

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 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 galleries on behalf of all hon. members twenty-two students from Grades VII, VIII and IX from United Junior High School in St. John's. They are accompanied by three of their teachers, Mr. Noseworthy, Mr. Gill, and Mr. Windsor. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these students and their teachers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. the Premier announced in this House a new Deficiency Guaranteed Term Plan Financing Programme to assist the larger fish processing companies in the Province. I am pleased to announce today the second phase of that programme, which is designed to assist the smaller processing companies in the acquisition of modern equipment and machinery to be used for the further processing of fish products.

The aim of the programme is to stimulate the introduction of modern efficient machinery in processing into the fishing industry by making monies available to the companies at attractive interest rates and reasonable payback periods. A system will be set up to process loan applications with a minimum delay consistent with good administrative practices. Loans will be made only to licenced fish processing companies in the Province having annual sales not exceeding \$2 million, and will be made for the purchase of machinery and equipment for use in the secondary processing such as frying, smoking, pickling, canning, breading etc.

The maximum loan amount will be the lesser of \$50,000 or 75 per cent of the landed cost of the machinery in the Province, and the payback period will not exceed five years. The specific length of payment period and the payments will depend on the

4088

Mr. W. Carter: amount of the loan and the expectant life of the equipment for which the loan is granted. The interest rates for loans up to three years will be one-half of one per cent over prime rates, for four year loans the interest rate will be three-quarters of one per cent over prime rates, and the interest rate for five year loans will be one per cent over prime rate. Payments for the first two years will be interest free as long as payments do not fall into arrears. Each borrower will be required to provide government with a chattel mortgage on all equipment purchased at the time of the loan. Loans will be made for modern machinery only if it can be clearly shown that productivity will be increased as a result of the purchase. Mr. Speaker, upwards of eighty fish processing firms in the Province should be able to qualify for this programme. These eighty companies, which employed an estimated 3,000 people during their peak production period last year had a through-put of approximately 300 million pounds of fish.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this programme will go a long way in increasing and expanding secondary processing in the fishing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we on this side welcome any assistance that will increase or expand the secondary processing sector of the fishing industry in this particular Province. And we welcome it indeed, Sir, but I would like to point out one thing, that there is really nothing terribly new or revolutionary in the Ministerial Statement made by the minister today. This is nothing new. Ever since Confederation we have had the government of the Province guaranteeing loans to various fishing industries in this

MR. F. ROWE: Province, whether it was for major expansion, bailing them out, or expansion of their machinery or what have you. It just goes to show, Sir, what great faith the financial community has in fact in loaning money now to the various fishing industries in the Province. And there is nothing new about this except - it is still a government guaranteed loan. The minister has simply changed the name to Deficiency Guaranteed Term Plan Financing Programme. Now if that is anything new and revolutionary, Sir, I would welcome it doubly. However, under the circumstances, Sir, we are encouraged that the present administration sees fit to carry on with much the same sort of a policy as was carried on by the previous administration in guaranteeing loans to the fishing industry for expansion purposes or to help them out where help is needed. And so, Sir, in that sense we welcome this Ministerial Statement. That hardly warrants a Ministerial Statement. It could be simply made as a press release.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, I rise and beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 1056 people from the communities of Middle Brook, Dark Cove and Gambo. The petition reads, Mr. Speaker - or the prayer of the petition reads; "Whereas Highway 320, Bonavista North Highway, runs directly through the communities of Gambo, Dark Cove and Middle Brook; and whereas this highway has very little road shoulder and-or pedestrian walking space; and whereas this town has suffered approximately twelve traffic fatalities within the past twelve years and numerous major and minor traffic accidents; and whereas lack of proper pedestrian walking space makes it impossible to carry out any safety training for our children; and whereas at present a substantial number of children live within a mile radius of five schools and have to walk to school; whereas we feel safety training is imperative to both elementary and high school students; and whereas it is the general consensus of a

MR. CROSS: public gathering that sidewalks or properly improved roadside shoulders would help to alleviate the potential hazard to all of our citizens, therefore we the undersigned, being residents of the communities of Dark Cove, Middle Brook and Gambo, do hereby humbly petition government to seriously consider our request for improved shoulders and-or pedestrian sidewalks."

Mr. Speaker, I can stress strongly the need for improvement to the road shoulders on the section of the Bonavista North Road that runs through these three communities. Certainly with the paving of the Bonavista North Loop Road the, volume of traffic going through these communities will increase when we realize that all traffic must pass through these three communities as they proceed through to the Northern part of the district. Certainly the petition makes mention of twelve traffic fatalities over the past twelve years in that area, and I might add here that four of these fatalities have taken place in the last twelve months. The people believe and I believe that a widening of the shoulders would help to reduce hazards and reduce the number of accidents, both minor and major. Certainly in closing I can only say that I support the petition wholeheartedly and will work with the people in their efforts to have the necessary improvements made.

I might add that yesterday a delegation of the Concerned Citizens Group did visit the building, Confederation Building. I met with them and we also met with the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications and he stated then that officials from his department will be visiting the area to assess the situation. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sir, I rise to support this petition presented by my hon. friend the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) both because of what the petition itself contains and

MR. W. ROWE: because I too was honoured with the same visit as he was, and the Minister of Transportation, and the Minister of Justice I believe, yesterday, Mayor Pritchett, and a number of her colleagues, concerned citizens from the area, came in to discuss this matter and another matter. I do not know if the member has another petition on another matter which he intends to present today. I think he does. He is going to present it tomorrow? Well, I will just make brief mention of it now as well, Sir, because the two things go together.

The highway, as anybody knows who has driven down that area, Sir, towards Wesleyville, the highway comes off the Trans-Canada Highway and just about immediately you are into the communities of the area of Middle Brook, Dark Cove, Gambo. And, Sir, you have the feeling when you come off the Trans-Canada Highway that you are in fact on a main highway. And you approach these communities doing much the same speed as you had been doing on the Trans-Canada Highway, fifty-five or sixty miles an hour, before you suddenly realize that you are in the middle of a built-up area and children are all over the road because they have no place to walk, adults as well, but mainly children all over the road, Sir, because they do not have the adequate space on the sides of the road to walk and get from one place to another in those communities.

As the hon. member has mentioned, there have been twelve fatalities in the past ten or twelve years, four in the past year, not to mention, Sir, the innumerable injuries which have been caused on that highway and people escaping from instant death or injury by a hair's breath in the area. I have heard some pretty scaring tales of very near fatalities and near injuries in those particular communities on that highway.

Now, Sir, part of the problem could be alleviated by in fact widening the shoulder, but I do not think that would do the job completely. I think what is necessary in this particular area,

MR. W. ROWE: as well as other communities which have a main highway going through them, I think it is up to the government - municipalities themselves cannot pay for it - it is up to the government to provide some kind of a pedestrian walkway in that community where there is a main road, Sir, or a main highway as in this particular case and in other cases in the Province, a main highway going right through the centre of communities where children and adults are required to walk on the road to get from one area of the town or communities to another.

We need sidewalks or walkways built at government expense, Sir, to get rid of that very severe, serious traffic hazard. The adults yesterday who came into my office mentioned, and you could see the anxiety on their faces, mentioned the ordeal it is every single day when one of their children leaves the house to walk to school, or goes down the road to see one of his or her friends, a state of constant anxiety experienced by parents who have children who have to use that road. And there is no other road to use, there is no other method of getting from one place to another.

The other point I wanted to mention, and I am glad that the member will be presenting a petition on it tomorrow, is the need for a greater police presence in the area. I believe they require or they want - they have been demanding now for nine years, that an RCMP detachment be put in the area, whether that is possible or not perhaps the Minister of Justice can tell us, but what they say is that part of this problem is the fact that there is an inadequate police presence. The police are stationed in Glovertown, what is it? About fourteen miles away or so, and it is very seldom that you see a police car, patrol car or policeman in the area of Middle Brook, Dark Cove, Gambo. They feel that if there was a police detachment there, an RCMP detachment, then it would have the salutary effect of forcing motorists to slow down to much slower speeds when they go through those communities.

MR. W. ROWE: I support that proposition as well, Mr. Speaker, because the time has come, I believe, for the government to get more involved in the highway safety of the Province, particularly in congested and built up areas where residents and children have no choice but to use a main road at considerable risk to their life and limb.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: MR. Speaker, a few words to support the petition from the residents of Dark Cove and Middle Brook, Gambo. The fact that over the past number of years this government has been successful in obtaining assistance from the federal department of DREE to reconstruct and pave the road from the Gambo area down around Wesleyville, and this year will see a completion of the road known as the Bonavista North Loop Road,

MR. MORGAN:

which makes it a very major secondary highway when completed this year. I am of the opinion as well that the road down to the communities of Gambo, Middle Brook, Dark Cove will see an increased number of vehicular traffic, tourists, etc. and I would feel, Mr. Speaker, that in supporting the petition and recognizing the demands that some type of walkway or sidewalk or the widening of shoulders would not be the answer. What I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, is that the federal government in their DREE funding would recognize the need for a by-pass road to go inside of the communities mentioned in the petition, to go down inside from the TCH down somewhere below Middle Brook towards Hare Bay. And that would mean then a secondary highway of the standard below Middle Brook all the way from the TCH down around Loop Road and around from Musgrave Harbour back to the Gander Bay area. And because of that, I feel that we should be requesting, and I think my colleague can maybe confirm that we are requesting assistance from DREE to complete that by-pass road which would take away the heavy traffic from the communities concerned. So I am hoping that in recognizing the problem of traffic in these communities that the federal government will continue on with funding of the Bonavista North Loop Road by means of constructing the by-pass road from just above Hare Bay on up to the TCH intersection. I am sure that this would overcome the problems being expressed by the residents.

In connection with the comment made by the Leader of the Opposition, I also sympathize with that. The RCMP are stationed at Glovertown, and Gambo/Middle Brook/Dark Cove is a very heavily populated area, more heavily populated, in fact, than Glovertown, and I would see the necessity one of these years in the

MR. MORGAN: very near future to have a fully-fledged RCMP detachment stationed in that area. And this would overcome the problem they now recognize with lack of patrol by the RCMP.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, being a native of Gambo I know the inherent danger in the conditions of the road there as expressed in the petition. Indeed, the hon. the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) should know what the road is like when he and I had a very narrow escape there some time last Spring. And I can assure this hon. House that I have had some very narrow escapes there myself with the kind of speeding that goes on in that community, because, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, you come immediately off the Trans-Canada and you are reduced to a speed of twenty-five miles per hour as you get into the Gambo Road about 100 feet. And it is a long road, some six or seven miles coming down through Gambo, Dark Cove and Middle Brook - that is the order, Gambo, Dark Cove and Middle Brook - about six or seven miles and the houses are stretched on either side of the road. The whole community, practically, is built on one side of the road or the other. And with deep ditches it makes it very dangerous - you cannot see children popping up and cars parked on the side of the street. It is a nightmare driving down through that community. And the parents there go through nerve-wracking situations when their children are out. They never know what is going to happen. I have been in houses and when you heard the screeching of tires and you go out, this would be some kid up on the road on a bike or something going out into the traffic. And I can recall

April 26, 1978

Tap 1452

EC - 3

MR. LUSH: friends who have been maimed and lamed from accidents there in addition to the fatal accidents, many of whom were my friends, and the others, who were not my friends, whom I knew through their family connections. So it is a most dangerous section of road, probably the most dangerous in the Province because of the length of the road, six or seven miles, going right on down through from Gambo to Middle Brook.

And certainly, I think the onus is on the government to accede to the request of the petitioners to either put in sidewalks or to improve the shoulders.

Now the minister mentions that

he

MR. LUSH:

would like to see a by-pass road there. I would certainly like to see that, but I do not think that takes away the need still for the sidewalks and the improved shoulders because that danger is still there even though the traffic would be tremendously reduced if there were a by-pass road there. That certainly would reduce the traffic but it still would not reduce the danger that is inherent there because of the condition of the roads where there are no shoulders at all and people have to walk almost in the middle of the road. As I said, it is a real nightmarish experience to drive down through there, particularly in the night when you see three or four people abreast walking on the road. Many times you do not see them until you are right up to them. It is a most dangerous situation. And even though I think we could be better served with a by-pass road there, I still think the necessity is there, it is indeed essential, that we still have the sidewalks there and the improved shoulders. These things are a necessity and by putting the by-pass road there does not at all take away the necessity of putting in these improved sidewalks and these improved shoulders.

Accidents are going to continue to happen there, it is a very dangerous situation and I would hope the government would see fit to act in this fiscal year to correct that situation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I was not here when the petition was delivered by the hon. member for Bonavista North, but I think that this particular situation calls for or should force the government to make public the findings of the Highway Safety Advisory Board.

