

Vol. 4

No. 8

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the Period

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

Thursday, February 15, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am pleased to welcome to the galleries a number of members of the Buchans Action Committee with their chairman, Mr. Don Head. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these ladies and gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 8th., 1979, Magistrate Joseph LeClair of the Provincial Court of Newfoundland in giving verbal reasons for his judgement in the case involving a fire which occurred at Elizabeth Towers, St. John's, April 26th., 1978, stated that confidential police reports prepared during the investigation into the Elizabeth Towers fire were unauthorizedly and improperly released to a person or persons, which reports were subsequently carried in the press. I expressed a view by way of a public statement on September 28th., 1978, that in my opinion the release of such reports and the statements which were contained in the press based on such reports at that time could prejudice the rights of a person or persons who might subsequently be charged as a result of such investigation. I was not aware at that time as to the person or persons who provided the press with such reports or who released same. The magistrate's findings dealt with the unauthorized release of the reports but made no findings on the subsequent distribution and publication of same. It is my opinion police reports arising out of any investigation into any suspected crime must never be made public other than through due process of law, namely, the laying of charges and the evidence which may be given in court subsequent thereto.

MR. HICKMAN:

To do otherwise would seriously affect the rights of every Newfoundlander and would cause **irreparable** damage to the administration of justice in this Province, something I am not prepared to see happen.

Government has, on my recommendation, decided to appoint a Royal Commission under the provisions of the Public Inquiries Act to thoroughly investigate and obtain evidence under oath concerning these unprecedented acts. The terms of reference will allow and ask the Commissioner to inquire into and report upon all facts and circumstances relating to or having any bearing upon the distribution and publication of the contents of the two confidential police reports in question, which reports are dated June 7th., 1978 and July 12th., 1978. The Commissioner is being asked to determine and report upon all persons involved in or connected with the release, transmission, duplication, delivery and publication of the contents of such report and to consider and report upon the justification, if any, for same.

The Commissioner will also inquire into and report upon the actions of any such person or persons involved in the release, transmission, duplication, delivery and publication of the reports. Further, the Commissioner will be asked to advise whether, in his opinion, legislation either by statute or by regulation should be enacted, if such statute or regulations are not presently in force, for the purpose of prescribing penalties for failure to maintain confidentiality of documents which are classified by the Crown as confidential. The Commissioner will be also asked to recommend what penalties or sanctions should be imposed on police officers or any other persons in the public service who have breached such confidentiality and any persons other than public servants who have participated in same.

I hope to be in a position to make public the name of the member of one of our courts who will

MR. HICKMAN: be the Commissioner at the earliest opportunity in the hope that this inquiry can be conducted thoroughly and without undue delay. I am sure all Newfoundlanders will agree it is absolutely essential to the efficient and fair administration of justice in this Province that all of these matters be dealt with by a totally unbiassed and competent person. This will be done.

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, just a few brief remarks in response to the hon. House Leader's statement about the Royal Commission of Enquiry into a leakage of certain documents. We on this side welcome that, and if there can be any legislative provisions which can stop members of the public service or the police department from leaking things in the future, if that is deemed necessary, we welcome that as well.

But, Sir, I should add that the people of this Province should not allow themselves to be fooled by any attempt by the government or anyone else to drag what might be characterized as a red herring across some other very important matters confronting this Province.

Point number one, while welcoming this Commission of Enquiry I would also ask the Minister of Justice if he is going to institute a Commission of Enquiry or a Magisterial Enquiry into the cause of a fire at Elizabeth Towers which could have lost the lives of 150 people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: - back last April, which at the present time the cause of which is completely unknown to the people of this Province and there is a great deal of public unrest, not least of all among the residents of that institution, that building, and among the people at large as to how that fire was started, accidental or otherwise. And I hope that the hon. Minister of Justice will appoint a royal commission or a magisterial enquiry to look into the cause of the fire.

Now, Sir, probably even more important than the cause of the fire at Elizabeth Towers, I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice whether he intends to appoint a commission of enquiry into the statements made by Magistrate LeClair concerning the state of the fire investigation service of the government in this Province. A couple of years ago the hon. minister stood up proudly and appointed Fire Commissioner Cardoullis as the Fire Commissioner of this Province and his appointment was applauded by both sides of this House - a very respected gentleman, a man who has

Mr. W. N. Rowe: the respect of everybody, I believe, who has ever worked with him. And now we find that a magistrate, whose views must also be listened to, has come out and said that he is not competent to investigate fires in this Province, and in fact there is nobody competent to investigate fires in this Province in order to determine the cause. That has caused a great deal of public unrest and anxiety

MR. W. POWE: In the Province and I would ask the minister if he is going to conduct a public enquiry into that aspect of the justice system of the Province. Because, Sir, I understand, not to mention the number of people who have already gone to jail on the evidence given in court in arson cases in this Province, not to even mention those at all and the questions that arise about that, I also understand that there is a great deal of concern among those people in the CID and the fire department who may be required to investigate future fires which occur at the rate of eighty or one hundred per year in the city or the environs of the city. It is going to be great difficulty in obtaining the services of anyone within this Province to investigate fires for fear that their reputation as fire investigators will be ruined, their evidence thrown out, their characters as fire investigators brought down low, so to speak, and that we are not likely to get the kind of competent fire investigation which we have had in the past because of the problems which have arisen. And, if the Minister of Justice, Sir, does not appoint a magisterial enquiry into the cause of the fire at Elizabeth Towers, and if he does not appoint a commission of enquiry into the state of fire investigation into this Province, then his statement made a moment ago can only be construed by this House and by the people of this Province as one gigantic red herring dragged across the issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must point out to the hon. gentleman that he may not debate the matters referred to in the Ministerial Statement. He may make comment or ask for explanation but may not enter into debate at this time.

MR. W. ROWE:

I finally conclude, Sir, by just saying that I would hope that the minister takes his responsibility as Minister of Justice and <sup>as</sup> Deputy Premier seriously enough to enquire into these very, very important matters. A fire which could have killed or injured one hundred and fifty people in this city and

MR. W. ROWE: the state of the fire investigative services of the police and the fire department in this Province, that is far more important, Sir, at this time than trying to determine the effect of the leakage of any document, confidential or otherwise. It is far more important, and if the minister does not take action it can only be construed as a political action on his part and an attempt to try and cover up the real issues involved.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker,



MR. CALLAN: I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 210 residents of Markland. The prayer of the petition reads as follows: "We, the undersigned residents of Markland, do hereby petition the hon. House of Assembly now in session to hear the prayer of the petition regarding the deplorable road conditions in our community.

"For the past number of years we have been looking for improvements to our roads but these improvements have not been made. The road through our community is in bad condition all the year round but is especially bad during the Springtime.

"We are requesting that government make monies available for reconstruction this year." Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. "We are requesting that government make monies available for reconstruction this year and, hopefully, pavement in a year or two when the reconstruction is finished."

Mr. Speaker, that is the prayer. The residents of Markland, some of whom are here today, who came in and protested their bad road conditions downstairs and are presently in the galleries, some of the residents from that community are here now. They are asking that the road through their community - which is not a dead end road, Mr. Speaker, it goes right on through Markland right over to Colinet, over to St. Mary's The Capes - and they are asking, Mr. Speaker, that monies be made available to provide some reconstruction. The people in Markland, Mr. Speaker, were successful in getting a couple of letters from which I have taken notes, a letter from the local doctor at the Markland hospital and a letter from the clergy, and I took a couple of notes from these letters, Mr. Speaker, which I jotted down: "I, as the United Church minister serving this

MR. CALLAN: community, join with the residents in respectfully requesting the Newfoundland Government to do their utmost to solve this most vexing problem" - concerning the road, of course. And then another quotation

MR. CALLAN: taken from a letter, "The majority of the residents are unable to drive their cars over the road. Only those with trucks and four wheel drive vehicles are sufficiently adventurous to attempt passage." Another quote, "Under such atrocious and Medieval conditions, I shudder to think of the tragedy that might result should an emergency arise and the services of an ambulance or fire engine be required." Just a couple of quotes from a couple of letters, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this House of Assembly nearly four years ago now, I had the duty and the pleasure and the privilege of presenting a petition in this hon. House of Assembly on behalf of these very same residents and asking for much the same thing, improvements to their road. And the only improvements that will satisfy the people, and the only improvements that will satisfy the road conditions, Mr. Speaker, is reconstruction. The maintenance crew located at Whibourne are not capable, they do not have the equipment, and they are not capable of maintaining this road. The road needs to be reconstructed to Codroy and the bog needs to be taken out and a reconstruction job.

Mr. Speaker, part of this road was reconstructed in '74-'75 and there was a great deal of hope that in 1975 that at least half of the road would be paved. It was made ready for paving. It has deteriorated since, of course. You cannot put pavement on what is there now. But in '75 it was made ready for pavement and many residents of that community have said to me, "We were supposed to get pavement in '75," which, by the way, was an election year. The election was held in September. What happened to it? And I have asked questions and from what I can find out, Mr. Speaker, the pavements that these residents were supposed to get in '75 went to another district, a district that the PC Party had

MR. CALLAN: not written off as a lost seat, which they had done with Bellevue. They knew that the district of Bellevue was written off. They cut off all the PC sections and left Bellevue the big district in between all the others.

MR. NEARY: It will not be long now.

MR. CALLAN: So they spent their money where they thought they had a chance of electing a PC member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. gentleman that he confine his remarks to the prayer of the petition rather than debating on possible motives.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I went down to meet the delegation downstairs, some of the ladies there said that they had the opportunity to speak to the Premier, the present Premier, and the Premier said he did not hear anything about the road. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in this Province who has not heard about Markland road, I am sure of that. There is nobody in the Province! Two ladies told me that they had spoke to the Premier in that community two years ago. Obviously he must have known about the road. Mr. Speaker, I have a minute left. Mr. Speaker, in the five minutes that I am allowed - only five minutes I am allowed under the rules of the House - I cannot say very much - I could say an awful lot. But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister of Transportation and Communications stands in his place that he will stand to support this petition and not make flimsy excuses about, "The Budget is not brought down for this year" and so on. The minister, Mr. Speaker, has set a precedent, he has done that with the infamous Monkstown story. He has done. After that story was aired on CBC television, the infamous story -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must call to the hon. gentleman's attention the same point I did make to the previous speaker. Matters must be relevant to the petition and he must stick to the prayer of the petition.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, when the minister stands in his place, I hope that the minister will have something concrete, something good to say to the people who are listening in the galleries. Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition I ask that the petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates. Thank you.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Thank you, Sir. I see my hon. colleagues are eager to support this petition as well, and well they should be eager, Mr. Speaker. The road in Markland referred to by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is, as has been reported to me - I have not been over it in recent weeks - but as reported to me is in a very, very deplorable condition. And, Sir, if

Mr. W. N. Rowe: it is symptomatic of the gravel road conditions and even the paved road conditions throughout this Province, it is in very bad condition indeed.

Before dealing with that, Sir, let me first of all congratulate the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) district. No other member in this House, Sir, has done more to try to bring forward in this House, in this public forum, the conditions of his district, especially as they relate to the road conditions. Scarcely a day has gone by in the couple of years that I have rejoined the House since becoming Leader of the Opposition that that hon. member has not been on his feet in a very vehement way expressing the needs for improved road conditioning, upgrading of its roads, and paving of the roads in his district, in common with many other members, but no member has done more than him to try to bring the needs of his district to the attention of this hon. House and the Minister of Transportation in particular.

I do not know what is happening to the roads, Mr. Speaker, around the Province but it will not be long before the gravel roads, the dirt roads particularly, are going to be absolutely unpassable, no longer passable for vehicles or any other kind of traffic. Every time you turn on the news you hear about mothers out picketing roads, Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the traffic from going over them, in order to keep school buses from going over the dirt roads, because not only are they in uncomfortably bad condition but in many cases are actually unsafe for school buses carrying school children to go over. And we have all heard the outcry in the last number of weeks concerning some of the conditions which attach to the transportation of school children.

Well, here is one thing the government can do; the government can make sure that the roads over which they have to go for their education are in some kind of a decent condition, a decent passable condition so that at least that safety aspect will be removed.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition wholeheartedly. I think the Minister of Transportation should rise to his feet now and assure the hon. member and the residents of his district who are in the

Mr. W. N. Rowe: galleries today and have been downstairs demonstrating, he should assure them that as soon as weather conditions permit this road will be upgraded to a suitable standard, and certainly maintained now at a standard which makes it a decent road, a passable road, a road which is safe and comfortable for all traffic, especially school children, especially people who have to use the road out of economic necessity to commute back and forth to their places of work.

I congratulate the member, Sir, for the work he has been doing, publicly and privately, on behalf of his district, trying to get decent road conditions. And I do hope the Minister of Transportation will get up now and assure the people concerned that something will be done now and as soon as the construction season starts.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister of Transportation, Sir, wishes to support this petition and tell the people who are sitting in the gallery from Markland what he is going to do with this road in the way of reconstructing and paving this road, I will gladly yield to the hon. gentleman. Well obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not intend to make a statement today.

Sir, first of all, I want to join with my colleague in congratulating the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) for bringing the needs, and the real wants and needs of his constituents before this House. I also, Sir, want to congratulate the people from Markland and surrounding area who came in today in the middle of winter, who were driven to desperation, came in and had a peaceful demonstration in Confederation Building.

MR. CALLAN: Seventy-five dollars to hire a bus.

MR. NEARY: It is seventy-five dollars, I am told, to hire a bus to come in, Sir, came in at their own expense, and unfortunately we were meeting downstairs and I did not have an opportunity to get down and meet the people personally, but I want to congratulate them, Sir, on the orderly fashion and the democratic way in which they carried out this very peaceful demonstration to try to impress upon the administration the need to do something with their road. It is not the first time, Mr. Speaker,



Mr. Neary: as Your Honour will remember, I believe Your Honour when he was Leader of the Opposition, and since Your Honour became Speaker that we have heard the case of the Markland road pleaded in this hon. House. I have heard it on at least ten occasions, ten different occasions myself, and the only conclusion that I can

MR. NEARY:

come to, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Markland and vicinity must be wonderful people, they must be a very patient people, they must be a very tolerant people to put up with the condition of that road and to put up with conditions that they have been forced to tolerate over the years. Mr. Speaker, if that road to Markland led to a fishing river, a salmon river, or if that road led to a good place for shooting partridge, or hunting, it would have been upgraded and paved long ago. Or, Sir, if some big shot had a summer cottage at the end of that road it would have been paved long ago.

MR. CALLAN: That is where the pavement went.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir, that is where their pavement went.

MR. CALLAN: Right.

MR. NEARY: And here you have a situation, Sir, where we saw this administration especially pave roads to people's summer homes and summer cottages and they cannot even get an ambulance over the road. If you go down there now you need an all-terrain vehicle to get over that road.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would point out to the hon. gentleman the same rule which was applicable to his colleague is actually applicable to him as well, the necessity of avoiding debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to restrain yourself, to stop yourself from getting carried away, because we have heard of the Markland road so often in this hon. House. Where now are all the leadership hopefuls? Let them get up and tell the people of Markland what they are going to do if they get the opportunity to serve the people of this Province. What will they do about this road? Mr. Speaker, let us not just hear comment from this side of the House; then it looks

MR. NEARY: like partisan politics, it looks like we are getting a little political mileage, getting some political Brownie points when in actual fact, Sir, we are not. And I can tell my colleagues right now that if we form the government, whenever the election is called, that I guarantee you this - and Markland is not in my district, and I know a lot of people down that way, Sir, and I sympathize with them - and I guarantee you that road will be reconstructed, upgraded and paved, and I make that as a commitment of the Liberal Party, Sir, if and when we get the opportunity to form the next government of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's West followed by the hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, time after time in this Legislature we have heard the very important case of the Markland road. The case has been presented here, and it has been presented well, why Markland needs this road upgraded. Every morning people leave Markland to go to work in the ERCO plant, take their cars, trucks and drive over this road. In the Spring it is a terrible road to drive over, in the Fall it is a terrible road to drive over, in the Winter it is a terrible road to drive over. The only time it is a good road to drive over, reasonably good, is in the middle of the Summer and then it is dusty.

This is an important farming area of Newfoundland, one of the original farming areas that were established; vegetables are grown. People should be going to Markland to pick up their vegetables and to go back to buy and to sell, and that requires a good road, hopefully one with paving. The school buses go over that road. Children go over it every day, or try to get over it.

DR. KITCHEN: There have been times when the bus has not been able to get over the road. Ambulances have been mentioned. It is a through road to Colinet. This is an important road for this Province. It is an important road in the area. It is vital that this road be passable. And it is not that this need has not been recognized in this House, because we have had commitments from the government to have this road paved. The hon. the Minister of Tourism, who was the penultimate or the antepenultimate, he was the Minister of Transportation a long time ago, but when the present Minister of Tourism was in Transportation I wrote him a letter on the Markland road and he responded saying that it would be upgraded and paved shortly. Now of course he was whipped out of that portfolio and they got another guy in and now they have another one in. Part of the problem is this musical chair game that is being played where one minister does not know the commitments of the other.

I might mention this. I was looking through some old papers the other day and I came across the Bellevue election material, and I came across the election material published by the Progressive Conservative candidate, Mr. Speaker, who was Dr. Graham Bennett, the dentist,

DR. KITCHEN: a fine man, in Whitbourne. In his campaign material he promised, the Progressive Conservative Party said, "We will upgrade and pave the road to Markland!" That was there, it was no ifs, ands and buts; it was not "if you elect me" or anything like that. It was a commitment by the party, a commitment by the party, which means the present guy who is going out as Premier, that was a commitment. That was five years ago now—it was just about four years ago that that commitment was made, a promise to pave, and it should be done. Now we talk about broken promises. What we need, Mr. Speaker, is a royal commission into broken promises, that is what we need, not a royal commission into hypocrisy and injustice but into broken promises.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out to the hon.

gentleman that the rule applicable to his colleagues further in the southerly direction is also operative in the northerly direction.

DR. KITCHEN: The people of Markland deserve a road, they deserve a road. It is very important for people to have a road that is upgraded and paved, a road that is used every day. I believe that it is time now not to make a promise — It is no good for the Minister of Transportation to get up in his place and promise to pave it. We have had enough promises. What we need now is for tomorrow morning for some highway equipment to go out there and start the job. Go out there tomorrow morning — not next week but tomorrow morning! Get out there and fulfill the promises that were made in 1975 and made again the year before last by the then Minister of Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to support the prayer of the petition as presented by my hon. friend in such a capable and able fashion representing the plea of the people of Markland in connection with the road, as he stated, that extends from Markland, Colinet and to St. Mary's the Capes. The question that arises as a result of

MR. NOLAN: this petition surely must be why the need for it in the first place. Why is it necessary for these people at some considerable financial and personal expense to be present here in the House of Assembly at all today? One would think with our system that they elect a member of the House of Assembly and that they would make their needs known to him. Are we to think then that they have failed in this regard? Obviously from the remarks made and the pleas made by the hon. member in the past this is not so. So we come to another point: have they then taken the trouble to call various officials in the Department of Highways or Transportation and Communications as it is known now? Have they done that? I understand, yes, they have. So they have covered that ground as well. Have they attempted to contact the minister's office? I understand, yes, that that was so. The next point is were they recently or ever made a commitment by anyone in a responsible position or running for election that the work in fact would be done? Again we are informed, yes, that this is so. So how degrading is it when we are all preaching about democracy to have these people here today practically on their knees, going around with placards, attempting to get what is rightfully theirs, no more or no less than anyone else in this Province. They are not asking for any luxury items, they are asking for a simple road. Now why do they not have it? We have asked in the last session of the House of Assembly, and the year before and the year before that, for the current Minister of Transportation to place before the members of the House, all members, the work schedule for the year, what roads will be reconstructed, what roads paved in all districts in this Province. Do you think we ever got it? No! No, because in that way you cannot play games with the people of the Province, you hold them up for ransom and this is what is being done otherwise, obviously, or the people would not be here today.

But I would like to mention one other thing in connection with this road and it is this. I have noticed in the past that the administration have been good enough to provide

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 299

AH-3

MR. NOLAN:

various funds for certain groups to go to certain places, whether it be Ottawa or to come into St. John's and so on, on public business. Is it so revolutionary then if I were to suggest now that the people of Markland be given two things today by the minister? One, the assurance

MR. NOLAN: that he will pay for the bus that brought them in, provide the funds to them and cover their expenses while they are in here today pleading for their rights on the road. And secondly, a very definite commitment: What is the position of the administration on that road, clearly enunciated so there will be no ifs, ands or buts about it, so there will be no need for another election, so that they will have more promises one way or the other? Let us lay it on the line to them now while they are here in this House and let us not continue to demean the people of Markland and other areas of this Province, who must feel ashamed of the whole system that they have, that they find it necessary to come here in the galleries of this House and also to placard and to demonstrate in the Confederation Building in an orderly fashion which they did today. Let us show them the respect that they deserve as members of the Province, as citizens, as citizens of Markland, as taxpayers, and as people who are asking for no luxury, merely the reconstruction of a road, and obviously it is a prayer that is represented by all the people in that area and I do not think for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that they should go home empty-handed.

So I strongly support the prayer of this petition and I am sorry that it had to happen in this fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman already spoke on this petition.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Another petition?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, if he yields, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.



MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to support the petition, not that I did not think it was worthy of support, but I had hoped that the Minister of Transportation and Communications would have seen fit to stand in his place and let the people, the demonstrators, the responsible demonstrators who spent \$75 of their own money to hire a bus and come in here today and present their facts. And they have done this in a very responsible fashion and I am sincerely sorry that the minister has not seen fit to reply to the prayer of this petition.

Sir, I wholeheartedly support my colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), and I congratulate him and the people who are in the gallery today for bringing this matter before the House of Assembly. I would like to try to get the minister on his feet to ask him one fundamental, basic question; In a time of restraint, Sir, when Heavens knows we cannot throw away dollars, or even cents, why it appears to be the policy of this administration to allow roads that have been upgraded for paving to deteriorate over three or four years to the point where massive upgrading is required again just to get the road back to normal? It has happened in my district, the district that I presently represent, it happened in my old district of St. Barbe North, and it has happened in other districts throughout the Province where, before an election, a road, in this case the Markland Road, was, I understand, that half of the road was totally upgraded, made perfectly ready for pavement and four years later that road is nothing more than a glorified bog. Where we have ambulances, school buses, fire trucks and other vehicular traffic travelling over that road, Sir, I cannot understand it. It is money down the drain when a department of government upgrades roads ready for pavement and then allows that same road, or these same roads to deteriorate to the point where they have to be completely rebuilt again.

MR. F. ROWE: I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that money would be well saved if the government did nothing during election campaigns, or prior to election campaigns, did absolutely nothing. It would be money saved, rather than the despicable situation that we have here of half of the road through Markland being totally upgraded, ready for pavement, and then deteriorated, washed away, muddy rocks and everything else.

Well, Sir, in that respect I would like for the minister to get up and support the prayer of this petition. I wholeheartedly support it and I would like to certainly hear a word of explanation from the minister for the sake of the people who have taken the trouble to come into town here today.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. F. ROWE: Look, you cannot get a squeak out of him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition, Sir, on behalf of fifty-one voters, citizens in the beautiful Southwest Coast community of Grand Bruit. I do not know if hon. members have had the opportunity to visit Grand Bruit.

MR. NEARY: If they have, Sir, I think they would have to agree with me that it is a beautiful community and, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the residents of Grand Bruit can not come to the people's House like the good citizens of Markland because Grand Bruit, as hon. members know, is an isolated community on the Southwest Coast. It is one of three isolated communities in my district, in the district of LaPoile. There are very, very friendly and hospitable people in the community of Grand Bruit, Sir, and for the longest time now they have been under the impression, rightly or wrongly, that this administration are trying to force the people to leave Grand Bruit, to leave it, to leave Grand Bruit and LaPoile. We heard so much bellyaching about resettlement and centralization from this hon. crowd before they became the Government that I never thought, in my wildest imagination, that I would find a community right in my own district that is in deadly fear that this administration are trying to force the people to leave Grand Bruit.

Well, Sir, I can tell hon. gentlemen that the people of Grand Bruit have no intention of leaving and they want their services improved. And this petition, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the electrical supply, with the power plant in the community of Grand Bruit. When this petition was sent to me, Sir, for two weeks past, so the petition says, the generators were not working, diesel generators were not working properly and the people had to cut down on the use of appliances in that community. And as my hon. friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) would say, "Electricity is not considered today to be a luxury item; very necessary". And just to show the House, Sir, how Grand Bruit has gone ahead in leaps and bounds and that the people have no intention of leaving it and that the Government may as well face the facts and replace these three diesel generators that they have there at the present time with one generator, one



MR. NEARY: in that community that they will have electricity round the clock, twenty-four hours, year-round to operate all the electrical appliances in that community.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure to rise and support this petition presented by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), a petition submitted to him for the hon. House

MR. W.N. ROWE: by fifty-one adult residents, which must be about the total population.

MR. S. NEARY: That is 100 per cent.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I have been there a couple of times myself, Sir, on the coastal boat - well, once really because another time we could not get off the boat the weather was so bad at the time so I could not go into that beautiful community. The name of the community, Sir, Grand Bruit as it is pronounced in Newfoundland, means, of course, translated in French 'great noise' or 'big noise.' And I think, Sir, that it is time that that name was put into literal operation in this House when in this day and age a community of fifty-one adults and probably three or four times as many children do not have an adequate supply of light and power and it is time there was a loud noise made about that, Mr. Speaker. And the member for LaPpoile district (Mr. S. Neary) is probably the best qualified of all the members in the House to put that name into action, well known as a fighter, a man for making noise when noise has to be made about injustice, and this is certainly an injustice.

When we are talking about developing Lower Churchill power and other power sources in this Province -

MR. S. NEARY: Superports.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Superports for this place and, you know, blasting holes in the ground on either sides of the Straits of Belle Isle leading up to elections at the cost of \$100 million of the people's money, when we are talking about that sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, then it would not be too difficult to get an adequate plant in Grand Bruit to supply those people there who want to live there, who enjoy living there and want to stay there, to supply them with adequate light and power and, Sir, I hope at reasonable cost as well. We hear very ominous noises coming from Hydro, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro recently concerning the fact that Hydro electrical rates are going to go up and up and up and up.

MR. S. NEARY: Up she goes!

MR. W.N. ROWE: And, Sir, I hope that not only can the government take this very reasonable request into consideration on behalf of the people of this community but also the larger requests of the

MR. W.N. ROWE: people of this Province generally to not only have a supply of power electricity, electrical energy but to have it a cost that every individual can afford to pay. Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this petition and I hope that the government can move on it immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for LaPoile. And I certainly can sympathize with the good people in Grand Bruit. I live in much the same environment as they do, on an island. We originally had to use diesel generated power but we are fortunate enough to have it come from Bay d'Espoir underwater, which some people think is a new concept. It is not quite that new. It is an excellent concept but not for Grand Bruit. I would think that the Power Commission could possibly get a better system in there than diesel. And as I remember only too well, diesel power gives a fair amount of trouble. You have to have so many standby generators and people who are sold the idea 'develop more electric facilities in your homes' and so on and it is surprising how many of these people are dependent on electricity for heating and the other things mentioned by my colleague. I do not think we can stress this too much; these people are hard working people. I would not doubt but today they are out on the fishing grounds, fishing, and it is their time to fish in the Winter and if you come home and the power is off it is not so good. If you wake up in the morning and they do not wake up in the morning; they are up going out on their grounds around 11:30 or 12:30 in the night - if the power goes off when they are gone they come back and find everybody half frozen. They are not too happy about it. And the backbone of our fishing economy is the Southwest Coast, I do not think anybody can deny that, going twenty-four hours a day, 365 days in a year. And anything that the Power Commission can do for Grand Bruit they should be doing, and we should not have to be standing up here in the House of Assembly asking, pleading for a service that should be provided. I heartily support the petition so ably presented by my colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. H. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my support to this petition because it is part of the birthright of every Newfoundlander to have sufficient heat and sufficient heat from electricity. This is the most wealthy province of all Canada, one of the richest areas in the world as far as electricity is concerned, and the idea that any part of this Province cannot have sufficient electricity is repugnant to anyone with any sense. And what we have to guarantee every single Newfoundlander is electricity,



DR. KITCHEN: electricity that comes out, all we need, all we want, and anything else will never be tolerated. And there are many things that can be done in this Province to guarantee electricity to us at reasonable rates, many, many things, and it is time that we got fast to that. Now this problem here that has been brought to the attention of the House is a serious one. There are many other serious ones with respect to electricity in this Province as well, and we should be addressing ourselves as a House to this question of electricity rather than to come in here for a few hours and go home again about our silly business. We should be here and stay here and we should straighten out this electricity problem in the Province. We have electricity for Quebec, we have electricity for Britain through ERCO, we have electricity for Bowaters, we have electricity for Price, but we have no electricity for the people of Grand Bruit. Why not? It is very, very serious why we have electricity for everyone except Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. And we must have it for us. It is our electricity, it is our resources and we have to use these things to make life pleasant, more pleasant, more possible for Newfoundlanders who need to be kept warm. There are many people, I do not know of so many in Grand Bruit but I know there are people in this Province now who are cold right this minute because they cannot afford to pay the electric heat bills as required to keep their house going, to keep it warm. And that is so. I can bring you to many places in this Province, and I am sure my hon. colleague can do so in his area as well, where people are cold -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

DR. KITCHEN: - because this government has not come to grips with this particular problem. Everyone in Newfoundland and Labrador should be guaranteed as a

DR. KITCHEN: birthright, because we have so much power, such huge amounts of hydro-electric power in this Province - we do not know what to do with it, we have so much of it. So we give it away to everybody but we do not have enough for ourselves. And I believe when the history is written this will be the big thing that people will remember about the past seven years of famine.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am not totally familiar with the details of this particular petition since I am presenting it on behalf of one of my colleagues who has been called out of the House of Assembly on urgent business, and in view of the fact that the news is out this will be the only day for a sitting, I would like to present a petition on behalf of the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), a petition, Sir, signed by twenty-seven salmon fishermen in the community of Burgeo.

Sir, it seems that a number of years ago these twenty-seven fishermen were lost approximately five days of salmon fishing because of certain conservation measures which were instituted by the federal Department of Fisheries in that particular area of the Province, and as a result of that they lost, they calculate, approximately \$1,000 each in these five days of salmon fishing. And what they would like, Sir - I realize that this really comes under federal jurisdiction - but through the offices of the provincial government I hope that the people in the provincial Department of Fisheries can consult with and negotiate with the civil servants in the federal Department of Fisheries with a view to repaying these twenty-seven fishermen who lost approximately \$1,000 each, very unfortunately, because of certain conservation measures that had to be taken, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: Like I said, Sir, I am doing this on behalf of my colleague and friend representing the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). I wish that I had a little more detail to present to the House; however, it is obviously a simple thing, but very important to the twenty-seven fishermen involved, Sir, and I would like to give this petition all the support that I can muster, Sir. And I ask that the petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the particular department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a few choice words to say, Sir, in support of this petition, because, if hon. members will recall, last year I presented similar

MR. NEARY: petitions in this House on behalf of my constituents in the district of LaPoile, because this regulation that was brought in by the Federal Minister of Fisheries, by the Federal Fisheries Department, Sir, a year ago, affected all the salmon fishermen of the Southwest Coast, especially in my own district of LaPoile, where the salmon fishermen lost anywhere from \$1,000 up to probably \$5,000 as a result of cutting five days off the salmon fishery at the beginning of the season, the most important part of the season for these fishermen. They were not allowed to put their nets in the water until five days later than in previous years and as a result of this there was a drastic cut in the income, Sir, of the fishermen in that area. And the salmon fishery on the Southwest Coast, especially in my district, is big. Fishermen depend in the main on the cod and salmon. A lot of the fishermen, the small boat fishermen, as my hon. friend from Gaultois probably is aware, depend on the salmon for a large part of their income.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the kicking up of a fuss about this loss of five days, the representatives of the fishermen in my own district and along the Southwest Coast came into St. John's, held a number of meetings - Mike Best from Diamond Cove was one of the chief spokesmen for the fishermen, a man who has no hesitation in putting forth his ideas and his views on this matter, a hard working fisherman - later went over to New Brunswick and did not get to first base, Mr. Speaker. What the fishermen were looking for - they understood that conservation measures had to be taken not only in the salmon fishery, the lobsters and the cod and the grey sole and the redfish and everything else; that they understand, the conservation measures - but what they do not understand is why, right out of the clear blue sky, these regulations

MR. NEARY: should be thrown at them and no compensation given the fishermen for loss of income. And they were told, in order to appease them, to pacify the fishermen, the Federal Department of Fisheries said, "Well, okay, wait until the season is over. If there is any loss of income we will take a good hard look at it." Well, they never did take a good hard look at it and if anybody benefited, Mr. Speaker, by cutting off five days of the salmon fishery in Newfoundland in the Gulf and along the Southwest Coast it was the fishermen over in New Brunswick that benefited by it, because that is where the pressure came from. What they were saying to Newfoundlanders, "Let the salmon go by for five days so they can get over in New Brunswick and be caught."

MR. W. CARTER: Where the minister comes from.

