier committed himself.

MR. SIMMONS: - fisheries colleges, Sir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Putting in the fisheries colleges, Sir, fisheries colleges galore all over the district, fish plants

Mr. W. Rowe: all over the district, stages, paved road, highways, superhighways, Sir, were all there. And the people of Twillingate district, New World Island and Twillingate Island, Sir, looked at the Premier, laughed in his face, and flung it back at him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: And said, we have heard this before. We have heard it before, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: You may have used your high office to persuade, I cannot say fool or deceive, but to persuade the people in certain other by-elections that it would be right for them to vote for a government member, but, Sir, that only works once or twice, And then people are normally believing, people are not gullible, but they will believe a man who comes down as the Premier of the Province or as a minister and commits himself, particularly on paper, to something, they will believe him, They cannot believe, Sir, a decent human being in Newfoundland and Labrador cannot believe that the government has the face to make a commitment which it knows when it is making it it has no intention of keeping it, which has been done in this Province hundreds of times since 1972, and which caused the resignation of one of the best ministers this government ever had, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: - because he had too much courage and guts -

MR. FLIGHT: Way ahead of the Minister of Mines.

MR. W. ROWE: Way ahead of the Minister of Mines.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Mines was fifth or sixth?

MR. W. ROWE: Fourth.

MR. NEARY: Fourth.

MR. PECKFORD: I am going down. I am going down.

MR. W. ROWE: There were only four on the list. If there were eighteen he might have been eighteenth, but he was fourth on this list.

MR. FLIGHT: Number four and going down.

MR. W. ROWE: Four of four.

MR. NEARY: Four out of four.

MR. PECKFORD: Four out of four.

MR. NEARY: Fourth out of four.

MR. W. ROWE: So, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SIMMONS: No, no, no. It was four out of three, was it not?

MR. PECKFORD: There was another survey. The member for the Straits was number one, the member for LaPoile was number two, and the member for Twillingate was number three, the member for Lewisporte was number four, the member for Eagle River is number five, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay is number six. There is another survey. You have not seen all of the surveys.

MR. W. ROWE: Is this the man who aspired to be leader of the great Tory Party?

MR. PECKFORD: There is another survey.

MR. W. ROWE: We are talking about a wandering troop of confidence men -

MR. SIMMONS: Who could not even burp -

MR. W. ROWE: - trying to deceive the public with their tainted wares and their quack medicine, and this troop finding that the people are not quite so gullible as they used to be or were thought to be, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, I mean, that strains anybody's credulity to think that certain hon. members opposite who are going to be running, or are already running for leadership, we hear the odd leadership speech, that they are going to fling in now pretty soon, soon as they can undermine the Premier a little more, indicate to the public of this Province that the Premier has lost control completely.

MR. NEARY: A little more back stabbing, and knife throwing, and then look out.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right. Wait, Sir, wait, Mr. Speaker, until the Premier leaves the Province.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: Right. I mean, Sir, the morals, Sir, of a snake in the grass when you look at it. Wait until the Premier goes down to get himself suntanned and beautified down South, and then, Sir, haul out the long knives and have a go at him, and then, Sir, when he comes back scurry into the corner and bide your time again, Sir, and then when the Premier goes down again on his semi-monthly holiday, down South, out come the long knives again, a couple of more cuts at him.

MR. NEARY: Seven threatening to come across the House.

MR. W. ROWE: Ah, yes, Mr. Speaker! Call in the newsman into your home and give him this, tell him what the situation is, give him stories and then withdraw them ten minutes before they are going to be put on the air, Sir. Do it all. Spread around the discontent and rumours, little knowing, Mr. Speaker, that it not only affects their party, but this government has a solemn trust, this party has a solemn trust given to them by the people to govern this Province, and to govern Labrador and Newfoundland.

And what happens, Sir? The political in-fighting and bickering going on all of the time. They cannot even pass a minister's salary. The ministers have got to live out of interim supply, Mr. Speaker, until that runs out, and then God knows what happens then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: Well they will have to live out of something. Governor's warrant.

MR. NEARY: They took up a collection for him this morning and got \$35.99.

MR. W. ROWE: I was talking about Labrador, Sir, and the point I was making - the point, Sir, I am making is that members opposite should not think that they can gull the people of this Province by standing up, Sir - ministers really, because the members that I have heard speak, the backbenchers, Sir, mean this sincerely, I am sure, but ministers, Sir, who know the difference, who know they have done nothing, and intend to do nothing, should not think that they can continue to give the public of this Province

MR. W. ROWE:

into thinking that they intend to do anything about Labrador development. They are not going to, Mr. Speaker. And when the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) gets up now in a minute, as I am sure he will, or next week as the case may be, we will hear it, Mr. Speaker, "The Government of Canada did this, the former administration did that. We, Sir, are caught in the middle there between the former administration and the Government of Canada." That is their plea. Sir, what a plaintive, what a sad, pathetic plea for a government to have to make for six years in office. We are caught, Sir, squeezed in the middle between the former administration and the Government of Canada and there is nothing we can do.