That board travelled

MR. HODDER: throughout the Province and was in every area of the Province. They just did not look at the major centres, but travelled throughout the Province and they made recommendations as to safety on the Newfoundland highways and the condition of Newfoundland highways and local roads.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that study was done about three years ago. It was presented to the former minister last year about this time. The former minister and the present minister have been sitting on that report for quite some time. I feel that we, the general public, have a right to know what the Safety Advisory Board said in that particular report because I am sure that there are other areas of this Province which have similar problems and it is in the interest of the Newfoundland public that that report be made public.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: A question for the Minister of Justice, if he can answer it. We were all concerned this morning to hear reported on the press that one of our colleagues in the House had an outbreak of fire in his apartment. I am just wondering if the hon. Minister of Justice knows if the hon. gentleman, who is not in his seat, is all right, if he was injured in any way, or if he was there at the time or what? If the minister would not mind giving us that information.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken to the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, consequently I am not certain whether he was in the apartment at the time. But I believe he was because the Fire Commissioner had reported to the Deputy Minister of Justice this morning that the hon. Minister of Industrial Development was somewhat

MR. HICKMAN: shaken up over the experience and he was trying to convince him that he should - unsuccessfully I might add - go to seek medical attention to ensure that he had not suffered from excessive inhaling of smoke, as apparently did two people living next door who fortunately very quickly recovered, but did seek medical advice.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sir, this is more of a formal question than anything else, to get to the main subject of my questioning today. Sir, would the hon. Minister of Justice indicate to the House whether he has instructed the police to follow up the allegations and investigate the allegations made in the document tabled in this House last night, particularly the affidavit by Mr. Davidson and especially, I should say, the letter purporting to be that of the Minister of Industrial Development's executive assistant? Has the police department been asked to investigate these allegations, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this morning at 9:00 o'clock sharp I met with the Deputy Minister of Justice, delivered to him the document which had been tabled in this hon. House last night, asked him to review it with the appropriate Prosecutorial Division in the Department of Justice, and let me know as quickly as possible whether in their opinion there is anything contained in the affidavit, the alleged affidavit and the alleged letter, which would warrant a police investigation. I inquired of the Deputy Minister of Justice just before I came to the House now, he informed me that he had been reviewing it this morning- not just the affidavit but reviewing the whole thing before them, the letter - and that he would hope to be in a position to let me have a detailed recommendation either tomorrow or Friday at the latest. But, Mr. Speaker, this is being dealt with with the utmost dispatch.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary the original questioner.

MR. W. ROWE: The Minister of Justice has a queer view of his role as minister, Sir, let me preface my question by saying that,

MR. NEARY: Neuter.

MR. W. ROWE: He keeps stating every time he is asked a question in the House that his officials are doing this or his officials are doing that or he would not do this because his officials are involved in it I do not know what he considers his job as Minister of Justice to be. I ask the minister this then, Sir; Does he not believe as Minister of Justice, not as Deputy Minister or Assistant Deputy Minister, as Minister of Justice appointed by the Premier and confirmed by the Crown and elected to this House by the people of his district and so on, Sir, as Minister of Justice does he not believe that this is a situation which bears police investigation? And if not police investigation, certainly then a public enquiry to be established by the government itself to investigate these very serious allegations, Sir, which are a concern to all of us in this House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: In other words, he does not move unless he gets the advice of his officials.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows full well the role of Attorney General, and he also knows full well the basis upon which a police investigation is initiated. There has to be some indication of criminality, The police are not involved in gossip. They do not investigate gossip. They do not investigate wishful thinking. The police will investigate -

MR. SIMMONS: Speaking of wishful thinking!

MR. HICKMAN: The police will investigate any facts or allegations that show that there may have been a breach of the Criminal Code of Canada. That is the police function. Consequently, any prudent Attorney General would ask the officials in his department to review very carefully the evidence, alleged evidence, that is tabled in the House or brought to the Department of Justice and to seek an opinion whether they feel there is any evidence or criminality. That does not take away from the Attorney General the final responsibility.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true.

MR. HICKMAN: And let me assure this House that if there is an opinion that there is any criminality or suspected criminality, or grounds for suspicion of criminality, or any suspected breach of the Criminal Code of Canada, which are the matters that come within the purview of the police and the Attorney General, I will without the slightest hesitancy direct an investigation. But there is certainly being no harm done, and most definitely it is an act of prudence to make sure that in examining this they not only examine the allegations as contained therein as they relate to one or two people, but advise me as to what direction they feel the investigation should go - should it be broader? - and I await with anticipation their advice.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir, on this subject.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. W. ROWE: I can understand the view which the hon. Minister of Justice takes of his position, Sir. Nobody is asking him, let me preface my question by saying, nobody is asking him to ask the police to, you know, get involved in rumour or wishful thinking or anything else. What I have asked the hon. the Attorney General, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, is whether he has referred to the police department - the police-for investigator - not for trial or anything else -but to investigate certain allegations which were made by documents, in documents tabled in this hon. House, which are a concern to us here and to every person in the public of Newfoundland and Labrador, allegations referring to

MR. W. ROWE: scandalous and corrupt practices, allegations concerning possible criminality. Now I am not saying they are true or false. What I am saying; Does not the Minister of Justice think intimidation that is a fine subject influence peddling alleged as well, Sir; does not the minister think that these allegations having been made, or alleged to have been made by the executive assistant of a minister in this government, that should this not be immediately turned over to the police for investigation, investigation, Sir, to see whether criminal charges will be laid, whether there is sufficient evidence to lay criminal charges and bring people to court, or in fact if there should be a public enquiry set up under the Public Enquiries Act as a result of an investigation? We want an investigation, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the minister whether he does not think that it is a dereliction of his duty to wash his own hands of it, like Pontius Pilate, and leave it to his officials. The minister himself, Sir, I would suggest, and I ask him in all humility, to assure the House that he will have a police investigation of these allegations, not wishful thinking, not rumour, but a police investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition cannot have his cake and eat it. He is talking about, one, a police investigation, and secondly, he talks about an enquiry under the Public Enquiries Act.

MR. SIMMONS: That is if recommended.

MR. W. ROWE: That is if recommended I am talking about.

MR. HICKMAN: The police are not asked to recommend an enquiry under the Public Enquiries Act. The police have absolutely nothing to do with The Public Enquiries Act.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice has the responsibility.

MR. HICKMAN: The Public Enquiries Act, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: Sweep it under the carpet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: I do not sweep anything under the carpet and when

MR. HICKMAN: I order an investigation it will be a very broad one, very, very, very broad one. Now I have got news for the hon. gentleman too that he is not going to like -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. HICKMAN: May I get back Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman threatening my colleague?

MR. HICKMAN: I am not threatening anyone. I am just asking that I be allowed to answer questions that are directed, on a matter that I consider to be very serious, in a serious and uninterrupted manner, without the heckling from the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), and I propose, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with the answering of the question.

The position with respect to the Public Enquiries Act is that that is not a question for the police. It is not a police matter. That is a government decision, as whether or not government feels - and it has nothing to do with criminality - that whether or not government feels that on particular evidence brought before it, it is in the public interest, and within the intent of the Public Enquiries Act, that there should be a public enquiry. That is a matter that will be dealt with by government. If, on the other hand, the officials in the Department of Justice indicate to me that in their opinion there is any suspicion of criminality, I will assure this House that I will order a broad and total investigation by the police forthwith. If that investigation is ordered then obviously there will not be a public enquiry. Because the police investigation will be far more thorough and far more effective and will be based not upon actual criminality, but upon evidence which may suggest that there is. And let me repeat to this House that before the end of this week I will have made that decision and I will communicate it to the House without the slightest hesitancy and it will then take its natural course where it will be expeditiously investigated.

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

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir, I am not sure if the Minister of Justice can answer my supplementary question, if not perhaps the minister may want to refer to his colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, who did considerable research around the time that Scrivener were the project managers for the Health Sciences Complex. And Mr. Speaker, just a little bit of background first.

Scrivener Canada went into bankruptcy. Scrivener Newfoundland Limited were the project managers at the Health Sciences Complex - I realize, Sir, this is a bit of a technical question - and they could not carry on because they went into receivership and were on the brink of bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker, a company called SNC then came in and a new set of fees was worked out with the company because Scrivener was on the brink of bankruptcy and it could no longer carry on even though they were under contract to finish the Health Sciences Complex, but at that point they could no longer collect fees so therefore they went into receivership.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: what I want to know is this; Did SNC when they took over the project, the Health Sciences Complex, did they absorb Scrivener Newfoundland Limited? Did Scrivener Newfoundland Limited stay into receivership or did it go into bankruptcy?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: To the best of my knowledge, and this was a couple of years ago, a year and a half or two years ago, to the best of my knowledge the situation was, and it was explained in the House at that time, that under the bankruptcy of Scrivener Projects that the - I do not know the legal term for it -

AN HON. MEMBER: The trustee in bankruptcy.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - the trustee in bankruptcy had by bond to complete the project, and as I recall it SNC was their choice to take it over. I would have to go over my notes again on that but that is to the best of my recall.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: What the hon. gentleman is saying then is that SNC in actual fact did absorb Scrivener Newfoundland Limited?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is what the hon. gentleman has just said in his answer. Well, what did the hon. gentleman say?

MR. ROUSSEAU: As I understand it, when Scrivener went bankrupt the only thing they had of appreciable value was the contract on the Health Sciences Complex, that is the only thing they had.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: The only thing they had, the hon. gentleman said, is the schedule of fees, the contract on the Health Sciences Complex. Is that correct? And under that contract Scrivener Newfoundland Limited had to finish the project without changing this fee schedule. Is that not correct?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I did not negotiate the SNC one so I do not know.

MR. NEARY: Well will someone on the other side of the House undertake to get me the information? It is very important information. What I am asking the minister to find out for me is if SNC absorbed Scrivener Newfoundland Limited, if they remained in receivership, if they took over their contract why - if they took over the contract why did a new schedule of fees have to be negotiated with SNC?

MR. HICKMAN: If I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: I certainly have not been directly involved in this, but as I understand what the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower said was this, and it is logical because it always flows from any company that finds itself disbonded in a position where it cannot complete a contract. The owner pays no more attention, if you put it that way, with the contractor if the contractor is financially incapable of performing the contract, The owner then turns to the bonding company and says, 'You have given us a bond that this work would be completed, now get on with the job and complete it, now you complete it is no concern of ours so long as it is completed.' And I would assume from the statement made by the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower that this company SNC negotiated with the bonding company, but that would not be any concern of government's.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it very definitely is a concern of government because as the hon. gentleman knows SNC negotiated a new fee schedule.

MR. HICKMAN: With the bonding company?

MR. NEARY: With the government, not with the bonding company. with the Government of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, therein lies the crux of the matter, the minister put his finger right on it. I want to find out if the bond was called by the government or

MR. NEARY: by SNC, who were acting on behalf of the government or if SNC did in fact negotiate a new fee schedule to carry on and complete the Sciences Complex, That is what I am trying to find out.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: I will certainly take notice of that question, Mr. Speaker. All I was doing was interpreting the answer that was given by my hon. colleague, the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower, which indicated to me that the negotiations were with the bonding company. That is the way that construction works. If the construction company is not capable of completing the job you look to the bonding company and tell the bonding company to go out and find someone at their expense to complete the job. If on the other hand a job is terminated for some other reason other than bankruptcy or inability, then of course the owner negotiates. So I will take notice of the question and will ask the appropriate minister to get that information.

MR. NEARY: When can I have the information?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I do not know because I do not know the answer.

MR. NEARY: Well it is only a matter of making a phone call. Can I have it this afternoon or tomorrow?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I will refer it to the appropriate minister and ask that he take it as notice and furnish it as quickly as possible.

MR. NEARY: When can I get it? It is a very important piece of evidence.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I too have a question for the Minister of Justice. It does not relate to his threats of me for the last couple of days. He has been threatening

MR. SIMMONS: to get me and that kind of stuff, but I can take that and he does not intimidate me. I still have a question, a question that very much needs to be answered. I would also like to know, and perhaps he can use the opportunity while he is standing to give us the information that he indicated he had for us just now, information I would not like, I believe he said.

My question specifically, though, to the Minister of Justice is that he undertook yesterday to get some information concerning the police investigation report. He undertook to go through his department and talk to all the members down there to see who had talked to me or who had given the information. Has he done that? And is he now able to verify that what I told the House last night is indeed true and correct?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, firstly on the question of the investigation. The information I gave the House, and which I suspected was true yesterday, I have confirmed is, indeed, correct. The investigation has not yet been completed into that matter to which the hon. gentleman referred. And it is not anticipated that the Director of Public Prosecutions will have all the evidence and complete all his interviews, so he tells me, for at least another ten days.