MR. NEARY: I do not care where the minister is from. There are lots of things that the Government of Canada and the Federal Minister of Fisheries and all the other ministers, lots of things they do that I do not agree with and this happens to be one of them. I agree with taking conservation measures, but if you are going to discriminate against Newfoundlanders compensate them for it—and it is not too late to do it yet.

This government, Sir, did not raise a finger to my knowledge, even though I brought the matter up in the House several times since last session, the government did not raise a finger to come to the aid and the support of the salmon fishermen who are going to suffer a drastic loss of income.

So, Sir, I support that petition presented on behalf of the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and I do not know if it is too late to do anything about it; I do not think it is. But certainly, Sir, this matter should be brought forcibly home to the Federal Minister of Fisheries and try and get something done about it if it is not too late. If not, certainly there should be something done this year because I have no doubt, Sir, this year,

MR. NEARY: and the season is almost with us, that there will be a repeat performance and that the salmon fishermen over in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia will reap the benefits of the loss of five days income, which is at the beginning of the season, which is the most important part of the salmon fishery as anybody who is familiar with the fishery on the Southwest Coast realizes, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts for the period ended March 31st., 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table special warrants and regulations under "The Financial Administration (Salaries of the Comptroller of Finance and Auditor General) Regulations, 1974, Amendment" and "The Civil Service (Bi-Weekly Remuneration) Regulations, 1978.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the granting of interim supply to Her Majesty.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the Premier has gone. I would have directed this question to him, Oh, here he comes, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: The latest (inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: A puff of smoke coming out of him. I thought you had to give up smoking because you have a spot on your lung?

AN HON. MEMBER: He cannot do it.

MR. NEARY: Cannot do it? Cannot give it up?  
Conquered the other thing, though.

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I never thought he would be able to do it,  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: My son, it is no trouble. All you have to do is have the will power.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if I can break into this unseemly camaraderie going across the House here, and ask the Premier if he intends as Leader of the Government to do as has been announced publicly by the House Leader, that is to close the House of Assembly by a motion to adjourn, obviously, or the motion will be deemed to be made this afternoon, whether the government intends to close the House of Assembly after this afternoon's session is finished or whether they

MR. W. N. ROWE: intend to carry on with the House and deal with some public business?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, we are planning to adjourn the House as the House Leader has advised, I understand, the Opposition House Leader not for any reason because as the Leader of the Opposition knows I just love the place and I would dearly love to be here. But it is a small matter of votes, Sir, and I am not just sure I have got the same control over some of the group over here as I had before.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Sir, does not the Premier agree that, just to take three examples alone, not to mention the other problems facing the Province that the unemployment problem, 40,000 of our fellow Newfoundlanders presently unemployed, the highest unemployment rate in our history now; the announced increase to Light and Power by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, 10 per cent this year, 10 per cent in the year to come, perhaps another 10 per cent thereafter; the complete lack of confidence of the people of the Province in our justice system as a result of the remarks made by the magistrate recently concerning the fire in Elizabeth Towers, and the failure of the Minister of Justice to take any action whatsoever to clear up the public unrest and lack of confidence: These matters alone, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to the Premier, would merit and warrant the keeping of this House open, any one of these matters, certainly all three together and the other matters, would ask that this House be open, or does he think that the internal leadership problems of the Tory Party, the P.C. Party, I should say, come first and foremost before the interest of the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all the fact is that the business of the government will be going on in the next month. The fact is also that obviously the new Premier and the new leader of the government is



Premier Moores: to have his own ideas as to what policy should be adopted and what issues should be brought before this House to be dealt with by the House. And for that reason, Sir, I think it is totally reasonable and totally rational when you have a new government and a new leader of that government that they bring in their policies to the House at the appropriate time.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The hon. the Premier is obviously taking his advice these days from a well known open line host. Sir, a further supplementary along the lines -

MR. NEARY: Is that the fellow who is embarrassing his brother up in Ottawa?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, well! One branch of what I asked the Premier about I will now direct to the Minister of Mines and Energy since he is eager to get his public leadership shot away, Sir. Did I understand him correctly to say that, after we had called for the same, that the government will be giving consideration to putting a freeze on further increases in hydro electrical power increases in the Province? And if I did not hear him correctly, or if there is a need for some understanding, will the minister give the House the commitment, and the people the commitment, that the government, as long as he is Minister of Energy - I will not go so far as to say he is going to rise to any higher post, but as long as he is Minister of Energy - will he endeavour to have the government, as long as he is minister, keep a freeze on the hydro rate increases which have been announced by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, my position on that is simply

MR. PECKFORD: that the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation when it requests an increase will have to appear before the Public Utilities Board and be scrutinized and investigated and after they have been scrutinized and investigated, the Public Utilities Board will decide whether any of the increase requested is justified. And if they so decide that some part of the increase is justified, then they recommend that to government. At that point in time I think government has a very strong responsibility to review the present circumstances in the Province economically and then to make a decision, not in the light of the economics of the corporation, not in the light of the financial autonomy of the corporation or of the Public Utilities Board; and that is the reason why in the Electrical Power Control Act we deliberately put in a phrase or a clause which allowed for the final arbiter of power increases to remain in the hands of government, where it must remain in my view. So therefore what I am saying is at that point in time, if these other two processes are followed, at that point in time government must, not only from an economic point of view but from a social point of view, assess whether in fact the Newfoundland people can bear an additional increase in electrical charges in 1979.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: The Public Utilities referred to, that is the one where the hon. Minister of Justice just appointed his best friend as the vice chairman, I understand.

MR. HICKMAN: Do not be so nasty.

MR. W. ROWE: "Do not be nasty!" Mr. Speaker, I will nasty the hon. Minister of Justice before this is all through.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. members are required during the Question Period to stick to asking questions and giving answers.

MR. W. POINE: Would not the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy agree - he has become very reasonable, Sir, since he threw his hat in the ring - would he not agree that he could save the Province a great deal of money, since it is a social question and a political question in the broadest sense of the word, a political question as to whether the people of this Province should bear the further burden of increases. It is not a financial problem, it is not a problem of economics with regard to the Hydro Corporation, but a social problem which the government must deal with? Does he not believe that the government could save a great deal of money, because those hearings cost hundreds of thousands of dollars which have to be borne by the Hydro Corporation and any interveners? Would he not agree that the time is now right for the government to seize this thing, grapple with it, and come out with some kind of statement to the effect that no further increases will be allowed, at least this year and perhaps for a couple of years, until we know where we are going with the Lower Churchill and so on? This would be a social and political decision which would be welcomed by everybody in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that that would be in the best interest of the Province because I believe that through the investigation process if a referral is made to the Public Utilities Board by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro we get the opportunity and the consumer groups in the Province get the opportunity to scrutinize again. But because there have been changes to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro as a result of the last investigation last year, it does not mean that there are still more changes that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro needs to make to make itself more efficient, to make it more accountable and so on. For example, Mr. Speaker, last year as a result of the hearing by the Public Utilities Board major changes were instituted by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro which have saved the consumer money and which have saved the government money. So therefore another referral to the Public Utilities Board might even

MR. PECKFORD: save additional money and at the same time government, with its social responsibility, can still decide upon deferring any increase for 1979, so you have the best of both worlds. One is the possibility that government will decide in its wisdom that there will be no increase and, secondly, you can still scrutinize and investigate Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and make further cost reductions which will enhance and improve not only Hydro but will save the consumer money. So you can have the best of both and that is why the process which is started should continue and at the same time government had the last say in the matter from a social point of view.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: To the Minister of Mines and Energy.

In view of the comments that he made that it was a social problem and so on, would he not agree that it is absolutely necessary for consumer groups, or one group, if you like, to be equally armed, if you like, as well as the power companies, whether it is Newfoundland Hydro, Newfoundland Telephone or Newfoundland Light and Power? I have often had the feeling, as I have stated in this House before and as one who has gone to various board meetings and so on when increases were coming up, that it is necessary - Newfoundland Hydro and Newfoundland Light Power and the telephone company have the wherewithal, the cost of which, by the way, is passed on to the consumer anyway, obviously, to bring before such a board expertise that is not available to consumer groups in this Province. I am not trying to be difficult on this; I am trying to ask

MR. NOLAN: a good solid question which I believe is relevant in this regard. Unless there is one body representing the consumer that can go before the board with the necessary data and expertise, whether it is financial or technical, I say that it is a shame to try to delude people, that, you know, you can appear before the board. Because they are not on an equal footing. It is like going to court, I suppose, without a lawyer, if you like.

So I would ask the minister if he would to address himself to this problem which I believe to be a very, very urgent one.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the hon. the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) has asked that question, because it gives me the opportunity to indicate to the House, and through the House to the people of Newfoundland, that we, the government, provided a grant, an outright grant of \$34,000 to the Federation of Municipalities, which was the total cost of their last intervention, to allow them to wipe off that debt for their intervention last year and to commit ourselves to providing whatever funds are necessary to the Federation or whatever vehicle the consumers of the Province want to ensure that the expertise from outside, inside or wherever is brought to bear. One of the reasons why the Public Utilities Board decided as they did last year was because of the expert intervention by the Federation. And that is why it cost so much. That is a fair figure, \$34,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to truly answer the question: After the hearing was over last year and the Federation had expended \$34,000 or \$35,000, the Public Utilities Board ordered Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro

MR. PECKFORD: to pay 90 per cent of the cost of the Federation's intervention. Newfoundland Hydro went back and said, "From a legal point of view we do not think we are obligated to pay," at which time the Federation said to the Minister of Mines and Energy, "Look, the Hydro Corporation is going to take this to court. We are still out our \$34,000 or \$35,000. What are you going to do about it?" And government decided at that time that we would pay it. If Hydro wins its case so that it does not have to pay any awards when the Public Utilities Board so orders, we will change legislation to ensure they do have to pay in future, if that is the appropriate course to take. If it is not we will establish a policy of paying by grant - not loan - a grant to the Federation or any other reputable consumer organization so designated and accepted by everybody to be the one to ensure that expert intervention is made on all requests to the Public Utilities Board in the field of telephone, Newfoundland Light and Power and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. I think the Public Utilities Board process is useless, totally useless, unless you have a group like the Federation, and like the gentleman who did most of the interventions last year, Mr. Clarke, the lawyer from Corner Brook, whom everybody recognizes as being very good in this field, unless you have that other balance to it. And I think we have said in writing to the Federation that whatever happens to the court case now between Newfoundland Hydro and the Public Utilities Board in the way of whether they are legally bound to pay any award that the board gives them, no matter what that legal case says, government will undertake to provide a grant to the Federation of Municipalities, which seems to be the organization to be the consumer focus in Newfoundland, so that they can bring in people from wheresoever to ensure that a proper intervention is held so that the Public Utilities Board

MR. PECKFORD: will be in an equitable position to award or not to award increases on all these utility requests.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear a final supplementary from the hon. the member for Conception Bay South. I will then recognize the hon. gentleman from LaPoile and the hon. gentleman from Windsor - Buchans.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. minister is probably aware that recently, in the last week or so, a former head of the Hydro, Commander Demarais, I believe is his name -

MR. DOODY: Commander Desbarat.

MR. NOLAN: - Desbarat, who lives in Mount Pearl, appeared on C.B.C. on Here and Now and indicated that the Newfoundland Hydro is overstaffed, overpaid and is becoming very much of a bureaucratic vehicle that is too expensive, overmanned, overpaid and so on, and is somewhat out of hand. Now this is coming from what you would normally consider, I suppose, a creditable witness. I am wondering how the minister feels himself about the bureaucratic setup that you have really within Newfoundland Hydro.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I did not see the interview that the hon. member refers to, so that therefore I am not in possession of all the statements made by the gentleman

MR. PECKFORD: who was having the interview, Suffice it to say now that we are aware that in all Crown corporations there is the tendency, because of the way you try to set them up on an autonomous basis and so on, to be overly staffed and as a result of our own internal review of the situation in the last twelve months the staffing requirements of Hydro have been reduced by some what over 100 in our attempts to streamline and make the whole corporation more efficient, and we are rather proud of our record in the last twelve months in that we have reduced and made those cost deficiencies so that the savings can be passed on to the consumer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. gentleman, Sir and I was hoping that the hon. gentleman would come into the House this afternoon and make a statement on energy because there is an awful lot of uncertainty, there is an awful lot of concern at the moment - whether or not we are going to have, apart from increases in electricity rates, whether or not there is going to be rationing of gasoline and oil as a result of all the unrest that is taking place in the world? What is the situation regarding Newfoundland? Has the minister had any discussion with Imperial Oil, or the parent company of Imperial Oil that are talking about rationing or cutting down on the supply of crude oil and gasoline in Atlantic Canada? Could the minister make a statement, allay any fears that people may have in their minds that we are all going to be froze to death before the Winter is over?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is a bit too early to make a definitive statement on that because there are negotiations underway in the last couple of days by many of the major oil companies with some suppliers of crude and gas from around the world. We are in touch with Imperial Oil, I was on the phone last night to seven



MR. PECKFORD: different oil companies in Canada for about forty-five minutes in which this whole matter is being discussed right now. So we are in touch with them almost hourly. We are on to Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa because of the national government and they must look at the national and global picture of the situation, so we are on top of the situation. It is too early to say. The only thing I can repeat is what I said last night on a TV interview and that is that some oil companies are indicating that the heavy users of crude oil or of gas might be put into an allocation kind of situation. If they are using now 30,000 barrels of oil in their operations, then that is where it will be kept. They will have 30,000 whereas perhaps that industry or that commercial venture might like to have a little cushion and usually order 35,000 barrels instead of 30,000, only using 30,000 and keeping the other in reserve; they would not be allowed to do that. It is still even too early to be definite on that. We hope within a few days to be able to make a more clear statement as to shortages or no shortages, new agreements made between Imperial or Shell or Texaco or some of the other majors as it relates to new supplies of oil in Mexico, swaps that are happening in Europe as well as in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: I would assume then from the hon. gentleman's answer, Sir, that there is a serious crisis developing and I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman will not spend his time out trying to straighten out the leadership problems of the party but will pay attention to this very serious crisis that seems to be developing on the horizon.

Now, Sir, in connection with energy, and that seems to be the topic of the day, could the hon. gentleman tell us if the government has taken any action on a suggestion made by, I

MR. NEARY: believe it was a civil servant in the Department of Forestry recently, that the government undertake a programme of going out and cutting all the wood that was damaged by the spruce budworm in this Province in the last four or five years that is going to be lost to Newfoundland forever? A lot of it cannot now be used to make paper or linerboard or anything else. The government have let it go too long, have left the timber standing too long, and this wood, Mr. Speaker, could be used to fire the wood furnaces that are being put in homes in this Province at the present time. The wood furnaces and wood stoves are going in houses now in galores. People are getting scared. They cannot cope with the high cost of electricity and oil and they are afraid of the oil shortage and they are going back to using wood. And what I want to ask the minister, Sir, is if last year the Government of Canada made a proposition to this Province, or this Province did not take advantage of a Federal/Provincial cost sharing policy

MR. NEARY: to cut the wood as Nova Scotia did, New Brunswick did, some \$30 million, as I understand it, to cut the wood that was damaged by the spruce budworm. This Province did not take advantage of that program and I want to know why, because that wood now is badly needed and could be used in this Province to generate heat and for people to do their cooking on their wood stoves and use it in their wood furnaces.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the first subject that the hon. member raised as related to whether, in fact, are we too busy on leadership matters to be aware of what is going on in the energy field, I will just bypass that, Mr. Speaker. I think it is enough for me to say that I have been on to all the companies and on to the Federal Government in the last twenty-four hours in an attempt to get a clear picture of the oil and gas supply situation and we will continue to do that in the next twenty-four/forty-eight hours until we can get some definite direction as to where the country is going on that very important matter.

On the second matter of wood generation for both heat and electricity, the hon. member, although most of us here in the House, Mr. Speaker, most hon. members recognize that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) usually listens to the radio and the television and gains most of his very valuable knowledge from those media sources, he missed on at least six occasions, obviously, listening to the radio and television at a time when I had announced, as Minister of Mines and Energy, and other people in the Department had announced that there is a \$10 to \$12 million program which we are about to sign with Ottawa as it relates to alternate energy sources; that this was started about six months ago, long before anybody was talking about wood generation or any seminars were being held. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we are the first Province in Canada to sign

MR. PECKFORD: such an agreement that has been available now for about six months under a new statement issue by Mr. Gillespie, so we will be doing wood demonstration projects around the Province to try to demonstrate, not only to use it for heat but to also have demonstration projects in areas where there are forest stands, to prove that you can generate electricity near a community at a cost which would be competitive with the conventional kind of generation now that is occurring. We are not only going to do it on wood, Mr. Speaker, we are going to do it on biomass, we are going to do it on solar, we are going to do it on wind and they are going to be set up all around the Province and in Labrador. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was in Roddickton last week where I was pleased to be able to indicate to the people there that there are a number of little rivers in the Roddickton area that are now being looked at, and one in particular between Roddickton and Conche which, quite possibly, will be a small hydro development.

MR. NOLAN: It is on the wrong side of Canada Bay.

MR. PECKFORD: No. The other one is Cloud River, which is further down the line, but the first demonstration project is the little river between Roddickton and Conche. There is also one on the South Coast and one in Labrador to start, small low-head hydro projects which we can start in 1979. So we are doing all we can, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that every conceivable means is found to keep electricity at a reasonable, sane level.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize the hon. gentleman from Windsor-Buchans, followed by the hon. member for White Bay and his two colleagues, time permitting. Perhaps I will, before the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans commences, draw the attention of hon. members in general to Beauchesne, the new edition, page 132. A question must be a question,

MR. SPEAKER: not an expression of an opinion, representation, argumentation, nor debate. The question must be brief. A preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. A long preamble on a long question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same sort of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble." I put that to hon. members for not their own knowledge, they know it already, but for their own realization. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Maynard). It comes as a result of his recent expedition. The minister is not in his seat so I will direct it to the Premier in this case. The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, on his recent trip to Europe, indicated that he was looking for markets to export Newfoundland's timber supplies, wood, to European markets or elsewhere. Now the question is, is it the Department of Forestry's policy as of now to seek markets in Europe or elsewhere to export wood in its unprocessed form, raw saw logs or pulpwood, not processed, is that the policy of the administration as of now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the talks that were held over there were in the main for sawn timber, for two by fours and that sort of thing. Regarding the policy of shipping just raw timber, there has been no definitive policy on that to my knowledge, but certainly to ship sawn timber the answer would be yes.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that he has issued permits for 30,000 cords of wood to be exported, raw pulpwood to be exported over the next few days or the next few weeks. And he has indicated that he was happy that this wood was coming off Crown land limits because it was wood that by and large may have been affected by the budworm and would be lost to the economy of this Province. I want to ask the minister have the paper companies - we know most of the budworm infested wood in Newfoundland today, wood that will be lost to the economy, is on the pulp and paper companies' limits - is he working out with the paper companies and have the paper companies indicated a willingness to allow that wood to be cut by private operators and put into the export market as opposed to being lost to the economy of the Province because the paper companies themselves, as he knows, have not got the ability to cut that wood and utilize it? Now is he attempting to get an agreement from the paper companies? Are we going to cut the budworm infested wood, the moribund wood right now that will be lost over the next four or five years, and allow private operators to cut it and put it in the export market the wood on the paper companies' limits?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD:

Right now, Mr. Speaker, there is really no need of exporting the timber from the paper companies' limits. If there is an export market developed for wood off the two major limit holders in the Province, I am sure that we can work out an arrangement. In the meantime, we have an agreement with the two paper companies to harvest budworm infested timber around the Province, some 260,000 cords per year for the two mills -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY:

Watch yourself now. Have some control.

MR. MAYNARD:

Does the hon. gentleman want the question answered or want his colleagues to babble on over there for a few minutes? We have an agreement with the paper companies, Mr. Speaker, to harvest the budworm infested wood on their limits to the greatest extent possible. There is only a certain amount of budworm infested wood they can put into their system and have the same quality of paper output. They can only take a certain

MR. MAYNARD: percentage and they are taking that percentage and putting it into their system at the fastest possible rate and they will continue to do that over a five year period, which is the length of the agreement we presently have with them.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister and the Province well knows that the only budworm infested wood that the paper companies will cut on their limits is wood that they themselves will utilize in their own operations. And my question is simply this: will the paper companies be prepared to allow the Province to export the wood that they will not be able to utilize and if not exported or used by sawmillers be lost to the economy of this Province simply because it is on the paper companies limits? It so happens the paper companies owns most of the merchantable wood in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is talking about export of budworm killed timber. First of all, I think he should understand or he should already know that it is impossible to export anything other than prime timber to the European market. The only places where budworm killed timber can be used is in the North American mills - or has been used in the past. The export permits that we have issued, with one exception, for wood going into Eastern Canada, other parts of Eastern Canada are all for prime timber and there is no way of getting into the European market unless one has prime timber to offer to that market and that does not include budworm killed timber. We have to find other uses for budworm killed timber to the greatest possible as the Minister of Mines and Energy was indicating a little while ago and as I have already indicated the two paper mills are already putting it into their system to the greatest extent possible.

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

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question

to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. I think the substance of this question comes under his jurisdiction. It is a question, Mr. Speaker, related to the McCarthy judicial inquiry. For the benefit of hon. members this was a royal commission set up in February of 1977 to investigate the causes relating to three deaths of employees working with the Iron Ore Company of Canada in Labrador City, and secondly, the commission was to look into the entire matter of health and safety with the IOC operations in Labrador City. And, Mr. Speaker, the matter of health and safety in the mine operations in



Mr. Lush: Labrador City and indeed in Wabush have been the cause of several labour disputes in recent months which have been resolved each time on a temporary basis pending the completion and recommendations of the McCarthy enquiry. So I am wondering if the minister could indicate to the House whether yet the enquiry has been completed or whether he has received a copy of the enquiry to this date?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. HOUSE: I am aware of the Commission report -and aware that there is action on it, but I have not received a copy of the report, I have not studied it. The only thing I might mention also at this present time that the occupational health and safety as it pertains to the mines comes under the Department of Energy, and that will not be under the Department of Labour and Manpower until after the 1st. of April, I believe.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the time has expired, the thirty minutes is up.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I hereby ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the imminent astronomical rises in the cost of electricity and home heat resulting from the emergency situation caused by oil shortages and from the announced intention of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to seek a 20 per cent increase in electricity rates, 10 per cent this year and 10 per cent next.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely in the power of this hon. House not only to prevent such increases but to bring about a dramatic decrease in the price of electricity by declaring null and void the power contract with Hydro Quebec and by instructing Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation to charge Hydro Quebec a higher price for electricity. I believe this matter to be of urgent importance to every family in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Under Standing Order 23 I must now decide whether the hon. member is asking for leave to debate this matter under Standing Order 23 is in order, not whether to debate the matter under some other heading is in order, but under Standing Order 23. As hon. members are aware this is a quite restrictive Standing Order and the precedents quite restrictive. There can be no doubt of the urgency of the matter. If it were the urgency of the matter, then the ruling of the Chair would obviously follow. But as hon. members are aware, one of the operative factors is the urgency of debate, and also that continuing conditions or states which have existed for some time and are continuing, or even becoming aggravated, that this is precluded under Standing Order 23, this and the stricture not on the urgency of the matter, but the urgency of debate. Under Standing Order 23 I cannot rule it in order.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Before moving on to the Orders of the Day, or before calling the order of business, so I will not forget it later on this afternoon, I would ask that when Your Honour puts the motion to adjourn later this afternoon that the House adjourn until Tuesday, March 27, 1979 at 3:00 P.M. subject to the provisions for recall.

MR. W. N. ROWE: When? March when?

MR. HICKMAN: March 27.

MR. NEARY: Is that a debatable motion, Mr. Speaker?

The hon. gentleman is not moving the adjournment, Sir, and I would like to speak on -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The question has come up whether it is a debatable motion. First, I must put the motion. It has been moved that when the House adjourn, it adjourn until the 27th. of March at 3:00 P.M., subject to the usual conditions of recall. In my opinion, it is a debatable motion. I am not aware of any authority to the contrary, and in my opinion it is a debatable motion.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, of course, we are going to vote against that motion, Mr. Speaker. We think it is ludicrous, it is an insult to the intelligence of the people of this Province, it is beneath contempt, it is disgusting, it is absolutely disgusting -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - that the government, Mr. Speaker, would put the internal affairs of their party, would put partisan politics above the affairs of state, above the running of the affairs of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is suggesting,

MR. NEARY:

Sir, and what the hon. members have been suggesting for the last few weeks is that the Province be put on automatic pilot for the next almost two months, that nothing be done, that everything come to a halt, and, Mr. Speaker, this could not happen at a worse time in the history of this Province. We have, Sir, at the moment, record unemployment, we have people faced with huge electricity bills and proposed ... increases in electricity rates, we have young Newfoundlanders, young men and women, desperately looking for jobs, and that situation is going to be aggravated in a short while when the students start to graduate from the vocational schools, the College of Trades and Technology and from the university in June - it will be further aggravated. We have record unemployment in the construction field among construction workers. We have teachers being laid off, we have very sensitive negotiations being carried on with the police and the nurses and the teachers and various other groups in the public service. Mr. Speaker, it could not happen at a worse time in our history.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the government to reconsider this matter, Sir, to close the House down. Open her up for one afternoon, bring members in from all over the Province at tremendous personal expense, come in to St. John's for a sitting of the House that will only last three hours! Mr. Speaker, this is a debatable motion, Sir, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the clock rolls around to 5:30 this afternoon, when, under the Standing Rules on the day that we have the Late Show, Your Honour has to assume that a motion to adjourn the House is acceptable, is in order, that Your Honour will realize that if we accept our responsibility in this hon. House, that if we take our responsibility seriously enough and we keep debating this matter until 5:30 this afternoon when

MR. NEARY: Your Honour has to rise the House, that Your Honour has no choice but to leave the Chair at 6:00 P.M., and there being no motion passed at that time, that the House will then have to meet on tomorrow. Does Your Honour realize that?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Eight o'clock tonight actually, too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Sir, my colleague says eight o'clock tonight as well - well, maybe - but if necessary, Sir, I am prepared to stay here -

MR. W. N. ROWE: All night.

MR. NEARY: - all night tonight -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - tomorrow night, back again next week at it. Let us have an emergency debate on the proposed increases in the electricity rates, high unemployment, the high cost of living, high taxes and all the other problems, all the other things that are nagging at the heartstrings of Newfoundlanders today, tearing the hearts out of our Newfoundland people. The uncertainty that exists in this Province at the present time, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely unbelievable and it is obscene, Sir, in my opinion, obscene to open up the House and close it down after two or three hours. And, Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in filibustering. That is not the purpose of the exercise, Sir. What we want is the government to come in and lay out their plans and what they intend to do about, for instance, increased vandalism and crime in this Province, when we are having armed robberies now at the rate of two and three and four a night. They not only go out now and hold up one service station, they are holding up two and three a night now.

MR. W. N. ROWE: And the minister is worried about a leak.

MR. NEAFY: And the minister is worried about a leak, about plugging up leaks in the police department! Vandalism and crime, Sir, are on the increase. We have, Mr. Speaker, in this Province one of the greatest curses in our society today, the effects of booze on our people. What is the administration going to do about that, the misuse and the abuse of alcohol? Mr. Speaker, this hon. crowd can claim fame for one thing: If they go down in the history books for one thing, Sir, it is for the number of brewers retail licenses that they issue in this Province and the number of night clubs and taverns and discos and joints and cabarets that they opened up since 1972. I believe the number has tripled since 1972. And yet, Mr. Speaker, they have done nothing to offset the effects of opening up the vats of the breweries and the distilleries causing a very serious drinking problem, especially among the teenagers in this Province. We would like to find out what the government are going to do about that problem. It is a very serious problem, Sir, and we want to hear what plans the government have to deal with it. If we are going to carry on, expand, throw open the vats of the local breweries and make millionaires out of the owners of these breweries and billionaires out of the distillers of whiskey, we would like to know, Sir - and the government is going to make-I believe, the highest amount of revenue they get is from the sale of booze-and we would like to know how much they are going to put back in an education programme, Sir, to try to do something about this serious problem. We want to find out what plans the government have. So I am prepared to stay here forever, if I can. We will move one amendment after another to this motion made by the Government House Leader. We will keep talking, if we have to, forever. This House is not closing today, Sir, if we have anything to do with it. It is a shame, it is shameful, it is disgusting and contemptible.

We want to find out, Sir, what plans the government have for the fishery. Mr. Speaker, we are on the threshold of entering into a new fishing season in this Province and we have

MR. NEARY:

not yet seen the government's plan.

We have heard a lot about conferences and meetings around the Province, we have heard a lot about superports and grandiose schemes for the fishery that will wipe the inshore fishery off the face of the map if this government are allowed to continue, because all they have done so far, Sir, is set themselves up as spokesmen for the multinationals. This government, Sir, and the Minister of Fisheries who is now aspiring to become leader of the Tory party, have spent the last six or seven years, Mr. Speaker, championing the cause of the multinationals of the big fish companies. And, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in this Province today, and anybody who has his ear to the ground knows it, is that Nickerson and National Sea are moving in and taking over all the fishery in this Province, swallowing up the independent processors. The next thing, Sir, they will have a monopoly, they will have a cartel. The fishery in this Province will be run by Nickerson and National Sea. Even Fishery Products, which is owned by the taxpayers of this Province, will likely be swallowed up by these big giants from the Mainland that are just swooping right across this Province and taking everything ahead of them. They are mowing everything down as they go across the Province. And the Minister of Fisheries is condoning that, aiding and abetting that sort of policy and following that suicide policy that is going to kill the inshore fishery in this Province. The inshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, is the - I am not sure if it was Your Honour who wrote the article recently in the Evening Telegram and I must say that I did not read it in any great detail, but I did browse through it and there were some good points in there - the inshore fishery, Sir, provides more employment

MR. NEARY: for Newfoundlanders and for plant workers than the off-shore fishery. Twenty thousand or more, between 20 and 25 thousand Newfoundlanders earn a living or a part-time living in the inshore fishery. That, Mr. Speaker, will go down the drain if this Government follows on its present suicide policy for the fishery of superports and grandiose schemes, new words they picked up travelling around Europe and so forth.

MR. F. ROWE: No chance for debate!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend says, "No chance for debate", just ram it down the throats of the Newfoundland people. Mr. Speaker, what we need in this Province, in the way of fishery development, is a multitude of small fish plants around this Province. That is what my hon. friend should be advocating if he wants to become Leader of the Tory Party and Premier of this Province, not act as a spokesman, as a front, as a mouthpiece, as a chaw-mouth for the multinationals and the big fish companies. Build a multitude of fish plants around Newfoundland so that the inshore fishery can thrive and expand and develop and create jobs in the smaller communities and in various regions of this Province instead of putting all your eggs in one basket. That is the kind of policy, Sir, we would like to hear about. No evidence of that being brought forward, Mr. Speaker. Instead of that, "Shut her down, close the House down, close her up!" And not tell the people, especially the fishermen, what this Government intends to do in the way of short-term and long-term fishery policy apart, Mr. Speaker, from criticizing Ottawa! That is about all they know how to do, criticize Ottawa. They have no fishery policy of their own. And we heard today, Sir, about the energy policy that this hon. crowd have. Non-existent! The energy policy now, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) is carrying it around in his new suit that he has got-- in the vest pocket of his new suit - for the leadership. That is the energy policy, in his vest pocket.

Mr. Speaker, just a few questions today during the Oral Question Period - we only had a half an hour at



MR. NEARY:

it and we discovered that the minister does not have a tight hold on the situation, does not have a grasp on the seriousness of the situation in Atlantic Canada and in Newfoundland at the present time as far as the energy is concerned, that the minister, Sir, prefers, instead of coming in and making a statement and laying out Government policy in black and white and saying, "Here it is," and reassuring the people of this Province that they will not go hungry or they will not be cold or they will not be wet and damp. As a result of what is happening in the field of energy, the minister puts his leadership asperation above all that. What the minister should do right now is drop out of that race, drop out and try to do a job for Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I put a question to the minister about a federal/provincial policy that is being carried on now the the last couple of years in connection with the cutting of damaged timber, timber that is damaged, in the various Provinces of Canada by the spruce budworm. Last year, Sir, I am told that New Brunswick and Nova Scotia took full advantage of this cost shared program to not only salvage the timber there, to salvage the wood but also as a job creation program to try to do something to solve the high unemployment problem in these Provinces.

Mr. Neary: Nova Scotia and New Brunswick took advantage of this cost shared programme, federal/provincial cost shared programme whereby the Government of Canada put up pretty well all of the cost of cutting the damaged wood. But, Mr. Speaker, my information leads me to believe and my research leads me to believe that this Province sat back on their fannies and did not take advantage of that programme like our sister provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. And as a result, Sir, as a result of their dereliction of duty, their negligence and their laziness, as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, we have timber that is now dead and lost to Newfoundland forever. Some of that timber, Sir, was damaged five years ago, and hon. gentlemen should know by now after all of the debates that have taken place in this hon. House that once timber is attacked by the spruce budworm, five years after it is attacked it is useless, it cannot be used in paper mills; it has to be cut within five years or it is lost to the Province forever.