MR. SIMMONS: We will hear one other now.

MR. W. ROWE: We will hear another one, will we?

MR. SIMMONS: He will blame it on the former Minister of Rural Development now.

MR. W. ROWE: Former minister, Yes. Well he will do that because that gives -

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, yes.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right. I noticed with what alacrity he jumped to his feet when somebody asked a question, my hon. friend from Lewisporte district (Mr. White) asked the question as to how he has cleaned up the mess left over from the former Minister of Rural Development. And he jumped up, Mr. Speaker and he said, we have had two meetings in the last two weeks, got it all cleaned up now. The mess is all cleaned up since I took over.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like he is enjoying it.

MR. W. ROWE: Loved it, Sir, and then we saw the spectacle

MR. W. ROWE:

a minute or two ago of the two ministers, Sir, having a go at each other, publicly. Sir, ambitions, you see - I would not know not being an ambitious man.

MR. PECKFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I enjoy what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe) is talking about, Mr. Speaker, but I do not know what it has to do with the resolution under discussion here this afternoon. And I would ask therefore that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe) be relevant to the resolution on Labrador rather than the comments that he was just making that have no relevance at all to that part of our Province.

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order; Obviously the rule of relevancy does apply and the amendment to the resolution, the resolution dealing with Labrador, the amendment being the dropping of one recital, and hon. members speaking should confine their remarks to that specific area.

MR. W. ROWE: The point I was making, Sir, is that while I was trying my best to make a few points on the resolution before the House, Sir, while I was doing that, talking about this resolution on Labrador, we had the spectacle of two ministers involved in a public altercation. It made it difficult for me to make my points, if you get my drift, Mr. Speaker. A brawl between two ministers, two leadership candidates, number three and number four. I will tell them next week, Sir, who number two and number one are.

MR. NEARY: You are going to keep us in suspense?

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, but I wanted them to know who number three and number four are according to the people of this Province. You know, they may not be too concerned

MR. W. ROWE:

about that because they may have their own ways of solving this leadership question. Maybe the long knives will come out again, Sir, on the next semi-monthly visit down South.

Now, Sir, the point I was making - how much time do I have, by the way, Mr. Speaker? Ninety minutes?

MR. SPEAKER: A total of ninety minutes.

MR. W. ROWE: Okay. Fine, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He is doing a good job. Several days he minded the House while Frankie was in the hospital.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the Tory organizer of the Twillingate by-election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: There he is. There he is, Sir. How many times, Sir, have I gone down to my district in the last few months since the by-election, Sir, and sat down in a hall, announced it beforehand on open line as to when I am going to be at a certain place so people can come to see me or I can go to see them, they can contact me, Sir, and I have had droves of people come in and say, Well, Mr. Rowe, do you mind fixing this up for me. And I would say, well that, I mean, I cannot fix that up. And they said, well the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) told me I could have it or the Premier told me I could have it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What about their bills? I have had people come to me and present me with bills.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, there he is. We have finally heard from him, the organizer, the campaign manager of the

MR. W. ROWE:

Twillingate by-election. There he is, Sir. Well, Sir, what a shock he got.

MR. SIMMONS: After Twillingate the question was did he leave the Cabinet or was he pushed.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, television should be brought into this hon. House, Sir, so the people can see the state of the government in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: What was that, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker does not know. Nobody knows what that was.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was a joke.

MR. W. ROWE: That was a joke. The biggest joke, Sir, was the job the hon. member did as campaign manager for the Tory Party down in Twillingate. That was the joke.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh, Mr. Speaker, what a joke! But getting back to it, Sir, getting back to the resolution, which I have been diverted from by the injections of partisan politics opposite, the point, Sir, that has been made from members who have spoken on this side of the House -

MR. SIMMONS: You missed what he said though. He said another couple hundred bucks and he could have won it. Is he suggesting he almost bought it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, for the record, A couple of hundred votes, I said.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no, no.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Okay, I am prepared to believe that the member would not have made that kind of a gross slip in describing what happened down there. What you say may be the truth, but I am prepared to say that he is not that far gone yet, that he would tell the truth as it happened.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What a leader!

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

MR. NEARY: He is bouncing back. He was in a triple-downer, I believe, there a few weeks ago.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He is starting to come back. I thought I would do the hon. member a favour, Sir.