I do not know how many senior advisors or officials in the Department of Justice spoke to the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) concerning this matter. I do know one senior official who gave some evidence - made a comment, whether it was a public comment - certainly to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee at the last hearing that the

MR. HICKMAN: Deputy Minister of Justice appeared before that Committee, And on that occasion, the Deputy Minister of Justice advised the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, and fortunately he remembers his exact advice, that interim police reports were still being received and that the reports received to date showed that an investigation was warranted, but that to date evidence against Public Works officials was negative. And I would wonder why the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, when he was asking these questions last night and yesterday, did not volunteer that bit of extra information.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: First of all; by way of clarification, to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman - to my certain knowledge - that information, that advice that the minister just read into the record was never given to me in any capacity, Mr. Chairman, never given to me. I am subject to being refreshed on that particular point, but to my knowledge it was never given to me in any capacity whatsoever, either as a member or as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. Now the minister is going to have to do better than that. To say that it has been done is not enough. He too, has to prove that it has been done and if he can do it I will quickly retract my statements. But, Mr. Speaker, I said last night, or yesterday sometime, and I repeat again, that I have information that the report - I do not care what you call it now interim, first, second, or initial or whatever - but a report of the investigation has been in the department for three months. I understand further - and I do not know how complete a report has to be or an investigation has to be - but I understand that

MR. SIMMONS: Justice has been notified that the police have uncovered evidence of possible criminality and my question now with that bit of background information is, What action is the department going to take? I think it is a fair question, given that the report on this police investigation has been in the hands of department officials for three months. Will the minister deny that? Is he saying I am not telling the truth now? I tell him it has been there, and I tell him the police have indicated that they have uncovered evidence of possible criminality. In the light of that, will charges be laid? What action is going to be taken?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a far cry from what the hon. gentleman said last night.

MR. SIMMONS: No, it is not.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman -

MR. SIMMONS: No, it is not!

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes, it is!

MR. NEARY: Go back to law school!

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman said last night that I was aware of the fact that the report was in the Department of Justice - he put it, 'the minister's Department of Justice - for three months and that I was sitting on the report. And I say that is totally and absolutely untrue. I will go further and say no one in the Department of Justice ever told the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir that I was aware that that report was in the Department of Justice and that I was sitting on it, for a very good reason, that I was not aware of the fact that -

MR. SIMMONS: Answer the question now.

April 26, 1978

Tape 1457

EC - 4

MR. HICKMAN: - that the report was in the Department of Justice. I do not know how long it has been there precisely -

MR. SIMMONS: Three months.

MR. HICKMAN: - but I do know -

MR. NEARY: Is he Minister of Justice and Attorney-General or what?

MR. HICKMAN: - but I do know that when a question was asked me by some hon. member a few weeks ago I undertook to immediately check with the Director of Public Prosecutions. He reported to me that yes, indeed, he had received the report and that he was examining the various bits of evidence that had been submitted by the police. The police

MR. HICKMAN:

make no decision as to whether or not any criminal act has been committed. That is the sole and exclusive responsibility for the Crown Prosecutor after reviewing the evidence.

MR. NEARY:

by the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

And may I repeat the procedure

again for the information of this hon. House, the procedure that is followed I hope in every Attorney General's department in Canada, And I know it is in the U.K. because there was a case before the House of Lords on it quite recently. The procedure that is followed is this, that after the report comes in from the police it is the responsibility of the Director of Public Prosecutions, or a Crown Prosecutor assigned by him to that particular case, to review all of the evidence that is submitted. After that evidence has been reviewed, then the prosecutor reaches a conclusion, if he can, whether charges should be laid and the nature of such charges. If on the other hand, and this is quite often the case in protracted investigations, the Director of Public Prosecutions comes to the conclusion that he needs additional evidence or that some of the statements have not covered all of that are necessary for him to make a decision as to whether or not an offence may have been committed, he will then go back. And I repeat that as of 3:00 this afternoon the Director of Public Prosecutions is not in a position to decide whether or not there has been any criminal act committed and he will not be in a position, he tells me, for at least a few more days. And I certainly do not want, nor would it be prudent for me or any other hon. member, to get into a debate with respect to an allegation, just made by the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), which indicated that he feels that there is evidence of criminality. Because all we are doing there is providing, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows this better than anyone, that if there is any public comment made on an investigation which may in any way prejudice the rights of a person who appears before court on the subsequent charge

MR. HICKMAN: that we have given that person, no matter how strong the evidence is, an absolute right to stand in the court and say, 'Your Honor, I am not capable of getting a fair trial because there was public comment made.'

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) not on trial.

MR. HICKMAN: Now that is why, Mr. Speaker, I find it incumbent on me as Attorney General not to get up and talk about matters that are under investigation whether it suits me or whether it does not. There has been many a time, Mr. Speaker, when it would have suited me to have stood in this House and given certain facts, that I am aware of in my capacity as Attorney General, which may have been embarrassing to other people. But I feel—and I will continue to feel this way, and I have not done it in twelve years—that I am not going to break the confidentiality of the Department of the Attorney General.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to need more than his record of the past twelve years when we are finished on this one, I will tell you that.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, listen to him!

AN HON. MEMBER: Go away, 'Roger', and do not be abusive.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, for the record, I did not say I feel that there was evidence of possible criminality. I said I understood from one of his officials that there is evidence of possible criminality, that is what I said. I did not say what I felt, let us be clear on what I said.

MR. NEARY: They are all on a witch hunt down in the hon. minister's department.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister has a way of twisting certain words. I did not say that the official gave me the impression that the minister is sitting on a report. I said the official gave me the understanding that the report has been in the minister's department for three months, and that I feel—and I do—that I feel that the minister is sitting on the report.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) in last night's Hansard.

MR. SIMMONS: I read it. The official has given me to understand that the report has been in the department for three months. I understand, I feel very strongly that the minister has been sitting on the report. Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the question. The minister just said a moment ago that as of three o'clock the Director of Public Prosecutions had no basis for laying any charges.

MR. PECKFORD: No, he never said that.

MR. NEARY: A few moments ago before the minister came into the House.

MR. HICKMAN: I said he has not completed his investigation to place him in a position -

MR. SIMMONS: Did you ever see such a useless exercise, Mr. Speaker, when the minister rewrites his words every few minutes! I wrote it down. He said as of three o'clock the Director of Public Prosecutions had no basis for laying charges.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

I must point out that the procedures of the Question Period have to be questions and answers and not debate. If there are differences of opinion on the answer, or interpretations of information given or its

MR. SPEAKER: relevance, that would have to come at a different time, under some debatable motion. But now it is questions and answers and these debates on different opinions and different interpretations really are irregular.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understood the minister to say that as of three o'clock the Public Prosecutor had no basis for laying any charges. I understand from an official in his department that there was a basis as long as three months ago. Now the minister and I can argue on that one all day and obviously we are not going to convince each other. But the question I want to put to him is can he give us now some kind of a commitment? He mentioned a few days a moment ago, Can he give us now some kind of a commitment or will this be ongoing for several other months? This investigation began last May. It is now nearly a year since the investigation was ongoing on a very specific set of events involving one building, as I understand it, and one set of expenditures. Can the minister now give the House an indication or a commitment as to when the investigation will be complete and action will flow from it, if action is required?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot give the House a commitment as to when it will be complete. But I repeat - and I do this with some reluctance because investigations that are in the hands of Crown Prosecutors should not become, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of debate - but let me repeat -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) they are being buried down there (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I said, and let me repeat it again very slowly and very carefully; that as of three o'clock this afternoon when I asked the Director of Public Prosecutions if he had any report to make to me, and I also showed him the copy of

MR. HICKMAN: last night's Hansard on this particular case - which I will not name because obviously that would be improper - he told me that there is still additional evidence that he requires before he will be in a position to make a final decision as to whether or not any charges are to be laid. I asked him if he could tell me when he would be in a position to reach that final decision. He said he could not tell me that, but he does have some appointments with certain witnesses, who are not available this week because of other commitments, sometime late next week.

So I assume that if, after he receives that evidence that he is looking for and conducts his interviews, that that places him in a position to make a decision, he will then decide shortly thereafter as to what charges he will lay. And I repeat, the Director of Public Prosecutions will not consult with me as to the nature of charges to be laid or against whom such charges, if any, should be laid.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a motion, seconded by the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), with the leave of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave to move a motion, without notice?

MR. HICKMAN: Without debate.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Without debate. Just a few words, that is all, just to - just a few words that is all.

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand it, then, the hon. gentleman has leave to present a motion without notice on which the question is going to be put forthwith without debate -

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is only a few words.

MR. SPEAKER: - seconded by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe).

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, on Saturday evening I, representing the Premier, and my friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde, representing the hon. Leader of the Opposition, attended, at the invitation of the Atlantic Region, Canadian Association of Public Employees, hosted, I believe, by the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, a talk by Mr. Harvey Webber on the concept of Atlantic Canada plus. During that meeting we discussed it, the hon. member and myself, and we thought that it would be appropriate to move a motion in the House endorsing this concept. Just a few words, if I may, Mr. Speaker, Atlantic Canada Plus is the name given to a programme of self-help for Atlantic Canada conceived by the Chambers of the Atlantic Provinces Chambers of Commerce and endorsed unanimously by its general membership. What it is saying, Mr. Speaker, in effect is that in Atlantic Canada we consume \$8.5 billion a year of goods and wholesalers, retailers and consumers use them and if we change it by one per cent we would bring \$85 million into our own Atlantic Provinces' economy and create many jobs as a result of it.

So without further ado, and

MR. ROUSSEAU: without further ado, and there will be a public programme beginning September 1st on it and myself and the hon. member after checking with our respective sides thought that it might be appropriate for the House to endorse this concept of creating more jobs in Atlantic Canada.

MR. SPEAKER; The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to endorse and, in fact, second the motion put by the hon. the minister.

I would like, on behalf of my colleagues in the House of Assembly, to congratulate Mr. Andy Creighton, a Newfoundlander, who, I understand, is going to head up this Atlantic plus programme, and also, Sir, to commend NAPE and the Chambers of Commerce of the various Atlantic Provinces for getting together. This is a situation, Sir, where you have labour - NAPE - hosting a speaker, Mr. Harvey Webber, who is, in fact, the President of the Chambers of Commerce of the Atlantic Provinces. And, Sir, it was a very healthy attitude and very enlightening and a great pleasure to be associated with a situation where you have businessmen and people in the labour force, for the want of a better expression here 'public employees' getting together and speaking about and debating and asking questions and listening to a speech concerning, really, the circulation of our own money within the Atlantic region and thereby increasing productivity and that kind of thing within our Province, Sir. It just goes to show that common sense is really not so common after all, because it is a very simple programme. If we in the Atlantic region will buy our own products from each

4120

MR. F. ROWE: other it is going to be very meaningful, it is going to mean something in the order of \$85 million - just 1 per cent, \$85 million - to the Atlantic region, which is a terrific sum of money, Sir. So I take great pleasure in seconding the motion and I would probably add that the motion be put in some formal style and sent from Mr. Speaker's Office to the appropriate organization, the Council of the Chambers of Commerce of the Atlantic Region. I think that would be the proper way to do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question on the motion? Those in favour 'aye, contrary 'nay', carried.

It being Private Members' Day, the House proceeds to Motion 5, the debate which was adjourned.

The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I believe I only have ten or fifteen minutes left and I hardly got on track last week because of a few broadsides from the other side of the House of Assembly, Sir, but a few minor body blows which I managed to sustain and survive over the weekend.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us one of the boldest and most creative and positive and far-reaching and foresighted, if there is such a word, resolutions presented in this House during the Private Members' session, and that is a motion calling on the provincial government to commence immediate negotiations with the federal government designed to bring about the bold, creative, economic strategy of developing and processing within Labrador its natural and raw materials.

MR. F. ROWE:

Now, Sir, there are four subheads in that resolution with respect to Labrador's hydro power, with respect to a Labrador port, the processing within Labrador of the raw materials including minerals, fish, forest and offshore oil and gas, and assurances that these developments will proceed only after full consideration of methods to protect the environment and after full consultation with the people living in all parts of Labrador. A package deal, Sir, not the exploitation of Labrador and its resources, but the exploration and the

Mr. F. Rowe: development of Labrador for the good of Labrador and its peoples, its various peoples, and also for the good of the Province as a whole. But not the rape of Labrador for the Island, Not the rape of Labrador for the Canadian nation, not the rape of Labrador for North America, but, Sir, Labrador and the Island portion of our Province first, integrated, packaged, common sense, consultative development, a very bold, far-reaching resolution, Sir.

And I might add, Sir, this resolution was supported whole-heartedly by four or five members opposite until we had the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) stand up in the House and move an amendment. Now, Sir, I have a great deal of respect for the member for St. John's East. Sir, he shows the occasional flash of insight and genius, and then everything suddenly returns to normal when he gets up in a partisan fashion and moves a resolution or an amendment, such as he did, deleting the whole recital, the second recital in the resolution. Sir, I will read the second recital; "And Whereas at a recent National Convention of the Liberal Party from which the Federal Government of Canada is now formed there was unanimous support for a resolution" unanimous support, Sir, at the Canadian Liberal Party Convention, unanimous, not one word spoken against it, not one word against it from any delegate from Quebec - "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 exporting the hydro power and other resources as raw materials for the use of industries elsewhere." The hon. member wants to delete the second recital, Sir. the guts of the petition, Sir, if I am permitted to use that word.

Sir, the hon. member for St. John's East has done to this resolution what you would do to a codfish - split, gut it and head off. If this amendment is carried, Sir, this is what will be

Mr. F. Rowe: left of this resolution.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, - listen to the hon. member over there mumbling and groaning and squirming and worming! Mr. Speaker, the hon. member last week admitted, and I said the only reason that the hon. member moved that resolution is because he needs a vomitorium when the word 'Liberal' is mentioned in the House of Assembly, and he was nodding in agreement.