Mr. Speaker, this Province had a golden opportunity not only to cut some of that damaged timber—and immaterial to what the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture says about how the mills only have a certain input, the mills can only handle so much. What garbage and hogwash! Is it any wonder we cut the minister's salary last year, reduced it down to a dollar? Is it any wonder, Sir, when you get that kind of negative thinking, that kind of an attitude from another leadership hopeful, who will not get enough votes to haul up a punt, not even in his own district, Mr. Speaker! The mills can only use a certain amount, 250,000 cords. How many million cords are damaged by the spruce budworm. My hon. friend for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) should remember. How many million? How many millions of cords of wood?

MR. RIDEOUT: Does the minister know, I wonder?

MR. NEARY: I do not know. I think it is up around about 10 million or 12 million or something cords of wood. And the minister tells us this year they are going to cut 250,000 cords because that is all the mills can handle.

Well, Sir, what about all of the other mills throughout the world? What about stockpiling the wood for future

Mr. Neary: use in mills, and export? What about cutting the wood for generating heat, generating electricity? What about cutting the damaged - how many million cords?

MR. FLIGHT: Five to seven million.

MR. NEARY: Five to seven million cords, the expert here tells me, Sir, on the spruce budworm, damaged timber, five to seven million cords. The minister says they are going to cut 250,000 cords. That means we are going to have approximately seven million cords of damaged wood that is going to be lost to Newfoundland forever as a result of negligence, as a result of laziness, as a result of stupidity on the part of this administration. A lot of that timber, Mr. Speaker, a lot of that timber could have been cut and should have been cut, and it is only now they are going to embark on a programme.

MR. FLIGHT: Even that is on Crown limits, That is not even on Price and Bowaters limits, which got all of the wood.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. FLIGHT: That is only on Crown limits, They are afraid to go in on Bowaters and Price.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is only on Crown limits. Five to seven million cords on Crown limits.

MR. FLIGHT: Total.

MR. NEARY: Total.

But anyway, Sir, Ottawa -

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member take his seat for a moment so I would be able to inform other hon. members of the three matters to be debated at 5:30 when the motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. There are three matters and the order in which I received them is the order in which they will be debated. The first notice, given by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, developing from a question asked the hon. the Premier with respect to the closing of the House of Assembly. The second matter, notice given by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture with respect to forest policy.

Mr. Speaker: The third matter, notice given by the hon. member for Terra Nova rising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations with respect to the McCarthy Royal Commission. They are the three matters which will be debated at 5:30.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making here, Sir, is one that I made outside of this House a week or two ago, and it is this, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Finance should be ashamed of himself, and all the ministers who have been involved in leaving money in Ottawa, money that is badly needed in this Province to create jobs

MR. NEARY: and to develop the Province. Literally, Sir, millions piled up on millions of dollars have been left on the Ottawa table in the last five or six years, some of it covered under agreements. The same minister I will talk about in a few moments left over \$10 million on the Ottawa plate that was covered under an ARDA III agreement, but, Sir, in the last two years at least, millions of dollars have been left in Ottawa that should have been taken advantage of in this Province to cut the wood that was damaged by the spruce budworm and to create badly needed employment in this Province, and I have confirmation that the offer was there. The same thing applies, Sir, to the cutting of the timber on the site of the Lower Churchill, a proposal from Ottawa. You know, Mr. Speaker, this crowd cannot even spend money when Ottawa gives it to them. Ottawa came along and said, 'Look, we are prepared to pay you so much per man to cut the wood on the site of the Lower Churchill.' And this government said, 'Ottawa, you can go jump in the lake, we do not want your proposal. We do not need the jobs and we do not need your money to cut the timber on the site of the Lower Churchill.' And they used the feeble excuse that Ottawa is only going to pay us so much a job and we would have to put the rest up ourselves. Well, I would say, Sir, that is tough. Why could we not put the rest up? Get rid of some of the political appointments, get rid of the Norma and Gladys, get rid of the helicopter contract, get rid of the office rental sweetheart deals that they have made and put the money into job creation, if they want to know where the money would come from. "We cannot afford it," they said, "because Ottawa is only going to give us so much a job and we cannot afford it." If they would only eliminate some of the extravagance and waste they would be able to afford it instead of bailing out people who create white

MR. NEARY: elephants and bailing out failures in business and put them down in the Newfoundland Senate, Newfoundland Hydro, cut out the luxurious helicopter service that we have in this Province, the best in North America, probably the best in the world, the most expensive in the world just to help out your political buddy. No, they cannot afford to take advantage of Ottawa's offer to cut the timber on the site of the Lower Churchill. 'We cannot afford it, We do not have the money. Ottawa will not give us enough, They will only give us 90 per cent and we cannot put up the 10 per cent because we do not have the money.' Mr. Speaker, who are they trying to cod? What a joke! What a joke, they do not have the money! They have the money for everything else! They cannot afford to build a piece on the Grand Falls hospital, they do not have the money; cannot afford to build a hospital out in Channel-Port aux Basques, do not have the money. Well, there will be lots of money now in a few months time; there will be lots of money, sometime between now and September there will be no shortage.

Well, I want to say to the people in Grand Falls and the people in Channel-Port aux Basques and the people on the Burin Peninsula and the people in Clarendville and the people in Bonavista and all the people who cannot get beds in hospitals and all the sick people on long waiting lists in this Province who cannot get badly needed surgery done, who cannot get treated for their ailments, who are ill and the Minister of Health has the nerve and the gall to tell us nobody is suffering as a result of this, 'This is all elective surgery,' he says, 'nobody is suffering; I am assured by my officials that nobody is suffering.' I wonder can the minister look me straight in the eye and say that? Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should come down in my office once in a while and hear the requests that I get

MR. NEARY: from people who cannot get beds in hospitals, referred, Sir, and waiting for a year or two, lying on floors with their discs sticking out through their backs.

MR. H. COLLINS: Oh, come on!

MR. NEARY: "Oh, come on!" he says. I could give the minister examples that would make his hair stand on end. But no concern, Sir, no beds available for these people - a lot of them have died while they were on the waiting list. Does the minister realize that? How could the minister be so hard and cold

MR. NEARY:

and callous and say nobody is suffering because of this waiting list of 2,500 sick people in this Province trying to get in hospital. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, and Your Honour may not agree with this, but in my opinion the level and standard of medical services in this Province is going down and down and down and we are losing doctors and our accreditation is soon going to be affected -

MR. H. COLLINS:

You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY:

- I do know what I am talking about - as a result of the internal politicking that goes on and doctors being driven into exile and vanished and discriminated against for political purposes, internal politics.

Mr. Speaker, the level of medical services in this Province is deteriorating and the only way, Sir, you can get admitted to a hospital today is to go in and fling yourself down on the floor in the emergency or out-patients and say, "I am dying." That is the only way you can get admitted. And the minister knows that and that is not good enough with the amount of money we are spending on medical care in this Province, \$210 million in this fiscal year and the service getting worse, a weak minister who does not care, who is satisfied to accept the word of his officials that nobody is suffering as a result of a shortage of hospital beds! Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to anybody in this Province to go down and try to get admitted to the new Health Sciences Complex that cost the taxpayers of Canada and of Newfoundland \$65 million and still climbing, try and get admitted. Doctors are assigned so many beds. They are frustrated, depressed, demoralized, they have half a dozen beds each, half a dozen beds or so and a long waiting list of people waiting for these beds, as Your Honour knows full well, and when somebody is sick, Sir, they are sick, whether it is elective surgery or not. If you are sick you are sick. And I know a case



MR. NEARY: recently where a man's wife was suffering with disc trouble and Your Honour may say, "Well, you could have that and you could live to be 100 with that." You could, Sir. But you could also suffer in the meantime as this woman did, had to practically go down and fling herself in on the floor of the emergency department of one of the hospitals to get admitted. The doctor threw up his arms and said there was nothing he could do, frustrated with the way the beds are allocated, the internal politicking that goes on, the favouritism, the discrimination. It would make you wonder sometimes, Mr. Speaker, if you get sick if it would not be better to go out and dig a hole in the back yard and bury you. You have just as much a chance, Sir, to survive as you have with the present system.

Here we have \$210 million being spent this fiscal year, the third highest spender in government, and the Minister of Health sits back on his haunches and lets her just drift on, drift on. He does not intercede, step in, try to straighten the matter out. In the meantime 2,500 or 3,000 of our fellow Newfoundlanders are sick, ill, suffering because of this callous attitude because nothing is being done about it.

We are losing our doctors. Our young doctors are so frustrated, are the victims of the high-handedness of some of the hierarchy that are in with the cocktail set and in with the administration, that they say, "There is no future for me here. As soon as I get my certificate, as soon as I get my training I am gone. There is no future for me in this Province." We have lost many good doctors and many good men and we are going to lose more unless the attitude changes, unless we open up and show our young people that there is a future in this Province in the field of medicine we are going to lose more than we have already lost. They feel that they have a better future on the Mainland or down in the United States.

MR. NEARY: What is the Government doing about this? We would like to find out. No, Sir, they do not want to tell us. They want to close the House down.

Now I drifted into the field of medicine there, I was on my hon. friend the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Maynard), the dollar a year man, when I got side-tracked and I was talking about the ARDA III agreement I mentioned earlier, Sir, ARDA III, an agreement signed back in 1973 by the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture on behalf of the Province of Newfoundland and what put it in my mind was the statement made the other day by the President of the Board of Trade who was criticizing Ottawa for their agriculture policy in this Province. The President of the Board of Trade was saying that Ottawa should do the same for Newfoundland as they are doing for Western Canada. Well, to that I would say: "Hear, hear." And I wrote the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Anthony, and I pointed out to him that Ottawa had offered this Province, under a cost shared agreement, \$16 million under a five year contract, ARDA III, and this Government only spent about three or four million of it. Out of \$16 million, Sir, they left over \$10 million on the table in Ottawa, on the plate in Ottawa, \$10.-\$11 million that should have been spent for greenhouses, developing farms, for all sorts of things in connection with agriculture, for going out and determining where we had suitable agricultural land, clearing land, development of agriculture in this Province.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that Ottawa looks at us rather askance down here and scratch their head and say, "What is wrong with that crowd. We give them money and they can not even spend it." And every chance they get they are criticizing us. That is not the only cost shared program, Sir, agreement where there was money left on the Ottawa table, millions of dollars. We had the same thing happen under the DREE agreement. We had the same thing happening under the two big refrigerated units that the

MR. NEARY: Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter)  
has been telling us about that he announced before he went to Ottawa -

MR. F. ROWE: Before he had the studies done.

MR. NEARY: - before the studies were done and before he asked Ottawa to help, **announced these programs, these two big refrigerated units**, and then went up and asked Ottawa to participate and that is all they ever heard of it since. Sitting back on his haunches now, waiting for the leadership of the Tory Party to drop into his lap. In the meantime Ottawa is up there waiting for the Minister of Fisheries to come up and show **them his program**. The same way with this alleged **superport** they are talking about. And the same thing, Sir, with the marine service centers. What has happened to that program, Mr. Speaker? What has happened to the marine service center program? Will it be discontinued? Is it going to be dropped? Ottawa is frustrated, they do not know. It is a 90/10 cost shared program, 90 per cent paid by the Government of Canada, a program that has proved to be of **immense** benefits to the fishermen in this Province, the longliner operator and the small boat fishermen, immense value, and again, Sir, again this hon. crowd is sitting back and doing nothing about extending this program and building new marine service centers in other parts of Newfoundland. And I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, and talk about various federal cost shared programs. I could talk about programs where agreements have been signed. I could talk about programs that this Government has not taken advantage of. And, Mr. Speaker, it involves literally tens piled upon tens of millions of dollars left in Ottawa, left on the Ottawa **table**. The same time, Sir, they are walking away from Ottawa leaving this money there, the same time every chance they get they have the flick at Ottawa because they think that is the thing to do. They think ~~that~~ that is the thing that is going to get them elected. "We do not need your money," they are saying to Ottawa. "We do not have any



Mr. Neary: walking away from it, Sir, As a result they have cost Newfoundland literally tens piled upon tens of millions of dollars, and the Minister of Finance should get a kick in the rear for his negligence. I know the minister could not care less, this is his last appearance in the House; the hon. gentleman made his swan song when he read his budget last year, the hon. gentleman will retire. Mr. Speaker, we are into a terrible situation. It is horrible, Sir. Look at the other side of the House now. We have, I believe, it is seven ministers running for the leadership. Last year the Premier told us in a rage of passion, in a state of emotion, in this House he told us that "Nobody is going to be interested in my job because all I get is abuse and criticism, character assassination, all they do is ridicule me. Nobody will be interested in public life because all they are is negative; and they are this and they are that, and they are running me down. And how are you going to get people to come in public life when they are abused like that?" Now, Sir, what does the hon. gentleman have to say now when seven of his colleagues are looking for his job?

MR. DODDY: The opportunity is left for you.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity! I hope the hon. gentleman appreciates it because there is a lot of common sense in what I am saying.

The hon. Premier told us—and we hear the parrots, the people out parroting him —, one gentleman who is an embarrassment to his brother up in Ottawa, a real embarrassment, Don Jamieson is a man who Canadians have a great deal of respect for.

MR. DODDY: Stop misusing his name.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. A man who people think should be the next Prime Minister of Canada, who Newfoundlanders respect and admire, a man that has done an outstanding job for Newfoundland, up there in Ottawa with the reputation that he has and one of his family down here embarrassing him, a noose around his neck, causing him all kinds of embarrassment. I think it is terrible,

Mr. Neary: Sir. But that gentleman was parroting the hon. the Premier and saying, "Yes, that is all they do is attack each other's character up there, character assassination. All they are interested in is smearing each other and making accusations about one another." And so therefore what the Premier was saying and what some of the ministers were saying was that, "How are you going to get a man to run as Premier of this Province?" Now we have seven of them and pretty soon it is going to be eight, as soon as Mr. McGrath flings his hat in the ring.

What kind of hypocrisy, Sir! What kind of hypocrisy is that! And if you had an election right now you would have people scabbling to run as candidates. So, Mr. Speaker, that does not hold water. It does not hold water, Sir, that argument. I do not hear these parrots now saying, "Well, let us see, last year-I thought I heard Mr. Moores say last year that, you know, you are going to have a job to get somebody who want to be Premier of this Province. Now you have seven of them looking for his job." Why?

MR. HICKMAN: They got no stamps.

MR. NEARY: Did they not want to serve their Province?  
They got no stamps. That is right, they got no sense.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is terrible that it should happen at this particular time, the worst time in our history, when we have so much unemployment and we have so many problems facing the people, the ordinary Newfoundlander, when we have so many things tearing the heart strings out of the ordinary person in this Province, who is finding it very difficult to survive, whose son and daughter cannot find a job, cannot cope with the high cost of living, ripped off by the big supermarket chains. As we saw the other day there is an investigation now, an enquiry going on in Ontario in connection with the big supermarket chains that are soaking suppliers, distributors, soaking them kickbacks, and kickbacks should have nothing to do with the cost of food. It is

Mr. Neary: happening in this Province. The last session of the House, if hon. gentlemen will remember, my colleague the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and myself asked the former Minister of Consumer Affairs some questions about the kickback policy of Dominion Stores in this Province. And we were told by the minister that he had not heard anything about it. He got up, "I never heard anything about it. If somebody would only tell me about it, bring it to my attention, I would look into it. I have no intention to look into it. It is all gossip. It is all malicious gossip." It turns out, Sir, now that over in Ontario the federal government - the provincial government, rather, have ordered an enquiry on behalf of

MR. NEARY: the consumers into the kick-back policy of the big supermarket chains. But has this government ordered an inquiry into the kickback schemes here in this Province where it is more blatant than in Ontario? Or are they just interested in plugging up little leaks? What about the eyeglasses? The federal Department of Corporate Affairs, Warren Allmand, the other day sent me a report that was done, that took two or three years to do, done by the Restrictive Trade Practices branch of his department. What they say is Newfoundland is one of eight provinces where eyeglass manufacturers, people who supply eyeglasses, opticians and optometrists, cannot advertise the cost of eyeglasses in Newfoundland. They cannot put an ad in the paper saying, 'Buy your eyeglasses here, we will give you a discount.' 'Buy your eyeglasses here, we will give you a pair free.' 'Buy your eyeglasses here and here is the price.' They are not allowed to do it in this Province no more than the lawyers say that they cannot advertise. Why is it? Because there is no legislation on the books! There is no legislation on the statutes, Mr. Speaker, to give the opticians the right to advertise in this Province. And I guarantee you that is something we are going to do in a hurry when we become the government of this Province - bring in legislation enabling eyeglass suppliers, people who have anything to do with examining the eyes, that they can advertise their wares in the newspaper and they can put a price on it and then people can shop around. Because one of the big causes, Sir, of the high price of eyeglasses in this Province is lack of competition. I do not know if my hon. friend read the report or not, and I certainly did, because I made a presentation to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission when they were here, so therefore I was interested in the recommendations.



MR. NEARY: And a major recommendation of that report that was released by Warren Allmand last week, presented to the department in December, was that suppliers of eyeglasses be allowed to advertise, put the price of their eyeglasses in the newspapers. And another recommendation which was fairly important is the fact that we should have another laboratory in this Province, because Imperial Optical have a monopoly. Imperial Optical not only have a monopoly in Newfoundland, but right across Canada and they have been ordered by the Restrictive Trade Practices branch of the federal Department of Corporate and Consumer Affairs to sell some of their holdings to create a little more competition in the industry, to try to get the price of eyeglasses down where they should be.

And we should also, Sir, while I am on the subject of eyeglasses, bring in legislation regulating the fitting of contact lenses which is something, as Your Honour knows, just cannot be done by any quack.

MR. POWER: My contacts are all right.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says his contacts are all right. Well, I would like to meet the hon. gentleman ten, fifteen, twenty years from now and I hope he will be able to tell me the same thing.

MR. POWER: I certainly hope so.

MR. NEARY: I hope so, Sir. I hope so, because the trouble with contact lenses is that you would never know unless they are done by people who know what they are doing, you would never know the damage that is being done to your eyes.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Not only that, but contacts are being used in Canada that have been banned by the Health and Food Administration in the States.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Contact lenses are being used in Canada that have been banned in the

MR. NEARY: United States. I do not know if we are using them in Newfoundland or not, but we certainly need legislation to regulate the industry and to give the industry the right to advertise.

And, Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of advertising, putting the price of eyeglasses in the papers and so on, I was highly amused - I believe it was in the morning news or the yesterday morning news - to pick up the news and see that the lawyers, the money-makers, the money-grabbers, have decided that they are not going to advertise in this Province. Is that not something? They are not going to advertise. They are afraid to advertise, they are afraid to follow the example given out in British Columbia where the lawyers put their fees in the newspaper to say, 'Here is how much we charge for this. Here is our charge for this.' And you could even get a cut rate in British Columbia. The lawyers here decided that they are going to keep their little - is it a green book or a blue book?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Cannot remember, boy, it is so long since I used one.

MR. NEARY: I think it is a little green book. They are going to keep it locked up in their top drawer and soak us.

MR. W. ROWE: Ask the Minister of Justice.

MR. NEARY: They are going to soak it to the consumer, give her all the traffic can bear. Mr. Speaker, is there anything we can do about that as a group of legislators?

MR. W. ROWE: Yes.

MR. NEARY: What can we do? My hon. colleague should advise me. What should we do?

MR. W. ROWE: Pass a law allowing advertising.

MR. NEARY: Pass a law, the same as the eyeglass.

MR. W. ROWE: No restrictions on advertising in any society, professional or otherwise.

MR. NEARY: Right. Right. Right on.

My hon. colleague is right on.

We should pass more consumer legislation in this Province. Give the eyeglass industry the right to advertise. Give the lawyers the right to advertise.

MR. W. ROWE: All professionals.

MR. NEARY: That is right. No discrimination, no recriminations; if you are a member of the Bar Society and you advertise you should not get the boot because you advertise, get kicked out. Right?

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: If my hon. friend became Premier I believe my hon. friend would do that. I must say I want to thank the hon. gentleman, by the way, just to change the subject for a moment, I want to thank the hon. gentleman, and I said before inside and outside of this House that of all the hon. crowd on that side of the House the hon. gentleman is the only one that will give you a straight answer and an honest answer and I found that in the last several years in this House since my hon. friend has been here. We are not of the same political persuasion but I have to give credit

MR. NEARY: where credit is due and I have to say that the hon. gentleman -

MR. DOODY: Too much praise (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No. I am not trying to build the hon. gentleman up for his leadership campaign because the one that I would like to see win is the Minister of Fisheries even though he is on a disaster course in the fishery. But we might be able to shake a little bit of common sense into him.

MR. W. ROWE: Not even though but because he is on a disaster course.

MR. NEARY: But that minister, Sir, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman I must say in the past several years is the only one who has given me straight, honest answers. Sometimes, I might add, to his own detriment, especially, Sir, when we were trying to stop the Public Treasury from being looted by some of his colleagues in the last - well, in the last six years. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows full well. We heard Mr. Andrew Davidson called a crackpot and a fool and a lunatic in this House, and now everything that that gentleman put in his 1974 affidavit and in his 1978 affidavit is now coming true as evidence unfolds in front of the Mahoney Commission of Enquiry - everything, everything! Anybody who has read the first affidavit and the second affidavit can only come to the conclusion that it was not Mr. Davidson who was cracked and who was a lunatic, that this was a diversionary tactic by some members of the administration to try to get the heat off themselves.

And Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be distracted, I want to come back to my hon. gentleman but I am going to go into the Health Sciences Complex and the other scandals and the Mahoney Commission of Enquiry and the Carbonear Hospital

MR. NEARY: and everything else, but I do want to thank my hon. gentleman especially for the recent and prompt reply that I received from the hon. gentleman in connection with a simple request that I made to the President of the Newfoundland Development Corporation for some information in connection with a company called Pelcon that is now in receivership, that conned the Newfoundland Government and the Canadian Government into giving them \$6 million or \$7 million taxpayers' dollars, conned them into it, duped them. And I could not get a simple bit of information from the President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation on whether or not, before Pelcon was given this money by DREE, by the Newfoundland Government through the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation \$2.5 million and \$700,000 or \$800,000 from Newfoundland Development Corporation, whether or not they proved to the Newfoundland Government that they had markets for their product which happened to be an inductive connector, an underwater connector.

All I asked, and I have been asking for months, did they have contracts for their product, for these underwater connectors? And the President of the Newfoundland Development Corporation had the gall and the face to tell me that he was not going to give me this information. He is only a flunky, a transplanted manager of a finance company.

AN HON. MEMBER: A transplanted Liberal.

MR. NEARY: No, he is not a transplanted Liberal. Now let us see what he said to me when I asked him. Let us see what he said. Just listen. You talk about contempt. Listen to this:

MR. NEARY: "February 2, 1979, Mr. Stephen Neary, MHA, LaPoile Electoral District, Dear Mr. Neary; In reply to your letter of February 1st we are unable to release any more detailed information on Felcon Limited than that which had been provided to you in our letter of December 1, 1978," which was the amount of money they gave him. "As outlined at that time this extent of disclosure on businesses receiving funding is that which has been agreed by both levels of government to which this corporation reports. In the light of this we are unable to be of further assistance to you at this time."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I interrupt the hon. member now for the debate on the adjournment. It is deemed that a motion to adjourn is before the House. The first matter for discussion, the closing of the House of Assembly. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, at the time that I gave notice that I would be debating this we had assumed that the House would in fact be closing and that the government would not once more have bungled the procedures of this House. I assumed that the government by its majority would once more be able to carry a motion, put a motion through that would carry without debate. They should have been able to devise that, adjourning this House until such time as they wanted it to be adjourned, namely March 27th or the 29th or whatever it might be. Instead, of course, the House Leader bungled it once more and we find ourselves in the position now where we have a debatable motion before the House which will not finish, has not finished as a result of Your Honour having called this debate, which will have to be debated further, tomorrow presumably, in order to give it some effect. And in the meantime Your Honour is bound by Standing Order 31(h) the latter part of which says at the end of this debate "the Speaker shall put the motion to adjourn, and if the motion is carried, shall leave the Chair until Friday, but if the said motion if defeated, the Speaker shall leave the Chair until 8 p.m., when the order of business considered by the House immediately before the Speaker having deemed the motion to adjourn to have been made shall be resumed."

MR. W. ROWE: So the position is now, Sir, that at six o'clock Your Honour will put the motion and the government has itself in the classic dilemma of if they vote in favour of the motion to adjourn we will meet again tomorrow at 3 o'clock and continue the business of the Province, or if they vote against it we will meet at eight o'clock tonight and presumably they will try with their usual arrogance, they will try to force the House through an all night session until this debate concludes and they can put the motion to adjourn until March 27th, a week or so after their famous leadership convention. Now that is the dilemma the hon. House Leader has got himself in as leader of the government side of the House. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, he is announcing in a quasi public manner that he is going to get out of politics and resume the practice of law. Certainly he will never reach the bench if his record as Minister of Justice is ever taken into consideration. But, Sir, why do we want the House not to close? Because, Mr. Speaker, there are many matters which demand the attention of members on both sides of the House. We have many matters which have to be dealt with, Sir, for the benefit of the people of this Province. I mentioned a couple in my question earlier this afternoon. Employment and unemployment - 40,000 people unemployed. Even if you do not take into consideration the people who have given up in desperation - eighteen or twenty per cent of our population unemployed, double, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate when this government took over six or seven years ago, double. It was nine per cent at that time.

Energy, Mr. Speaker, power and -

MR. ROBERTS:

Is there no place to sit down?

I am sorry to interrupt the hon.

gentleman.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, power and the electrical rates in this Province which are going to go up double if this government does not do anything about it during the next three or four years. The

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 322

AH-3

MP. W. ROWE:

Vice President of the Newfoundland and  
Labrador Power Corporation stated at a public enquiry last year,



MR. W.N. ROWE:

I guess, or maybe a year and a half ago in front of the Public Utilities Board that we could expect power rates to go up double within five years and now we are seeing that self-fulfilling prophesy coming through - 10 per cent now, 10 per cent last year, 10 per cent this year, 10 per cent the year after-and the people of this Province, Sir, driven to desperation, having been encouraged by the government to install electrical heat and so on in their homes, now having to pay through the nose for electrical heat and for light and for power generally.

Mr. Speaker, surely any government which had the concerns of the people of the Province at heart would want to get into that matter to try to decide what to do about the matter and then perhaps even put a freeze on any further increases until such time where we knew where we were going with regard to Upper Churchill power and Lower Churchill power.

And, Sir, another matter as a result of the statements made by Magistrate LeClair about the state, as he saw it - many people would not agree - the state of fire investigation in this Province, as a result of that, Sir, you have the whole population of this Province in a state of disquiet, anxiety and unrest not knowing whether fires are going to be adequately investigated or not. I happen to believe, knowing as I do some of the people involved in fire investigation, that we do have an adequate service here for investigating fires. But, Sir, the public is generally uneasy about this. And the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, to complete with one or two more sentences, the Minister of Justice, Sir, is not the least bit concerned - he is only concerned about getting out after the next election - not the least bit concerned, more concerned with political attacks, setting up royal commission into things which are water under the bridge and which were dealt with in an internal manner by the police department, leaks by the police department, ~~not concerned~~ about fires at Elizabeth Towers and the risk of 150 lives, not concerned about the unrest of people in this Province about statements made by a magistrate. No, Sir, not concerned about any of those things but 'Close her down' to suit the interests of their own political party and forget about the interests of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The second matter for debate; subject matter, forestry policy. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread suspicion in this Province today that the forestry in this Province is in a mess and the utterances from the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture today, and the utterances we heard this Province listen to and the people who makes a living off the forestry industry in this Province today, the utterances that came from him in Europe re-affirm any fear that the forestry management as we see being practiced in this Province today is indeed ruinous, will ruin the forest industry of this country.

Mr. Speaker, three years ago the Premier of Newfoundland, with the then Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, went to Europe and having come back - the press remember this; the people of Newfoundland certainly who depends on the forest industry will remember this - he said that over the next three or four years as a result of our being to Europe and having looked at what the Europeans are doing with their woodlots and their forestry products we will see 5,000 new jobs created in the forestry of Newfoundland. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that there are far less jobs in forestry in Newfoundland today than there were when the Premier made that statement, far less. Linerboard has shut down, most of the sawmills are shut down, the two major companies have reduced their logging operations. Now not only do we not have one of the 5,000 that the Premier promised us, but we have a lot less. Now shades of the Premier's statement came out of, I think, Vienna where the minister and everyone in Newfoundland will remember this - that the Minister of Forestry led that delegation for one reason and for one reason only: within a day, a day before the Minister of Fisheries was supposed to have left Newfoundland and represented Newfoundland in that anti-sealing campaign, he decided that the leadership of the party was too important. So the Premier tapped the Minister of Forestry to go and take his place and within three or four days, having arrived in Europe, the Minister of Forestry was making statements, let me quote, "I do not think there is any limit on the market for good timber in Europe."

MR. FLIGHT: "I do not think there is any limit." If there is no limit on the market then let me tell the minister there is no limit on the jobs that can be created in the forestry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Is the minister telling us that the markets in Europe today, when the Premier made a statement that he was going to increase by 5,000 the jobs in forestry in Newfoundland how was he going to increase the employees in forestry by 5,000 if he was not aware of the markets available in Europe? It was in Europe that he and the previous Forestry Minister spent a week touring the various forest industries.

Mr. Speaker, this is the crunch, this is the position of forestry in Newfoundland today; we have to presume that if the Minister of Fisheries had led that delegation, as was planned, we would never know about the unlimited markets for our forestry raw materials in Europe today. Now that is the kind of management, that is the kind of control and that is the kind of awareness that the present Minister of Forestry and his department is putting on forestry in this Province. There are more people in this Province today employed in the catering sector. Forestry is our second largest resource next to fish - renewable resource - and there are more people employed selling fish and chips! Less than 12,000 people in this Province today are making a living in forestry, Sawmills shut down, sawmillers cannot get any more licencing. The bulk of the budworm damaged timber in Newfoundland today is on Price and Bowaters limits, yet the minister stands up and tells the people of Newfoundland that he just issued permits to export 30,000 cords of woods off Crown limits when the minister knows full well that the timber on Crown limits in Newfoundland today cannot sustain the sawmill operations we have. We have sawmills shutting down because they do not have a sustainable supply of timber, yet he allows 30,000 cords to be exported off those limits

MR. FLIGHT: and at the same time he allows Price and Bowaters to sit on the best part of 7 million cords of budworm damaged wood, and Price and Bowaters will not allow the Province, the Department of Forestry or the private operators to go in and salvage that wood for either our local sawmilling industry or for export.

Mr. Speaker, there is no forestry policy. There is one forestry policy in this Province today; that is the forest policy that Price and Bowaters are setting for the minister. The only input the minister is having in forestry in this Province is the measley bit of wood that is situated on Crown lands in this Province, and that is not worth talking about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will wind up by just reading this. Listen to this logic. "The Forestry Minister says that he is encouraged by the development, exporting wood, as that means markets are beginning to open up for Newfoundland wood which is located in areas where it is not now economical to have the wood shipped to local markets." What he is saying is he has discovered a way to market wood in Newfoundland - cut wood in Newfoundland and ship it to Europe cheaper than he could ship it to Grand Falls or to some of our local operators.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the people making a living in forestry can understand that logic, or can have any confidence in the forestry future of this Province, it escapes me.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MAYNARD: Well quite simply, Mr. Speaker, I did not expect the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to understand the logic in any case.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

He is against Abitibi as well.

MR. FLIGHT:

And you are for Paul Demarais.

MR. NEARY:

We know all about Abitibi.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

And against Price.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MAYNARD:

The hon. member is bringing up again the situation that sawmillers cannot get on Price and Bowaters limits. Sawmillers are operating on Price and Bowaters limits at this point in time and they have been for a number of years. The matter of sawmillers operating in integrated operations producing both sawlogs and pulpwood, the economics of it has not been worked out by either the sawmillers themselves or anyone else at this point in time, and it is going to take some time to work it out. But the integrated logging operations are being pursued, the studies on them are being pursued and hopefully at some point in time we will find a way to have integrated logging operations on the Price limits and on the Bowaters limits. I think the hon. member must also be aware that any wood that is cut on Bowaters and Price limits is under strict union control and we have to

Mr. Maynard: work with the union, and their wage rates and scales in this matter.

As far as the statements in Europe were concerned, the statements that I made in Europe were the result of many contacts that we had over the past three or four years with the embassies in Europe through their trade commissioners, and specifically the trade commissioner in London who has been looking for markets in Europe for specifically Labrador wood. Why Labrador wood? Because it is some of the highest quality in the world and we wanted to find a market for the vast timber resources in the Lake Melville area and in other parts of Labrador.

Since Southern Sweden and Czechoslovakia, which has the only wood comparable to the Labrador fibre in the world, are now in a situation where they cannot supply the British and the French markets, these markets are opening up for wood from Labrador. Now the trade commissioners in the various embassies have been working on this for some years, and what the Premier said when he returned a few years ago was no way out of line. The prospects were there sometime in the future, not necessarily immediately at that point in time, but once the Europeans discovered, which they have at this point, that they do not have an excess of wood and that they have to import it from other countries.

The prospects for Labrador wood in the European market looks good because it is tremendously good fibre. Now if Labrador wood is developed for the European market it will be developed on the basis of having it turned into lumber, not the export of raw pulpwood. It will be turned into lumber and the residue, hopefully, if we can work out the details on thermo-mechanical pulping the residue will be put into other products, pulp products. That is something we have to pursue now that the markets are there. There is no point in pursuing it when there is no markets available for the fibre that is there.