MR. NEARY: He should have had his bio-rhythm test done.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I thought I would do him a favour, Sir. He seemed to me to be depressed after he was prised out with a crowbar or left the Cabinet. Nobody seems to know what happened there. But, Sir, he has been sitting there in the corner in the House depressed, a little bit sulky. Even his points of order have been a

MR. W.N. ROWE: little bit confused and meandering. So I said to myself, the best thing for me to do is get his vital juices flowing again, Sir, get his hormones spurting, and now, Sir, we have him going again. I am delighted, Sir, that I have been able to effect this cure, this miraculous cure. He is on his way, Sir, into the leadership against the hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford). Number four against number three.

MR. SIMMONS: That is not a contest at all.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, there is no contest yet, but wait until you see who two and one are, it will scare them to death.

MR. SIMMONS: You have not told - you told who was third and fourth but you have not told who the others are. You will let them know when they get there.

MR. NEARY: Harbour Main and Bell Island do not rate at all.

MR. DOODY: That makes three three of us who -

MR. W.N. ROWE: We should make the point, Sir, for the sake of accuracy -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A point of order. I was sort of half hoping - I had half hoped that it was a forty-five minute time-frame - I know it is a ninety minute time-frame - and I said at twenty-five past, He is only going to go another five or six minutes, or fifteen I will tolerate, but at twenty-five past five the hon. member gave up on his topic, on the resolution which has to do with a serious matter about Labrador. I am sure the people of Labrador, if they could see here right now, in the last half hour he has talked about the snake in the grass, he has talked about the Twillingate

MR. LUNDRIGAN: by election, he has talked about the conference out in Corner Brook. The member, Mr. Speaker, has not been on the topic for the last half hour.

Now I would accept that totally, Your Honour, if it were somebody totally inexperienced who stood up and rambled on a little bit, perhaps from the lack of confidence, but the hon. member is making an absolute fool of himself and more importantly, he is making a fool of the people of Labrador and I think that is a very serious matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: I assume Your Honour is going to dismiss the point of order with the contempt that it deserves.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order, at least the part of the submission that was a point of order, was a valid one and was identical to the one raised a few moments ago and that is the rule of relevancy being applicable. Really, the resolution is on Labrador and the amendment still keeps it within that confine, the amendment whether a recital will be dropped or not, so I would ask the hon. gentleman to have his remarks within the Labrador area, and I would ask other not to interrupt.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The point, of course, Sir, is that we are talking about the amendment, not the main motion, and the amendment is the injection of partisanship into the main motion, Sir, and I was trying to articulate that point using as evidence, Sir, I wanted to display publicly what I was talking about, the partisanship I was talking about. We have seen that happening, Sir, the last twenty or twenty-five minutes. Constant interruptions, the truth, Sir, being warped and twisted by members opposite in an effort to avoid

MR. W.N. ROWE: their ultimate fate in another year or so, and maybe two weeks for that matter.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) we do now by the appropriate -

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is right, Sir. We over here judge, as a matter of academic curiosity, the applause accorded to certain ministers when they rise and make their little leadership speeches and so far, Sir, the member for Grand Falls is far ahead of the member for Green Bay, far ahead.

MR. NEARY: They should have a meter over there to record the applause.

MR. W.N. ROWE: And when the hon. minister stands up - well, he will not get a chance now, Sir, but when he stands up next week we will be here listening, academically curious because it makes no difference who is leader anyway, but we will be curious to see what kind of applause he gets, Sir, from the other side. It will be very interesting.

Now, Sir, reverting back to the matter under discussion.

MR. SIMMONS: The question is, can third or fourth come first?

MR. DOODY: My, you are a dear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: I have some thing which will hurt the feelings of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir, where he stands, and this poll will show.

MR. DOODY: I am not on the list.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, you are on the list.

It is

MR. W.N. ROWE: both right and wrong to say you are on the list and you are not on the list, because if you are so far down the bottom of a list that you disappear off the paper I suppose it is to true to say you are not on the list. But, Sir, he was in fact there but you had to look very low down in the footnote somewhere to find that he was an also-ran. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is this, that this is an important resolution and an important amendment, Sir. The importance of the amendment is not in the substance of the amendment itself but in the attitude, the psychological outlook of this crowd, Sir, on the other side to whom the people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: This hon. crowd.

MR. W.N. ROWE: This hon. crowd, Sir. That is right, Sir, very honourable crowd. They are all honourable men, Sir. The outlook, the attitude, Sir, the way they deal with things, they cannot rise above partisan politics. They cannot do it, Sir. Even in a motion as important and as non-partisan as this one, they find it impossible even though the more sensible of the members opposite, like the member from Naskaupi and the member for Kilbride are quite prepared to stand up and say, we support it. It is non-partisan. They think it is a good idea and inject a few good sensible points. In spite of that, Sir, there are one or two over there who are leading the flock of bleating sheep, one or two of them.