MR. MARSHALL: Not just in the House of Assembly.

MR. F. ROWE: Or in the House of Assembly, or anywhere in the Province, he is adding, Sir, anywhere in the world, mention 'Liberal' and the bile comes out of the - well I will not go that far, Sir. He needs a vomitorium.

Sir, the only reason I submit that the hon. member for St. John's East moved this amendment, which takes the punch out of this resolution, is purely based on partisanship, the worst kind of partisanship. Now, Sir, I would like to see that second recital stay right where it is, because, number one, it is a fact. It came from the grass roots. It happens to be the Liberal Party. I cannot help it if the Liberal Party had a convention in Ottawa and they unanimously accepted this resolution from a Newfoundland delegation, unanimously. Sir, I would like to see that second part of the resolution remain right where it is, so that we can continue to remind the federal government after the next election, which will be Liberal, we can continue to remind them that this resolution was passed at their last National Convention. And I might add, Sir, that the Liberal Party, the Liberal Government of Canada, is on record, has a record of accepting and putting into policy, and putting into action 98 per cent of the resolutions passed at their Convention from the grass roots level.

MR. PECKFORD: It was 80 per cent last week.

MR. F.B. ROWE: I said ninety-eight, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. minister thought it was 80 per cent, sobeit. Next week he will think it is 60 per cent, the following week he will think it is 40 per cent, and the next week it will be 20 per cent and then it will be in the negative percentages, Sir. So I will not be distracted, Sir, by the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy who had the gall to get up and wholeheartedly support this full resolution without a squeak against it, and then turns around two weeks later and supports the amendment. Supports the amendment and the week before he wholeheartedly endorses the full resolution! Sir, what kind of gall does the hon. minister have, the Minister of Mines and Energy?

MR. PECKFORD: All kinds of it when it comes to -

MR. F.B. ROWE: All kinds of gall? The minister - Boy! some great revolutions here today, Mr. Speaker. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) admitting that he is partisan, the Minister of Mines and Energy admitting that he has gall, all kinds of gall. Sir, I submit that we should get on with the business of the House, vote on this particular amendment -

MR. DINN: Your colleagues are all gone.

MR. F.B. ROWE: We have great control over here, Sir. Just a little flick, you know. The hon. members here are in the House when required. We have not been caught off guard this session. The hon. government opposite were defeated, Sir, and they brazened it out. They were outvoted in Committee stage and they brazened it out; they hung on by their fingernails and their toenails there several weeks ago. So the last people to talk about members being in the House, Sir, should be the hon. members opposite. Let the record show, Sir, that the conduct of the House of Assembly and the control and the business of the House rests

MR. F.B. ROWE: wholly and solely with the government in power - wholly and solely! And if members anywhere, on any side of the House get out of hand or become unparliamentary, there are the usual methods of taking care of such situations. That is why we have Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Now, Sir, I would ask hon. members opposite, particularly those who have already gotten up and spoken and fully endorsed this resolution, to vote against the amendment moved by my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who has openly admitted that the reason he moved the deletion of the whole recital is because he did not like the word 'Liberal'. And, Sir, I will repeat that in deleting that recital the hon. member is deleting the following: "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 exporting the hydro power and other resources as raw materials for the use of industries elsewhere."

Now, Sir, I submit that that is a very, very important part of the recital and in deleting that the hon. member, unwittingly or not, has taken the backbone right out of this resolution which, up until the hon. member spoke, had received the complete, full, undeniable, unqualified support of every single member in this House of Assembly on both sides.

Now, Sir, we have to call the shots the way they are. The fact is there was a national Liberal convention recently. The fact is the Newfoundland delegation did present this resolution. The fact is that it was unanimously accepted by every single person at that convention. The fact is that 98 per cent of the resolutions passed at the Liberal conventions are

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was just listening to the member for Trinity - Bay d' Verte (Mr. F. Rowe) and I think he was, towards the end there, really sort of being a bit humorous and maybe somewhat joking -

AN HON. MEMBER: I was laughing, I was laughing.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - and certainly not quite serious, because if the Leader of the Opposition, or whoever introduced the resolution, was sincerely interested in the resolution receiving the unanimous support of this legislature then certainly he would have eliminated -

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not think it is parliamentary, Sir, I do not have the citation in front of me but the hon. ex-minister is questioning the seriousness and therefore the sincerity of hon. members opposite here and I am sorry, on page 131, I can remember seeing in Beauchesne words to that effect that to question the motives or the sincerity of an hon. member of the House of Assembly is quite unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement without qualification, Sir.

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

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

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. gentleman has not produced, he keeps referring to something in Beauchesne that he cannot find. He has not produced and therefore he has not made a case that there is a point of order and hence it is a specious, foolish attack on the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) for no reason that he can give, so there is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I recognize the hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. There is no point getting up on points of order unless you have the reason for it. Page 130 of Beauchesne, "The imputation of bad motives,

MR. MARSHALL: or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another " etc. There was no imputation of motives on the part of the hon. member, just a mild statement, and if he is not able to make statements of that nature he cannot debate. I mean, it is not a point of order. It is specious and it is foolish and points of order of this nature really constitute disorder of the House.

MR. F. ROWE: Citation, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, Section 155, page 130 "The imputation of false or unavowed motives." Now, Sir, the hon. member opposite - this is unparliamentary - the hon. member opposite, number one, he referred to myself as saying I was humorous and I was not serious, and then he said of the Leader of the Opposition if he was really serious. Now if that is not question the motives of an hon. member what is? And it is not good enough for the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Mines and Energy to get up and say that is not a point of order, that is silly, that is foolish. That is all they say, Sir, these are the only citations they ever make, things are silly, things are foolish from this side. Now I have pointed out in Beauchesne, page 130 "The imputation of false or unavowed motives or the misrepresentation of the language of another or the accusation of misrepresentation" is unparliamentary. Now if people are accused of not being serious or being foolish or being humorous, I would submit, Your Honour, that they are questioning the motives and the sincerity of hon. members opposite and I ask the member to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to draw hon. member's attention to Beauchesne page 130, (3) "The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another, or accusing him, in his turn" and so I will ask the hon. member if he would withdraw the remarks.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I might as well withdraw from the debate if I have to go along with that ruling, but I guess Your honour is the authority and I withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What else have I done wrong now, my son?

MR. F. ROWE: You said you had better withdraw from the debate if you had to listen to that ruling.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, this is getting a little bit ridiculous. I am no expert debater, I certainly have not been involved in many debates over the years, I am no relationship to Tommy Douglas, but I do say that it is a little unfortunate that I can refer it to the fact that I am concerned about the fact that here is a resolution where we are requested as a legislature to ask -

AN HON. MEMBER: Withdraw.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have withdrawn, my son, what is the matter with you?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I wish to remind hon. members that they should only speak from their own seat on being recognized by the Chair.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not take that hon. member is very serious anyway and I should not even react to him. But in any event, Your Honour, the problem is here is a situation where we get a member and an opposition and a leader standing up and asking for unanimous support from a legislature of a political resolution, a political resolution. Here is the situation - I have been in a few conventions over a period of years - what happens with a convention? The convention

Mr. Lundrigan: is an assembly of the political body of a party. They get together and they look at all of the potential resolutions - several hundred of them in the case of the Liberal Party, the one that was held recently - and they all vote for motherhood resolutions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And what has happened here, the Leader of the Opposition gets up and he has done two things; number one is present a political resolution which obviously in its political form cannot receive the support of members on this side of the House in its political form. And he says, we want to have the grass roots Liberal Party being supported by the P.C. Government to put pressure on the Government of Canada in the event they do not go along with the kinds of resolution that we presented at our Conference a few days ago, A level of arrogance! I would not want to see some of the hon. gentlemen across the House in power according to the way they stand seventeen feet tall right now with anticipating power.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I do not think -

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

MR. WHITE: - there is a quorum in the House.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): A quorum call.

MR. WHITE: They are obviously rather interested in what he has to say.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I will ask the Clerk to count the House.

We have a quorum.

I recognize the hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I think it should be recorded for Hansard that there was not one, single official member of the official Opposition present in the House when the quorum call was made. The member who made it dashed out and left about tenth of zero. Now, Mr. Speaker, I sat in a Legislature where there were 265 members with a quorum of 20. I never saw a quorum called in the total of six years in the House of Commons.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I never saw a quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: We are speaking to an amendment to a private member's motion, which is a very specific thing. And I would submit, Sir, that the hon. member is completely irrelevant in talking about quorum in this House or any other House in this country.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): To that point of order. I feel there is a wide range of debate and it is quite wrong for the hon. member to drift from one side to the other and I feel he was irrelevant. I will ask him to continue.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it is a little bit, I get the impression, the impression in the House today - and I guess you have got to accept the moods, that Legislatures change their moods from time to time, they are almost like they have a personality - there is sort of an unusual type of feeling emanating from the other side of the House. It is manifest in the resolution that we have before us. It is manifest in the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe). It is a little bit of an unusual thing for an Opposition that is not in power, that is not the government, aspires to be the government, might even have a very impressive poll taken, it is a little bit unusual for him to be able to stand here - sensitive, I never saw anybody more sensitive than the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde. I never saw more sensitivity. He stands in his place there, with the other members, and says, 'What is wrong with you people across the way you cannot vote for our resolution. We want to put pressure on the Liberal Government in Ottawa.'

Now let us look at the resolution, look at the resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is right nish.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The resolution, as far as I am concerned, if I were living in Labrador today, and I worked there as my first job - and

Mr. Lundrigan: I have been around Labrador a bit. I cannot trace back my heritage to, you know, 400 years or anything, but that type of resolution as far as I am concerned is very, very patronizing, very patronizing, almost as if to say, 'Here you are, boys over there'— and I heard the Leader of the Opposition talking about we and they, and they and we and so on, 'here you are over there, here is where we stand for you people, here is where we stand for you people'. And it goes

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

on talking all the motherhood stuff; "develop Labrador hydro resources primarily as a source of power for the industrial development of the Province, particularly Labrador - do not forget Labrador - and for the Province's domestic and commercial use with any serviced power being made available to other provinces of Canada on a short term, recallable basis only" assuming the barometric pressure is twenty-nine and a half inches, it is in the middle of the Summertime and we have 15,000 people daydreaming, you know.

It goes on with all of the qualifications, all of the and so on and so on and so forth to the point where the thing is ludicrous. 'Develop a fully fledged, fully serviced Port Labrador on the Labrador Coast and constructing a railway and a road' it goes on. 'Processing within Labrador of Labrador raw materials including minerals, fish, forests, offshore oil and gas as discovered in commercial quantities, snails, you know, flatfish, sculpins, bake apples. Now why did they not put all that in there. Nobody can be against it. Motherhood, patronizing, absolutely patronizing! If I were from - it is almost like somebody in Ottawa, like when we used to get into great debates in the House of Commons someone from Western Canada standing up and saying, 'Here we are in Alberta, we have got it made, the land of the living, the land of economic opportunity. And you people back East, we agree with you. You have got to develop your fisheries.' And they would go on and make nice speeches to be political when we have debates on fisheries, get up and support us, the people from Newfoundland. And this is exactly the attitude that you have epitomized here in the resolution.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

And the boldness and the arrogance to stand up and say that whereas a recent National Convention of the Liberal Party presented and accepted unanimously that resolution, Mr. Speaker, the member has to be a little bit - you know, he is certainly expecting a bit much, is he not, from the government, the P.C. Government, to support the Liberal policy convention resolution which is motherhood, patronizing just to make themselves look good politically.

Now, there is what happens. What does a convention do? A convention has 300 or 400 resolutions. Everybody sits down, they draft it all out, they bring it all to this convention. It has a meeting of the people of the party. It has an election of a president, and they vote on all of the motherhood resolutions. They go on the open line programmes, they get a bit of press - never hear tell of it again! Ninety-nine per cent of the things that happen at a policy convention is a political thing to capture the imagination of the people in your party, to make you look good for a few days, to give your leader a chance to be accountable, as the Prime Minister was at his convention. And he comes back here and introduces this as if everybody is retarded on this side of the House. Totally a political maneuver!

Now, if the member was interested in Labrador I would have suggested a resolution be brought in and I will suggest a resolution which is the nub of the problem. Maybe one of the reasons why people are losing a bit of respect for the political system is the fact that we spend so much of our time looking at the political advantage rather than the sincere, genuine aspect as it relates to our people.