Mr. Maynard: As far as the wood on the Island is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the wood on the Island, as the hon. member knows, is not a high quality wood. It is not a high quality wood compared to some other parts of Eastern Canada, certainly not a high quality wood compared to the European standards and it is very, very difficult - it has been difficult over the years to find a market for it. And the only market that can be found for any wood off the Island is for first class wood by Newfoundland standard. There is no point in the member saying that we are going in to cut the budworm killed wood and we are going to be able to sell it to Europe or sell it to other parts of the world, because they just will not buy it. There is no market for it. Whatever budworm killed wood can be used has to be used in the Province by the two existing paper mills and the one that is coming on stream in Stephenville, and possibly by some others in Eastern Canada.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that over the past five years since the 1974 Forest Management Taxation Act was introduced this Province has embarked through the DREE programmes on an intensive forest management programme, and that forest management programme has now been put into place and is being pursued. It is the first time in history that we have had one, but we do have one now and we will continue to pursue active and sensible forest management for a long time in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The third matter for debate is the McCarthy Royal Commission.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower respecting the McCarthy judicial enquiry, an enquiry that was set up as a result of three industrial deaths in Labrador City, at the Iron Ore Company there, of the deaths, just to brief members on them, one was attributed to an explosion in the

Mr. Lush: mine, another was a matter of electrocution, and the other was a truck accident where it was determined or suspected that there might have been some manufacturing malfunction in the truck. And this brought the whole matter of safety and working conditions in the Labrador City area into question. And as all hon. members know, for some time the workers had been concerned with other health and safety measures, and particularly dust control, so as a result of these three deaths there was pressure put upon the government to look into this. So the McCarthy Royal Commission was set up in February of 1977 to look into the causes of these three deaths and to further look into the whole matter of health and safety measures in the IOC operation.

My question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, was whether this enquiry was completed and, if so, whether the minister had received a copy. The minister indicated that he knew very little about the situation. He knew that there was a place called Labrador City. He knew that there was a situation where there was some problems related to health and safety, but



MR. LUSH:

he knew very little.

beyond that he showed that

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Energy knows less.

The Minister of Mines and

MR. W. N. ROWE:

the report.

The minister is sitting on

MR. LUSH:

Now I do not know who has the report. I do not know whether it is the Minister of Justice or whether it is the Minister of Mines and Energy, but somebody has the report. And, Mr. Speaker, my question was; What is happening to the report? Is the government going to take any action on this or are they going to take this Royal Commission the way that they have taken so many others from the Labrador area and just put it away on the shelves to collect dust and take no action on it? That is the question, Mr. Speaker. So where is the report? When is the government going to take action on it? My information from officials in Labrador City is that the report was submitted about a month ago - one part of the report submitted about a month ago. So, Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong it is up to the minister to straighten the situation out. But I have been informed by union officials in Labrador City that the report was handed to some Cabinet minister about a month ago, or mailed to the minister or whatever, but it was sent to the minister a month ago. The report is to be compiled in two parts, one related to the industrial deaths, the three industrial deaths, and the other to the Health and Safety measures. And my understanding is that the first part is compiled, mainly that concerning the three industrial deaths. So now, Mr. Speaker, why is this report not being made public? Why is there not some action taken on this report? Why is the public not informed about this report concerning the workers of Labrador City, a report which concerns this

MR. LUSH: important industry, a report, Mr. Speaker, that will have some tremendous ramifications for the people of that area and indeed for the whole Province? So we should hope whatever minister is responsible will tell us today something about this, tell us, if they have received the report, why they are sitting on it, Is there some evidence to suggest that the government is negligent in coming up with the kinds of legislation that these workers want? Just what is the situation? That is what we want to know, Mr. Speaker, so that we sort of allay the fears and put to rest the anxieties and frustrations of these workers in the Labrador City and the Wabush area. So if the minister in rising will give us some answers to these questions to tell us the status of this report that has now been two years - two years since this report was set up, February of 1977-and still no action, so can the minister indicate what is going on? If they have not received it, why this tremendous delay when the matter of health and safety is such an important matter to the workers in the Labrador City-Wabush area?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond very briefly to the questions of the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova, the position is that no report has been completed by His Honour, Judge McCarthy to date. I realize that Judge McCarthy announced at the beginning that he would be dealing with it in two parts and that he would be filing a report on the first part and then continue his hearings on the other. My understanding is - and I know it is true - that Judge McCarthy has been holding hearings not only in Labrador City but he has held them in other parts of the

MR. HICKMAN: Province; he has also travelled outside the Province and in fact outside of Canada where he has been hearing evidence in connection with the manufacturing of the machines in question. In any event, I simply want to assure the House that the report is not finished. I have made inquiries as to when we could expect to receive it and I am led to believe it will be very soon, but, you know, that is up to the Judge, not up to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that the House adjourn. Those in favour, 'Aye', contrary, 'Nay'. In my opinion the 'Nays' have it. I therefore leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
8:00 p.m. THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1979  
9:00 a.m. FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1979

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker!

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. House Leader.

MR. W. ROWE:

Which one?

MR. HICKMAN:

I move that this

House -

MR. W. ROWE:

Is this a point of order?

MR. HICKMAN:

- do not adjourn at

eleven o'clock.

MR. NEARY:

What does the hon.

gentleman want now?

MR. W. ROWE:

A point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order

has come up.

MR. W. ROWE:

My hon. colleague

had the floor and the hon. the Government

MR. W. N. ROWE:

House Leader rose and did not indicate that there was a point of order or anything, and I would submit, Sir, that my hon. colleague as a matter of right is entitled to be recognized having adjourned the debate before 5:30 P.M.

MR. HICKMAN:

To that point of order.

I was recognized by the Chair. I am not dealing with the matter that is before debate. The motion is a simple motion that must take place before 11:00 P.M. and that is that this House do not adjourn at 11:00 P.M. That is the only motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! This has come up a number of times before. Two members arose. The Chair has to recognize a member. This in no way takes away from any other member's rights before the House. Each member has his rights that will be recognized by the Chair. As it happened I did recognize the hon. House Leader and I understand that he has now put a motion before the House which is in order, and the substance of the order is such that the precedent of this House is that it is a non-debatable motion so I now do have to put before the House the motion before the Chair. And the motion before the Chair is that at 11:00 P.M. this House do not adjourn. Is the House ready for the question?

MR. NEARY:

That is exactly what we wanted.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour, 'Aye', Contrary, 'Nay', carried.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order has come up.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning the rules of the House as they apply to these proceedings. I am looking forward to hearing my hon.

MR. W. ROWE: friend a little later on, Sir, but there is something we should get clear here. Standing Order 22 of the rules, the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, goes as follows. "A motion to adjourn (except when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance), shall always be in order, but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been had."

The point, Sir, is that the last motion before this House, not counting the one the hon. House Leader just made which was a motion not to adjourn, was the motion that was put before this House at six o'clock which was that the House do now adjourn. Now, Sir, we have the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) rising to speak to another motion that the House do adjourn until such and such a time, another motion to adjourn. Now, Sir, I would be the first to say that the wording of Standing Order 22 is a little ambiguous in that it says, "No second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been had," Sir. But I would submit, Sir, that we are talking about a motion to adjourn, which we had at six o'clock. Now we are dealing with another motion to adjourn in slightly different words -

MR. NEARY: It is out of order.

MR. W. ROWE: - and, Sir, that that is out of order until such time as an intermediate proceeding is had before this House, perhaps a bill is introduced and dealt with or some intermediate proceeding as defined in Beauchesne and in Erskine May. And Sir, once that

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 327

MM - 4

MR. W. ROWE:                    intermediate proceeding  
is dealt with, then, Sir, we get back to the motion to  
adjourn, but -

MR. NEARY:                    Right.

MR. W. ROWE:                    - that it is out of order .  
now, Mr. Speaker, to deal with another motion to adjourn,



MR. W.N. ROWE: the House having dealt with a motion to adjourn immediately previous to this matter and no intermediate proceeding having been had.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right. You cannot make another motion while this one is before the House.

MR. W.N. ROWE: You cannot have two motions to adjourn in a row.

MR. S. NEARY: You have to have another sitting of the House or we have to do something that can be recorded.

MR. HICKMAN: Or we go all night.

MR. S. NEARY: We will just carry on, that is right. But before we can get back to the regular business we have to have another motion to adjourn, because if we carry on all night - excuse me, Mr. Speaker if we carry on all night, say we go on for two days, for forty-eight hours, the minister then at the end of the forty-eight hours, the Government House Leader, cannot make another motion to adjourn. There has to be something happen in between, another sitting of the House. There has to be some ordinary business of the House transacted.

MR. W.N. ROWE: An intermediate procedure as defined in Beauchesne.

MR. S. NEARY: Exactly.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will carry right on?

MR. S. NEARY: We will carry right on up to a week before the leadership, then we will adjourn to let them straighten out their problems.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Order, please!

Just to recapitulate, there was a motion before the House that the House adjourn to a certain date. At 5:30 Mr. Speaker announced that a motion to adjourn is deemed before the House. That is not another motion to adjourn; he is just merely stating that that motion is still in effect. After a certain period of time the question was put to the House that it should or should not adjourn, and that motion was negated. So the motion to adjourn was negated at 6:00 and according to our Standing Orders we therefore had to return at 8:00. Now at this point in time,

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): if the House will give me leave, I will consult with the Clerk of the House as to what proceeding is now before the House. Is the proceeding to adjourn still before the House? Is the motion to adjourn still before the House or do we need another item of business, another proceeding before we can go to that?

MR. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in that case and to relieve Your Honour of the anxiety and the perplexing question that has been put before Your Honour, I ask that we move to Motion no. 7, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Housing." Second reading,

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that Bill No. 9 entitled "An Act Respecting The Department Of Housing" be now read a second time.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) is not yet in his seat but I am sure he will be here shortly. The purpose of this bill which is before the House, which I know and gathering from the comments of the hon. the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) who is the official spokesman on housing for the Opposition is that it is a piece of legislation that is welcomed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I recall very vividly the last day we sat in December. The hon. gentleman, and I commend him for it, it shows the spirit of independence that the hon. gentleman for St. John's West possesses. He is not subject to party discipline, he never has been subject to party discipline, he never will be subject to party discipline; he is the absolute epitome, the absolute epitome and essence of democratic independence -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Democratic Toryism.

MR. A. HICKMAN: - and his right wing philosophies do have a place in this hon. chamber. And I very distinctly remember, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman was co-operating with my hon. colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, that he showed a certain degree of anger and a certain degree of chagrin over the fact that

MR. HICKMAN: this bill before the House, that we so desperately and with great anxiety wanted to bring before the House before the Christmas adjournment but could not get the unanimous consent opposite and I share the concern, and I did at that time, and the regret, as I know my colleague the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) did, with the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen).

Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before the House, the explanatory note is clear and unambiguous, the kind of explanatory note that anyone would read and understand, but if anyone has any questions I will read it twice. The explanatory note says: "This bill would provide for a Department of Housing and the responsibilities of the Minister of Housing." Nothing could be clearer than the intent of that explanatory note. But, Mr. Speaker, all of us have know, all of us have learned from experience in this hon. House that we do have a responsibility to our colleagues, to all hon. members, to sometimes look beyond these lengthy explanatory notes to bring to the attention of the House the full intent and purpose of the bill and I see my colleagues from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) and St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who have been advocating this major step forward for quite some time, nodding their approval as I embark upon my lengthy discourse concerning this magnificent and forward looking piece of legislation.

It is indeed, Mr. Speaker, proof positive that the Moores Government, that will soon be replaced by either the Morgan Government or the Hickey Government or the Maynard Government or the Doody Government or the Peckford Government or the Carter Government or the Barry Government or governments yet unannounced, the last act of the Moores Government, the Moores administration - I am never quite clear whether it is Moores administration -

MR. ROBERTS: The Queen's Government -

MR. HICKMAN: - the Queen's Government,

MR. ROBERTS: - the Moores administration.

MR. HICKMAN:

Well I will go back over it. The Morgan administration, the Dickey administration, the Maynard administration, the Doody administration, the Carter administration, the Peckford administration, the Barry administration, and I am not at liberty, Mr. Speaker, to disclose the intentions of other Newfoundlanders who are aspiring to the greatest office in this land. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the hon. the Premier is proud indeed that the last act of his administration will be to bring before this House, and hopefully have it unanimously passed, Mr. Speaker, the protection of those people, those residents of Newfoundland who are fortunate enough to own houses or, indeed, those who find themselves in a position of a leasehold arrangement or leasing arrangement will have some protection at law, they will have a minister - whose name has already been announced but I can not refer to him with enthusiasm because I am sworn to fine impartiality in so far as the leadership campaign is concerned - but in any event, the theme, the purpose of this act is to show to Newfoundlanders, to prove to Newfoundlanders beyond all reasonable doubt that the Moores administration is determined that there will be a new thrust in housing in this Province, a new thrust of caring for the people who are struggling to find adequate housing in the Province of Newfoundland, people who are struggling and trying to cope with the horrendous cost of housing that we see in this Province with ever increasing costs.

Mr. Speaker, I would wish that when the Constitution is amended that it be so amended that there would be some paramountcy in housing extending beyond the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures so that indeed we can legislate, or try to legislate to try and control the cost of housing materials and other goods that are manufactured beyond our shores and when they come in here we are almost helpless to do anything about them.

MR. HICKMAN: This is one of the things, Mr. Speaker, that has caused, in my opinion, some of the strains that we see upon the confederacy today: It is because we have been placed in ten airtight compartments in so far as legislative jurisdiction is concerned; it is because we find ourselves in a position, Mr. Speaker, where we cannot legislate upon matters that will in time affect the well-being of the residents of our Province; that things occur in other Provinces that have a very traumatic effect and a very significant effect upon, Mr. Speaker, what occurs within a province and we have no alternative but to put up with it and try and control it when it comes within our sphere of jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Carry on.

MR. HICKMAN: I was going to because I know that the hon. member from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) will have a lot to say on this when he arrives, but it has been suggested to me that most hon. gentleman are being overwhelmed by my oratory and they want me to continue. So in all humility I accede to the requests and adoration of my colleagues behind me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we believe that setting up a separate department of housing will allow a minister to devote his full attention and his full interest - I see some of my colleagues starting to leave, which annoys me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is encouragement.

that I need, Mr. Speaker, when I am standing here -

MR. NOLAN: That is because you said you are not running.

MR. HICKMAN: Who said I am not running? Who said I am not running? You have not seen the draft yet. You have not seen that draft movement that is emanating from Calmer.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there was a draft that started in Calmer only today, and it would appear to me that all citizens, all two of them, who reside in Calmer in the ancient and hon. district of Grand Bank, will be insisting that -

MR. NEARY: We are not going to loan you 'Roger' so you may as well forget it. You are not getting him.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is another agonizing decision that I have. There was a proposition put to me by the hon. gentlemen opposite - I will say 'gentlemen' so that I will not identify the three or four - who said, "How about doing us a favour? How about running for the leadership of the Conservative Party?" And I said, "Well now, that is something that is not to be overlooked." "We will give you the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) as your campaign manager, you will lose the leadership race, and you will have done us a great favour because he will have to join you in order to be your campaign manager." And I said "No, I am not prepared to make that supreme sacrifice in the interest of my Province." So whether the hon. gentlemen like it or not I cannot relieve them of their problem. They have it and they will have to solve it and resolve it as best they can. But I have passed on to one of my colleagues - and this was before the impartiality rule was imposed - I have passed on to one of my colleagues, and obviously then it was not Mr. Barry - the information that the band is available.

MR. NEARY: Who are you supporting? That is what we want to know.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, do I have to repeat again that the rule of fine impartiality has been imposed upon us.

MR. NDLAN: Who gets you to the dentist on time?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, does my colleague have to be harassed like this?

MR. HICKMAN: May I be heard in absolute silence? Mr. Speaker, I am being interrupted again now. The hon. the Premier has gone up for a chin - wag with Mr. Speaker, which he is wont to do at times; interrupt, not showing any respect for my seniority on

MR. HICKMAN: this side of the House at least. Other than the two hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. the member for Burgeo—the three, the member for Burgeo-LaPoile, Fogo and Burin-Placentia West, I have fallen into the category of being a very senior member of this House. But I am still virile, still young, still ready and willing and able to serve.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have digressed from the principle of this bill.

MR. DOODY: A home is a home even if it is the House of Assembly.

MR. HICKMAN: The principle of this bill, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, is that we should have and we must have a department of housing so that the Minister of Housing can devote not only his attentions to what falls within the legislative sphere and the legislative jurisdiction of this hon. House constitutionally, but to try once again

MR. HICKMAN: to persuade the appropriate minister, I think it was the hon. Mr. Danson in Ottawa, to change his mind and once again come into the cost sharing programmes that I thought were so effective in Newfoundland prior to the announcement to their cancellation. And I notice that the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) shares again my concern that the Feds have unilaterally decided to remove themselves from these cost sharing programmes that were so relevant and so beneficial to the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I find that I am not getting the attention I deserve. This bill is not getting the attention it deserves. I am going to reserve the major thrust in this debate for the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) when he arrives and consequently I move the adjournment of this debate.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, this is a private member's motion. I can submit the authorities to Your Honour if Your Honour wishes, but I move, Your Honour, that this House do now adjourn until March 27th, 1979 at three o'clock in the afternoon.

MR. HICKMAN: That is not a debatable motion.

MR. WELLS: That is not a debatable motion, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER (DR COLLINS): Order, please! My understanding is that the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) has moved the adjournment of the House until a certain day. The hon. member for Kilbride had the floor of the House at the time and I would refer hon. members to the standing order that the hon. Leader of the Opposition read a short time ago which stated that a motion to adjourn is always in order. So in my view the motion put forward by the hon. member for Kilbride is a motion in order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is non-debatable! It is non-debatable!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour has no choice but to revert -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, Order!



MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour has to revert back to the -

MR. HICKMAN: He has not.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I beg your pardon, Sir; Your Honour has to revert back to the original motion.

MR. WELLS: To that point of order, Your Honour, if I may, There has been an intervening procedure or proceeding before the House, namely debate under the housing bill, and then the new motion is in order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! If there are no other comments to be made, and I do not really think there are any others necessary because it seems to be quite straightforward. There was a procedure before the House, that is Bill No. 9, I believe it was, Bill no. 9, and a proceeding is when a question is put from the Chair. It was moved that Bill no. 9 be read a second time, That question was put from the Chair, therefore that constitutes a proceeding and the hon. member for Kilbride, in my understanding, following the hon. minister's introduction of the bill, then rose, was recognized, almost immediately, as was his right under standing rule no. 22 he moved the adjournment of the House and I see that this is quite in order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, on a point of order, Sir. The member for Kilbride, Sir, stood in his place tonight and stated quite clearly that this was a private member's motion. Now, Sir, my understanding is that private members' motions are only entertained on Private Member's Day which is on Wednesday. You can give notice of

MR. F. ROWE: a private member's motion on any other day or at any other time but the question is can you move a private member's motion on any other day -

MR. WELLS: The motion is in order.

MR. F. ROWE: If the hon. member for Kilbride will hear me out he will have the opportunity to speak to the Speaker on the subject. My question, Sir, is this; I submit that it is not in order for a backbencher to move such a motion calling the private member's motion on a day other than Private Member's Day. He did not give notice of the motion, he moved the motion and therefore it is out of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is very clearly set out in our Standing Orders that a motion to adjourn is always in order and a motion to adjourn can be made by any member of the House, private member or government.

I might refer

Mr. Wells: Your Honour to page 106 of Beauchesne, when it refers to various motions before the House, Subsection 2 of Clause (32) on page 106 says, "All other motions, including adjournment motions, shall be decided without debate or amendment." Beauchesne is full of references to these, I have a list of them here, and I will gladly read them to Your Honour if Your Honour wishes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! If the hon. -

MR. NEARY: We already have -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Just pardon me one minute, please.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, we already have a ruling from the Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I believe the hon. member was referring to another edition. If he could just give me the paragraph again.

MR. WELLS: The Fourth Edition, 1958.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): And the paragraph number?

MR. WELLS: That is the same one. It is page 106, Your Honour, Clause (32) at the top, Subsection (2) almost down towards the bottom of the page. Perhaps if you wish, Your Honour, while I am doing it I ought to refer Your Honour to some other selections from Beauchesne so that Your Honour can - I will hold on to mine and give my hon. colleague's.

MR. J. NOLAN: Did the hon. member finished his question?

MR. WELLS: Well, I have asked the hon. Speaker if he wishes more citations from Beauchesne. I am waiting.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I understand the point of order before the Chair was raised by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) related to whether the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) could put the motion to adjourn. That was the substance of his point of order.

MR. NEARY: We have not had a proceeding yet, Sir. You cannot make a motion if you have not had a proceeding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): And the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde mentions it was stated that this is a private member's motion. My understanding of the matter is this, and I will go over this again, that the hon. member for Kilbride rose and was recognized and he very shortly put a motion. Whether he stated that this was a private member's motion I think is immaterial. One can regard a backbencher as a private member. I think one has to regard a backbencher as a private member. I do not think the fact that he said that this is a private member's motion means that he cannot put a motion as a private member. On certain days, if he is a private member, he has right over government orders, but that does not mean that on another day if he is recognized by the Chair he cannot put a motion, because if that were so it would mean that only members of the government itself could put motions, including dilatory motions and other sorts of motions which of course would limit the rights of the members of this House unless they were members of the government.

I therefore would rule that the hon. member for Kilbride was correct and within his rights that when he was recognized by the Chair he made a motion to adjourn. And Standing Order (22) states that, "A motion to adjourn shall always be in order."

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, actually it is a point of order - already raised before Your Honour made his subsequent remarks - which I did not have an opportunity to speak to.

AN HON. MEMBER: So what!

MR. W. N. ROWE: It is an important matter, Sir, and it should be dealt with. I refer Your Honour to some citations in Beauchesne, Fourth Edition, 1958. Now there is a later edition of Beauchesne over there without the notations. Page 89 of Beauchesne, Paragraph 99 (2)

Mr. W. N. Rowe: states, "The term "intermediate proceeding" used in Standing Order 25," - which is similar if not identical to our Standing Order - "means a proceeding that can properly be entered on the Journals. The true test is that if any parliamentary proceeding takes place, the second motion is regular, and the Clerk ought to enter the proceedings to show that the motion in question is regular." Now the point is, Sir, it has to be something which can be entered on the Journal of the House before it is considered to be an "intermediate proceeding".

Now, Sir, I go further and refer Your Honour to Page 109, Paragraph 118 of Beauchesne, the same edition, which goes as follows, "It has never been understood in the Canadian House of Commons

MR. W. ROWE: that the word "proceedings" covered speeches; it is not applied to arguments but it covers utterances bearing directly on making motions, moving amendments, presenting reports, putting the questions, answering questions placed on the Order Paper, voting, naming a member, etc.; it is construed as relating to procedure and not to debates.

"A Member's speech dealing with such matters as explanations, congratulations," etc., "which have not been appointed for consideration and do not appear on the Order Paper, cannot be regarded as a part of the proceedings of the House."

And I refer Your Honour to paragraph 120 of the same edition of Beauchesne, on page 111, and it goes as follows:

"The proceedings between the rising of a Member to move a motion and the ascertainment by the Chair of the decision of the House constitute a debate, and this process affords an opportunity for, and usually involves discussion, although a decision may be reached without discussion. The interval between the proposing and the putting of the question, which is usually used for discussion, gives an opportunity for further proceedings such as the moving of an amendment; and this may give rise to a subsidiary debate, with its own question and decision, within the principal debate."

The point, Sir, is that a minister merely rising in his place and making a speech on a bill which has already been introduced and given first reading -

MR. NEARY: Right. That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: - Mr. Speaker, does not constitute an intermediate proceeding.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear! That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, it is important.

MR. F. ROWE: It is right there in black and white.

MR. W. ROWE: It states in black and white, Sir, in Beauchesne that a speech or debate does not constitute an intermediate proceeding. If somebody moved an amendment, if somebody gave first reading, I would submit, Sir, to a bill that is before the House and that was entered in the Journal or anything which is entered in the Journal of the House, an amendment, the introduction of a bill, answering a question, for example, or a ministerial statement which is entered in the Journal of the House, a petition, for example, which is entered in the Journal of the House, all of these matters are intermediate proceedings. The fact that the hon. Minister of Justice got up and spoke for ten minutes or so on second reading, Sir, is not an intermediate proceeding as covered by Beauchesne and, therefore, Sir, should not be construed as an intermediate proceeding unless it is in the nature of something which can be entered in the Journal. And, Sir, of course today's copy of the minutes of the House for December 12th., which I believe was the last time the House met before today, gives some examples of things which are considered to be intermediate proceedings because they are entered into the Journal of the House.

The Minister of Justice, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, noted the death of Mr. Dixon of Fortune, for example. The hon. Minister of Justice moved a motion for adjournment, for example; that is entered into it. On motion it was ordered that the said bill, which is the Department of Housing Bill, be read a second time on tomorrow. That is an intermediate proceeding, Sir, and it is entered in the Journal of the House.

Now, Sir, it is an important matter because it bears on the rights and privileges of the members of the House of Assembly. It is something which should be dealt with seriously, whether

MR. W. ROWE:                   there has been an intermediate proceeding now between two motions for adjournment. Because of course it affects the rights of the House whether we are going to sit, carry on with debate and so on. And, Sir, it is a decision which should not be made lightly. It should be considered by Your Honour very seriously because it is something which may set a very unhealthy and wrong precedent for this House. And, Sir, I would submit that there has been no intermediate proceeding, merely debate by the Minister of Justice. Nothing has occurred which will go into the Journal of the House, therefore it is not an intermediate proceeding and, therefore, Sir, another motion to adjourn the House is simply not in order in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:           Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:                    To that point of order, the page which my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, quoted was 109. I am now going to read from page 109 and I will read without argument because it is not necessary, Your Honour.



Mr. Wells: "While the term 'proceedings in Parliament' has never been construed by the Courts it covers both the asking of a question and the giving written notice of such questions, and includes everything said or done by a member in the exercise of his functions as a member in a Committee in either House, as well as everything said or done in either House in the transaction of parliamentary business."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: My hon. friend the Minister of Justice was carrying out his function as a member of the House in the transaction of parliamentary business, and therefore it had to be a proceeding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

Before ruling on the point of order itself, I would just like to bring to the attention of hon. members that there are several editions of Beauchesne available now, but the latest one is the Fifth Edition. And I would suggest to hon. members that this should be the one that is referred to in debate, because there are changes and when an hon. member cites a page or a paragraph in some earlier edition this might be quite different from in the latest edition, and it does lead to confusion.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to Beauchesne, The Fourth Edition, and the main substance of his submission was in Paragraph 99, Subsection (2) which states as follows, "The term "intermediate proceeding" used in Standing Order 25, means a proceeding that can be properly entered on the Journals." Now if one refers to other parts of Beauchesne, and in the Fifth Edition - I am now referring to the Fifth Edition - a definition of a proceeding is as follows, and this is on page 85, Section 251, "Motions, amendments, references to committees, and the three readings of bills come under the term of "proceedings in Parliament". They are the means used to the end that a matter may be considered and disposed of by the House. Members take part in the proceedings usually by making speeches; however, many proceedings take place without any debate. Speeches are not essential."

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I would also refer hon. members to page 91, 284 (2), which is essentially the same point brought up by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, which states, "The term "intermediate proceedings" used in Standing Order 25, means a proceeding that can properly be entered on the Journals. The true test is that if any parliamentary proceeding takes place, the second motion is regular and the Clerk ought to enter the proceedings to show that the motion in question is regular."

Now hon. members will recall that the hon. House Leader did rise in his place and move a motion, the motion being that there be second reading of Bill No. 9. This motion was put from the Chair and the hon. House Leader spoke to the motion. So this is a proceeding; there was a motion put from the Chair so therefore a proceeding took place. In other words, as was stated earlier in Section 251, "Motions, amendments, references to committees," etc. So this was a motion, therefore it was a proceeding.

The hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) then rose and was recognized with that motion still before the Chair. He then put a motion to adjourn, which was in order, which is in order at any time according to Standing Rule 22. So I would rule that the motion is in order and we are now on to the motion to adjourn.

MR. F. ROWE: Which question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is that a debatable motion?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. W. N. ROWE: We debated it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

The question now arises whether this motion that the hon. member for Kilbride has put to the House, and which has been recognized by the Chair, whether this is debatable. I would therefore hear some comments on that.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon Your Honour ruled the motion was a debatable motion. We were in the process of debating that motion, Sir, when a most improper and an irregular procedure took place. And now I would suggest, Sir, that we just go back to where we were. We are back to square one again.

MR. F. ROWE: Right.

MR. NEARY: The Speaker has already ruled that it is a debatable motion. I should not even have to ask the Chair. We have a precedent no later than this afternoon from the Chair.

MR. DOODY: No. That was a government motion.

MR. NEARY: It does not make any difference.

MR. F. ROWE: It does not make any difference.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says, "a government motion." A government motion is probably more important than the motion that was just made, more important, more significant.

MR. MORGAN: You were told it is not debatable.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I beg your pardon, Sir! We already have it on the record, a precedent this afternoon.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Right.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Kilbride.

P. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, we will have to deal with this in some detail. Referring again to the fourth edition of Beauchesne, page 106. Mr. Speaker, "The following motions are debatable:" and then it has a whole list of them which are set out and then subsection (2) and then (m) - (m) and subsection (2) are the ones that have bearing on this. They say "and such other motion, made upon routine proceedings, as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangements of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment." That means, as I take it, adjournment in the afternoon or the evening, whether we adjourn at six or eight or whatever it might be. But then subsection (2) says, "All other motions, including adjournment motions, shall be decided without debate or amendment." That is the first reference I wanted to make. page 106. Your Honour.

I will then ask Your Honour to go to page 114.

MR. NEARY: Are we in the old book now or the new one?

MR. WELLS: This is in the fourth edition. I might say that there is a certain doubt about using this new edition because the Standing Orders in Ottawa, for instance, Your Honour, are very different. We have not kept up with them in that sense. Up there on adjournment motions which are debatable there is a time limit of thirty minutes. Anybody can debate it but the whole thing is limited to thirty minutes. We have not got that and I would suggest that some of the references in the new Beauchesne are inapplicable. But at any rate, on page 114, section 127 says, Your Honour, "Formerly all motions were debatable, unless some rule or other parliamentary usage could be quoted to the contrary. But at present the rule is reversed. All motions are to be decided without

MR. WELLS: debate or amendment, except those specifically recognized as debatable under Standing Order 32. " Now we have not got the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, but the general rule applies that all motions are to be decided without debate or amendment unless our Standing Orders say otherwise, and our Standing Orders are silent on the point. I would now refer Your Honour to page 83 of Beauchesne. Now I will read the whole paragraph. It begins on page 82 and is paragraph 89 (1). "In case of ministerial changes, explanations are generally allowed to be made when the Orders of the Day are called. It is usual to permit the Leader of the Opposition to make some remarks thereon. Considerable latitude is allowed on these occasions. In the British House no debate is allowed after the ministerial statement has been made unless the adjournment of the House is moved," - the adjournment of the House is an exception in England - "but such a practice could not take place in Canada, as our adjournment motions are not debatable. " That is the end of that paragraph.

I would refer Your Honour now to page 89 of Beauchesne, Subsection (3) toward the top of page 89, Mr. Speaker. (3) "A motion for the adjournment of debate upon a question for the adjournment of the House will not be entertained because no adjournment motion can be debated or amended." There is another matter and that is the precedent before this House, the parliamentary usage and precedent of this House, Your Honour, and that is that on no occasion to my recollection or have I heard when an ordinary motion made by a member of the House to adjourn the House to a specific date has been debated. And in that regard I would draw Your Honour's attention to the precedent established on the third or fourth of July past, the fourth of July, when this House was adjourned on a similar motion which passed without debate. The motion was accepted, it was not debated and the House immediately voted on it and that also was not a government motion. So I think both Beauchesne is clear and

MR. WELLS: I think, also I would submit, Mr. Speaker, the precedent in our House is clear that this is not a debatable motion and ought to be put to the House forthwith.

MR. W. POPE: Mr. Speaker, could I speak to that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. POPE: Mr. Speaker, it is very clear how this House guides itself in its practice and procedures. We have our Standing Orders which refer to a motion to adjourn but which are silent with regard to whether it is a debatable motion or not. When our Standing Orders are silent, of course, we go to our practices and procedures established

MR. W. ROWE: by this hon. House. If we do not have any practices and procedures established by this House, we go to the House of Commons and to Beauchesne. We bind ourselves, Mr. Speaker, as members of this House as to what practices and procedures and if there are precedents which impinge on, which explain, which interpret, which deal with our Standing Orders, then those precedents of course have to be followed.