Sir, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has moved the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before adjourning the House I will deal with the matter brought up at the commencement of the session and that was the point of privilege by the hon. member for LaPoile referring to statements made outside the House by the hon. the Premier, and the allegation by the hon. member for LaPoile that these statements to the effect of deliberately delaying the business of the House and deliberately obstructing the business of the House imputed base motives and were a breach of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member referred to Beauchesne page 103, section 114 the last sentence thereof to the effect "in a just sense, any offence committed by a member relating to the Parliament, though done out of the House, is termed an offence in Parliament." That section in my opinion is certainly authority for the premise that a breach of privilege may occur outside of the House and is answerable in the House; or to put it another way, that with respect to a breach of privilege, the House and the Chair have authority for a breach of privilege occurring outside of the House. And that is quite obvious and I do not think there is any serious difference of opinion on that.

It is, I think, also true that with respect to a breach of order, not privilege but order, the authority of the House there, of the Chair there is limited to what happens in the House. So what I have to determine is whether it is a breach of privilege or whether it could be a breach of order. On the question of the breach of order, that would be hypothetical because I would not have authority to make a ruling on an alleged breach of order outside of the House, that is limited to within the House. Now in order to determine whether in the strict parliamentary sense the allegation of deliberately obstructing the business of the House and deliberately delaying the business of the House is in a strict sense a matter of privilege, I have made some research and I refer hon. members to May, page 348, in which it says, "Precedence refused to matters indirectly affecting privilege." Then it goes on, " - As Precedence is naturally desired by members, care has been taken by rulings from the chair not to extend that claim to any motion which does not directly relate to a matter of privilege, properly so called. The following are instances of refusals by the Speaker to grant precedence to matters claimed by Members to affect privilege:" and there is a list of seven or eight and one of them, the top one, page 349, "Allegations of obstruction of the business of the House." I would therefore determine that if the alleged occurrence had happened in the House, and it came

MR. SPEAKER: up as a point of order, obviously I would have authority and I would have to deal with it in that context. But that did not happen and obviously there is nothing further I can say on that. But according to the authority of May, the allegation of obstructing the business of the House is not in the strict sense a breach of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before putting the adjournment, I have thought of doing this before and I would make this point now. It is not a ruling, it is more of a request. Obviously when the Chair makes a ruling, I could not entertain and would not entertain any people voicing objections thereto, or boo, or saying that is unfair or that is wrong. I could not allow that because that is challenging the authority of the Chair. When a ruling is given, and members on one side or the other happen to find it convenient for them, or they like it, then when they indicate that it is almost the reverse, and it does put the Chair in a difficult position - or appears to put the Chair in a difficult position, because the adversary aspect of it does not and should not affect the Chair and it sort of could give that impression. So I make that as a request, that just as it is completely wrong for hon. members to state their disagreement with a ruling, really to be perfectly consistent they should not state their agreement either.

It being six o'clock the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 P.M. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL, 12, 1978

April 12/78

Answer to Question #34 from the House of Assembly from
Order Paper 9/78/ dated March 20, 1978.

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Premier to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

- (1) Does the Government of Newfoundland provide a motor vehicle for the use of the Honourable the Premier and, if so, what is the make and model year of the said motor vehicle, when was the motor vehicle purchased and from what firm, what was the cost of the said motor vehicle and all accessories used in connection therewith?

ANSWER: Yes. A 1976 Lincoln 4-door sedan purchased December 19, 1975. The vehicle was purchased from Elm Mercury Sales (1976) Limited, Kenmount Road, at a cost of \$9,188.90.

- (2) During the financial year that commenced April 1, 1977, what was the cost of the Government of operating the motor vehicle provided for the use of the Honourable the Premier including the salary of any official driver of the motor vehicle, gas and all other expenses in connection therewith for the year?

ANSWER: The cost of operating is:

gasoline and oil	- \$400.27
mobile telephone	- 486.00
tires and parts	-1,016.47
chauffeur salary	-9,455.00

April 1978

QUESTION #55

Mr. Heary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Statement of new vehicles purchased in the current fiscal year to date.
- (b) Cost of purchase of new vehicles.
- (c) Type of vehicle.
- (d) Purpose for which these vehicles are to be used.
- (e) Were public tenders called for all of these vehicles?

ANSWER

- (a) None
- (b) not applicable
- (c) not applicable
- (d) not applicable
- (e) not applicable

April 6, 1978

April 1978

QUESTION #56

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

- (a) Number of dental students in training as of January 1, 1978.
- (b) Name of dental school students are attending?

ANSWER

Answer is confined to Newfoundland dental students under bursary agreements.

- (a) Students 9
- (b) Dalhousie 8
- McGill 1

April 5, 1978

2603

Report 15-2

QUESTION #59

Mr. Neary (LaPojie) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A statement showing the capital cost of the Twillingate hospital.

Original estimated cost of Twillingate hospital

ANSWER

Total project cost	\$8,100,000
Original Estimated cost	\$5,500,000

April 11, 1978

2604