We have a problem in Labrador. One of the problems is the lack of development of our resources,

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

the ones that are now being exploited and taken out of the ground. And now there is the lack of development of resources that are not even touched at the present moment. Another is the threat in Western Labrador, as the members from Labrador have indicated, and I would just like to refer to - somebody sent me a copy of the Newfoundland Telephone Directory effective September 7, 1977. And under government you have, Government of Canada. And then you have in French three or four - this is as it appears in the directory, Government of Canada, three or four, Bureau de Poste, I do not know. I do not speak the French language. And it goes on like that. And then you have the Government of Canada in English, three or four of the departments of the government that we have there. And next in line - what do you think comes next? This is in Western Labrador, Labrador City - Wabush. Next, Government of Quebec. Government of Canada, French, Government of Canada, English. Next is in French only Gouvernement of Quebec. It is the next in the phone book. Justice. When you read it carefully, if you did not know the difference you would not notice it, that the phone numbers are Montreal phone numbers. If anyone did not know the difference and picked up that, they would say that Western Labrador belongs to Quebec. This is in our Newfoundland Telephone Directory.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not the Newfoundland Telephone Directory.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Whatever. I thought it was the Newfoundland Telephone Directory. Is it?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Western Labrador, is it? Whichever it is, Newfoundland Tel is owned by Bell Tel anyway. So it is only a subsidiary. But in any event this is the five or six - the Department of Justice, the Department of Labour - I suppose that is what it means - and the department of something else; three or four Montreal numbers with the government of Quebec and the third one is the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. What I am trying to say is that there is a concern in Labrador about the fact that maybe there is the lack of presence of Newfoundland, the lack of sensitivity on the part of the people of Labrador that Newfoundlanders are relevant to them, Newfoundland Government is as relevant to them as it should be. There is another more major problem, and anybody who listened to the debate a few weeks ago on the budget in Quebec would have recognized the more major problem. The only Government of Canada to my knowledge which was able to bring in a \$500 million tax cut, here is a government that only took power a year and a half ago that could bring in a \$500 million tax cut, even a tax cut in excess of that which is being brought in by the Federal Government. none of the other provinces could even look at that sort of a tax cut. Where are they getting the \$500 million? Where is the revenue coming into Quebec to enable them to take the very progressive action as giving tax cut and tax relief which will help stimulate the economy?

The obvious answer, Mr. Speaker, is that it is coming from our Province. It is coming from the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now nobody disagrees with the contents of the resolution. Let us look at where the problem lies with respect to the core problem in Western Labrador, therefore the core problem to a large extent in Labrador generally, and that is with respect to hydro. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition stand in his place from time to time, and I have heard him on the air, talking about the fact that we have to take much more aggressive action regarding Quebec. I agree we have to take more aggressive action with regard to Quebec and the business of the Upper Churchill and the power. I agree that we have to take more aggressive

MR. LUNDRIGAN: action. I agree that it is above politics. I agree that it is one of the most fundamental issues in our Province today. I also recognize the reason why we are over a barrel with respect to the Upper Churchill. I also recognize the reason why we are over a barrel with respect to the development of the Lower Churchill. I also recognize the reason why we have to go almost with cap in hand and sit down and discuss with Allister Gillespie from Toronto the business of joint relationships with respect to the Lower Churchill in Labrador. What is the reason? The reason being is that this Province has never been given the right to transport our energy across the border of Quebec and across the territory of Quebec. Why is not somebody saying, let us forget about the Liberal Party in Ottawa and ganging up on the Liberal Party with respect to Port Labrador, with respect to the various other motherhood aspects, why do we not gang up on Ottawa or on the issue of transporting our energy across Quebec? The only part of Canada that has been denied their rights under the constitution of our country. The Western part of Canada today would be just like a prune, dried up like a prune if they did not have the right of access to the rest of the Canadian markets.

Under section 91 of the British North America Act which was put in specifically for that purpose, the Federal Government has the right to regulate trade and commerce in our country, a specific term which enables the Federal Government to exercise its authority and the transmission of power in Labrador. Under section 92, which spells out the terms of the constitution of our country, the provinces, in each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in respect of matters coming within the class of subjects next to and herein enumerated. It goes on talking about taxation, borrowing money, tennure of office, management and sale of public lands, maintenance of public prisons and the establishment and maintenance of hospitals and the like, education - except the governments of the province do not have the power when it comes to other works and undertakings connecting the Province with another province or other provinces or extending beyond the limits of the Province. Such works as although wholly

April 25, 1978

Tape No. 1466

JM - 3

MR. LUNDRIGAN: situant within the Province are before or after their execution declared by the Government of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more provinces.'

 Under these sections, one with the authority given the Federal Government, the other without the authority

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

within the Province, under these sections the governments of the Western part of our country have been able to develop their natural resources, transport it across the provincial boundaries with no impediment. You never heard any conversation about the pipelines and that with respect to provincial boundaries. In the last few months when we talked about the Western pipelines, the Alcan pipeline, any of these matters, no conversation about them, no talk, because under that act the federal government enforced their authority, constitutional authority to prevent a province from barring another province from economically surviving, economically developing, transporting their energy, oil and gas.

In our Province, and this is where the hon. the former Premier was gypped by the federal government - he might have made a bad deal. I grant you, it is one of the tragedies - but one of the aspects where he was gypped, where the government was gypped on is that the then Government of Quebec said to the Province, if you do not sell us the power for nothing, if you do not give us the power, if you do not allow us to have it and do what we want with it, you will not do anything with it. What were we going to do? We could not get the power back across. There was no technical skill or capability then. Today we are faced with exactly the same situation. In twenty-four hours we could finance the development of the Lower Churchill if we had the right to get to the marketplace. No question about it. Before the end of this year, before the end of this week we would have people involved in some kind of an employment position and before the end of the year we would have the thing moving ahead full tilt before, the end of 1978.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Even if we recall the power from the Upper Churchill today, the entire block of power, what do we do with it in our Province? We have got no right of access. If we owned it, if the courts came out today and said you own all of your power, we have got no right of access again. This is the core issue, this is the kind of thing that we have got to talk about. And we are letting our people down in this legislature when we stand here day after day bickering. A lot of it is nonsense. A lot of it is serious. A lot of it causes rumblings out in the field, maybe even politically advantageous for a member or another member or a party or another party.

There are a few core issues. This, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion is one of the core issues in our Province today. The people in the rest of Canada are laughing at the people in this Province. The Ottawa people are laughing at the people in this Province. Because here we are as a legislature finagling - I was just going to use a few words which are a bit unparliamentary - over a lot of nonsense from day to day when on the two or three core issues, there is no unanimity, no debate, it is not talked about, you do not hear it on the open line programmes. Turn them on today and you will hear the usual stuff. It is not talked about around the coffee tables over a cup of tea. There is no great debate going on in our Province today over these core issues. And one of the reasons there is no great debate is because it is not happening here in this legislature. We are not talking about it.

We bring in the Private Member's Resolution - a very good resolution, a motherhood resolution, politically motivated and maybe oriented - that is okay for a few hours. We never got to the nub of the problem, our

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

problem which is preventing a \$2.5 billion development in our Province today, costing us thousands of jobs in construction, costing us hundreds of millions of dollars in exporting our power. We would have lots of people come in. Quebec right now, Mr. Speaker, I will bet you a dollar to a donut will be prepared to take all of our power in the Lower Churchill, maybe even give us enough money for the power from the Lower Churchill to justify, barely justify borrowing the money to build it.

What does it do for the revenue in this Province and the people in this Province? Here we are today one of the wealthiest parts of North America, certainly one of the wealthiest parts of Canada, a half a million people with one resource generating almost \$1 billion in revenue. And here we are today - I have had to resign over it from Cabinet because we cannot build my hospital, a commitment I made and a commitment I stood on. We hear about today the hon. member out in his riding needing a little bit of sidewalk or needing a little shoulder, because and I know his area quite well, we cannot even talk about it. The minute you mention a buck in this government today everybody gets scared because we do not have the financial resources. I recognize that myself. We do not have the flexibility. We do not have - no matter what kind of an imagination you have about development we are hamstrung with our financial condition.

The Minister of Fisheries and I was in development for a couple and a half years. The thing I learned after a few months is do not do any thinking because if you come up with an idea that is going to cost any money, you are in trouble. You will frustrate yourself to death because largely we do not have the resources.

Mr. Lundrigan: And here we are sitting on a billion dollar resource developed and another resource, which is almost as rewarding financially, undeveloped. Why is it not developed? Because Quebec got us exactly where they want us. I am not a bit anti-Quebec. I have been in the Province of Quebec dozens of times, around dozens of ridings speaking for the various candidates over a period of years with not a great lot of success, now or maybe in the future. But I recognize, yes, I recognize the unique culture they have, very akin to our Province, a unique population distribution outside of two urban major urban settings, and I think most Canadians have a kind of respect. But we are over a barrel, and I think it is about time for us to start talking the key issue. And if you are going to put pressure on Ottawa, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, if you are going to get up and say that we want to tell the people of Canada, across the country that this government and this party and that party supports a pro Newfoundland decision, let us get off our motherhood stuff. Everybody agrees that we need the things that are spelled out in the general resolution as presented here, but the key is that Ottawa has to be shamed into recognizing the fact that we are being gypped by the refusal of access across the Province of Quebec. This has been brought out in the last twelve months at a number of conferences. It was amazing that the Premiers across the country did not recognize why we were in such a bind on the hydro issue. The various Premiers folded their arms and said, Are you kidding me? Are you serious that you people are not allowed to transport across Quebec your power? And maybe for the first time in the Spring of this year at the First Ministers Conference the issue became maybe a more enlivened issue when the Premiers presented the statistics on the amount of power equivalent almost to the entire amount of crude oil consumed annually in Canada, being generated by one resource in our Province. The people did not know that. The people across Canada got an inkling about it. They got a bit of an awareness about it. And I think it is about time for us here in this Legislature

Mr. Lundrigan: to flex our muscles on some of the real issues.

On these issues, Mr. Speaker, there is no politics in it. Every Newfoundlander agrees, whether he is a Liberal or an NDP or a Conservative or whatever, every Newfoundlander agrees there is no party allegiance on it, everybody knows that it is a Newfoundland issue first and foremost. But I think we have responsibility here to make sure that the rest of Canada feels the urgency - and that is what we are not doing. The rest of Canada can sit back and laugh because of the fact that they know here in our Legislature, here in our Province, we are not going to get on to the key issues, we are too busy fighting each other.

AN HON. MEMBER: Playing politics.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Leader of the Opposition has his poll in his pocket. You know, he has got his poll in his pocket, and he is going around waving his poll. As far as he is concerned he has got it made. It is like an investment now, he has got a good investment. And we are over here, we are struggling along day to day, a controversy here, a bit of good here, announcement here, you know, struggling along. We are in the middle of an election, and all day long -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: All right scandals. Lots of scandals. Scandals today, scandals tomorrow. Who is getting gypped? Who is getting gypped? Who is getting taken to the cleaners? Not the Leader of the Opposition, not the member for Grand Falls. He can always pack his suitcase and go back to Island Cove. No problem with the member for Grand Falls.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He might get defeated. No problem. But the people of our Province, Mr. Speaker, are getting gypped, getting gypped maybe because we are all a bit at fault. But I think right now in this session, if we do nothing else, we have got to come to grips with these two or three core issues. And this is one of them. The resolution

Mr. Lundrigan: is not the core issue. The resolution, and I would be prepared to stand here and back the Leader of the Opposition or back the Government House Leader or back anybody, and willing to debate it for a week, and willing to go across the country and stand on stages in communities anywhere and spend whatever dollars we need in Open Line programmes across the country, travelling across the country to let the rest of the Canadian people know that we are getting gypped here in our Province. Not because of the contract. That is one area that is before the courts. And that is one area where I feel maybe we might have to one of those days flex our muscles a bit more, maybe reassess our approach, I will go along with any of that type of thinking, but when it comes to the business of this little rock that we have here on the East Coast - insignificant, seven members out of almost 300 in the House of Commons, insignificant politically, uninfluential, maybe with a very, you know, a half decent image, fifty-fifty, not a very positive image across Canada, looked on as being very heavily supported by the rest of the country, it is about time for us to let the rest of the Canadians know that we are alive down here. The people in Manitoba have done it. And the people in other parts of Canada are doing it.

But I got a funny feeling, Mr. Speaker, that a little bit of it relates to our

MR. LUNDRIGAN: political system and I am going to be saying more about that in the next couple of months. When you analyze us I sometimes wonder whether we are capable of governing ourselves, whether the system maybe has not emerged to the point where we recognize what the responsibility of a legislature is. And I am not lecturing hon. members but it certainly makes me feel that we are sort of bogged down in it; we cannot rise above it and see it from a different vantage point and a different level. Maybe that is because we are only relatively new in self government in the most modern sense and maybe in many ways, Mr. Speaker, only emerging because many of the other areas of self government and democratic governments have had hundreds of years behind them, and maybe that is the process of evolution.

But if I do not say anything else in this session this year I hope members will treat this matter as a serious one, that we get down to the business, bring in that kind of a resolution even if it takes us a day or two to get at the nub of it, and find ways and means, debate it, find ways and means to let the rest of the country know, let the leaders of the various parties know--there is an election around the corner. I do not think the Prime Minister is certainly going to lose much sleep about whether we flex our muscles, I do not think Mr. Joe Clarke will lose much sleep, but they might lose a little bit of sleep if we are aggressive enough and make these kinds of issues into national issues. Now we have done it before. The member for Green Bay, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, I think has done a tremendous job in making the issue of oil and gas regulations, that issue, into a national issue. I think he is winning his war in that particular area. I think we did, in the ten years it took us ten years to make the continental resources an issue. Now I just want to say to the member lots of times you stand here and you talk on and on and ramble on; people have very short memories, ten years ago when the issue of continental resources started to be talked about in Canada in Ottawa it was a joke.