Now, what is the most recent precedent? This afternoon the hon. Government House Leader rose and made what in substance was a motion to adjourn the House until March 27th. The hon. Speaker, not Your Honour, the hon. Speaker - Your Honour is the Deputy Speaker - the hon. Speaker ruled, Sir, ruled this afternoon that that motion to adjourn the House until March 27th. was debatable. And my hon. friend, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was standing up, stood up, made a speech, Mr. Speaker, until five-thirty when the Late Show came on and of course sat down. The latest precedent of this hon. House, Sir, is that a motion such as the one cast in identical terms as the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) just cast a motion, was ruled by the Speaker, the Speaker of this hon. House, it was ruled that the motion was debatable and members were proceeding to debate it, Mr. Speaker, until there was the Late Show this afternoon. And I would submit, Sir, that the same rule absolutely applies, the same interpretation laid down by the Speaker, the same practice established by the Speaker this afternoon applies to this motion to adjourn. Otherwise, Sir, we have the absolutely ridiculous spectacle, and it cannot be described as anything else, of the hon. the Speaker ruling one way this afternoon, that the motion was debatable and was in the process of being debated and was in fact debated, and Your Honour in the Chair in the same day, in the evening, making a ruling that the motion to adjourn is not debatable.

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything calculated to throw this House into a ridiculous light, I would submit, Sir, that two contrary rulings on the identical same point in the same day is sure to do so, especially when members' memories are very fresh on the matter. And, Sir, I would submit that that motion to adjourn the House, like the one this afternoon, is debatable and that the hon. the Speaker of the House established that as a practice and procedure this afternoon.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I just want to say a few words with respect to what he said indicating that any ruling by Your Honour that was contrary to what he interpreted to be the ruling this afternoon be contrary to any ruling that Your Honour might make tonight.

The ruling this afternoon was in the nature of a motion made by the Government House Leader. It was a ruling that in effect was in the nature of a government motion. It is what then is known as a substantive motion.

MR. W. ROWE: No.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Your Honour, I listened, albeit with a certain amount of restraint, without interrupting the Leader of the Opposition and I would ask him to show me the same courtesy if he is in fact capable of showing any courtesy at all.

Your Honour, a substantive motion given by the Government House Leader is a motion with respect to government business per se, which the Government House Leader got up and gave. I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne again, the fourth edition - long live Beauchesne the fourth! - paragraph 195 which says, "A substantive motion is a self-contained proposal not incidental to any proceeding, amendable and drafted in such a way as to be capable as expressing a decision of the House." And subsequently, further on in that paragraph, it refers to dilatory motions as contrasted with substantive



MR. MARSHALL: motions and it says, "Dilatory motions are designed to dispose of the original question either for the time being or permanently. They are the following" "That consideration of the questions be postponed to .....(date)." "That the orders of the day be read," etc. "That the debate be now adjourned" etc.

In other words we had a question before the House and the question before the House was with respect to the second reading of this bill, this bill to enact a Ministry of Housing, an act with respect to the Department of Housing. So consequently when the hon. member for Kilbride gets up in the midst of that and makes a motion, it becomes a dilatory motion and being a dilatory motion it is a motion within the ambit of

MR. MARSHALL: the section referred to by the hon. Member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), this is on page 106, section 32, that: "All other motions, including adjournment motions, shall be decided without debate or amendment." The other one, with respect to the sitting days of the House, is a substantive motion and was one which the hon. the Government House Leader moved and consequently it came within the purview of section 32 (1)(m) which referred to the sitting days of the House. So the reason why I got up, Your Honour, and speak on the point of order is because it is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to get up and attempt, once again, to say that because a ruling was made this afternoon and another ruling is made tonight that they are inconsistent, but they are completely and absolutely, and entirely and absolutely different facts.

The fact of the matter is, Your Honour, that this motion is being put by the hon. Member of Kilbride, it is a motion that has been made, I suppose many hundreds of thousands of times in the British parliamentary practice, and it requires a motion to be put without debate, it requires then a determination of the majority of the House. The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have been suckered by the first living Premier and have never learned what the really the majority - they have never accepted the fact that this side represents the majority. It is a majority that rules, Your Honour, and this motion has to be placed without debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins)

Order, please! I think -

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins)

- if the hon. member will

permit me for a moment, I am not -

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins)

Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will sit down when Mr. Speaker asks me and not by the likes of that hon. gentleman over there.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! Order, please! The question is a very important one but, however, I think most points have been covered and I do not propose to delay members too much longer. I will hear one further member from my right. The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe).

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sir, hon. members opposite should realize that we all have equal rights to speak in this House of Assembly. Sir, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) submitted to Your Honour that because of the fact that this afternoon the motion to adjourn was a motion moved by a minister of the Crown it therefore became a substantive motion. That is what the hon. member for St. John's east said.

Now, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) this evening stood in his place and said that he was rising as a private member or this was a private member's bill - or motion, I am sorry, private member's motion, resolution, bill, what have you - and therefore the argument was made that it is non-debatable. Now, you can not have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. You can not have it both ways. Your Honour said himself, Sir - I believe you can check the tapes - Your Honour said in this House this evening that the fact that it was a private member's motion was irrelevant to the point of order that I raised earlier. The fact it was a private member's - I said because it was a private member's motion it can not be entertained on the non-Private Members' Day and Your Honour ruled that the fact it was a private member's motion had nothing whatsoever to do with it, it was irrelevant. So, therefore, Sir, we come back to the point now where the motion moved tonight is identical and similar and the same as the motion that was moved this afternoon, so we come back to square one and

MR. F. ROWE square one is this; is that the Speaker of the House of Assembly this afternoon, Sir, ruled in answer to the question by my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the motion was debatable, was debatable and indeed it was debated and there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! Oh!

MR. F. ROWE:

There is no difference in the two motions, Your Honour, no difference whatsoever. Your Honour stated the fact that a private member moved the motion tonight is irrelevant. Now the Speaker this afternoon ruled that the motion was debatable and we go back, Sir, to the one, two, three, four, five steps and that is this, in any decision taken in this House with regards to the rules we obviously refer to Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, in this particular case the Standing Order 22, which is silent on the matter. Then we refer to precedents established in this

Mr. F. Rowe:

House of Assembly. That is point number two. If we cannot solve the problem at that point, we then go to the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. If we cannot solve the problem there, we go to Beauchesne and or Erskine May, the last resort so to speak. But it is very simple; our Standing Orders, number one; precedents established in this House of Assembly, number two; the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, if we cannot solve the problem, number three; Beauchesne and Erskine May in that order.

Now I will turn back to my original point; Your Honour ruled tonight that the fact that the motion was moved by a private member, or it is a private member's motion, is irrelevant, which therefore makes the motion identical and similar to the so-called substantive motion moved by the Government House Leader this afternoon. The second point; the Speaker ruled that it was indeed debatable. Therefore the precedent has been established now in this House of Assembly that a motion to adjourn is a debatable motion, and, Sir, I therefore submit that we should debate this particular motion. Not to debate this particular motion, Sir, is just another effort on the part of this government to put the P.Cs. ahead of the people in this Province, close down the House, get on with the P.C. Leadership Convention. That is all they want, Sir. They are putting the party ahead of the people.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: And I submit, Sir, I am just as relevant as the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) when he had to bring the Smallwood era into this debate or into this point of order, just as relevant.

So, Sir, I submit that Your Honour might give some very serious -

MR. NEARY: What about Coaker? What about Sir William Coaker? Can you get him into it?

MR. F. ROWE: I submit, Sir, that Your Honour might wish to give some very serious consideration to this particular point because the line of command or the line of order, so as to speak, in terms of resolving

MR. F. ROWE: that particular problem of procedure has always, to my knowledge, been our Standing Orders, precedents set in this House, the House of Commons, Beauchesne and so forth and so on, and we seem to be doing things in the exact reverse here tonight. What we are doing is forgetting about our Standing Orders, which in fact are silent on it, we are forgetting about the ruling of the Speaker of the House of Assembly this afternoon, and we are taking all of these fancy quotations from Beauchesne. So therefore I submit this motion is debatable.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

If the hon. House Leader would permit, the question is not at issue whether the motion is in order. It has been ruled by the Chair that the motion is in order. I think that this is an important issue to settle, the points of order that have come up subsequent to that ruling from the Chair. I think it is clear that hon. members on each side must be satisfied with any ruling on the subsequent points of order. And I think it would be wrong for me to make a ruling that was not given some thought to and over which I have not taken the advice of officers of the Table and so on.

There are two points that come out, I believe, in the point of order that has been brought up. Firstly, is there a difference in the motion to adjourn as between being moved from the frontbench, being a government order, and being moved from the backbench, that is, moved by a private member? And secondly, the motion that has been put, is that a substantive motion or is a dilatory motion? I think that these are the two points that must be addressed in a ruling.

I would therefore propose to adjourn the House briefly until this can be researched a little and put in a form that hopefully will be satisfactory to all members concerned.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I think the first point to be cleared up is whether the point of order before the Chair has to be considered in the light of who made the motion that we are considering, that is, a motion to adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I think it can be said without any doubt that what the Chair has to address itself to is not who makes a motion, but the substance of the motion. As long as that motion is in order it does not concern the Chair who makes it. The ruling has been made that the motion is in order, so whether it was made by the House Leader or made by a private member is quite immaterial. I think that is one point that can be disposed of.

The second point is whether this is a dilatory or whether this is a substantive motion. A dilatory motion is made in the course of a debate and it is phrased 'that this House do now adjourn.' And that is all there is to that motion and that is a non-debatable motion. If a dilatory motion is carried the House must adjourn, but then it would meet at the time prescribed in the Standing Orders which in usual cases is the following day or in our parlance 'tomorrow', although 'tomorrow' may be after several days or a weekend intervenes. So that is a dilatory motion.

The motion which we are considering here and which was ruled in order was that the House adjourn to a certain date. This is not a dilatory motion, this is a substantive motion. Whether it is debatable or not is not related to the fact of adjournment per se. It is related to the fact of adjournment to a certain date. And I would refer hon. members to the House of Commons standing rule no. 32 and the part 1 (p), and this refers to the following motions are debatable and so on and so forth, and then we come down to 1 (p) and it says, and these are debatable motions: "such other motions made upon routine proceedings as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the House, and maintenance of its authority, the appointment and conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangement of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its



MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment."

And I would also refer hon. members to the fifth edition of Beauchesne, the latest edition, paragraph 300, and specifically to section (2) of that paragraph, and subsection (a) of that paragraph, which reads as follows:

"Examples of motions which come under S.O. 32 (1)(p)," which I just read, "and are debatable are motions:

(a) relating to the time of sitting and the business of the House."

The motion before the House at the present time is that this House do now adjourn to a certain time. Accordingly that motion is debatable in terms of adjourning to a certain time. That clearly falls within the meaning of the section I just read, that is, the time of the sitting in the House.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when I finished up, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was talking about the Newfoundland Development Corporation.

MR. ROBERTS: What motion are you speaking to?

MR. NEARY: What do you mean?

MR. ROBERTS: Are you speaking to Wells' motion or Hickman's?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is right. We have two motions now, Sir. We have a motion made by the Government House Leader that the House not adjourn at eleven o'clock, that we carry on beyond eleven o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. W. ROWE: No, The one that he made this afternoon or the other one.

MR. ROBERTS: If my hon. friend would yield?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Is the hon. member raising a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I understand that this afternoon, Sir, the Minister of Justice, acting as the House Leader for the government, moved that the House when it adjourned this day, or this night or tomorrow morning as the case may be would adjourn until the 27th day of March. I believe that is what he moved. Now, Sir, that being so, the hon. gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) is not able to move a further motion, dilatory or substantive, to the same effect. It is the clearest rule of parliamentary law, as Your Honour will concede, that there cannot be two motions to the same effect before the Chair at the same time. Now my point of order is simply that the motion before the House at this stage, I submit, is the motion moved by the gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman). The practical effect of it, Your Honour will be delighted to know, is that my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) therefore has unlimited time to speak in response to it and not the forty-five minutes which he would have to speak in response to the motion moved by the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the House Leader will just permit me for just one minute. The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), would he again lay out for the Chair what he feels was the motion that was being debated this afternoon?

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I was not in the Chamber but I am told, and Your Honour could refer to the clerks at the table, that the motion before the House before five-thirty— at five-thirty the late show proceeding of the Standing Orders came into play, which was also a motion for adjournment but of a completely different sort, obviously—the motion before the House to which the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was addressing himself was a motion moved by the House Leader to the effect that the House,

MP. ROBERTS: when it rose, rise until the twenty-seventh day of March. That motion, to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, has not been disposed of in any way by this House and there the matter stands. When the House resumed at eight this evening, the Opposition Leader, my friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe), rose to point out that because there had been another adjournment motion there had to be an intermediate proceeding, but that matter was disposed of. We have had an intermediate proceeding as I understand it. But I simply want to raise the point of order that I believe that the motion before the House now, or I submit that the motion before the House is not the one moved by the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) - because that is a work of supererogation and cannot be admitted; the motion is just not proper in the circumstances - but instead the one from the gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman), the Minister of Justice, which is exactly the same or almost the same word for word. The practical effect of it - and it is of some importance, as Your Honour will appreciate - is that the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who has been put up to speak first from the Opposition side, has forty-five minutes speaking in response to a motion made by a private member, as the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) at present is, whereas he has unlimited time speaking in response to a motion made by the government - a government motion - and obviously a motion made by the Leader of the House is a government motion, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: To that point of order. Two points, Rule 22 says that after there is an intervening act, and Your Honour has ruled that there was an intervention, an intermediate proceeding, then a motion can be made. Secondly, Your Honour has already ruled, as I understood Your Honour's ruling just now, that from the point of view of adjournment there is no such thing as a government motion. And I clearly heard Your Honour rule that it made no difference what hon. member made a motion, made the motion to adjourn, be it a member of the government or be it a private member, then it made no difference. If that is the case, then

MR. NICKMAN: the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), if we are still debating the first motion, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he exceeded forty-five minutes - because under Rule 49(a) it is quite clear that only in response to a government motion and order can any hon. member, the first member leading off, go more than forty-five minutes. He has been speaking with implied leave because no one had objected and if that is the case that implied leave is withdrawn right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think this can be settled quite simply. The motion before the Chair before five-thirty this afternoon was not a motion to adjourn, as the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) pointed out. That was a motion that when the House adjourned it would adjourn to a certain date, and it was not on an adjournment motion. The hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), after an intervening proceeding,

Mr. Speaker (Dr. Collins): rose in his place and did make a motion to adjourn. According to Standing Rule 22, a motion to adjourn is always in order. This would mean that his motion is in order and supercedes any other motion that was before the House, so that in actual fact the House has before it the hon. member for Kilbride's (Mr. Wells) motion, which is a motion to adjourn, a substantive motion to adjourn to a certain date.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are arguing on this side of the House, Sir, that the House should not adjourn, that the government should put the affairs of the Province before party politics, that the matter of electing and straightening out the leadership problems of the Tory Party should be a private matter. And we are quite prepared to co-operate, Sir, with the government. We are quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to carry on the proceedings of the House up to about March 9 and then adjourn the House for a couple of weeks. Let the Tories go out and try to clean House, try to clean up the mess that they have had on their hands for the last six or seven years, straighten out their leadership problems and then take a week or so after they get their new leader and we will go back in session again.

Now that is a pretty fair position, Sir, for the Opposition to take. Let us carry on with the business of the Province.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Even Trudeau had less time than that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, Even when they elected the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Trudeau, they merely interrupted the proceeding of the House of Commons for a few days with the co-operation of the Tory Opposition of the day -

MR. T. RIDEOUT: A minority government.

MR. NEARY: That is right, a minority government, but they allowed a couple of days for the Liberal Party to go out and to elect a new leader, Mr. Trudeau, just a few days. This hon. crowd want to take a few months, a few weeks and a couple of months to try to clean up their Act, to clean out the House, to straighten out their leadership problems. It should be a private matter, Sir. It should not interfere

Mr. Neary: in any way, shape, or form with carrying on the business of this Province. And any minister, Sir, I contend that any minister who cannot perform his duties, who cannot spend his time in the House, which he was elected to do, if he cannot carry on his duties then let him resign and let him go out and wander around the Province and try to scrape up a few votes for himself. But, do not do it, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to hon. decent members on the other side of the House, not to close the House down; do not do it at the expense of the senior citizens of this Province, of the young people who are looking for jobs, of the construction workers who are unemployed, of the people who are faced with increased electricity bills, social assistance recipients who will not know until a budget is brought down, if it is ever brought down, whether or not they are going to get an increase in the social assistance allowance this year.

The minister only today, Sir, gave us notice of interim supply, March 27, he said, we will start discussing interim supply. Well, Mr. Speaker, traditionally interim supply should be sought in this House and, if it is granted, granted before the end of March; either that or a budget has to be brought down before the end of March. And while the House is in session it is improper and illegal for the government to carry on on Lieutenant-Governor's warrants, although the Minister of Finance agreed with me last year that that could be done. The Financial Administration Act, Sir, states clearly that while the House is in session, and unless they get a new leader who immediately calls an election the House will still be in session on March 27. It is virtually impossible for the government to get the interim supply that they need to pay the public service, to pay social assistance recipients, and to pay the bills. It is impossible, Sir. The whole thing is in shambles. It is chaotic, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: The government has created a chaotic situation that is going to have devastating effects on the economy of this Province. And, as I said this afternoon, it is happening right at a time in our history when we can ill afford it, when we have record unemployment; the highest cost of living in the whole of Canada; we have vandalism and crime on the increase; we have a drinking problem in this Province. Senior citizens are having their problems; they cannot cope and they cannot survive on the income that they have. Social assistance recipients have their problems and their difficulties. We have the highest taxes in the whole of Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, this hon. crowd could not care less. By some divine right they are saying, "No, no. We are going to put the Province on hold, put her on automatic pilot. We are going to play at some political games. We are going to try to straighten out our leadership problems." And while they are doing that the whole Province must go down the drain. Decisions on offshore drilling and mineral rights have to be made. Decisions have to be made in connection with the development of the Lower Churchill. That will be stalled now for another year or two as a result of this little game of political musical chairs that the government is playing.

And what difference does it make, Mr. Speaker, what difference does it make who wins the leadership? They are all a part of that administration that has mismanaged the affairs of this Province for the last six or seven years. They are all guilty of extravagance and waste. They are all guilty of building up a big bureaucracy and insulating themselves from the ordinary people of this Province. They are all guilty of leaving millions of dollars on the table in Ottawa that they have not taken advantage of. They are all guilty of skulduggery that we have heard so much about.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: The allegation by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that all members of the government who happen to be members of this hon. House are guilty of skulduggery is purely unparliamentary and I would ask that it be withdrawn unequivocally.

MR. NEARY: If it would make the hon. gentleman any happier, Sir, I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member has withdrawn and that disposes of it but certainly moderation in the use of language is required and that kind of allegation should be avoided.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me say this, that every word that Mr. Davidson uttered in his first affidavit and his second affidavit that the Minister of Justice and the administration chose to brush aside and attribute to a lunatic, a mad man, has come true. Every word has come true. The skulduggery in connection with the Health Sciences Complex, the Carbonear Hospital that Mr. Davidson spoke about has come true. The evidence is now unfolding before the Royal Commission of Enquiry, the Mahoney Commission, and Sir, immediate action should be taken. We should not have to wait. We should not have to wait for a report from Justice Mahoney. Now it will probably come in too late. The election will be over by the time we get that report.

And, Mr. Speaker, in connection with what I would consider to be irregular and improper actions on the part of this government, the Minister of Finance himself gave instructions to the Department of Public Works that Mr. A.B. Walsh was to get no more work from this government.

MR. HICKMAN: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker? Well let me put it another way. If that is not true let me put it another way. Instructions went



MR. NEARY: out that he was to receive no more payment from the public treasury. Sir, that is true. The minister already confirmed it for me. I have it here somewhere in writing.

MR. HICKMAN: If what the hon. gentleman is saying is that under the Financial Administration Act payments cannot be made to any persons who may owe the government monies, he is quite correct?

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir, and that is why the instructions went out.

MR. HICKMAN: It has got nothing to do with impropriety, nothing to do with skulduggery, only a simple -

MR. NEARY: Well what did it have to do with? If it did not have to do with skulduggery, how did he owe the government money? For not putting the lights and the fixtures in the hangar down at Torbay!

MR. NEARY: "A very prudent step." Just in case the court decided that the man was guilty, that the money was owed to the government, you were not going to pay him any more money.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: I see. Okay.

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

If the hon. gentleman would take his seat for a moment, I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members that there are certain areas related to what is now being referred to which are sub judice, and I would ask hon. members to bear that in mind and to avoid reference and to give a generous rather than a restrictive limit to anything which is sub judice. I draw that to the attention of hon. members. It is not my wish to intervene after sort of each few sentences or to interrupt hon. members, so I would point out that there are matters which are before the courts and hon. members should give those a wide berth.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, the orders went out that no more payment was to be made to this firm of A.B. Walsh, A.B. Walsh Electrical. Payments were to be withheld, payments for maintenance work worked under a maintenance contract with the Department of Public Works, with the Provincial Government. But, Mr. Speaker, did Mr. Walsh accept that? No, Sir! Mr. Walsh decided to kick over the traces and says, "Well, okay, if you are not going to pay me I am not going to do any more work under that contract." So they called the bond, as they had every right to do, the Department of Public Works called the bond. And they called the bond, Sir, and then what happened? Lo and behold, the work was passed over to Stares Mechanical. Now, Sir, who is Stares Mechanical? Well, there is the share list, the latest share list of Stares Mechanical: John Stares, St. John's, Newfoundland, Director; Alex Walsh, St. John's, Newfoundland, Director; one W. Marshall, in trust, the member for St. John's East, Newfoundland, lawyer. And the hon. gentleman will now argue that the

MR. NEARY: member for St. John's East is not a shareholder of that company, he is merely holding one share in trust, so therefore that does not make him a shareholder of the company. Well, according to the Companies Act and the Registrar of Companies he is a shareholder of that company, his name is on the share list, and the hon. gentleman can say it is a qualifying share all he wants. It is there, Sir. So what Mr. Walsh could not do, Sir, through the front door he is doing through the back door, and he is getting paid from the Public Treasury. The government are not withholding any money that they may be owed.

Mr. Speaker, there is courage for you. The Minister of Finance, who also happens to be the Minister of Justice, will sit back and allow that to go on, sit there and take it, be dictated to by Mr. A.B. Walsh, this government. Why? Why, Mr. Speaker? Why do they sit back and take it?

MR. HON. MEMBER: Have you ever met him?

MR. NEARY: No, I have never met the man in my life, and I have no desire to. But it is a good question. It is a fair question, Sir, to ask this administration, "Why?" On the one hand they say, "No, you are not going to be paid for your work." They called the bond; the bondholders turn it over to another one of Walsh's companies.

MR. HICKMAN: The bondholders? You mean, bonding company? Not government.

MR. NEARY: The bonding company.

Mr. Speaker, the government on behalf of the taxpayers are paying the bill, paying the bill. And do not try to pawn the blame off on the bondholders.

MR. HICKMAN: When a bond is called, the bonding company has absolute jurisdiction as to how it completes the contract and to whom it turns it over.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the bondholders have no jurisdiction over the Public Treasury.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, that is nonsense!

MR. NEARY: And we all know how the Public Treasury is being looted.

MR. HICKMAN: Why did you not say that at the beginning that the bonding company had handed it over instead of implying it was the government?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do you mean to tell me that I have to give the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Justice, Sir, a lecture -

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - a course in procedure -

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - in the Department of Finance and the Department of Public Works?

MR. HICKMAN: No, give me a lecture in bonding -

MR. NEARY: Yes, I could do that too.

MR. HICKMAN: - on how the bonding works.

MR. NEARY: And so, Mr. Speaker, we want to keep the House open so we can try to straighten out some of these matters. And apart from that, Sir, apart from correcting some of the mismanagement of the past six or seven years,

MR. NEARY: we want to put forward some ideas and some suggestions on how we think some of the problems that are facing the ordinary people of this Province can be corrected.

Number one, Sir, let us show the House how this hon. crowd do it on the other side. They issued instructions to Newfoundland Hydro two years ago that Newfoundland Hydro would no longer be subsidized from the public treasury. They decided that it is all right to subsidize ERCO's electricity, Bowater's electricity, Price (Nfld.) electricity, but "we are not going to subsidize any longer electricity that is used in private homes, to heat homes and to cook. We are not going to subsidize it." The Minister of Finance, the Premier and the ministers of the day decided that Newfoundland Hydro would have to stand on its own two feet. There was going to be no more subsidy from the public treasury so they issued instructions to Newfoundland Hydro, "You have to declare a profit. Stand on your own two feet. It does not make any difference how you put the screws to the ordinary people, we are not going to give you any more subsidy." And what was the consequence of that, Mr. Speaker? What were the results of that?

The results, Sir, are obvious, that the cost of electricity is skyrocketing and it is going to go up this year by another twenty-five or thirty per cent and perhaps even more. It is unbearable, Sir, the ordinary person cannot take it any longer, cannot take much more of this. And that is the way this government has done it. In the meantime, Sir, every time the administration or Newfoundland Hydro - it is the same as the government, there is no difference; it is a creature of the Cabinet, of the government - every time they ask for an increase you will always hear the Minister of Mines and Energy or the Premier or somebody down in Newfoundland Hydro saying, "Oh, is it not a wonderful resource we have down in Labrador. We have the greatest hydro potential left in the world. We have it. We have a natural

MR. NEARY: resource in this Province that is the envy of any Province or of any country in the world."

We all know that, Sir. These are nice words. But, Mr. Speaker, they do nothing about it. It is merely a smoke screen they put up to distract from the increase in electricity rates that the Cabinet has to approve, not the Public Utilities Board. It is the Cabinet that approves the increase in rate. The final decision rests with the minister, the Premier, the Minister of Health and all the ministry, not with the Public Utilities Board, and the government should stop trying to pawn the responsibility and the blame off on the Public Utilities Board. And so, Sir, that is the way they did it.

Now how would we do it? Well, here is how I think we would do it, Sir. The first thing we would do, Mr. Speaker, is put a freeze on electricity rates in this Province, put a freeze on, lower them. Put a freeze on right away. No nonsense, no fooling around, put a freeze on electricity rates. No more increases for five years and during that five years we would develop the Lower Churchill. The surplus power that was not needed in Labrador we would bring it to the Island of Newfoundland. We would either bring it through the technology that my hon. friend has been speaking about, underwater submarine cables, or we would go ahead with the tunnel. Number one priority, Sir, number one priority of a Rowe Administration, a freeze on electricity rates, put them back to where they were three years ago when this hon. crowd issued the instructions to Newfoundland Hydro, "No more subsidies, sock it to the householder, to the ordinary person." Put the freeze on.

Full speed ahead with the development of Gull Island and the Lower Churchill and the tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle, or alternatively the submarine cable. Bring the surplus power to the Island of Newfoundland and use the rest in Labrador. Or, if necessary, export it,

MR. NEARY: and in the process of exporting it, in the process of exporting the power, Mr. Speaker, if we have to, if we can, if we have a surplus that we can not use in Labrador or here on the Island, we would get enough income or enough resources to wipe out electricity rates here on the Island of Newfoundland. Give every Newfoundlander and every Labradorian free electricity and make the people down in New York and Montreal and the other places pay for it. That is how we would do it, Sir, as compared to the way that the present administration is doing it.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, another thing we would do, at least I think we would if we are Liberals, we would either give senior citizens free drugs, free prescription drugs or we would subsidize prescription drugs to senior citizens. How does this crowd treat the senior citizens, Sir? They ignore them. The senior citizens are now out in Corner Brook appealing to their members, appealing to the Government to step in and try to straighten out the tax problems they have with the City Council in Corner Brook and, up to now, Sir, up to this afternoon when I had a conversation with one of the members of the committee, I am told that they had been completely ignored by Government and I want the word to go out now, Sir, that senior citizens, people who have contributed so much, so much of their lives to the development of this Province, will get the preferential treatment, Sir. Senior citizens will get the recognition that they deserve once we have the Rowe administration properly installed in Confederation Building and they will not be herded into big homes that look like hospitals. They will be comfortable in their own homes and they will be able to pay for their heat and light and they will get their drugs; they will not have to scrape and scrounge to try to get some prescription drugs to take care of their ailments.

MR. NEARY:

That will be done by the Rowe administration, by the new Government when we take over.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland railway, the Newfoundland railway that this Government have been playing politics with and saying to the Government of Canada, "Oh, yes, we want to keep the railway but we will not tell you where it sits in our order of priority," Well, Sir, we will give the Newfoundland railway equal status with the Trans-Canada Highway, if I have anything to do with it. And when we go to Ottawa and Ottawa says, "We are going to spend X amount of dollars in Newfoundland on transportation, how much did we spend on the Newfoundland railway?" We will be able to tell them how much to spend on the Newfoundland railway and how much to spend on the Trans-Canada Highway. And it will not be an either or situation, it will be straight common sense and, Mr. Speaker, something else we will do, the Rowe administration, the Liberal Government, we will within days, Sir, within days after we come into office, we will try to enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada to set up a joint Provincial/Federal Crown corporation for the purpose of job creation in this Province.

Instead of wasting money on LIP projects, Canada Works projects, Young Canada Works projects, DREE, Unemployment Insurance, welfare payments, put all the money into a Crown corporation, all that you can, and let this Crown corporation come up with top priorities for developing the Province, such as I mentioned a few moments ago. The tunnel underneath the Straits of Bell Isle, the development of the Lower Churchill, taking the curves out of the rail line, putting in, possibly, a standard gauge line, upgrading the Trans-Canada Highway - a massive make-work program, run by a Crown corporation and not by a crowd of bureaucrats who do not know what they are doing. I put that proposition to Prime Minister Trudeau a year or so ago and I must



February 15, 1979

Tape 345

SD-3

MR. NEARY: say he looked upon it very  
favourably and promised me that he would bring it up at the  
Constitutional Conference but as members know the Premiers and the  
people who attended

MR. NEARY: that conference did not give them the opportunity to do so. It is a wonderful concept, Sir, a Federal Provincial-Crown Corporation designed to set up projects, to set priorities, massive make-work programmes and while you are creating jobs for the unemployed you are developing your Province. You are doing things that will be everlasting in the development of the Province. That is the way we will do it, Sir. It will not be a hit and miss affair like we see happening now. You will not be carrying your plans around in your vest pocket or in your hip pocket. We have short-range plans to deal with unemployment and we will have long-range plans. That is the way it will be done, Sir. And if I may, Mr. Speaker, be a little partisan at the moment, I want to say to the people at Channel-Port aux Basques - and this is a firm and solemn commitment on behalf of the Liberal party, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, the next Premier of this Province, the Rowe Administration; I want to say this, Sir, and this is a commitment I have made in Port aux Basques, my colleague has made it in Port aux Basques and I want to repeat it now for the benefit of the people in Port aux Basques and the southwest corner in connection with a district hospital - Mr. Speaker, we will within weeks, within days after we are elected, Sir, we will let contracts for the start of construction of that hospital. Within days that will be done. The people on the southwest corner will no longer have to suffer because of lack of facilities and accommodations, they will no longer have to put up with outdated and outmoded methods and techniques of looking after the sick and the disabled and the crippled and the lame in that area, and men and women shoved in on the same ward. They will no longer have to tolerate that, Sir, because within days, Mr. Speaker, and I have been authorized by my hon. colleague to say this, within days, Sir, that contract, whatever contracts can be let - I understand a lot of the preliminary work has been done, the site has been picked out, the hospital board in Channel-Port aux Basques has done an absolutely magnificent job. The administrator of the hospital out there has done an absolutely fantastic

MR. HEARN:

job under very, very difficult

circumstances, very difficult circumstances. I congratulate them for it and I want to tell them they just must hang on for a few more months until we can get a chance to get to the polls and get a crack at this crowd. When my hon. friend is installed on the eight floor the first one to knock on his door will be your's truly and say, "Mr. Premier, did you issue instructions to the Minister of Public Works to call tenders and then award contracts for the construction of the Channel-Port aux Basques hospital which my hon. friend the Minister of Health knows is the number one priority in hospital construction, new hospitals, new facilities in this Province?" That will be done. And the people of Grand Falls will get their extension. There will be no ifs ands and buts. What we will do, Sir, is cut out the mismanagement and the extravagance and waste and the saving, Sir, we will use to extend the hospital in Grand Falls, to build a regional hospital on the Burin Peninsula and one in Clarendville and look after the needs of the people in Bonavista. So that will be done, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to have a few words on Palcon but I doubt very much if I have the time now. How much more time do I have? Well, I have eleven minutes. The point that I want to make is this: We heard so much chaw, Sir, and so much bellyaching from this hon. crowd about the Smallwood administration and the way they squandered and wasted money on the industrial development programme. We heard it so often that you would almost need a barf bag here in your seat. Well now, Sir, this hon. crowd has a cuter way of doing it, They have a little sneaky way that they do it; they do it through the Newfoundland Development Corporation and they do it through the Rural Development Authority. They will not give us a list of the loans that are made under the Rural Development Authority and up to this year will not give us a list of loans made by the Newfoundland Development Corporation. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me point out, Sir, to this House that any member if he wanted to could take the list, go down in the Registry Office, do a little homework and if he could pick up enough loans and grants

Mr. Neary: made by the Newfoundland Developing Corporation, Sir. You would pick up enough, Sir, enough political patronage, you would pick up enough of waste and extravagance, you would pick up enough of failures, Mr. Speaker, that would make your eyeballs roll around in your head. And I started this afternoon to give the House one example, Pelcon. Ah, Mr. Speaker, this administration had their chocolate bar factories and had their rubber plants, but they are hidden down in the Newfoundland Development Corporation, The people cannot get any information from the Newfoundland Development Corporation, as I indicated this afternoon when I asked the President of that Corporation to give me a simple bit of information, like, before Pelcon set up their business of producing underwater connectors, did they prove they had markets? And I could not get the answer. But I got the answer in other ways. I got the answer, Sir, by doing my own research, and I discovered, Sir, and the Minister of Justice better pay attention to this because I think there is a conspiracy here to defraud the Public Treasury by the gentlemen who said that they had a great invention; two gentlemen from Ontario, two gentlemen from Ontario said they had an invention and they had to come down to Newfoundland to set up a plant because their own government up in Ontario would not give them any money, because the Government of Quebec would not give them any money, none of the other provinces would give them any money, and they could not find a sucker, So they said they were going to go down to the United States and open up this plant and take their invention, so-called, down in the United States, and they came down to Newfoundland and they found a milch cow and they found a sucker in the Newfoundland Government, in the Newfoundland Development Corporation, and they got their plant set up, and they got it set up at the cost of about \$6 million or \$7 million.

MR. W. N. ROWE: They said they had a contract?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am coming to that. That is what I was leading up to. They said they had a contract and the contract was with the United States Navy. "Newfoundland investment keeps new

Mr. Neary: industry in Canada, by P. J. Stamp. P. J. Stamp, I understand, is a public relations man for the Newfoundland Development Corporation. And here you have a picture there of Mr. Weston, a man who was supposed to have invented this underwater connector.

Mr. Speaker, in this article and a number of other articles - and the tremendous research that I have done on this; I am building up a file on it - it was indicated, Sir, that the reason the Newfoundland Development Corporation - the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation were conned for \$2.5 million, and DREE were conned for over \$2 million was because they had a contract with the United States Navy for these underwater connectors. And I wrote the former minister, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan); he did not have the courtesy to give me the information I wanted. He told me to put the questions on the Order Paper. And I have been trying, Sir, desperately to get information from the Newfoundland Development Corporation, and the only one so far that I have gotten any co-operation from worthwhile is the present Minister of Industrial Development, who has now instructed the President of the Development Corporation to give me the information that I asked for.

Now, Sir, did this crowd - and I cannot go into all of the details, but I am going to, This is a story, Sir, that should be published in a national magazine. It is the con job of the century. So when I discovered the basis upon which this crowd were given \$6 million or \$7 million of taxpayer money was the fact that they had a contract with the United States Navy, I wrote the Secretary of the Navy on December 21, 1978, Remember now, this company is now in receivership; they are not producing anything. I wrote Mr. Graham Clattor, Jr., Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, the Pentagon, Washington. I said, "Dear Mr. Clattor, enclosed you will find an article published in the Atlantic Advocate magazine in 1978. I have marked passages on pages 24 and 25 implying that the United States Navy

MR. NEARY: had contracted with Pelcon Limited as 'prime contractor' for further development and production. As Pelcon has gone into receivership or bankruptcy, and as a good deal of taxpayer money was involved in financing this company, I am asking for verification of the existence of the contractual arrangement referred to in the marked passage. May I please have a statement from you at an early a date as possible?" And I got a reply back on January 23rd., 1979. Remember now, this is the basis on which \$6 million or \$7 million of Newfoundland taxpayer money were given to this crowd.

MR. HICKMAN: Canadian.

MR. NEARY: No! Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation, \$2.5 million wrote out of the public treasury; \$800,000 from the Newfoundland Development Corporation.

MR. HICKMAN: How much of it depends on the (inaudible)?

MR. NEARY: I do not know how much it is. But I do know \$2.5 million came out of the minister's treasury.

MR. DOODY: They had a majority on the board.

MR. NEARY: But what about the \$2.5 million belonging to the provincial taxpayers? Anyway, Sir, it is addressed to me, "Dear Mr. Neary: This is in reply to your letter of December 21st., 1978 requesting verification of the existence of a contractual agreement between the United States Navy and Pelcon Limited as implied in the magazine article which you enclosed.

"We have conducted a thorough search of the Navy contracting records and have surveyed the Navy technical community familiar with inductive connector technology in an attempt to verify the existence of the contract in question. While we uncovered no evidence that a significant contract for the development and production of inductive connectors was awarded to Pelcon Limited by the Navy, we were able to ascertain that a number of small purchase orders for the device were awarded to Pelcon for a total amount of approximately \$2,500."

\$2,500 worth they bought from them and this

MR. NEARY: is why they conned \$7 million practically out of the Newfoundland Government. "No contract," the Navy is saying, "all we did was buy \$2,500 worth of these things."

"All of the devices," the letter goes on, "ordered were received by the Navy and the purchase orders have been closed out.

"I trust that you will find the information responsive to your needs."

Well I would say so, responsive to my needs. I was so mad when I saw that; And then they talk about rubber plants and chocolate bar factories. Well what about the funeral homes and what about the nurseries and what about the beauty salons and what about this con job?

MR. W. ROWE: Where is the royal commission on this?

MR. NEARY: What about a royal commission on this? Mr. Speaker, I suggest this was a conspiracy to defraud the public treasury. And the Minister of Justice, I know, could not care less, also the Minister of Finance.

Now what has happened to this company? And the share list, Sir, is a Who's Who of Newfoundland businessmen. The top businessmen in this Province were duped and conned by these two con artists from Ontario. And then I also wrote the people who were responsible for patents in Canada, because this was supposed to be patented, and I found out it was not patented, it was only a principle that was patented, a principle. Can you imagine a patent on a principle, not on the actual invention itself?

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder we want to keep the House open, Sir? We want to keep the House open. Not just to stand here and talk a lot of wind and hot air; we want to do something. We are quite sincere, Sir. We want to do something on this side of the House and I am sure my hon. colleagues when they get a chance to speak tonight, apart from the positive suggestions and ideas and recommendations that I have made, will put forward some of

MR. NEARY:           their own and we will show, Sir, the people of this Province that we are an alternative to this government. We will show how they do it and we will show, Sir, how the Rowe Administration and how we will do it once we are installed in office.

MR. SPEAKER:           The hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN:           Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I raised the question of an emergency debate on the astronomical rises anticipated in electricity rates in the Province, and



DR. KITCHEN:

Your Honour quite properly ruled that this did not come under the definition of emergency debate as the House of Assembly operates. But it is an emergency because everybody whom I know in this Province is in desperate straits with respect to the cost of electricity.

Last year the Public Utilities Board awarded the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro a substantial increase in their rates which did not hit the people as much because the Government then went and took away the taxes on electricity so that the rise was obscured. Having gotten one large rise in electricity rates they are now going to be asking for two more, twenty per cent now, ten per cent this year and ten per cent the next.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Compounded.

MR. KITCHEN:

Compounded, right, ten on ten that is twenty-one per cent in a way. And then we are facing another very serious question caused by the crisis in oil, the temporary, we hope, crisis in oil which we do not know what is going to happen there, how much the cost of oil is going to go up for Holyrood. And if Holyrood oil goes up, electricity rates will go up. So there is a very serious emergency confronting the people of this Province in the next few months having to do with heating our houses, keeping us warm, cooking our food, driving our machines that operate on electricity. This is why we must keep this House of Assembly open. It is wrong, it is immoral to close the House of Assembly as is proposed by the Government side. There is too much at stake in the Province now. There are too many things happening. We must get a grip on this Province. We must get a grip on electricity rates. We must get a grip on a good many other things as well. At the moment we are at the tail end of the seven lean years, the seven hungry years, seven

DR. KITCHEN: years of an administration which has not done very much. It has done very little to move this Province ahead. There were never more unemployed people in this Province as there are today. There was never less hope in the people of the Province then there is today. There use to be hope in this Province, Mr. Speaker, ten years ago, twenty years ago, young men and women going through school would be hopeful of the future, jobs, houses, attempts to get ahead in the world. Boy, there was hope here twenty years ago and fifteen years ago, and even ten years ago there was hope. When the great reforms of the sixties were going through, and the fifties, we were booming ahead, we were moving ahead. And then disaster hit us, Disaster which hopefully we will be getting rid of when someone has the nerve to call an election. Because it is all unnecessary, all unnecessary all this leanness, these seven years without hope, the desperation which you see when you meet young people who can not get a job. We put an ad in the paper the other day looking for a clerk-typist down in our headquarters. I go down and there is a bushelful of mail every day. I can hardly lug it home. People looking for jobs, just one little job, people looking for jobs. It is frighening to see the qualified people that are without work in this Province. Look at the education scene, A few years ago many people were going to the university, Memorial University. Look what has happened to that institution. It has stagnated. The enrollment is gone down. There has been no increase in enrollment for a number of years and yet the number of young people is up in the Province. There has been stagnation at the post-secondary level. I believe that if there is any Royal Commissions to be established the one that should be established is to look into the affairs of Memorial University. Look into it. You know there are more people on the Board of Regents than there are students these days, more Tory hacks on

DR. KITCHEN: the Board of Regents than there  
are students at Memorial. Every year they add a few more hacks  
What do they do there? What we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to  
prune that institution. We have

Dr. Kitchen: to cut away the deadwood change the administration, flick them out on their ear, and make that institution into the dream that Newfoundlanders had. This is a memorial to people who died for this Province. This is not a little Tory clique. What has to happen in that University is that it has to do the job for the people of the Province. This is one of the places of hope; instead of that it has become a fan of stagnant waters, stagnant, stagnant, going nowhere, not meeting the job for which it was intended, and it has to change.

We cannot allow this session of the House to close while that institution is not fulfilling its duty to the people of this Province. We have a Division of Adult Education, I had an occasion to look at that the other day, they are playing these little games on the television. But just look at this: I know people in this Province who are poor and who want to get their education evaluated: "We want to take an equivalency test." Do you know, Mr. Speaker, a poor person cannot take an equivalency test unless he has got a \$10 bill to pay for the test. Oh, that is good, that is good! That is real conservative philosophy, is it not? You are down and you can take a test providing you can pay for it. If you cannot pay for it you do not take it. And not only that, but you have to buy the book to study for the test. Now this is the type of education that we have had in the past few years.

Our dropout rate: 50 per cent of the people who start school do not finish. You can walk the streets of this city and you will see young men and women who have not finished high school; you can walk almost any place in the Province. The great strides we were beginning to make in education have come to an end in this Province and we are fooling around doing all sorts of irrelevant things in the schools and not getting on with the basic task of teaching people things that will give them hope in this world. The educational system has deteriorated in the seven years, the seven lean years of Conservative administration.

Dr. Kitchen: Look at recreation in the Province, look at recreation. I guess the biggest recreation is to send the police up and poke them in jail. That seems to be the way that the youth of this Province are looked at now. Stick them in jail. Never mind trying to have wholesome recreation. Never mind opening up programmes for young people! People who are unemployed have to do something. It is no good sticking people in jail. What you have got to do is have wholesome jobs and wholesome recreation, and this government has made recreation a very poor stepchild.

Let us look at the senior citizens. We know that one of the biggest problems facing old people is sickness, sickness. When we get old we get sick, we get sick, and when we get sick you need medical attention, you need drugs. Many old people whom I know are spending fifty dollars, sixty dollars, seventy dollars, eighty dollars and ninety dollars for drugs. This administration brought in a bill last time, they are going to substitute generic for brand name drugs. My druggist friends tell me this will cut perhaps 5 per cent off the cost of drugs, but we have not even got that bill through here. We are going to adjourn the House while people cannot even do that. We suggested that the total bill for drugs for senior citizens and people with chronic illnesses would be assumed by the government. A bill was introduced recently here, which was not debated yet, that you would pay a major part of the cost. I think that was a good bill, but it is no good unless we debate it and pass it. It was not good enough, we should pay the whole cost, but it is better than what was proposed originally. But we have no right to close this House of Assembly while people whom I know and you know are unable to pay for the drugs that they need to keep healthy. I know people who cannot afford to buy these drugs.

DR. KITCHEN:

They cannot afford to buy the drugs, they do without! And this should not be. It is unchristian, it is unnecessary, it is not the way we should be treating our people, it is totally unnecessary. We are not talking about a lot of money on the Public Treasury but we are talking a lot of money to the few individuals who require this help. Senior citizens need housing too. It is no good spending large sums of money poking senior citizens away in old folks homes, which seems to be the policy of what we are doing here, sticking them away whereas the person who wants to stay in his own house, her own house and live in her own house where all the memories are, cannot get a few dollars to fix up the roof. It would be much cheaper to put a few dollars into the roof, to put a few dollars into the heat than to take the lady or the gentleman, or both, and stick them into an old folks home that costs this government and the federal government large sums of money. This is wrong policy, it is inhuman policy, inhuman policy on the part of the government. We cannot close the House of Assembly while these serious social issues go unresolved. They are not hard to solve, they are easy to solve providing we have the stamina to stay here and solve them.

Look at social assistance. My colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned social assistance. Last month the federal government increased Canada Pension by 9 per cent, Everybody who was receiving Canada Pension got a 9 per cent raise in their Canada Pension, and that was a good thing, in keeping with the cost of living. It is a good thing for old people or any person who is getting Canada Pension to have an increase in tune with the cost of living. But what did this government do for those people who are getting Canada Pension supplemented by social assistance? They chopped it off! If your Canada Pension went up \$25 your social assistance went down \$25 so you are just as well off as if the federal government had never increased it. When will they get an increase? When will these individuals get an increase? They will get an increase only when this House of Assembly increases the social assistance rates. You have no right to close this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, there is no

DR. KITCHEN: right here. It is wrong to close the House of Assembly while people who need this increase cannot get it. It must be increased, it is a paltry increase anyway, but it has to go through. And we have no right, no right! This selfish business of closing down the House of Assembly to have a bit of fun choosing between Winkin, Blinkin and Nod and the other three or four as to who should lead this party, who should sit in the crow's nest on the Titanic. That is what we are talking about, who should sit in the crow's nest on the Titanic?

Look at the electricity rates going up 20 per cent. It is a funny thing. Why is it that electricity rates are higher in this Province than they are in Quebec? Why? It is because of our power that is being used by Quebec -

MR. HOUSE: The Liberals gave it away!

DR. KITCHEN: Do not blame it on the Liberals. You fellows have been in seven years and you can change it at the drop of a hat, you can change it at the drop of a hat. It only takes a few minutes in this House of Assembly to change that if you have the nerve to do it. And you have no guts! There is no guts on that side!

MR. G. FLIGHT: None at all!

DR. KITCHEN: None at all! A bunch of silly old men who should retire and give it up and let the vigour of a Liberal Party take hold and run this country for the benefit of the people. That is what has to happen!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: Why is it that mil rates are lower in Montreal than in St. John's? Because the side opposite has not got the nerve to handle the problem. Let me tell you how to handle the problem, because it is not hard. There are any one of a number of ways to handle that problem, any one of a number, any one of a number of ways! We heard Mr. Desbarat the other day on television tell us one way of increasing electricity in this Province. Harness up the small rivers, he said. Get at it, prune down, harness up the small rivers. While we are doing one we are

DR. KITCHEN: not doing enough. We should be pushing in that direction more vigorously than we are maybe. That is one way of doing it, his thought. There are other thoughts too, there are other thoughts as well. One is to develop the Lower Churchill. I do not know why we have not proceeded faster and further with the development of the Lower Churchill. What is the problem? We have not had a good debate on the development of the Lower Churchill here. We have never had an explanation as to what is holding up the works. We seem to be waiting for some other agency to



DR. KITCHEN: take the initiative. What is wrong with this government that they cannot get anything going at all? You have not even got Stephenville going yet. All you did was pass over title to another company. There is still nothing happening over there. Nothing happens, you cannot get anything going. What you could do in the meantime to keep electricity rates down would be to have a talk to Bowaters. What about this paper contract that you have for less than four mils? Why do you fellows not pay your way? There is no reason why the people of this Province should be subsidizing power to Bowaters anymore. There is no reason. They are making millions of dollars on export. There is no reason.

MR. HOUSE: Drive them out!

DR. KITCHEN: You will not drive them out. There are there. They have lots coming.

MR. HOUSE: Subsidize them?

DR. KITCHEN: No, Sir, we do not have to subsidize them. But what we have to subsidize, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister of Education are the people of this Province who cannot afford to pay for electricity. I do not care about Bowaters but I do care about the people in my district who cannot afford to keep warm, who are cold. Who are as cold as the minister's heart. They are cleaning her on this windfall and now is the time, Sir, to renegotiate. Now let me tell you this, renegotiate with Price and Bowaters now, not later, now when they are in a windfall position. This is the time to do it. Look at ERCO, that is another one. Last year in 1976 they made \$31.5 million. That is something.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

DR. KITCHEN: Albright and Wilson, of which the ERCO plant is a major contributor. Now then, this is the time to renegotiate that power contract. Now make them an offer that they cannot refuse. Say to them, "Renegotiate, Albright and Wilson, renegotiate, go at it." Do not say, as the Minister of Mines and Energy did the other day, that we are in the process of negotiating. I want to know in this House more detail. How far are you? What are your proposals? How far have you gone? When is it likely to come about? You mean

DR. KITCHEN: you have the nerve to close this House while the people of Newfoundland are confronted with a twenty, thirty, forty, fifty per cent increase in electricity rates without having the courtesy even to tell us how the negotiations are proceeding, if indeed there are any negotiations with Bowaters, Price and ERCO. These contracts should be renegotiated. There is no good telling me what happened twenty years ago or ten years ago. We are living now and it is the responsibility of this government to act in the now and in the future. Never mind what happened, that is past. Forget about that, never mind that old nonsense; that is like talking about your grandfather. We are talking now about the present government and the future government. We have to renegotiate those contracts now. What was good years ago is no longer appropriate and this should not happen. There is no reason why the people of this Province should be paying high electricity rates when these companies are making many millions of dollars and being subsidized heavily by the very people who cannot afford to pay their electricity bills and who are being cut off, who are cold.

Now, what about the Upper Churchill? This of course is the big one and we have to be careful on this Upper Churchill because the time is now on that. We have to come to grips with this Upper Churchill contract. We have got to come to grips with it very shortly. James Bay will be coming on soon. When James Bay comes on stream in Quebec we can cut off the Upper Churchill and they can say, "Good-by." James Bay is an important source of electricity which means that the Upper Churchill power - we will not have the power over Quebec that we have now as soon as that comes on stream. This is the point. We have to act now. We talked about dilatory motions a few minutes ago. We were arguing about dilatory motions but what could be more dilatory, Mr. Speaker, that the actions of this crowd on the other side who are going to spend ten or fifteen years through legal shenanigans, lawyers fees one after the other? We heard them arguing over there, did we not? We heard them arguing the little points of order and all this old stuff and Mr. Speaker this and Mr.

DR. MITCHEM:

Speaker that, one hour and fifteen minutes and we are back where we started from. Now that is what they are going to do with these dilatory motions, Good Lord. We have to come to grips with the thing now. We cannot go delaying, we cannot go through these silly old court cases on whether or not. What we have to do is take the bull by the horns and we have to tell we are supreme, this legislature is supreme

DR. KITCHEN: in this Province, nothing else is supreme. We have to say to CFLCo, 'this contract is void and you go ahead and charge Hydro-Quebec the very price we want them to pay.' Now go and do that. It has been checked out. It has been mentioned by my friend and colleague, the Liberal candidate in St. John's West, who has checked it out nationally with lawyers and constitutional experts, and this is the way to do it, this is another way to do it. We have suggested several ways of doing it, but this is a good way. But you have to come to grips with this question of the Upper Churchill now. Now that is better than the Lower Churchill. The Lower Churchill we have to construct; the Upper Churchill we have constructed, the power is there, the low cost is there, it is ours if we only had the nerve to do it. Why should our people do without electricity and power? The very salvation of this Province is low cost electricity. We may never need to develop the Lower Churchill for years and years and years and years if we had the power of the Upper Churchill at our disposal. And all we want is somebody occupying that first seat there with the guts to go and handle that problem. That is what we need. There is nobody on that side. Look at the seven. My gosh! I cannot see any of those seven coming to grips with that problem, or the other seventeen either as far as that is concerned. We should certainly not close the House of Assembly until we have had an opportunity to explore these questions in great detail and come to some resolution. It is immoral to dilly and dally, play little games with the people for two whole months while someone is trying to decide whether they are going to lead that particular party to the bottom of the sea.

In the future we can increase our social policies, we can make this Province into a great Province, we can provide the social services, we can provide

DR. KITCHEN: the education, we can provide the health, we can provide the roads, we can provide the housing that people need, We can provide all of that - that is not the problem. We can do all that. That is not the problem. The problem has to do with having the imagination and the nerve to do what has to be done, namely, that is to develop our resources. It is no good talking about it, we have to take action on it, and the action has to be taken now. We have to take action to take back the power of the Upper Churchill. It has to be done immediately before competing sources of energy make our move of no significance - we have to do it now. And then with that power we have to develop the resources of Labrador, we have to process the minerals, we have to process the wood, we have to bring power to the Island, we have to develop our industry based on this cheap power. And that is the salvation of this Province, cheap power, most of which has already been developed. The cheapest power has already been developed, it is just waiting for us to do what has to be done. And we must do it. Never mind the law courts, never mind that nonsense. You will never get anywhere with the law courts, that does not decide things. What decides things - we cannot abrogate our responsibilities here in this House of Assembly and pass them over to a bunch of lawyers. That is not what has to be done. We are elected by the people of this Province to do things for them, not to put money in the hands of lawyers as they argue back and forth for the next fifty years. It might be said of this government that they have been fiddling while Rome burns.

The most serious question in this Province, Mr. Speaker, in my view, apart from the unemployment, is the question of housing. The housing question in this Province is very, very serious and I want

DR. KITCHEN:

to say a few words about it.

The Minister of Justice when he mentioned the bill today in a very amusing way - I suppose he thought it was amusing; I could not find very much amusement though because it was so pathetic. How can you be light-hearted when you realize the sad condition that many people are in in their houses? What we need is a Department of Housing, there is no doubt about that. We need a Department of Housing, but we do not need a weak department, we need a strong Department of Housing. I saw that bill. That bill is not a bill at all, it is only two or three pieces of paper. It does not even say what the Department of Housing is supposed to do. There is no statement of purposes, no statement of aims.

DR. KITCHEN: There is no statement of principle that the purpose of the Department of Housing is to ensure adequate housing at reasonable cost to every Newfoundlander. It just says they are going to administer four or five acts; a very weak bill, a very weak bill. I suppose we have a minister there. He is supposed to be the Minister of Housing and you cannot be a minister unless you have a department. There is really nothing there. I cannot see how we can close this House of Assembly now for two or three months. How can we close the House of Assembly without having a Department of Housing for the minister to administer? I wonder how legal is his activity in moving in as head of the St. John's Housing Corporation? How legal is it when that has not been passed by the House of Assembly? How can he do that? How can he take over a department when he has not been given the sanction by this House to do so? How can he be head unless the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing appoints him to that position. Then I can see it might be proper. But for the so-called Minister of Housing to be attempting to call the shots in housing when he has not got the authority from this House seems to me to be perfectly inappropriate and highly questionable.

We have serious problems in housing. We have the housing problem in Virginia Park, not all of which is a federal responsibility, not all of which. Because as we know Newfoundland and Labrador Housing have houses constructed down there too, of the same bricks which will also deteriorate, which are also deteriorating. We need a strong Department of Housing to come to grips with this question in Virginia Park. Some of it is federal, some of it provincial. We need a strong Department of Housing too to come to grips with this silly RRAP programme that we have been working with in the past few years, where if you live south of LeMarchant Road you

DR. KITCHEN: can get a grant, but if you live north of LeMarchant Road you cannot. That is kind of foolish that is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not any more.

DR. KITCHEN: Well, it is still true. It is still true. You still cannot get a grant north of LeMarchant Road. If you live in one part of Newfoundland you can get a grant. If you live in another part you cannot, identical people everywhere. This is a foolish programme. I do not care who set it up, whether it is federal or provincial it is still a foolish programme. And a strong Department of Housing should control housing in this Province. It should control housing and should say to the federal government, "We do not want that silly programme, give us the cash instead." Quebec did that in education, Quebec did it in other fields. We should do the same thing. It is so serious. And then you have the heritage people downtown who want to preserve as a perpetual memory to what should never have been done. What we should have for heritage is one house kept down there, one house, to remember what it was like and hopefully we will never have again, not keeping these houses which are not modern and which people do not want to live in. That is not what we want. We want good housing in this Province, good housing, and we want a strong Department of Housing to do it.

I want to speak again of the non-responsibility of the St. John's Housing Authority. I have mentioned this in the House before and I will mention it again. This is a corporation which is responsible to two bodies, both national and provincial. I do not know who can serve two masters. There has to be some master over a Crown corporation, it has to be either the federal government or the provincial government, and these joint corporations are not particularly successful. There is no one you can appeal to to the people from the management who operate it. I am not talking about the management. I am talking about the layer of volunteers at the top who call the final



DR. KITCHEN: shots. We have to have a Minister of Housing and a Department of Housing that in the ultimate analysis is responsible for housing in this Province and if we do not like what they do we can flick them out. That is the way it should be, not people hiding behind Crown corporations and things like that where you cannot get at them.

We need housing. Look at the people on fixed incomes. We were over in Corner Brook the other day and we were talking to the senior citizens there who cannot afford to pay their municipal property taxes. Surely there can be a uniform policy in this Province about senior citizens and property taxes. There should be a uniform policy from one end of the Province to the other. Whatever that policy is it should be fair and equitable. There should not be one policy in Corner Brook and one in St. John's and another one somewhere else. That is not fair. It should be the same policy throughout the Province. And it should be that senior citizens with little

Dr. Kitchen: income should have to pay very few, if any, property taxes, particularly if they have no or very little income. I do not believe people should be forced into homes because they cannot afford to maintain their own homes, their regular homes, I think they should be assisted, people should be assisted to live in their residence if they are able to do so, physically able to do so, and wish to continue with the memories and to have people in. Why should we stick them away into homes where they cannot have visitors and have people overnight and things like that? That may be fine for people who want to live that way, but a great many people whom I know want to remain living in their houses, and they need a little help for a number of years to do so. And this is what a strong Department of Housing should be doing. And all that stuff should be spelled out in the legislation, you know, what the purposes of the thing are and so on.

One of the main problems is heating. We do not know how much it costs to heat our houses, each person knows, but the government does not know. I believe that there should be a survey of housing, a very comprehensive housing survey from one end of this Province to the other to see what our housing stock is like in this Province. There has never been a comprehensive housing survey carried out in this Province. We need that, a housing survey. How many of our population are adequately housed for modern living? How many are not? Where are they located? Is it bad insulation? Can the houses be repaired? How much would it cost? We need a comprehensive housing survey so that we will know the job that has to be done and when we can do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: You cannot make policies by the seat of your pants, you have to have the data on which to do it. I do not know why we are closing the House of Assembly now when these issues are on the carpet, on the table, why we have to run off and hide away just because the Premier is tired. He was tired before he started. It is all right for him to go off to rest after a few years of doing nothing,

Dr. Kitchen: but the rest of you should not be going off to rest, you should be working. Let him go. Let him resign. Who cares. It does not matter if he goes or stays, he has not done anything anyway. But the rest of you should be working. You should be here working.

And you talk about housing and what you are going to do. The biggest problem in housing in this city and in other places has to do with people who are speculating in land. I would like very much for this government or this House of Assembly to come to grips with this criminal activity, this criminal activity indulged in by half the lawyers in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: I believe it is criminal, I believe it is criminal when land is taken hold and frozen and people say you have to pay \$25,000 for a little lot on which to put a house just because somebody bought it and the interest is accumulating and their speculative profits are going up. It should be a crime in this Province for anyone to ever make a copper on the sale of land. This is wrong. Land is put there by Almighty God for everybody. It is not put there and made it is not a product of man's labour. It is put there and it should be like air, it should be controlled by the government; if you need a place to build a house you get it for nothing; if you want something to farm you get that too. But the idea of someone holding title and hanging on to it, and then selling it at a profit it is wrong, it is absolutely immoral. And that is what is raising the cost of housing in this Province. And when we have the Minister of Housing suggesting, as he did the other day to the City of St. John's, that he has got to lower, narrow the streets, cut out the sidewalks, build more slums in the City of St. John's, as if we indeed need any more! What we have got to have is decent housing, and we can have decent housing if we can cut out the land speculation. And I believe land speculation should be a hanging offence, a hanging offence because it is a crime against the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: And all because of those speculative profits.

DR. KITCHEN: Right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cut their hands off.

DR. KITCHEN: Chop their hands off, Absolutely! Chop their hands off.

The hon. member feels that it is - I do not know how many houses he has visited lately where people cannot afford to keep to their houses warm, where the woman is in an overcoat, people staying in bed, because they cannot get up, to keep warm. Houses which the rain is coming down through. I do not know if that happens and you have seen any of that? But I have seen it, I have seen it. Many, many people in this Province are cold. Many, many people in this Province have houses which are no good. And many young people cannot afford to buy a house. Where is the average young person on unemployment insurance or without a steady job going to find \$22,000.

DR. KITCHEN: to buy a piece of land before he starts to buy a house? That is the question. This is a serious question. I know the would-be leader of the Tory Party over there does not give two hoots about the poor people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: He wants the hands laid on.

DR. KITCHEN: He does not care.

MR. DOODY: It is just the hanging bit that has me a bit worried.

DR. KITCHEN: You would rather be electrocuted. Well, it does not matter as long as the evil is expunged from our Province.

MR. DOODY: Well, with your kind of energy policy I do not think they would be able to spare the electricity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, the levity opposite is pathetic really.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is all one big joke.

DR. KITCHEN: It is all one big joke, absolutely. To them government is a little game they play between their stocks and their bonds. Half the people over there - not half, quite a large number of them over there - are not even full-time at this game of politics. They go down and dabble in law and they come up and they dabble up here and then they go dabble somewhere else with a bit of land speculation, they pull a tooth here or do something like that and then back they come up here. We want people who are taking the business of the Province seriously, not people who can adjourn the House of Assembly for two whole months while they get on with the job of changing hats, Mr. Speaker, what we have to have is a government that takes things seriously, and that is what we are going to have. And I tell you why I know we are going to have it.

DR. KITCHEN: We were over on the West Coast this Summer in an area where there were eight Conservative seats, including the Premier's - eight, Humber East, Humber West, Bay of Islands, Humber Valley. You know, a few years ago they were all Tory seats, but they went over and they got 5,000 votes. The handwriting is on the wall.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Six hundred votes a district.

DR. KITCHEN: The Titanic is going along, you see. And now they are jostling for chairs.

It is a serious question. And the reason the people in Western Newfoundland have given the boot to the Tories is because they have not done anything.

I was over there the other day talking to the senior citizens on this question of property taxes. I said, "What about your member? Did you ever talk to your member? Who are your members?" "Well, our member is Premier Moores." "Who is your member?" "Dr. Farrell." "Did you not ever bring it up to them about the senior citizens taxes?" I said, "Why bother me, I have my own troubles? Why? Why?" "Well, we cannot get hold of them. They do not talk to us. They do not care about us." "Well, what about your federal member?"

PREMIER MOORES: Dr. Cooper.

DR. KITCHEN: Do not mention him. I was talking to more than that. I was talking to him too, I was talking to others. But the question is they cannot get any satisfaction from them. And naturally they are going thumbs down. You should hear some of these people on the radio this morning in Corner Brook, what they were saying about the hon. gentlemen opposite and the attention they were getting on the municipal taxes field. Now you have to look after the people, that is what you were elected for.

DR. KITCHEN: You were not elected to spend your time partridge hunting. You were elected to look after the people who put you there and you have not done it. And you cannot close this House, you dare not close this House while there is business to be carried out. It is wrong, it is immoral, it is improper. This House must remain open. There are too many important things, the whole future of this Province rests with this House of Assembly and what goes on here in the next two or three months. You close this House of Assembly and it may be that we will never be able to put her back together again because of the big things that could be happening. It is very difficult. What will happen now if you get a new leader and you hang on for another year or so, another year or so wasted? It is a serious situation. Mr. Speaker, there is no alternative on that side of the House but to keep the House open, to put through the business, whatever little bit of business you have there to put before the House. We will put more business on the table than you will; we did in the last session.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right.

DR. KITCHEN: Our Labrador policy on energy was something that was the only positive thing, I believe, that came before the House last session.

MR. W. N. ROWE: We got the federal government to adopt it.

DR. KITCHEN: Right, we got the federal government to adopt it. Whatever government is going on in this Province is coming from the Opposition. We are the positive people, you are the guys who are doing the knocking. You are the guys who want to close the House of Assembly and run off to your retreats and peddle your mortgages or whatever you do. What we want to do is keep the House open. What we want to do is to put the people's business here, discuss it.