I remember standing up and my colleague the Minister of Fisheries and the other ministers and members from Newfoundland, all

MR. LUNDRIGAN: of us were on the one wave length. We always had a good common attitude and you never heard us standing up and criticizing the member for Burin-Burgeo, never once did you hear us picking on each other. We had a common front in Ottawa when it came to the business of our own problems, particularly with the continental resources. We got involved and the members across the way used to shout back 'fish,' 'fish,' 'fish' and I remember standing up, embarrassed a little bit sometimes as it would be constantly on the business of fish and the continental resources. About three years afterwards the present Minister of Fisheries and myself came down to the Province on a visit and called a press conference - two or three of our colleagues were not that enthusiastic about it - and we presented the ICNAF findings, the International Commission of the Northwest Atlantic Fishery, and what had then happened to the resource, the over-exploitation of the resource. As it started to develop the press picked it up and the next thing a year later W5 did a programme on it, a national programme. This is the way it evolved. Then you got the fishermen starting to become really active. Over a period of several years, eight or ten years, we developed, all of us adding a little bit and piece, and the petitions and the leaders of the various political movements and Gus Etchegary and his Save our Fisheries Association and so on, we made that issue into a thing which today happens to be giving us one of the best opportunities we have in our Province, an opportunity which we almost lost completely.

MR. CARTER: And Ottawa opposed it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And Ottawa - some of these people up in Ottawa were as old fashioned as Maternick. They were so backward and they were so reactionary they thought you should wipe it all out as there was no future in it. Even some of our political leaders, and I do not want to make it political today, said that fisheries was poverty, get rid of it. That was the official attitude of some of our political leaders. It is not poverty today. This is the same kind of an issue but in order for the issue to evolve, to be talked about on Open Line programmes or over

MR. LUNDRIGAN: a cup of coffee a great debate has to take place and first it has to happen in our legislature. We have to be sensible and serious about it. We have to do a bit of our homework and we have to have the Premier telling what the financial chances are of raising the funds and maybe providing a bit of leadership there as well. We have to have the Leader of the Opposition put a little bit of politics aside. There is not going to be an election for a few days so he can just coast a little bit on these issues and talk about the issue. Eventually you will get the issue becoming a very live one in our Province. On that particular point alone, the transmission of our power, the right of access, the constitutional rights of our Province then I think, Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation across Canada, and that is going to require every one of us in our own ways. some of us will be able to do it through travelling and talking, television and Open Line and the like-to try to make it into a national issue. Sooner or later, and it has to be sooner and it should happen this year and it should happen during the election period, we have to get a commitment from the leaders of the parties, the political forces in Ottawa, that they

MR. LUNDRIGAN: will give us our constitutional rights. That is all we ask for - give us our constitutional rights. And we can take that particular resource and we can start developing it tomorrow morning without Allister Gillespie, without Norske Hydro in Norway and without anybody else involved in the business of aluminum or anybody else involved in the world, we can do it ourselves here in this Province. We are not going to do it without our constitutional rights. That is the thing that is barring us from going ahead and moving ahead today. And we, worse than any part of Canada, we need a real shot in the arm - I grant you and I am totally supportive of the business of all of our small industries, the gradual evolution, the gradual uptake in fisheries - but today we need a shot in the arm and that is the kind of a shot in the arm we need, Mr. Speaker. And that is why I say - I was delighted and I have been on pins and needles to get involved in this debate in the last couple of weeks - that is why I say maybe all of us when we get involved have to put a little less emphasis on politics, be a little less ostentatious with respect to politics, because that resolution, as much as it opens up the right of debate which we are doing today, is off base, is off target, it is motherhood, it is a bit patronizing and it is political. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough and the kinds of issues that we have to get ourselves involved in are the more fundamental issues. I think the people will respect us a lot more for it, I think that the legislative system, the political system of our Province will emerge more strongly for it. And I challenge the members on both sides of the House to get at the nub of this issue, I do not care who introduces the resolution or how it is debated or how it is put forward, Mr. Speaker; it is the type of thing that we have to get involved in. I thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise now to speak to this resolution. I am sorry that there has been politics brought into it but

MR. DAWE: I see I have no other choice but to support the resolution as presented by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I think to support the amendment would only bring further politics into this most important issue. I do not know if there is any way or compromise around the position we find ourselves in. I was thinking - I do not know if this would be in order or be the right procedure to adopt - that if possible, if we could adopt the motion as presented but then select a committee of the House, a select committee of the House, that and after all the debate has taken place and all the opinions expressed on both sides, with a select committee comprising of both sides of the House probably they could be given then the authority to draw up the necessary correspondence to pass on the contents of this resolution to the federal government. I suggest that, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if it would be in order or not but I certainly would like to see the politics taken out of this most important resolution.

My remarks are going to confine themselves mainly to how I see Labrador will be developed or should be developed. Now I have heard these very same things that are contained in this motion discussed in my father's house more than forty years ago - more than forty years ago. If the hon. member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) were here I am sure he would know of the late Joseph DeChamplain, a famous Quebecer, who was talking this same development of the Labrador forty years ago - railroads, bus services, everything you can mention in this, quite familiar with it and quite knowledgeable. So it is nothing new but I do want to give credit to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for bringing it before the House at this time.

MR. DAWE:

And I am going to deal with some of the points contained in the resolution and express to the House how I think it should be developed. And I am going to deal first with the position of the railway. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, you will not see a railway extending from Happy Valley, Labrador to the heartland of the United States. Why? You have in place in Labrador today a railroad running North and South. That railroad was put in place at at least a quarter of the cost that it would take today to replace the same railway. You have a shorter railway which leads to an ice free port, and the cheapest way to move cargo from A to B is by water.

I am going to give the House just one example to prove this. Now at Seven Islands a 30,000 ton vessel - I will call it by name - the motor vessel Algocen - can go to Seven Islands and load 30,000 tons at the rate of 4,000 tons an hour. She will then sail by water to Montreal and through the lakes to her destination. And when she reaches a landing point for discharge, she can discharge that same material at the rate of 6,000 tons an hour, And imagine that in the moving by water as comparison to moving it by rail.

At the same time I will say that you can move iron ore from Seven Islands to Montreal for the rate of not more than \$3.00 a ton. This is the international market. It is the market that the development at Labrador will have to compete with. To move that by rail will cost at least, the railway itself will cost at least, I would say, \$1 million a mile to construct. This will be amortized and paid for by the hauling of the various processed or semi-processed material from Labrador. I think

MR. DAWE:

this will make it prohibitive. And I would say that the way that Labrador should be developed, if a railway is required, is that interlocking railways should be constructed in Labrador to connect with the railway that is now in place running from Wabush and Labrador City and the other towns in Labrador. And if necessary in the national interest, probably the federal government will ask to nationalize this railway and nationalize the loading facilities at Seven Islands to make certain that the products of Labrador will get to the market in the most economical and cheapest way possible.

I do not see, Mr. Speaker, a railway. I do not see it is practical and I do not see it coming about. But that should not deter further development of the Labrador. We have a railway there in place. It is cheap. We have modern loading facilities at Seven Islands. And you have a service through the Great Lakes the cheapest possible way to remove cargo, both bulk and semi-processed right now in place.

I am going to refer to now my opinion of the development of the power resources in Labrador. The hon. leader has suggested that we should put a resource tax

MR. DAWE:

on the power that is leaving Labrador. The government from their point of view express the opinion that this tax is not feasible and just would not stick. They must be of the firm opinion because, I am sure, because as the hon. member just mentioned they would not have hospitals closing down or hospital extensions not going ahead or other public services if this money was readily available to the Province. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition, who has legal training and, I am sure, has had outside legal advice, I am sure that he is just as convinced that he could make this tax stick as the other side say it is not possible.

So, I have come to the conclusion that if a resolution was brought before this House imposing this tax, I would support it. Then we would have the opportunity of putting it into effect. As I see it the worst could happen is we could prove then and there that it is not feasible or not legal. And if it is not collectable, it is not collectable. I think then the onus would be on Hydro Quebec or some other agency outside this House for them to defend themselves and for them to say, no, the tax is not legal. As I say I would support a measure to this effect just to see if such a tax was legal and was feasible. I am sure hon. member would agree that such a tax would change Newfoundland's position overnight. And it is a pity, I think, that some way is not tried to see if it was at all feasible.

Mr. Speaker, in failing that, one other course is open, as I see it, to development of the Upper Churchill and the Lower Churchill. The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) just mentioned that we should try to get transmission rights through the Province of

MR. DAWE:

Quebec. I would say if we had an all party resolution, unanimous, passed by the House of Commons of Canada, we would have a chance. And that is what it would need, in my opinion, an all party resolution by the House of Commons of Canada so that the Quebec people would see this is the feeling of the other parts of Canada, this is in the national interest and this is what should be done.

Again, Mr. Speaker, failing that recourse of action, what is the next course of action as I see it? The next course of action as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is this, that we would accept this clause that is contained in the agreement with Brinco. We should accept that clause.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Port de Grave is making a terrific speech down there - nobody here listening to him, the government not keeping a quorum in the House! The least we can do is have a quorum to hear the member for Port de Grave.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! We are supposed to wait for three minutes after the bell, and we have no bell. So I will ask the Clerk to count the House.

We have a quorum.

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: To continue on, Mr. Speaker, I was going to refer briefly to the other course of action that I see that we could take with regard to hydro development in Labrador, and this deals mainly with the Upper Churchill. I feel that we have a right under the terms of agreement, the terms of lease, for Churchill Falls Corporation to withdraw the power from the Upper Churchill. And I would take that position, Mr. Speaker, without any decision at all outside of this House. This clause or this law was passed by this House, and I feel that we should accept that. Why should we have someone outside to pass on the validity of a law or an act passed in this House?

I would say we should stand on that point, should accept that as valid, and it would be the other person or the group outside of this House to prove to us this law is not valid or this clause is not feasible. I would take the position today this clause is law, this clause is applicable. And I would say to anyone outside of this House it is for them to prove to us that it is not, and for us to prove to them that it is. And if we could do that, why, Mr. Speaker, we could serve notice on Churchill Falls or Hydro Quebec, after a detailed survey was made, to draw back the power from the Upper Churchill that was required.

To do that I feel that we need a commitment, again from the federal government, that they would construct, at least on a 90-10 basis, a commercial tunnel connecting Newfoundland and Labrador. And I feel that it is incumbent on the National Government, again in the national interest, that they should undertake this tunnel immediately. Probably members will recall in the last federal election the then

MR. E. DAWE: Leader of the PC party, Mr. Stanfield, made some reference to this tunnel, and if that was done I feel, Mr. Speaker, this again would have a tremendous impact on our Province. Users of electricity both in Labrador and on the Island could immediately see that this cheap power would be made available. It was my understanding that to bring power, and to be consumed in Labrador from the Upper Churchill will cost in the vicinity of seven mils. To bring that same power to Newfoundland from the Upper Churchill would cost about fifteen mils. To develop the Lower Churchill and for the power to be consumed in Labrador would cost fifteen mils and the power to be developed at the Lower Churchill and be consumed in Newfoundland would cost twenty-five to twenty-seven mils.

So I, Mr. Speaker, just do not see it. Why should we as a province have to pay this much higher price for power from the Lower Churchill when we have already in place this power from the Upper Churchill? I think that with some firmness and with mutual desire or mutual determination possibly we could bring something to bear or some position to bear so that this position could be brought about.

Again I want to refer as well, Mr. Speaker, to some of the points raised in the resolution with regard to the development of smaller industries in Labrador and in Newfoundland. When we think of Labrador, naturally we think of iron ore and we think of steel. The position of the markets today with regard to steel is very soft. In Japan today the shipping industry is one-seventh of what it was in 1974. There are new iron ore mines now coming on the market from Brazil, from Australia and from Indonesia and all this is having an effect on the markets from Labrador. The new iron ore development in Indonesia, it is said they have the most modern and technical equipment that is available but their rate of pay there is seventy cents an hour, and the movement that is possible by these ores with the cheapness of bulk cargo carriers I am sure members can readily see the competition there is on the world's market today for these products. Norway and Sweden have had a

MR. E. DAVE: traditional market in Central European countries, and they are finding this competition today, inasmuch as a lot of their mills are closing down, and they say they cannot compete with iron ore today that can be brought from Brazil and from Australia. All of that I am sure hon. members will realize if we just look at the map and we see Brazil in relation to the Eastern Seaboard of the United States, ice-free ports, then they have the Panama Canal just to go through from the Western side of the United States and then you will see Australia in relation to Japan, the second largest producer of steel in the world today.

This position, Mr. Speaker, will affect us here in Newfoundland and Labrador. I want to refer to briefly as well the position of the aluminum industry.

MR. DAWE: The hon. the Premier now as I understand is over in Norway trying to negotiate an aluminum industry for Newfoundland. I recall that twenty years ago Mr. Smallwood tried to encourage Kaiser Aluminum to Newfoundland and Labrador utilizing cheap Labrador power. He has not been successful. And I am saying now that the Premier is going to have it very difficult in encouraging an aluminum industry to Newfoundland today. What is taking place, there is cheap electrical power already installed at these aluminum plants. The capital costs have been written off. And what they are doing, there is a normal increase of five per cent of aluminum required in the year based on the annual growth, five per cent. And how this is being supplied, Mr. Chairman, is not by new plants but by increasing the efficiency of the present plants already installed. They are doing that by computerizing the operations and by new technology, particularly in the blast furnaces, and they see that they can do this with their present installations. The reason they are doing this is because it now costs \$2,000 per ton of capital investment to produce one ton of aluminum as compared to a figure of less than \$500 five years ago per ton of capital investment. There are new aluminum plants going ahead now in the states of Oregon and South Carolina, \$800 million. But this, as they say, is quite a gamble. But the longterm prospects, the aluminum producers are indeed looking to Brazil and Australia, which have plentiful supplies of cheap power and bauxite, as places where to expand production in the years ahead.

Now here is the position, Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves in in Newfoundland: To have large development we have to compete with world markets, the steel industry is soft, there has never been a successful woods operation in Labrador. I do not know why, Bowaters tried it several years ago and had to pull out -

AN EON MEMBER: J.O. Williams tried it.

MR. DAWE: J.O. Williams tried it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Do you know Capt. Esau Reynolds, Bishop's Cove?

MR. DAWE: No, I do not know them.

MR. LUNDRIKAN: You did not know him they had one in (Inaudible) for two years and it could not succeed either.

MR. DAWE: So, Mr. Chairman, the only possible way I could see that wood could be supplied, say, from Labrador to the Linerboard mill at Stephenville would be to chip the wood in Labrador. The wood should be just as cheap or cheaper to harvest. It is my understanding that it is one third per cent more dense than the wood found on Labrador, naturally the more dense it is the more end product you get, and increase the carrying capacity of the vessel. And I have given some thought to it and I see that if the wood were, chipped, say at dock site in Happy Valley and then loaded again on this self-unloader as I mentioned here a few minutes ago, she could load this wood by conveyor belt in Happy Valley, this chipped wood, and then bring it to Stephenville and unload it in a similar way as I mentioned, she could load and discharge in one day.

MR. DAWE:

And based on our experience, we have had this boat several times, based on the product we were involved in and the cost of freight, I will say that you could move those chips from Happy Valley-Goose Bay to Stephenville for not more than \$5.00 per ton. That is what the freight rate should be. The carrying capacity of such a boat of 30,000 tons would be about 18,000 tons dead weight. The volume and the size of the ship would not permit her to carry the full 30,000 tons dead weight. But she should make that round trip in five days and, as I say, based on our experience she should bring that up in the chip form for \$5.00 per ton.

So, there are a few things that I like to bring before the House, Mr. Speaker. And there is another concept that we should not lose sight of; the Japanese have a new conception in that they have complete, floatable, producing plants. That is paper mills, you can have a steel mill, you can have four or five, several mills. And they have built one actually in Japan and it is now on its way to the Amazon River in Brazil. These can be made to float or they can be made to come to the site and be anchored. And they produce 700 tons a day, this new mill they have, and that can be brought down, say, to Happy Valley for six months and put to work down there and when the ice conditions prevent it, move it up to the Southern part of Newfoundland and back again in six months. They have them that can float or they can have them that can be put in permanent positions. They are making them now. There is one on the way now to Brazil. There are six other countries getting into this. They are cheaper. They are more or less, I suppose, prefab, assembly line production.

MR. DAWE:

The on site production is much cheaper and they are very economical. And this, I guess, is the thing of the future with these processing plants, moveable, floating, self-contained units.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much more time I have. I want to just refer briefly to what I think our relationship should be with Labrador. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that due to the geographical position and the ice conditions that will always be present at Labrador it is going to be very, very difficult in having Port Labrador developed. The main reason for this is, number one, you would need constant ice breaker service, and this is most unreliable. Anyone who has been in the shipping business will know this is most unreliable. You would not get a ship to go to Labrador in the Wintertime only at a most excessive rate, mainly because of the insurance factor. The insurance factor, Mr. Speaker, would be the most compelling reason why you will not see a port developed at Labrador.

We all know the position of these bulk super carriers of oil. They built two or three up to 500,000 tons and they were predicting they were going to build them up to one million tons. They have had a complete cutback on these type of ships. And the main reason is not the cheapness in moving the oil from A to B but because of the insurance premium involved, the risk. There is so much contained in such a package, environmental risk, the risk of the oil, the risk of loss is so great that the insurance premium is so high that these ships now are not practical because of the insurance rate. The same thing would apply to putting a ship in the ice in Labrador.

Mr. Dawe: We had the occasion to try to bring a boat to Corner Brook this last Winter. When we came as far North as Halifax that ship carried the going rate, the world rate. When she came North of Halifax as far as Port aux Basques the insurance rate went up 50 per cent. To move her then possibly on to Corner Brook, the insurance premium they wanted was doubled to such an extent that the freight carried by that boat was actually doubled; to bring from the South through Halifax then to Corner Brook was doubled to what you could bring it to Halifax because of the insurance and, number two, they want an ice clause. If that ship got stuck in the ice they wanted it immediately to go on demurrage. And this is the problem you have trying to navigate a port on the Labrador.

The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is nodding. This makes it so much more difficult, when you have to compete against world markets, ice-free ports all the year round to move these ships down there in the Wintertime. The most, I would say, you could have - I am sure the Speaker is certainly familiar with what I am saying, that the most you could have is an open free seaport six or seven months of the year.

That is not speaking against this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I would just point out to the House while it is a good resolution there is no timetable set to it. But it is something that is not going to happen overnight, and there are many, many difficulties before we see a large scale development as we would like to see it on the Labrador.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my good friend and colleague opposite for what I think was an excellent speech, both in content and delivery. He has obviously a lot of experience in the commercial life of Labrador, of course, and some of the problems that are encountered by people who are doing business certainly on the Coast of Labrador.

Mr. W. Carter: Mr. Speaker, when you talk about development in Labrador, of course, one of the most important things to come to mind would be the fishing potential of the area. We believe, on this side of the House and I am sure this view is shared by my friends opposite, that the fishing industry does have a lot of potential in Labrador. Of course, with that in mind the Department of Fisheries over the past three years have spent upwards of \$2.5 million-or at least \$1.5 million constructing and upgrading marine facilities on the Coast of Labrador stretching from L'Anse-au-Clair in the South to Cartwright in the North.

We are now responsible, Mr. Speaker, for the operation of approximately twenty facilities on the Labrador Coast ranging from small slipways to large and sophisticated and expensive marine service centres, one of which, of course, was constructed last year on the Southern part of Labrador at a cost of \$400,000. Mr. Speaker, like I said the fishing industry is very important to the future social and economic development of that part of our Province.

Recently we had the pleasure of meeting the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, a large delegation representing the Council came to the city and met with the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet at which time they presented to us their annual brief and of course, spent a couple of hours or more going through the various items mentioned in their brief, and questioned the various Resource Ministers on our respective plans for their area.

One of the big concerns, Mr. Speaker, expressed by the Advisory Council

MR. W. CARTER: delegation was the condition of the resource, some reservations with respect to the continuation of fishing on the Hamilton Banks, and what if any effect that would have on the availability of the resource for people living in Northern Labrador. It is rather amusing, Mr. Speaker, in their report they appeared to have put their complete faith in the Ottawa bureaucracy, to the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, whom they think is primarily concerned with the conservation and management of the resource on the Hamilton Banks. Of course that makes the people from the Advisory Council very happy because they say it will ensure continuity of supply for fish with respect to their inshore fishery.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few myths that I think we should deal with at this point in time, one that certainly concerns for and knowledge of the importance of the Hamilton Banks fish stocks that no one group, and certainly the Ottawa people, do not have a monopoly on interest in, like I said, or knowledge of that resource and its importance to the Labrador fishery. In fact it is rather ironic that they would express their pleasure with respect to the attitude of Ottawa with respect to the conservation and management of that resource and in the report, and this is public knowledge, express some reservations as to the attitude of the Province when in fact the people in Ottawa, I suppose, more than any other group - in fact they are responsible for fishing in that area and in 1978 for allowing 500 ships to fish in the Northern areas including the Hamilton Banks, ships that were licensed by the Federal Governments and given quotas by the Federal Governments, in fact quotas that are in excess of 50,000 metric tons without regard for the need to have that fish landed in our Province and processed in our plants for the benefit of our people.

So if there is any plundering taking place on the Hamilton Banks, or if the stocks there are being endangered, or if there are any impediments to the replenishing of that stock, well then I think

MR. W. CARTER: that they must start pointing the finger where they should point it and that is at the Ottawa level, because the Province, as hon. members know, we are not responsible for establishing quotas. Indeed we do not have the scientific capability to repute the information on which the quotas are established, and that being the case of course we must rely on the advice being given the Federal politicians and Federal bureaucrats by their experts.

Mr. Speaker, we have expressed our concern to Ottawa with respect to fishing on the Hamilton Banks. We have expressed the view that quotas should be kept at a minimum in that area and in fact we are on record, indeed there is a telegram that I sent to the minister some months ago, or at least last year, which was tabled in this House wherein we offered to support the Federal Governments if and when they should see fit to impose a ban of all foreign fishing effort on the Hamilton Banks and certainly in other areas known as the Northern Waters. But one would think, Mr. Speaker, having listened to members opposite, certain editorial writers and others that Ottawa in fact has a monopoly on interest in and concern for the Hamilton Banks cod stocks when in fact that is anything but the truth. In fact quite the opposite is true. We as a government are

MR. W. CARTER: very concerned with respect to the Hamilton Banks cod stocks, we are very concerned with respect to the effect that the continuation of fishing in that area will have on the inshore fishery, and to that end we have expressed our views to Ottawa and, as I said a moment ago, offered to support them if, in fact, they should see fit to impose a ban on fishing in that area.

Mr. Speaker, it appears in the Province, in certain areas, that the Province is always at loggerheads with Ottawa, that I am always at loggerheads with my federal counterpart. Of course, some people will go as far as to say that that kind of an attitude on the part of the Province is hurting the fishing industry, in fact hurting the Province in our desperate need to develop, especially to develop the fishing industry.

Mr. Speaker, if these people want to believe that, well then, so be it. But certainly, as far as I am concerned I have no apology to make for my attitude towards certain policies of the Ottawa government, the federal government. I believe that there are times in this Province when we must be Newfoundlanders first and maybe Canadians second. I do not believe that in some areas, particularly in the matter of fisheries development, that we can in all honesty serve two masters. There are times when I believe we must take a stand for our Province, we must take a stand for our fishermen, and we must have the courage of our convictions and take a stand for the things that we believe are best suited for the development of our fishing industry and for the welfare of our fishermen.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday interjected a few words when I was answering a question. When I said that slipways, for example, were, in fact, the responsibility of the federal government, I believe he said I was becoming - I had an Ottawa phobia.

MR. W. CARTER:

Well, I should inform the hon. member that I have a Newfoundland phobia. And when I have to make a decision between appeasing Ottawa bureaucrats, or Ottawa politicians as opposed to doing what I believe to be in the best interest of our own Province and our own fishermen, that then is not a very difficult decision for me to make.

Mr. Speaker, I can say this, that certainly while it may appear at times that politics come into play, certainly I am satisfied, as far as I am personally concerned, that that is not the case and that I have very little concern as to what party is governing in Ottawa insofar as the fishing industry is concerned. I would not care if my eighty year old mother were Prime Minister of Canada, or Minister of Fisheries, if I saw the need to take an opposing view, or to fight for what I believe is in the best interest of our people, well then, so be it. But there is a certain train of thought in this Province that if one dares say anything that might have the effect of offending Uncle Ottawa, that it is tantamount to treason almost, it is subversive. That attitude, Mr. Speaker, does very little to give us the kind of an image that I think we should have in the nation's capital.

It is no wonder that in many areas, and I can speak from first-hand experience on this, in many areas Newfoundlanders are not being accorded the courtesy and the consideration that we deserve as Canadians, that in many areas we are being treated like second-class citizens, in many areas we are being laughed at. I contend that in that respect maybe we are the authors of our own misfortune in that sometimes we are too inclined to kowtow to the Ottawa bureaucrats, to compromise ourselves and not have the courage of our convictions in pushing the things that we believe are important to our people. But as I said before, there are times in this Province

MR. W. CARTER:

welfare of our people, certainly the welfare of our fishermen. Like I said, I do not believe that—at least there are times when it is impossible to serve two masters.

The 200 mile limit, Mr. Speaker, will of course have tremendous benefits for the fishermen of Labrador as indeed it will have for the fishermen in the country generally. Well let us go back a couple of years and let us talk about the 200 mile limit declaration. It is rather amusing to see people who are now taking full credit for what is happening, people who in my view have succeeded in hookwinking, to a certain extent, the fishermen of our Province. If one were to read the Hansards going back in the House of Commons, say, to 1972 and 1973 I am afraid they would get quite a different opinion as to exactly how these people feel about the 200 mile limit and exactly what their positions were at that time.