DR. KITCHEN: We want to hear your proposals on housing and if your bill is weak as I suggested it is - what I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, is why when they - I can understand why before Christmas a hurriedly conjured up



MR. KITCHEN: bill was presented here but it has been two and one half months since the House met. That is ample time to prepare a half decent bill on housing, withdraw the old one, bring in the new one, the good one. But, no, nothing happened in the housing bill; we still have this little piece of paper that is not worth anything. It does not state any directions on housing, it just says give me a blank cheque and I will do something with these five bills. I do not know why we bother really when the government is so determined not to govern. One thing I suppose we can give them credit for - there has to be something that everybody gets credit for, I suppose - one thing they have done is placed every Tory hack in the civil service in one place or another. in Crown corporations all over the place. I suppose that will be a nice job of weeding out next year or the year after, weeding out the inefficient ones. I suppose anyone is good we should keep on. You cannot just look after your friends even though you might not have very many. You have to look after all the people and that is the singular failure of this government, to look after the people. And any attempt to close down this House of Assembly is going to have to be voted against by this member.

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all if I may I would like to address myself to a matter that I think I should because I do not know how many opportunities I am going to have since we are informed by the hon. House Leader opposite publicly before the House opened that the House would only be open for one day or one afternoon. Since we last met as we know the hon. the Premier has indicated publicly of his intention to resign his position. I realize you always run some kind of a risk the way politics sometimes is practiced in this Province by saying anything good about anybody opposite but the fact is that I have known the hon. the Premier as we

MR. NOLAN: all have for some time. He and I have obviously have not always agreed on matters of public policy but that does not mean that you have to, as I see in some instances, I am ashamed to say, that you have to detest someone, dislike him publicly and privately because of the fact that you are on opposing teams. To me when you are in politics in this Province, or anywhere else in the world for that matter in a so-called civilized society, the forum we have as we have it here was merely devised as a debating forum. If the Premier has a policy or a statement to make which I agree or disagree with then that is the end of it. I will pursue my beliefs as long as I am involved in public life and he will no doubt stand by his. But, as I understand it, the reason for debates, the reason for this kind of a forum is merely to replace the ancient custom of throwing spears at each other. It is as simple as that. It is supposed to be a civilized method where men and women can come together to debate public affairs and the affairs of the people of the Province or of the country or whatever it is we are charged with debating. But I can tell you, and I can say frankly, that I am sorry to see the hon. the Premier announce his resignation even though I believe that from a purely selfish perhaps political point of view, I believe that it would make it easier for us to win by his going. I am honest enough to say that. I believe that. I believe that when he removes himself from the scene that in spite of the Moodys and all the rest that may be in the offing that are going to take over, that the party opposite, the government opposite, the administration opposite will be weakened to some degree because who is foolish enough to deny that the hon. the Premier had a certain following within the Province, as did the hon. the Premier preceding him. And only the most biassed can deny certain facts that are available which will be proven eventually by history if one is not prepared to admit it now. So I do not think I am amiss in saying that I regret personally that he is going because I think on a personal basis I have admired the man in many ways. While we have disagreed in public

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 357

AH-3

MR. NOLAN:

issues as is my duty, and as is his for that matter, the fact is I am sorry to see him depart from public life. Now why do I say that? Well there are a number of reasons and one is that I am sadly in fear of the fact that

MR. NOLAN: there are certain impressions being spread abroad today that do not encourage very many people in this Province to enter public life. I am amazed when I hear some of the things that I hear from educators, from students, from people in the press and so on about the House of Assembly. I am afraid it is largely misunderstood. A House of Assembly is a debating forum, that is what it is, a debating forum where sensible, mature people are supposed to get together to attempt to present the views of those that elected them, to discuss and debate and offer alternatives for various policies and so on that are brought in by the administration, if any are brought in, and that is it. But how often do I run into this simple fact? I have run into it. I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition has run into it. I am sure almost every member of this House at one time or another from a dear friend or from a friendly physician or a clergyman or someone, when you told them you were going to get involved in politics, never mind the party involved, they said, "What are you getting involved in that for? Are you out of your mind? There are so many ways you can make a living. Why get involved in that? One way or another no matter what side you are on, you are bound to be the subject of enormous amounts of abuse from some source or another, not necessarily in this House of Assembly." So therefore I am always sorry, believe me, and I say this with all the sincerity I can muster, to see any man or woman who has committed himself to public life in this Province decide, whatever the reasons, to resign. So I can say quite honestly that I am sorry to see the hon. the Premier who has made a decision, which is his right, and I hope that in the years ahead, whatever he may choose to do, that he and his family will be blessed with good health, prosperity and a long and happy life. And I say that with all my heart. Well now that is it and I would not want to con the Premier or anyone else into believing

MR. NOLAN: that I am going to go on for forty-five minutes in this vein. But I felt that since I do not know how long the House is going to be open, I do not know if they are going to call an election - we know very little on this side as my hon. friend the doctor will attest to - I felt that at least for the record I would like to say it and I am glad that I did.

Now on the adjournment, I cannot help feeling that whatever the hon. the Premier's reasons for resigning, I am not sure that it was a life or death matter or his part, or the part of the PC Party or this administration that he had to do it on the day or the night in which he announced it. I believe that the hon. the Premier is much too skilled a politician to merely choose a time to announce his resignation that was not advantageous in some way to the administration that he heads or to the party that he leads. So therefore I cannot help but say, in spite of what I have said previously by the hon. the Premier, that the whole thing has been orchestrated and orchestrated in this way, if the House of Assembly is not open you can only come to two conclusions: one, that there is no immediate need for the House to be open, no matter of grave public urgency or matters of public urgency that would warrant the House being opened, and as for those who say, "Then so what? What is the House of Assembly anyway? It is only a bawling and shouting match," and so on. Well if you are going to adopt this philosophy I suppose you could say the same thing about the House of Commons. Are we going to close that down? You do not have to close down the House of Assembly in order for -

MR. F. ROWE: Westminster over in England.

MR. NOLAN: Correct. You do not have to close the House of Assembly in order for the PC Association to have their leadership convention, no need in God's world for this to be done. I believe when the hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau was elected, and I might say if I

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 358

NM - 3

MR. NOLAN: am not mistaken in a minority government situation, that there was agreement between the parties concerned, the PC's and Liberals, that they adjourn for a week or so.

MR. J. NOLAN:

But this House of Assembly could have been opened in September or October, but the fact is that this is one grand scheme that anyone who has even a casual nodding acquaintance with politics must see through and the scenario is this; the hon. the Premier offers his resignation at a certain time, announces the leadership convention for a certain time, and this will give the excuse for having the House of Assembly closed so they will not get the unmerciful pounding they got last year, the year before and the year before that. This administration knows as well as I do that while this House is in session they are going to be pounded and pounded to death with embarrassing questions, many of which they will never answer, or questions which when they do answer, they will probably make a mess of it as they have so often in the past. And this is it! So what have they done? In some ways it may be sort of a textbook case for politic manoeuvring for those who can see through it, but surely God we have not got to wait for history to see it, have we?

We have the Public Accounts Committee, The Public Accounts Committee has been voided, the Public Accounts Committee has been silenced and anyone who knows what is going on knows this, and my hon. friend opposite has casual awareness of it also. So they have finished off the Public Accounts Committee so that that will not continue any longer to be an embarrassment to the administration. That is point one. Then the Premier announcing his resignation, point two. The announcing of the leadership convention, point three. And I am staggered, I am absolutely staggered by some people who have fallen for this tripe that the House must be closed because the PC leadership convention is going to be held on Paddy's Day. Well, all I can say is that St. Patrick is alleged to have driven the snakes out of Ireland and before this is over there may be a few other items driven from this land. There is no reason in God's world for the House of Assembly to be adjourned at this time. Someone mentioned to me today that there are certain conventions that should be agreed upon privately between parties. For example, if the members opposite want to have a meeting or something for two or three days, on the weekend, say, coming up, we adjourn tomorrow and maybe for Saturday and Sunday and Monday. Nothing wrong with that! It has been

MR. J. NOLAN: done in the past and it will be done again by hon. men and women; it will be done. But this business of adjourning the House from when - when did we really meet? Never mind the one or two days in between: last July was it? I mean, what has been going on is an absolute charade and is there anyone foolish enough in this Province to think that this is the way it should be done? The House of Assembly is supposed to be here now meeting to discuss programmes and policies that have some relevance to the people in this Province. Are all the items on electricity rates, housing, education transportation, justice and so many others so unimportant that you can shove them aside in order to have a leadership convention, no matter what the party? Are they? Certainly not! But this is exactly what the hon. gentleman opposite are guilty of and one day it is going to haunt them and it may not be in the too distant future. We have a situation now in this Province where people are really feeling the bite - on housing, on electricity rates, on so many other items that it is frightening to imagine. I know what happens, of course, sometimes with some people in public life that they get so isolated from what is going on with some of the great worries, the great schemes, the great projects of the day that they are not really in touch with the ordinary, common people who put them there in the first place and there is your danger for any party, any member, any minister. So here we have a situation where the House of Assembly is closed and we have to, on this side, Grovel, attempt to move and use every parliamentary tactic and so on to try to keep it open for a few hours, and that is probably the best that we can hope for, to try to demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that there is no collusion, there is no agreement, secret, private or otherwise, none, absolutely none between the members in the Opposition and those opposite for this House of Assembly to be closed. For the House of Assembly to be closed, let me make it firmly clear, distinctly clear that it is the decision of one group and one group only and that is the gentleman



MR. NOLAN: opposite. If any of those individually want to keep it open they have not risen to say so and have not stated so publically to the press or otherwise. So, therefore, the members of the administration opposite, the backbenchers and the PC Association, for whatever influence they have, are guilty for keeping this House of Assembly closed. And so is there any wonder that so many people shrug their shoulders and say: "Well, what is the use, It is all a game; nobody cares and they are all alike". And this is sad to hear for me and for others because I know there are people who have very strong feelings about this Province, about its history, about the present state of the economy, where we are now and where we should be going.

In housing we are faced with a bill where we have had a minister, a sort of housing Henry the VIII, who has now declared himself Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and the St. John's Housing Corporation. Imagine, can you imagine the Minister of Welfare or, say, the Minister of Health as an example appointing himself Chairman of the Health Sciences Complex, Chairman of every other hospital in this Province or the Medicare Board and so on? Can you imagine it? Even from a purely political point of view, it is the last thing in God's world you would expect a minister to do. And yet he has done it. Why? Why? What is happening in housing behind the scenes that we, the Members of the House, and the people of this Province are not informed of? We have already had a demonstration of the kind of thing that we are probably going to be faced with by the reaction of the St. John's Municipal Council on the project that was mentioned earlier on the widening or narrowness of the streets concerned. So there we have an indication of it right there.

My hon. friend from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) made some mention of land and the cost of land

MR. NOLAN: and so on. There is a very sad thing in some ways in this Province, and I am not recommending or suggesting public hangings as my hon. friend did.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are an abolitionist.

MR. NOLAN: I am, yes. But let me give you a case where the hon. members opposite may be familiar with this. You take the land in Newtown that was bought allegedly to provide homes for many people badly in need of it and it is now being administered by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing corporation. If you were to look back far enough and find when that land was purchased, and if I am not mistaken the present federal member for St. John's West may have been minister at the time in a liberal administration when that land was purchased, you will find in some cases that land, acres upon acres upon acres, purchased by the Crown for maybe in some cases \$100 an acre, \$200 an acre - believe me, the prices were extremely low - and yet if the hon. member for Trinity were to go out today and buy a lot in the Newtown he would probably pay somewhere in the vicinity of \$12,000 to \$14,000. Now, what I would like to know is: what happened between the price that the public, the Government paid on the one hand in order to landbank land and the price that it is now being sold for today to the people of this Province? From \$100 or \$200 or \$300 an acre to \$14,000 a lot, surely there is something wrong. Now, where did that money go and into whose hands or are we prepared to have a Royal Commission on that. I doubt very much if we want to do that because it may be embarrassing to some people who shout and bawl about free enterprise but for them free enterprise is really only what a Government, whatever Government it is, is prepared to do to feather their nests.

MR. NEARY: Who is buying all the land out in Cape Spear?

MR. NOLAN: Well, I do not know who is buying land at Cape Spear. Have you bought some land at Cape Spear?

MR. RIDEOUT: Who is selling all the land out in Harbour Granc?

MR. NOLAN: So, I can go on on housing and land but these are some items that I believe are worthy of attention.

The matter of the Department of Justice is one that causes me some concern. Without getting

Mr. Nolan: involved in the Elizabeth Towers fire and so on directly, I have addressed myself to a number of problems in this Province concerning the Department of Justice for all these many years. I have seen people who have been victimized in one way or another and who never seem to be able to get the kind of justice that they feel they deserve. More and more people in this Province are very skeptical, very, very, very skeptical about how justice is administered in this Province. People do feel that there is a law for the rich and a law for the poor.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I believe, has made reference to what they have happened to the people, for example, involved in, say, arson or fires of one kind or another, who may have been brought to court or to trial and convicted on the basis of criminal investigation departments turning in certain findings, and those involved in electrical investigations of the start of fires and/or a fire commissioner, some of whom have now been termed incompetent in some ways by a certain judge. What is going to happen to them? Are we going to review their cases and see whether they have received a fair trial? Apparently coming out of the preliminary hearing we have had a suggestion that there was a possible cover-up right within the Department of Justice on this particular case, that it was being sat on. Now you must remember that there are certain cases that come and whether they go to trial or not is strictly the prerogative of the Justice Department. They can decide to go to court or not to go to court. This is well known.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: Well, what I am saying is: who protects the people of this Province from the Department of Justice? You want to have a royal commission investigation - and please God I have never made a public commitment of any kind promising people something be done - but if a new administration is formed in this Province by the Liberals, and if they do not set up a royal commission to investigate the Department of Justice in this Province then you will hear me speak

Mr. Nolan: out on it publicly.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) lawyers in the department (inaudible).

MR. NOLAN: You do not have to have a lawyer as minister.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Put a non-lawyer in there.

MR. NOLAN: While we are talking of lawyers, since you brought it up, how offend do we get, and I am sure members opposite do too, we get letters from people who have had certain cases, land disputes and this, that and the other, they write a lawyer and the lawyer will say, "Yes, I will write to the certain minister or the department concerned." The department writes back and they are turned down. The lawyer has written one letter and the poor devils get a bill for \$200. If they go to court it might cost them \$600 or \$800. When are people going to learn? And this is where I believe all members of the House of Assembly have to inform more and more people.

AN HON. MEMBER: We need more and more advertising. They are too ashamed to advertise.

MR. NOLAN: They are doing it in Alberta right now.

Well when you get advertising in this Province for the lawyers is when you get enough young people in and they are fighting for business - alright? I mean, you have had a nice cozy little arrangement going for so long, who wants anybody to horn in? What do you want to advertise for if you got a captive market? It is as simple as that.

Anyway, when any reforms in justice or in the Law Society comes this will be the last Province to see it, I will guarantee you that. It is as simple as that.

Members of the House of Assembly are continuously writing letters on land dispute and this, that, and the other in an attempt to represent people, some people do go through lawyers. And how many intercessions have we had from time to time saying that some lawyer wrote a letter for him and it cost him \$200, and then they have to come to the members of the House of Assembly afterwards to see if they can get it resolved. And it is shocking, just shocking what has happened

Mr. Nolan: So I tell you now if the Liberal Administration, which I firmly believe will shortly follow in this Province, if they are not prepared publicly to commit themselves to an investigation of the Department of Justice and what has been happening there - what cases, if any, have been sat on, why it is that certain persecutions have not been carried out then there is no way, no way that anyone who has any interest in justice in this Province can be associated with the Liberal Party in this Province, it as simple as that. It cannot be done, not and be a Liberal.

MR. NOLAN: We are now in a situation where every member of this House, at least on this side and I assume their constituents talked to the people opposite - where we are deluged daily with requests for assistance on roads, on electric rates, on everything under God's earth, and yet we have the people who are charged - I mean, the people in 1975 decided, rightly or wrongly, but they decided and that is what we have to honour - that the group opposite should be the administration of this Province. That was what happened because of the votes and so on, and rightly so - that is the system we have. But can you imagine anybody in his right mind, be he Liberal, Tory, N.D.P. or whatever, voting for anybody who is going to use the House of Assembly as a sort of hobby, sort of a place to fill in occasionally when there is bad weather? Because that is what has happened. No wonder the House of Assembly is becoming irrelevant. As long as those in charge of the administration of this Province continue to treat it as a joke, to ramrod something through whenever they want to and then close her down and go off to another meeting somewhere in the four corners of the earth - no wonder people have lost hope.

I found it interesting in the remarks of the Minister of Mines and Energy today in talking about the social problem associated with the electricity rates of this Province, very interesting. Because if anyone were to look at Hansard, and you will remember that thousands upon thousands upon thousands of petitions, names signed to petitions that we brought in in the last three years - is that not right, 'Fred'? thousands. I do not know if anybody counted them all up - and look at the Hansard statements then and the arrogance we were faced with, the absolute and utter arrogance, there was not a sympathetic response, there was not a sympathetic

MR. NOLAN: bone opposite, at least that spoke on this matter. We were stupid, we did not know what was going on, we had no programmes, we had no policies. All we had were thousands and thousands of names, pleas from people who voted for you and for me. There is a programme for you. Is that to be ignored? Well, it was. And I am telling the Leader of the Opposition to look out for something now. Look before the next election to a move by the successor opposite for a big announcement on hydro, either to freeze the rates or even to subsidize some. How is that for you? But let there be no mistake about it, that the people of this Province remember some of the things that were said and done during the 1975 election, because right after the election things can come to a halt all of a sudden. In my own district I saw them out on the roads during the election with red vests on, men going around measuring. I saw this poor woman down in Chamberlains, I will never forget the poor devil, and they were measuring from the middle of the road in to see how far the water and sewer would go, you see. Alright?

AN HON. MEMBER: I guess so.

MR. NOLAN: She was expecting to have it in by October. This was September.

MR. RIDEOUT: Unfortunately the election was too far off.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does she have it now?

MR. NOLAN: Yes, she has. But, I mean, this is the kind of thing that we have had.

MR. RIDEOUT: The gunpowder plots down in the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. NOLAN: Now then, I think I have heard the Minister of Justice and Minister of Finance saying on the radio recently - I believe someone questioned him on the Budget and the fact that, you know, will he bring in



MR. NOLAN: a Budget and how can you prepare a Budget so fast after the Tory Leadership Convention? Well, I think he said that so much, a very high percentage of the Budget is committed. Well, that is true.

MR. RIDEOUT: Fifteen per cent flexibility, he said.

MR. NOLAN: Fifteen per cent flexibility? All right then, fine. But, I mean, as one who served on Treasury Board and served in government and so on, surely this administration now have their roads programme planned for next year. Surely to God, they have it done now, do they not? They have their major programmes planned for this year. So therefore, are we not entitled to discuss these things in the House? Is a new leader of the government going to change that? Most unlikely. It does not make any difference who the leader is, the planning has to be done or you cannot call all the tenders. And this is going to be one whopping year if they have an election because they will pave your strawberry patch if you leave it in the way, it is as sure as I am standing here, as we have seen that before.

MR. NEARY: I hope it is not like Bell Island where all the pavement is starting to fall apart over there.

MR. NOLAN: We had also before us-which we defeated, I am proud to say- this regional government situation which now we are having some meetings on again, or the new minister is. And there has been some suggestion on a plebescite, I do not normally go for the plebescite route; however, the gentleman who is presently the Minister of Municipal Affairs saw fit to have a plebescite to determine whether the people in Newtown should be a part of Mount Pearl or not. The former Minister of Municipal Affairs put all the people of Foxtrap in with Conception Bay South and gazetted it and all the rest of it and then was forced to take them out again. Again no consultation. The people up in Seal Cove have asked for their own council and they have been refused just recently. How can you go making chalk of one and cheese of the other? I do not know how many people live in Newtown, is there 10,000, 5,000, maybe 4,000 at least? Well, okay, If they deserve a plebescite do not 165,000 deserve a plebescite? I mean is this erratic or revolutionary or something? But it is not going to work. It is simply not going to work. I believe the minister is going the right route in this respect and that is at least he is having some meetings and consultations to try to reach a consensus on this business. So I will give him a hand for that.

Out in the district of Conception Bay South there are a number of roads that one cannot seem to get anything done with and yet I am told in St. John's East Extern and other areas that I know of there is more paving going on, my God, you would not believe it! They would need their own asphalt plant there permanently. Now why is this? Why is it that the people on Dunn's Hill Road in Foxtrap have been denied, in spite of constant pleas to my present friend over there who is running for the leadership, and others who held the Minister of Transportation portfolio, why is it they have been denied the right to reconstruction and maybe a little paving? Is it because they were unfortunate enough to vote

MR. NOLAN: Liberal? Is this it? Must they be penalized for the rest of their life, or as long as they have a Liberal member, because of this? The people up on Indian Pond Road, the problems we have in St. Phillips and other areas of the Province, why is it that their pleas have fallen on deaf ears?

I am not promising when this administration changes, as it is going to, I have never gone to the Leader of the Opposition and said, "This road must be done on such and such a date." But I will tell you one thing, I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and the next Premier of this Province, if you cannot do this now be good enough and honest enough to tell the people from what information we have available now when it can be done. Do not keep them dangling on the string. Do not treat them like dirt, because that is what has happened to the people in Foxtrap and other areas of Conception Bay, they have been faced with the type of arrogance that has not been seen since Hitler knocked himself off in the bunker. Absolutely shocking, and it is not being forgotten.

The district of Conception Bay South is the largest single provincial riding in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, the largest in terms of numbers of people. I do not mean geographically the largest. And yet if you see the callous treatment that many of the people in communities there have received it is unbelievable to behold, but fortunately they will not forget what has happened. Because remember the mud and the pot holes; the rain falls on the just and unjust alike. And the rain in the pot holes, in the mud, and no ditching and water overflowing in the road penalizes the Tories as well as the Liberals. And they will all remember when the time comes. They will all remember. And that is what they seem to forget opposite. If they are going to punish

MR. NOLAN:                   them because they voted Liberal, the  
time will come when you will not even get the few votes you got  
before. It is as simple as that in certain communities.

MR. NEARY:                   That is right my son.

MR. NOLAN:                   Yes, as sure as I am standing here.  
The district of Conception Bay

South surely in

MP. NOLAN:

order to be developed properly needs an overall plan. What kind of a plan am I talking about? Am I talking about one that should be done by the planners down here in Municipal Affairs, Public Works, Fisheries? No. They may be included I am talking about a well financed plan which involves the experts, yes, but let them be second, third, fourth or fifth on the list. Give every single community, everybody, every single soul from St. Phillips in the East to Seal Cove and Indian Pond Road in the West, an opportunity and make a real effort to do it, that every church, every clergyman, every service club, every organization, municipal, every single kind including kids in school, to have an opportunity to express how their community should be developed. And I tell you why I say that, because by so doing - you may go in as a member of the House of Assembly with the best of intentions in God's world, with a good plan, but unless you have the feed from the people one day it will come back to haunt you, that it was yours, they were not consulted and this, that and the other thing. So if you look at Conception Bay South you cannot help but feel that if you have enough people involved, as they have to be, that here is the potential for tourism, for proper development in housing, for small industry and for so many other things, farming, fishing and so on. It is all there but you need an overall plan to do it right, not the higgledy-piggledy way that it is done now to try to appease certain groups in certain areas at certain times. There is no programme, and unfortunately Conception Bay South provincially is indicative of the state of this Province - no plan. They go running off to an election with all kinds of grand schemes, promising everything under God's sun, and the moment the election is over - look what happened to the municipal grants after 1975. "Money is tight." They all discovered right after the election money was tight. Money was pretty loose in September of 1975, pretty loose. That was not the only thing that was loose. So there we have it.

On the electricity rates in this Province we heard the other day on CBC TV Commander Desbarat, I believe you mentioned his name was, the former head of the corporation, stating

MR. NOLAN: that there were overstaffed, overpaid and so on.

DR. KITCHEN: Cars going everywhere. They have more cars!

MR. NOLAN: How do you explain it? I am sure I am not alone in the calls that I get from widows and so on who tell me, "Look, I can just afford to meet my house payment and get enough food in and a few drugs" if they need it.

DR. KITCHEN: Or I cannot do it.

MR. NOLAN: Or I cannot do it. Now how can I reach it? What is going on? For example, if you had a light on your pole on your property where you do not have municipal lighting and so on throughout your community, a few years ago you paid four dollars for that light and now it is nine dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: The same pole.

MR. NOLAN: The same pole and the same light. They have not even changed the bulb. Now it is nine dollars a month from four. I was reading somewhere - I do not seem to have it in my pocket that the - remind me to get this, will you? - I believe the salaries for the Chairman of Hydro in British Columbia -

DR. KITCHEN: \$48,000.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, I believe you are right.

DR. KITCHEN: It was in the paper.

MR. NOLAN: \$48,000. And what was the last figure we had on Mr. Groom? \$75,000 or \$81,000 plus a house, plus a five per cent interest rate.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Mortgage money free of interest.

MR. NOLAN: Free of interest? It is wonderful. Here is one of the most prosperous provinces in all of Canada, British Columbia, and they can pay \$48,000 to the chairman of their corporation and we can pay \$75,000 or \$80,000, plus houses, plus interest free loans, cars, four-wheel drives, marvelous! Poor little Newfoundland. We can really lay it on, boy. No wonder they say we are too green to burn.

February 15, 1970

Tape No. 364 (Night)

AH-3

MF. NOLAN:

Newfoundland Hydro is now a problem of such proportions that it is eating up the people of this Province. It is eating them up. Now I am not one who has gone around shouting

Mr. Nolan:

and bawling about nationalization, and this, that, and the other, In fact Newfoundland Hydro, if it were to continue the way it has, is a good case for not nationalizing anything. In the name of God, if this is what is supposed to be the best for the people, God help them! God help them! Newfoundland Light and Power, maybe they should be nationalized. In fact, there are very few provinces of Canada now where you have middlemen the way we do are there? How many provinces in Canada now do you have another body like Newfoundland Light and Power between the producer, like Newfoundland Hydro? Not very many. You do not have it in Nova Scotia.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not have it in Quebec either.

MR. NOLAN: No. That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Duplication of engineers

MR. NOLAN: All kinds of it. You will also find that one of the people that are tied in with Newfoundland Light and Power is Montreal Engineering, a very, very large stockholder, and have common people on their boards and so on. They are also consultants who, you might find out, from time to time have done work for Newfoundland Hydro. So there is an awful there that needs to be looked at.

But unfortunately we are not going to get to the bottom of Newfoundland Hydro as long as this crowd are in office, because they have got more feather-bedders that they put in down there. I mean, they have people in some cases who failed at everything in this life just about, they made a mess of it, and they finally found their nest at Newfoundland Hydro at my expense.

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland senate.

MR. NOLAN: The Newfoundland senate, that is a bloody good fact. The Newfoundland senate.

Well, I will tell you this that one of the first things that this party has to do and commit itself to -

DR. KITCHEN: Cut out the Crown corporations.

MR. NOLAN: Well I do not know about cut out the Crown corporation, but clean up their act - that is item one. And look at



Mr. Nolan: Newfoundland Hydro, and a royal commission on the Department of Justice in this Province, because no one thinks that there is justice in this Province any more, nobody in their right mind, the way it is going.

MR. NEARY: A law for the rich and a law for the poor.

MR. NOLAN: Four or five million dollars in the fisheries scandal -

AN HON. MEMBER: Terrible.

MR. NOLAN: - you know.

MR. NEARY: We have not heard about that for two years.

MR. NOLAN: Oh, no! and you are not going to, not going to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: Some poor devil gets a parking ticket or some poor widow is overpaid on her welfare or something and they get nailed very quickly. I wonder what they think about justice in this Province? Well, all these people fortunately can vote, and they will. And they are not all Liberals; they are just people who want an even break that is all. They want an opportunity not to be over-governed, taxed to death, because that is what is happening, you know. There are cute forms of taxation going on now. One of those days the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) might want to take a look, or the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), at what they did when they raised the gas prices, by the way.

MR. NEARY: When they converted to metric.

MR. NOLAN: When they converted to metric. Take a look at that one one of those days.

MR. NEARY: They take a percentage at a cent per gallon.

MR. NOLAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: It was too complicated, nobody knew about it.

MR. NOLAN: And actually Newfoundland Hydro, whether people realize it or not, is another form of taxation, because what they are doing is for all the extravagances and all the rest of Newfoundland Hydro, they are just having Newfoundland Hydro charge extra rates, that is all, as simple as that, and up it goes. So people are being

Mr. Nolan: taxed from all ends. But there is one thing they do know; all the people may not be able to explain in detail exactly what is happening, but they do know this, that the various boards, the various corporations, public corporations, all comes under the administration of the people opposite. They are the ones who have the final say. The Minister of Energy said today that they have protected themselves - so that no matter what happens, no matter what the Public Utilities Board and so on might do or say, or no matter what Newfoundland Hydro might ask for, they have the final word. So therefore if they are going to take the credit, as I am sure they will try, to hold or freeze the rates, they have also got to take the blame for the increase in rates over the past few years, where people have suffered and suffered and suffered enormously. And I do not think that this administration or any administration that behaves in such a savage and cavalier fashion will even continue to hold the confidence of the people of this Province.

We have come to the point now where people are really hurting, because you are not talking about certain little luxury items which we are entitled to, hopefully, in this life; you are talking about the basic necessities, You are talking about the prices of drugs that some of them have to have, and many of whom, because they are proud

MR. NOLAN: people, I know, who have never looked to any government agency or any member or anyone else in their lives because they have always been independent, and now in attempting to buy their drugs on prescription from doctors and so on, they are going without badly needed food - people on pensions with houses to keep up and so on.

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

MR. NOLAN: My time is up. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is, Thank you very, very much, and with God's help you will be the Speaker in the next administration also.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Fogo.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should rise to debate this motion which is now before the House, and the motion is that this House should not adjourn until the 27th of March. We on this side are debating why it should not close, but we have not heard one speaker from the government side rising to his feet and telling us why it should close.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPT. E. WINSOR: There is not a single word over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are muzzled.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Why should you close it? Why should the House close at this particular time? Surely because a half dozen of your members and Cabinet ministers are out fighting a leadership campaign that is no reason to close down the business of the House. Surely there are enough men on that side to keep the House going at least until the week prior to the leadership convention. There should not be any problem there. But, Mr. Speaker, be that as it may, then why call the House together this afternoon? Why did we call the House together this afternoon if we are

CAPT. E. WINSOR: going to adjourn again after three hours? Now I can only assume that there was one reason and one reason only why this House was called together this afternoon, and that is to give the Minister of Justice an opportunity to introduce a motion to have a Royal Commission appointed into the leakages pertaining to the fire at Elizabeth Towers. That is the only reason. Surely it was not because he wanted to debate the housing bill, because, Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for that bill is not even in the House, He has not been here since 6:00 P.M. So the Minister of Justice got up to try to, I suppose, pretend that this is a very important piece of legislation. So he spoke on it for a very few minutes. But, Mr. Speaker, again I repeat, the man who is supposed to pilot that bill through the House has not been here, so therefore it certainly was not for that reason that the House met this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the only reason that we met at all this afternoon was to give the Minister of Justice an opportunity to put that motion to have that Royal Commission set up. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Justice should have appointed a commission to find out what caused the fire. And let me tell the minister, although he is not in his seat right now, that the people of this Province are more concerned with the cause of that fire than they are to find out who leaked what, because whoever leaked what it was about time that it had been leaked to someone. It had gone long enough, and there are a lot of people concerned, especially those tenants who are in Elizabeth Towers. You scarcely can meet one living in there who is not worried. I met one elderly lady a few nights ago and she said, "You know, I have not had a good night's sleep since that fire. I am worried, disturbed." And yet we find a Minister of Justice coming in here and

CAPT. E. WINSOR:                   introducing a motion to set  
up a Royal Commission to find out who spread the gossip  
or who leaked the confidential report. Surely, Mr. Speaker,

CAPT. WINSOR: we have more pressing problems and more urgent problems in this Province today than to go and find a Commission to inquire into the leakage of some confidential or supposedly confidential - I do not know when it became confidential became there were rumours around about the report of that fire long before we ever heard of it over the air or even in any of the news media. There has been little get-togethers, little rumblings and little chit-chats and I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, perhaps every member on that side of the House had heard all about that report long before it became public knowledge. So I do not know what was the urgency of having a Royal Commission set up to appoint - a Commission rather, to inquire as to where the leakage, who made it and so on and so forth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many varied reasons why this House should not close and I am going to take one which was brought forward very forcibly by the Member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) and that is the high cost of electricity. A few years ago we recall that Newfoundland Light and Power and Hydro itself went around and carried on a great campaign to have people install electric heat in their homes and a great number of people fell for that advertisement. Electricity was clean and it was cheap so therefore the most sensible thing to do was to install electric heat. But, Sir, they did not have electric heat installed very long before they found out that they could not afford it, and now a great many people are faced today with electric heat and just can not afford to pay their bills, and it is going higher and higher almost every other day. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that one item alone concerns more people of this Province than perhaps the Government gives it credit for because, Sir, it is a very disturbing problem which we have to deal with. That is one reason I think we should keep the House open and debate whether or not Newfoundland can afford to keep

CAPT. WINSOR: the high cost of electricity as it is today. There has got to be a cut-off somewhere and if it can be done, as someone suggested, by cutting down the expenses of Newfoundland Hydro, so be it. I think it is a very wise suggestion to trim and cut the garment according to the cloth, not to lay the burden on the people of this Province who can least afford to pay and that is what we seem to be doing all the time. The people who can least afford to pay the additional taxes, taxes which are the highest in Canada - our SSA tax is the highest in all of Canada - and I would not be at all surprised if there is not an election on the horizon after the 17th of March that we may be faced with another increase in SSA tax. If there is going to be an election there maybe a reduction of a point or half a point or a cent, maybe, to attract the voters. But, Sir, this is another very important reason why we should not adjourn this House at this particular time. We are faced, as was pointed out, with a budget. Normally budgets are brought down in March or otherwise the whole economy suffers; construction people can not plan their work, and I am sure the Department of Transportation and Communication can not plan their work, they can not let any contracts or call any tenders because the money has not been voted by the House of Assembly. So, Mr. Speaker, I would strongly suggest we keep this House open and let the ministers who are not running for leadership buckle down and prepare a budget and bring a budget in shortly after the Leadership Convention. Now I do not think it would be unfair - or it would be fair to the Leader, the next Premier of this Province, for someone else to have the last say on a budget which he is going to be responsible for and one which he is going to have to take the responsibility of enforcing whether it be good or

CAPT. E. WINSOR: bad, increasing or decreasing expenditures. This is going to be the responsibility of the next leader, whoever he may be. And I would suspect, though, Mr. Speaker, that that Budget should be ready no later than the 20th of March. Actually it should be brought down the first week of March but circumstances will not permit that. So, Mr. Speaker, that is another reason.