My hon. colleague from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) mentioned one gentleman, Mitchell Sharp, who is now, I believe, still a member of parliament, a privy councillor, sitting on the treasury benches in the House of Commons, former Deputy Prime Minister, one time Secretary of State for External Affairs, Minister of Finance, President of the Treasury Board, Mitchell Sharp, and this is no secret, made a statement to the effect and this can be substantiated by checking Hansard, that the fishing industry in Eastern Canada, especially in Newfoundland, represented poverty, it should be abolished. That is on public record, that kind of a statement made, I believe, back in the late 1960's or early 1970's. The

MR. W. CARTER:

present minister in Ottawa who succeeded in building up what I consider to be a pretty good image in this Province - I am not saying it is deserved - that hon. gentleman-and I have proof of this in my home from Hansard - is on public record in the House of Commons as expressing some, indeed not some but quite a lot of concern with respect to the pressure being applied on him and his associates in the Cabinet by Newfoundlanders for the declaration of a 200 mile limit. That gentleman is on record as telling the House of Commons, and through the House the people of Canada, that it was totally impractical to talk about unilaterally declaring a 200 mile limit.

Other gentlemen who are now pounding their chests and taking credit for what is happening are on record as well stating that the 200 mile limit was totally impractical, would not work and, in fact, the Prime Minister went as far as to state that if we were to impose unilaterally a 200 mile limit that we might very well be guilty of helping to touch off a third war because he said that countries with traditional fishing rights within our 200 mile limit would not stand by and allow Canada to unilaterally kick them out. And he said that it might very well be the means of touching off a third world war. That of course was a ridiculous statement but I cite it, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the length to which these gentlemen went five years ago to discredit anybody and indeed everybody who dared suggest that a 200 mile limit should be declared.

I give full credit for the declaration of the 200 mile limit to the people of Newfoundland because it was in Newfoundland that the fight for the declaration of the 200 mile limit was started. It was led by Newfoundlanders. It was supported by Newfoundlanders.

April 26, 1978

Tape 1480

IB-3

MR. W. CARTER:

More than any other province Newfoundlanders supported the concept of the 200 mile declaration and without that kind of support, without that kind of organized effort on the part of the Newfoundland people, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we would still be moaning and groaning over a dying fishery and listening to certain Ottawa politicians and bureaucrats bemoaning

MR. W. CARTER: the fact that certain people would have the audacity to suggest that there be a 200 mile limit declared. So the 200 mile limit, Mr. Speaker, just did not happen. It did not happen by accident. It happened because a lot of people, including the Newfoundlanders, certain Newfoundlanders in the House of Commons at the time, forced the issue, made it too uncomfortable for the then Minister of Fisheries, Jack Davis and others, to remain silent on the matter. So certainly I think we should give our own people full credit for that.

Mr. Speaker, that being the case then I believe, I am parochial enough to believe, that as Newfoundlanders we have special rights to that fish. It might not be enshrined in the Terms of Union or in the Canadian Constitution, but I believe that Newfoundlanders do have certain preferential rights to that resource. If one were to look at the map of Canada you do not need to be a genius to see that without Newfoundland Canada today would not have an Eastern Continental Shelf, certainly nothing worth talking about. Eighty per cent, I am told, of the Eastern Canadian Continental Shelf on which this great resource now lives was brought to Confederation by Newfoundland in 1949. Therefore I believe that certainly in the case of the Hamilton Banks and certain parts of the Grand Banks that we do have, well, maybe not legal priority or preferential rights but certainly I think that we do have certain moral rights to that fish or preferential rights to that fish. That is why I contend, and this is what I have been saying now for the past six or seven years, that Newfoundlanders must be given the right to have a greater say in how that industry is going to be developed. We must be given a right to have a greater say and have more input into the future plans of the social and economic development of our Province insofar as the fishing industry is concerned. We must be given a chance to have certain input into the overall planning and to some extent, certainly to a larger extent, to be the architects of our own destiny and under the present system, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case.

Unfortunately most decisions are still made in Ottawa

MR. W. CARTER: by the upper Canadian oriented politicians and bureaucrats sitting in their ivory towers making decisions almost daily that will have the effect of determining to a large extent the future social and economic development of this Province and the future well-being of our people in generations unborn. That, Mr. Speaker, is the sort of thing that I believe in, that I stand for, and that is the basis of my argument, if you want to call it that, or my discontent with the Ottawa attitude and I make no apology for it. And I serve notice now that as long as that kind of attitude exist in Ottawa with respect to Newfoundland, as long as the Ottawa bureaucrats and others are going to continue to treat our people like somewhat less than first-class citizens, as long as they try to impose their wills and wishes on us, well then I believe that we must resist that kind of an attitude on their part. And like I said, one would think from reading certain editorials in certain newspapers in the Province, columns written by certain columnists, that to talk back to Ottawa is tantamount to being responsible for cutting off next month's family allowance cheques, veterans' pension cheques or their contribution to the Canada Assistance Plan.

Well what a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker! What a sad commentary on a proud people, people who have stood alone, pretty well, on this rock for the past 400 years, longer than any other province we retained our independence and were the last province in Canada to seek shelter under Confederation.

MR. W. CARTER: I think we must be very proud of that fact, and certainly I think it should give all of us the strength that I feel we will need to let it be known to Ottawa in no uncertain terms that we do have certain rights, that we are a proud people and, in fact, we insist that in matters pertaining to the development of this Province that we are going to have a say one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, the plans for the development of the Labrador fishery are progressing; substantial amounts of money will be spent in Labrador during the present fiscal year. Last year a lot of money was spent in Labrador providing Marine Service Centers, community stages, slipways, ice making machines, for example, other fish handling facilities, stretching the entire coast, like I said, from the Southern part of Labrador to say Cartwright in the North.

Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Fisheries we are now looking at the possibility of acquiring from the Department of Rural Development plants, fish handling facilities at Hopedale, Makkovik and Nain. And I want to make this abundantly clear now that before any attempt is made by the Department of Fisheries to acquire ownership from the department of my colleague the Minister of Rural Development that there will be ample consultation with the fishermen of Labrador and others to insure that their views are known and that their wishes are respected. Certainly it is not our intention to unilaterally take over these plants, arbitrarily take them over without consultation with the people that will be affected and without any concern at all for their wishes or their hopes and aspirations. So I repeat; before any attempt is made to execute that order, to acquire the three plants in the three communities that I have mentioned there will be ample consultation with the people that will be affected.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is about all that I have to say on this matter, but again I repeat, the fishing industry on the Labrador coasts is alive and well; new interest is generating in the area; new facilities are being built by the Department of Fisheries

MR. W. CARTER: and others and I believe that given time and with the kind of attitude that is now emerging in that part of Newfoundland, the new interest, the new spirit that is developing, that within a few short years the industry will be back to where it was years ago when a lot of our fathers and grandfathers fished from their schooners off the Labrador Coast and from facilities on shore.

So certainly, Mr. Speaker, anything that can be done in so far as fish development is concerned to enable the fisherman to better himself, to improve his chances to make a decent living for himself and his family, will be done. Thank you, very much.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the amendment; it is not an amendment that I can support unfortunately.

MR. J. CARTER: Why not?

MR. SIMMONS: I will give the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) my reasons. They are the kind of reasons he can subscribe to but for some other strange set of reasons he has aligned himself with this diabolical amendment. It does not jibe with his normal actions in this House, very disappointed on the subject -

MR. J. CARTER: Wait until I speak.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, he is indicating that he might vote against the amendment. Well I am not sure if that is the best news or the worst news we have heard today, Mr. Speaker, but it is certainly news.

MR. W. FOWE: They are trying to get out from under over there.

MR. J. CARTER: When I speak I will say something.

MR. SIMMONS: Very well, we will wait and hear what the member has to say. If he wants to know why it is that I cannot support the amendment I am coming to that as quickly as I can as a matter of fact. I am puzzled, Mr. Speaker, as to why the amendment was necessary at all because I listened with some interest to the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau), the Minister of Manpower, when he spoke in the debate before the amendment was introduced, and without paraphrasing him too much I got the net impression that he was fairly happy with the resolution. I heard him speak subsequently to the amendment and I get the impression

April 26, 1978

Tape No. 1482

AH-3

MR. SIMMONS: from him that he is going to vote for the amendment. Now what is the amendment? Well it it to remove certain words - not allegations, not words which together make an allegation or make an assumption which is not necessarily proven in fact or state an opinion, it is none of these -

Mr. Simmons: the amendment would remove certain words which are factual in every respect. There is no question about that. And one of the first things that we have to accept as mature adults is that we might not like all the facts all of time, but they are facts nevertheless. You might not like the fact that it is raining on a given day, but that does not make the rain stop; it still rains even though you do not like it, it is still a fact that it is raining.

And it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, as the preamble says, that a national convention of a national federal party made a decision. And that is all of the whereases, that a national party meeting in convention made a decision. That is the fact. It is just as simple as if I said it were raining. Just as factual if I inform you that it is daylight outside. It is a fact.

So why then, Mr. Speaker, why does the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), why does the member for St. John's East, why does he get up and oppose, object to what is a clear unmistakable fact?

MR. LUSH: A true fact, too.

MR. SIMMONS: Is it, Mr. Speaker, because it is not factual? That is not the reason obviously. Is it because it is inflammatory in some ways? Is that the reason? Is he against it because it is inflammatory? That it makes some kind of allegation or statement that he just cannot live with because of its inflammatory nature?

MR. J. CARTER: It is political.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is a political fact, but that does not mean that I want to wish that he does not exist. He is there. He is a political fact.

MR. J. CARTER: Plus it makes political statements.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, ha! Political statements. Political statements.

Is the member for St. John's East against it because it is inflammatory? No, Mr. Speaker, He is against it for one reason, and one reason only. He is against it, Mr. Speaker, he is against it

Mr. Simmons: because the fact of that whereas, the fact or the facts contain just do not jibe with his jaundiced,warped view of reality.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: That is it. That is it.

MR. MARSHALL: Is that parliamentary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. W. ROWE: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Simply put.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: It does not, Mr. Speaker, jibe with his jaundiced warped view of reality.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order. You know, I do not know why I get up - I very rarely get up on a point of order against the hon. gentleman because he is prone with these things, but it is late in the afternoon, and it is kind of hard to listen at the best of times, but I think words of that nature appear to be unparliamentary, and certainly are unnecessary, but understandable coming from the hon. gentleman -

MR. W. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: -coming from the hon.gentleman that is understandable.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. W. ROWE: Every time the hon. member gets up on a point of order is the wrong time, and that is when a statement of fact or opinion directed at himself,which he may not like,is made in this House, Mr. Speaker. To call someone's view of reality jaundiced and warped means that his view of reality is yellow and a little bit twisted. Now,I mean,what is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? It is a statement of opinion, it in no way imputes base motives. These words are not unparliamentary in themselves, in ^{se} so to speak. It is simply a statement of opinion, I would say fact, but a statement of opinion by my colleague directed towards the member for St. John's East, which has prompted him to rise on a point of order,again in a most

Mr. W. Rowe: irregular and improper fashion.

MR. MARSHALL: Further to the point of order, I will not put Your Honour to the test. I would really withdraw it. I think I have given the House a bit of relief from the hon. gentleman for a couple of minutes, so I have really served my purpose.

MR. W. ROWE: You have to have a ruling on it.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not really care, you see.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members are aware that there is a stipulation in the rules of procedure that offensive language should not be used, and that moderation in language, when hon. members' views are of a different of opinion and when there is this kind of confrontation, in that circumstance moderation of languages is required. A particular word here, a particular sentence there, is very difficult to make specific rulings on. What I will say, and certainly this governs generally, is that I think hon. members, all hon. members, should make a particular effort to avoid language which is offensive. I do not know if I can go any further with that.

The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you,

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I actually thought, Sir, I was being very moderate, that I was being descriptive. If I was descriptively offensive or offensively descriptive then I would certainly withdraw any offensiveness in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, apart from that, of course, I believe there was another motivation in moving the amendment, and if you would look at the next resolution on the Order Paper you would see what the motivation is. Government does not want to discuss Nordsee. It is the last thing in this world they want to have discussed and the longer they can put it off with amendments, contrived amendments, pseudo amendments, the longer they can put off the inevitable, they are going to do it. And I suspect when we deal with this amendment there will be another one to keep putting off the Nordsee debate as long as they can because they have not made up their minds on it over there. And that is the real reason, Mr. Speaker, we have an amendment. Let us not get caught up on what the words say or what words the amendment would delete. That is not the reason at all. The reason is simply to delay the inevitable debate, the inevitable facing up to the question of Nordsee. The longer they can put it off the more time that gives them to rally their forces— if that is possible. I predict that is beyond being possible over there judging by their difficulty to rally on other points.

But that is for another day, Mr. Speaker. It being six I would move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has moved the adjournment of the debate. It being six o'clock the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 P.M.