And there is another very pressing problem which has surfaced only this last few days. As a matter of fact, it only came to the surface a couple of days ago, and that is the scarcity, or maybe the scarcity, of oil - fuel. What is the government doing about that? Now we can very well say, 'Well, that is the responsibility of the federal government,' but surely our provincial government should take steps to make sure that the federal government sees to it that this part of Canada will not be reduced and will not be in a position where we will have to do with less oil and gas. Because, Mr. Speaker, as sure as night follows day that is what is going to happen. It has already been advocated by the President of Imperial Oil and other companies have already stated that they are going to follow in their steps. So this is a very serious problem. And it never fails, Mr. Speaker, when we see things happening in other countries, in foreign countries like what is happening in Iran these last few months, the effects of that are bound to reach this part of the world and perhaps sooner than we think. And with the anticipated oil shortage then I think we are heading into a very, very serious problem, one which the government of the day is going to have to take responsibility for. It is no use to try to shift our responsibility to the federal government. We must get in there and make sure that Newfoundland's case is presented to the federal government, and if there is such a thing as an oil shortage we will see to it that we do not get the



CAPT. E. WINSOR:

dirty end of the stick.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why I do not think we should close the House at this particular time. We have, as was stated, the highest rate of unemployment in Canada and there is no programme, there is nothing on the drawing boards to improve that situation. There are many people today who are now running out of their unemployment insurance and they are quite concerned about what they are going to do next, where they are going to get the next job, where they are going to make the next dollar, and yet our provincial government is just sliding along, status quo, making no effort at all to create employment. We have woods operations in this Province closing down. We hear over the air where the Canada Bay Lumber Company is not operating and it is doubtful if they are going to operate. And there are a great many sawmills closing down for one reason or another, and yet we find no action at all from the provincial government. And we must place ourselves in that position, the situation where the heads of families have to say to their wives and to their sons and daughters, 'You know, after my unemployment cheque is received next month I do not know where to turn.' There is no hope of getting a job, especially this time of the year. But, Mr. Speaker, the woods operation alone should be in full swing in this Province today. Lumber was never in any greater demand than it is today. Prices are higher, especially in the United States. We can sell all the lumber we can produce in this country today to the United States at a much higher price than we can get in Canada - anywhere in Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, the government should make an all-out effort to get those sawmills going and produce the lumber where we know there is a ready market for it.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to carry on for any great length of time. I usually get a little tired at this hour, especially coming on towards midnight. I always try to get a little beauty sleep before midnight, but it looks as if I am not going to get it tonight. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very unreasonable request the government has asked this side of the House to agree with and that is to adjourn the House, whenever it does adjourn tonight, until the 27th of March without any reason, without any defence, without any argument from the other side why it should close. This is what I would like to hear. You know,

CAPTAIN WINSOR: the backbenchers, the seats are over there, you know, no one rising, no one producing an argument why it should close.

MR. NEARY: The wind is popped out of them, boy.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Yes. There should be one reason. Let us hear from one minister or one member why the House should adjourn.

MR. NOLAN: Yes. Give us a reason.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: I do not think they can produce one.  
So, Mr. Speaker, those are the problems which we are facing - and they are only very few and I have only touched on them without going into any detail the importance of keeping this House open. So I hope perhaps the government will reconsider, after tonight, and keep the House open until, as I think the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) suggested, until at least the 9th. of March. And then there is lots of time for campaigning. There is lots of time for campaigning and not only that but the candidates can always agree among themselves, you know, where to go and what time to go. They do not have to keep at it night and day between now and the 17th. of March to get elected. Some of them though -

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Industrial Development has it won now. He has the cards stacked.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Well, some of them know that it is only labour in vain. I would say ninety per cent of them know now that it is only labour in vain.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: It is only an exercise in futility.

MR. RIDEOUT: 'Morgan' is leaving now.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: So why take all the time? This is no insinuation for the hon. Minister of Industrial Development. I have a feeling that he has the feeling that he will be moving across in the seat

CAPTAIN WINSOR: next across the floor there on the 27th.  
of March.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

CAPTAIN WINSOR: We wish him well.

MR. F. ROWE: He was even trying to get to that seat  
today.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Now if the hon. Minister for Tourism were  
here I would probably say the same to him, or any other of the  
candidates.

Mr. Speaker, on a more serious note,  
there are very urgent and important problems facing this Province  
today and I do not think the government can close their eyes to  
those problems. They are problems which are affecting every individual  
of this Province and they are affecting the people mostly who are in  
a position where they just cannot afford to go on much longer. They  
cannot afford to go on much longer the way it is going. And I would  
not be at all surprised, Mr. Speaker, we saw today a delegation from  
Markland in here pleading, pleading for the upgrading of a road which  
was built more than forty years ago. I can have a delegation in  
here any day from Fogo Island, from all of the communities at  
Fogo Island, pleading for the same thing.

All of my years in politics, Mr. Speaker,  
I have seen more delegations parading on Confederation Building  
this past five years than I have the other eighteen or twenty. There  
is a reason why they have to parade on Confederation Building.

MR. NEARY: When I was in welfare they used to come  
up to see me quite often.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: They were single individuals but not  
in groups. If I were on the government side I would be quite concerned  
and alarmed to have people parading. And it is a wonder we do not  
get more and perhaps we will get more if we do not have an election  
before 1980.

MR. NEARY: It is a wonder they have not been up and  
smashed the windows out of it.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree that we should keep the House open and let us debate the problems facing this Province today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Surin - Placentia West.

MR. CANNING: Now, Mr. Speaker, I never thought we would come to this on the 15th., almost gone, just disappearing, the 15th. day of February. I find myself in this House getting up to speak on a motion

MR. P. CANNING: with the House closing, about to close or they want to close it, to leave the House on the 16th., if we should tomorrow, on the 16th. day of February about a month from Spring or less, closing the House until the 27th. day of March. So, Mr. Speaker, there will be no budget brought down in this House before sometime in April, so the people out in my district and across this Province now are wondering what is going to happen this year. When this time of the year comes people are interested, people are interested in their own welfare, people are interested in the welfare of the Province, wondering what the season ahead is going to be. And, Mr. Speaker, with what is happening now I can see a very poor year ahead. At the present moment you have heard here about unemployment, the state of roads, people crying out for water and sewer and you name it. And say that the House closes until the 27th. of March, what is it closing for? They are closing because we have come to the end of a Tory era, we have to the end of seven years of Tory era. And there is a minister grinning at me at the moment, a young man here from St. John's -

MR. S. NEARY: A laughing hyena.

MR. P. CANNING: - and perhaps he can grin because the things that I am concerned about for the people I represent he has not got those to worry about.

MR. S. NEARY: He is still on the payroll from the telephone company.

MR. P. CANNING: He has the roads.

MR. S. NEARY: He is still on the payroll at the telephone company, Am I right?

MR. P. CANNING: Keep out of it. 'Steve'. Let me talk. will you? I am no good when anyone is talking.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Carry on, Pat.

MR. P. CANNING: Now, Mr. Speaker, they can laugh. To me it is a sad night. Perhaps I take things too seriously, perhaps I am too much concerned. I cannot say to hell with the people; to hell with the people waiting to know if they are going to get water and sewer projects, if they are going to get roads repaired, if they are going to repair the roads that

MR. P. CANNING: are flying up in the people's faces out there now, the little bit of pavement they did do in the seven years. And, Mr. Speaker, I have here practically all the time since 1949, I have seen over four times seven years. Looking back tonight, Mr. Speaker, on the past seven, I certainly can take any seven years of the last thirty and compare them to the last seven. I can take three of them - I can take three and a half - three times seven, that is another three and compare it with the seven and, Mr. Speaker, it would be no comparison because this Province has not forged ahead in the last seven years. We have come to a mess, we have seen a Tory era come to an end. I am sorry for it. AS I said in this House before, the day that I was defeated by a young, brilliant lawyer up in my district, the people said, "We have a young fellow, The other fellow is gone. They said, "He had done his part." They did not criticize me for what I had done when they looked around, but they thought now they were coming into a new age, youthful fellows coming in, a youthful Premier coming in. I mean, I began to think that way. What I said when I was defeated, I was not very sore, I was not very cranky or crooked over it although I did not think I should be for what I had done, for the way I had been dedicated to the area I represented and the way it had progressed in twenty-three years

MR. CANNING: from poverty to one of the most prosperous areas of the Province, on the whole. But, Mr. Speaker, that area has stood still in the last seven years and a lot of the facilities we gave them and the roads we built have been deteriorating, and since 1975 there has not been any pavement done. On the Burin Peninsula, to go up there now, as the minister knows -

MR. HICKMAN: We paved from Fortune to Grand Bank.

MR. CANNING: Oh, here he comes with his bit of pavement from Grand Bank to Fortune.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: There you go! Two miles, is it?

MR. CANNING: Well, I tell you that he has something to boast about. He has something to boast about in the last seven years, what he has done on the Burin Peninsula. I will tell him that I have a lot to boast about, what I brought to the Burin Peninsula. And, Mr. Speaker, when I was with the Liberal Government when he could not stop things - he was with the provincial government, he should have been doing as much as I did. But I do not know what he did or I do not know what his colleague who went into Fortune Bay did after we left it. There was Fortune Bay and the tip of the Burin Peninsula, and my area was neglected because he was not standing up for it like I stood up to the Liberals. And I stood up in this House, I can tell you this, that I did not worry very much about the government that I was with. I told them what was wrong up there and what we lacked and what we should get. I was not crawling around looking for a Cabinet post. I was there representing the people, that was my first interest, that was not me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



MR. CANNING: Because if I had wanted one I suppose any day at all I could have gone along with a little threat, I am going to pull out or I am going to cross the House or something like this. I probably would have been in. I did not have time to get in, because there was so little in my district when I went in there it took all my time going back and forth helping the people out, showing them how to apply for this and fighting for them and fighting with them. And there is one thing certain, if you picked Burin - Placentia West on the Southwest Coast - you never had me as a Cabinet minister there, but I will tell you this much, the progress that was made and the part it played in the prosperity of the Burin Peninsula, I will put it up against any of the districts where they had Cabinet ministers. Now, Mr. Speaker, this government came in. The people had twenty-three years of the Liberal Party and the people wanted a change. It was a natural thing, I suppose. However well they were doing they would think, well, after this length of time they may be going stale, there may be some of them getting rusty, there may be new ideas out there. They won easy elections - well, perhaps they did. Perhaps there were Liberals who were in Cabinet or in this House of Assembly who probably got a little bit careless. And I did not think I would see what has happened. And I am not going to praise the Premier tonight as he goes out, because I do not think he was a good Premier. I do not think he was a good administrator.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: And I do not think he did his part as he sat there. The man did not spend very much time there. I am not going to praise him. It would go against my conscience. I would be only a hypocrite. Like some people go to a wake - the man is dead and they praise him up. He is gone. That is what it looks like to me when

MR. CANNING: I hear the praise on either side of this House, I do not care who gives it. I have nothing to praise him for. He was not a good administrator, never meant to be a Premier. He should have stayed out in the world and enjoyed himself, stayed outside this House and enjoyed himself like he is going to do now when he goes out. He does not have much left behind.

And here we are tonight. We are talking on this side. That is what we have been doing since I came in here in 1975 and I guess that is what they did here between 1972 and 1975. I have not heard anybody speak up for his district over there. I will tell you this much, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has kept pretty quiet over there. I will tell you that the member for Burin - Placentia West when he came into the House did not sit down there and keep as quiet as that.

MR. PATTERSON: I was taking care of all the people you had resettled.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, there is no good in my going over that again because I could not beat it into his head,

MR. CANNING: I could not beat it into him the few things that he talked about. Did you hear him? The resettlement! Look, I did not cause resettlement out of Placentia Bay and I did not encourage them to get out. And when they were there in the isolated areas I had more done for them than you have done for them and that Government had done for Monkstown since they took it over. The biggest joke you ever heard about is this resettlement. The Premier, when somebody asked him something great he had done, he mentioned he stopped the movement of people.

MR. NEARY: He moved them out to Alberta.

MR. CANNING: But I can assure you if the twenty or thirty settlements, whatever cleared out of Placentia Bay, if these people had stayed on the islands, had stayed there instead of moving to Placentia or moving to Mayrstown or moving into Red Harbour or anywhere else, I will tell you they would be in a sad state today. If we are to judge from what was done in Corbin where they stayed, if we are to judge from what was done in Monkstown, if we judge what is done in Southeast Bight and Petite Fort what attention the Tories have given to that since they got in -

MR. NEARY: And Grand Bruit and LaPoile.

MR. CANNING: - I am some glad they got off those islands, I tell you that. Up there in Southeast Bight now they got a school there - they can not put heat in it, electricity, there is not enough electricity there.

MR. PATTERSON: There is a new school being built there now.

MR. CANNING: Does he want to know what the new school is in Southeast Bight? Will you listen to this? Listen to this one! I will tell you how they got a school in Southeast Bight. But whoever is going to be the next Premier over there, you know, we should really go along to that member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). Poor Placentia! Poor Placentia! With that sewer scandal is it? -

MR. CANNING: or water scandal out there that they buried, they never unburied, supposed to be up before the courts, people are; when the Municipal Affairs was under one of the present runners for the leadership, the Minister of Mines and Energy. He had a glorious history in Municipal Affairs. There was never the like, never the like! There were more municipal councillors, more mayors resigned with frustration when he was in than resigned for the twenty-three years that we were in.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. CANNING: Placentia water and sewer if it was my business to tell it, if it was my business to tell it I would tell you this much: Placentia West had guts in the seat for Placentia West for twenty-three years but I do not see very much guts in the seat for Placentia. I do not hear very much noise from him only some kind of an ignorant retort across the House that has no substance or no sense to it. That is it, Mr. Speaker.

They did not get up tonight to tell us why they were closing the House. It does not surprise me because when the petitions were coming in about electricity last year, about the cost of electricity, they did not get up and talk about it. Teacher ratio petitions came in, they did not get up. They never gave their opinion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the end of seven years, seven sad years of Tory rule in this Province and what we have out in the field is a bunch of ministers, a group of ministers. The last couple of days I have done a little bit of research and I got a table made up and I had a look at where they were, where they moved. Six months here, six months there, a year here, I got three or four pages of it, back and forth. Such a jingling of musical chairs, I do not suppose ever took place in any Province since Canada was Canada, and now this is what they have come to. And what administrators have we got out in the field now. Look at the departments they were in and what they did. No

Mr. Canning: questions answered. I asked some fair questions, like how many offices were rented? What were their rentals? I did not get any answers to them. I asked the number of civil servants in 1972, 1973, 1974 or something like that. No answers. Until today-I spend nearly every day doing something for my district here in St. John's, when I am here; if I am not here I am up in my district- and I do not know yet where to find certain divisions and certain people in this town. We soon will because a couple of years ago when I was here speaking in the House and wondering if they were going to bail out Atlantic Place, so we will soon, I suppose, take them out of the tops of building supply places, and all the nooks and corners, all the Crosbie buildings, and all of the others they got them in, I suppose they will get them together down there. I see they are down there finishing off the building. There is something like three-quarters of a million dollars they are spending getting Atlantic Place ready. What it is all about I do not know. I do not know why whoever owns it are not getting it ready and renting it. I do not know what the government are doing down there spending \$650,000 I heard the other day getting their offices ready in a private concern's building. It will be interesting to know what that is about; you know, where is that \$650,000 going?

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned tonight I do not know what the people of Newfoundland think of this. Come in here for a day; the Minister of Justice bringing in some kind of a resolution, trying to get at somebody or something through leaking something. The people of this Province do not want leaks. They know how they came in. They know they came in on promises and promises and bought your way in, I do not know but there were some fellows blackmailed and everything else to try to defeat the Liberal Government.

MR. CANNING: Leaks! Do you not think these things have to leak out? The people know, people are not stupid; the people know that this government, this Tory Government passed out \$4.5 million, \$5 million to the City Council, and the City Council passed it on a platter to a certain merchant, and gave the reason for it, there was nobody in Newfoundland could build the Aquarena. I do not know but it is true because I think it was built by a company from Montreal. They know about \$650,000 went out to somebody for a piece of land, you know, and another \$100,000 somewhere else, they know that. They know there were five contractors up in Burin Bay Arm and spent nearly \$3 million of federal money, DREE money, wasted it, and then the federal government stopped it because they knew there was such a racket on there, and it was some racket. It is too bad the Minister of Justice did not set up a royal commission on that when I said in the House it should be investigated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: Another scandal, another buried one. But they know, and they are tired of scandals, and they are tired of Tories. I thought the Premier was going to come in, but he passed by. I was just going to say and they were tired of the Premier, and he got tired. He looked tired from the day he came in here and sat in that chair. He looks tired tonight. He looked tired often, and ten minutes or the fifteen minutes he spent in the House, when the House was opened in the afternoon he used to get very tired, and he looked tired going out through the door.

AN HON. MEMBER: Born, tired.

MR. CANNING: You know, the smiles -I do not understand why the one is on the member for Labrador, I do not believe he means it. Somebody must have said a joke over there because

Mr. Canning: I am sure he is not smiling at this tonight. He knows the conditions down in Labrador. He knows we cannot afford to close the House for a couple of months and not get to work on it. No, Mr. Speaker, this Province is going apart. It is not only the roads that are curling up in their faces -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CANNING: The only thing that I can say in favour of the hon. minister who came through the door joking, the only thing I can say in his favour is

MR. CANNING: he was drafted by four people on the Burin Peninsula to stand for the leadership.

MR. HICKMAN: Your are wrong.

MR. CANNING: There were five. There were two in my district- not belong to the district; they came from somewhere else; they are settled there, working there-and there are three over on the other side somewhere. But the only thing I can say in his favour is that he would not go out and join that circus. I really think he would have gone but he could not go out in that circus, that Tory circus that you have across this Province right now. They are out there now, they have one from outside, they were ministers, both of them were Ministers of Mines and Energy, and the two of them are going on the same record; the one I was speaking of awhile ago who was Minister of Municipal Affairs, and a wonderful term they had there. I should repeat it again now because I do not think the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) was here when I said it, that there were more resignations of councillors and mayors, more messes made of water and sewer, more money wasted, contracts after contracts let out to greenhorn contractors who backed up the Tories, never constructed a water and sewer system before. The hon. minister was the member for Burin when five of them went in there, plus the three consulting engineering companies, \$3 million spent on water and sewer in one area. It was DPEE money and he made such a mess of it that DPEE cut it off and Lewin's Cove never got their water and sewer. They are living up there with sewer flowing over the roads and with a pollution problem that this government knew about since they came in and which they did nothing about. It is disgraceful. But on the Burin Peninsula and up the Southwest Coast I do not know when they are going to call an election but I can assure you that we do not intend putting in any Tories anymore. They have had it and I do not think that Newfoundland has any notion of putting them in. All you have to do now is get them back and get them in and get the Premier from St. John's, get the Minister of Industrial Development and make him a Premier and get him here in St. John's and he will get



MR. CANNING: his crossroad done, he will finish his arterial road, he might build another medical complex. That would make another half a dozen millionaires in St. John's, what they would make off that.

MR. NEARY: Another Atlantic Place.

MR. CANNING: Another Atlantic Place- sure, I would say the Tories in St. John's are praying that the hon. minister will be the Premier. I would say they are scared of some of the others because they may look into rural Newfoundland, they may go outside the Crossroads and start cleaning up up there. They may come up on the Burin Peninsula and finish the roads, They may even pave the road into Beau Bois among the dragger fishermen there or they may finish another little bit or they may go up and repair what pavement they put over the rocks and the mud and the dirt before the 1975 election. The Minister of Justice did a bit of that too.

MR. HICKMAN: Tell us about the wooden bridge you put pavement across.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the court hours on your cousin's land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, that hon. minister will not throw anything across this floor over here that will keep me from getting elected next time, I can assure you that.

MR. HICKMAN: The first time (inaudible)

MR. CANNING: He is talking about a paved bridge. I can tell him about a bridge that was up in the middle of a river for two years, I can tell him a good one about that because I think the mistake was made in here and that bridge was supposed to go in some other river. They made a mistake and they brought it up in Tides River. They built it in 1973 or 1974 or 1975, out in the middle of the river, no road going to it, — the

MR. CANNING: biggest joke they ever saw. I remember one of the Ministers of Transportation - they had three or four of them the last few years. It is hard to remember when or anything - when he went up there I brought him down and I showed it to him. I give him his due, he laughed at it and shook his head. He shook his head. He had never seen it before, he never knew what it was there for. And he did join it up to the road. He did divert the road and join it up for shame sake. I asked him to do it for shame sake. There was something else I asked the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) to do, I asked him would he for God's sake take down that sign that is up there in Salt Pond. He did not take it down. Oh, no he went back again.

MR. RIDEOUT: It was after taking root.

MR. CANNING: He went back again, Mr. Speaker, and had another little - I do not know what to call it - he was up with the policy committee. You know, they have a policy committee, three or four more from St. John's, and they went up and talked about the hospitals. And he told them, he went up and they drooled and they dripped and they said, 'Now look here fellows, you know we have not got the money to build a regional hospital. We have not got the money. You know, we are going to keep repairing those wooden fire traps we have, "- he did not call them that; I do, and they are -" we are going to get a little bit of repairs. We cannot let that beautiful hospital over in Grand Bank, that forty-three year old wooden building in the middle of the town." Forty-three years old, is it not? I thought it was as old as the others. Perhaps it is older. Or is it younger? You know this one you have in Burin up there -

MR. HICKMAN: If 1951 is forty-three years ago then you must be right.

MR. CANNING: It was not finished until 1951. I thought you had it.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) totally out of funds.

MR. CANNING: In 1951 they built a wooden hospital? All wood construction. Imagine. What in the heck was - well that Liberal member could not have been much better than the one - not the one who followed him, the one who followed him was very good, the last one, because he thinks anything at all is good enough for the Burin Peninsula with this sign up there.

MR. F. ROWE: Especially signs. He is real good at doing signs.

MR. CANNING: The latest telegram they have by the way from the Minister of Health was that, well, Ottawa is cutting down on her allocation to us and we cannot do anything about it - or something like that. There is not enough money coming in from Ottawa, we are sorry. I do not think we will put them in the estimates this year. But anyway they went up and they told them they could not build it but we would build another cottage hospital or something like that and we will build it. So some day, perhaps say when the Liberals get back they may expand on it which we would do if they put it there. No, Mr. Speaker.

We have come to the end of the Tory era. It will not last much longer. They will last as long as they will refrain from calling an election and I will challenge them tonight, after they close this House until the last of March, instead of bringing down a big glowing budget, and all the promises they are going to make again the Spring, they are making them time and time again. They did not only make promises to come in, they are making promises ever since, year after year. Delegations will come in, "Well, we have not got the money this year in the estimates; we are going to look after that next year," So they told the people of Lewin's Cove and the people of Little Bay or the people of Marystown, and the people of Mooring Cove. But next year,

MR. CANNING: they keep on promising. They have come to the end of it. What they will do, they will go out now and they will waste their time and then they will come back and they will bring down a glowing budget. They are going to have all kinds of things in it. You will hear of all kinds of promises, and then they are going to call an election.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you this, they are not going to fool the people of the district that I am in because they did that before and they called - in 1975 they made promises and they called a contract, they put it out and they called it to put the water in Little Bay, part of Marystown. What did they do? Cancel the contract, they cancelled the contract. Aylward's Limited had the contract. There was one of them here in the House and the others were after turning over to the

MR. P. CANNING: Tories and I suppose they agreed because if they had any kind of a contractor who was anxious to get his contract I imagine he would have sued them. Not only that they dropped the two contracts under the table they already had let. So you are not going to fool those people. No! So then they will go out, they will be defeated because the people will know. I guarantee that outside the crossroads - and several districts inside the crossroads will never go Tory again.

MR. S. NEARY: The con game is over.

MR. P. CANNING: It is over, they have come to the end of it. They have come to the end of it. The last thing they will do before they go out, seven or eight of them out together seven or eight beauts in Newfoundland. When I think about the fine people in Newfoundland today who could be out there, good Tories. I call them Progressive Conservatives. I call those Tories because they are acting like Tories. They are nothing else only Tories and they are still a St. John's Tory government. They are going to try to get in again. There are some of them now out there, one fellow out there now says, "I am going to be the Premier. You put me in and I will be the Premier for rural Newfoundland." And the other day he said, "Surely God, not that fellow from" - I cannot say names, can I?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. P. CANNING: "No, not the Minister of Industrial Development! Do not put in that. They are not going to put in that," said one of the fellows out in the field. "No, he is all for St. John's, he is a St. John's Premier. No, you have to put an outport Premier in" That is first of their break. I do not know how they will get on towards the end with them all craving to reach the top -

MR. S. NEARY: 'Morgan' was naming his Cabinet the other day.

MR. P. CANNING: - craving to get the Premier's job. They must have been praying for the Premier to get out all the time. Their prayers must have been answered and he got out. He did not come back to lead them again, he did not try. I think he is cute there because he knew he could not make it anyway. He could not make it, Sir. The people of Newfoundland, you know, no way. No, it is coming to the end. It is a sad end and it is water under the bridge. Never as much scandal after scandal coming out, and it is still coming out down there today or yesterday. The condemnation of the Opposition of what is over here is that we talked about it in the House, we delayed the House looking for millions, wondering where it was gone, not \$50,000 or \$100,000 - millions. Asking about a million dollar contract put out for some electrical fellow without any tender, and that was not so bad but when it turned out they had paid the million dollars with no work and nothing supplied.

MR. S. NEARY: Could not find a fixture.

MR. P. CANNING: Nothing supplied. They were out looking for thousands of thousands of dollars worth of some fittings that they had paid for. What an administration! Like the fisheries scandal, like the \$4 million the Province had to pay that the federal government refused to pay. The federal government was going to pay for the loss of fishing gear - \$4 million had to come out of next year's estimates to go pay it. The Provincial Government had to pay it and then some poor fellow suffered for making a fire, but the administrator, the great administrator, that great politician is up yelling and roaring and bawling now in Ottawa, he quit, went out, he went to the mainland.

MR. S. NEARY: He knew when to get out. He went berserk the other day in the House of Commons, you know.

MR. P. CANNING: Now, Mr. Speaker, if we carry on here until morning, there is nobody on that side getting up, no one to get and tell the people of this Province why they are closing the House. Why are we here clinging on tonight trying to keep it open? To get on with the work of the Province, get on with the work of the Province. We are hoping to get on with the work; we have not got too much hope because they do not work anyway. Well, Mr. Speaker, to me it is disappointing. I am a Newfoundlander who believes in Newfoundland, who spent thirty-five years in the service of this country, five or six

MR. CANNING: besides my time representing the people, five or six of that I consider defending democracy, giving us our freedom. After my first five when I was prepared to give it all for democracy, for justice, to do away with dictatorship, I did not think that years afterwards I would be standing up in the House in my own Province, among my own people begging the people's House of Assembly to stay open and do the business. That is not the kind of world that I visualized. And I spent five or six of my useful years hoping that we would retain our democratic system and I hoped that my little country, as it was then, and my Province would be ruled democratically. For the last seven years there has been the most bungling, the most waste. I have listened here in the House, I have looked at them across the House, the bunglers, knowing how little they were doing, not getting up on their feet and explaining their actions or their policy, not defending themselves, and then putting out the propaganda about the House, about how all the Opposition does in there is keep it in an uproar. It should have been in an uproar. I am surprised it is not in more of an uproar when we know what is going on. We had to stand here today and see the Minister of Justice open the House of Assembly, getting everybody in for one day for three hours to bring in a resolution to investigate or find out who reported scandal. Why did he not come in and bring in a resolution to let us know there was no scandal there? Then bring in a few more resolutions for some more commissions to clean things up. I suppose - no, I will not go too far with it, but I could and I would not be speaking an untruth. But all I can tell them, Mr. Speaker, is tell those in the field that the show they are putting on, this circus they are having, they are still out campaigning on the mistakes the Liberals made, like selling the Churchill Falls, they are still blaming



MR. CANNING: the past administration for their failures, but I do not think anywhere they are getting much of a hearing because they have not done anything. I am going to advise them something else, that the people are not going to listen to them. I do not know if they realize it or not, but you cannot fool the people of Newfoundland anymore. You certainly cannot fool them. I wonder when the Minister of Industrial Development goes through the Burin Peninsula, when he goes up through as far as he is going to go, through Fortune Bay, down around the Northeast Coast or up on the West Coast somewhere, I wonder are they going to believe that he is out there seeking their support and is going to help them?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. CANNING: No, I do not think so. The minister was born in St. John's, he knows St. John's; St. John's is his great interest. Last year I begged him to go through with the road to - suggested what the people came on the air with the other night. I told him for heaven's sake to break through, give them a road that they can drive twenty miles or thirty miles over for a few years

Mr. Canning: and bring it up to standard. No, he did not do it; he did not do it until they put a show on CBC and the whole Province shouted out and told him for shame sake to let those people out of it. And they are the crowd that said -it is criminal to move people off islands. You can imagine what they would do for the people of the islands of Placentia Bay when they would not go through with a few miles of road. But I believe the minister this year now has committed himself. I hope he is wising up. I think he has committed himself to do it now.

MR. DINN: There are eight miles done.

MR. NEARY: If you want to make a speech, get up.

MR. CANNING: Eight miles done, and the people of Monkstown are free, there are eight miles done. I hope there is not an accident there tonight and a helicopter cannot get out tomorrow to take the people out of it. They cannot drive out of it yet. Seven years in, Mr. Speaker, and I am begging for them to finish a few miles of road. I will tell them something now then; when I was seven years in Placentia West I will tell what was relieved of isolation, I will tell you how many roads we put there. In seven years I will tell you how many we put there; we relieved the people of Garden Cove of their isolation, of North Harbour of their isolation, of Brookside and Boat Harbour of their isolation, relieved Parker's Cove of their isolation, and Rushoon of its isolation, Rock Harbour of its isolation - I built a lot of them; perhaps I missed one - Rushoon of its isolation and Baine Harbour, if I have not said them, and Red Harbour I think there were thirteen of them or something I had built. In seven years, they were opened, they were free in 1957.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CANNING: So they got seven years in, that is how they went in, on a promise, told them, and the people voted for them, everyone of them. I do not blame them. I did not blame them for voting - they always voted for me, I used to get 100 per cent there, I believe when they promised it and when they started to build it in 1975 I do not think I got either vote.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where was that?

MR. CANNING: In Monkstown, I never got a vote. They are Libeals.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good.

MR. CANNING: And I am going to get them all the next time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: - but I never got them then.

But I will tell you what I said to them; I did not play the politics that they played, I did not ignore them or anything, I phoned them before I got time to get to them and told them, "Do not think because none of you voted for me that I am not going to do what I can for you." And I also added that if I were in the bottom of Monkstown and someone came out and I believed they were going to build a road, I would vote for them too.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought we would ever come to this, come into the House for three hours in the middle of February with no estimates brought down, people do not know what is going to happen this year, they have to wait until April or May. No construction will be going ahead, and they are asking us to wait until the 27th. of March, they are going to close the people's House until the 27th. of March to get out in a circus, in a futile campaign, let them call the election and there will not be a Tory Premier for Newfoundland, it will be a Liberal Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for  
Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I find it a little  
bit ridiculous for an hon. member to have to rise at this  
hour at night just to speak in this hon. House about his  
district, about his concerns so that he may be felt and so  
that he may represent his district as best he can in this  
hon. House. I do not believe that it is necessary to close  
down this House for the upcoming P.C. Leadership Convention.  
I do not think that the Tory Party is so disorganized that it  
needs the month of February, the month of March to put things  
together for a Leadership Convention, not when you look at it  
in terms of the Federal Party when they had a

MR. MCNEIL: much larger House, when the present leader of the federal party came to power, they broke the House just for a mere week and they had a much greater distance of travel across Canada to meet delegates, to organize delegates, to elect a leader of the Liberal Party. So I guess maybe it is an indication of the disorganization within the Tory PC Party and I would hope that maybe in future they would try to keep their act together a little better.

MR. RIDEOUT: They cannot find enough delegates, that is what is wrong. They have to go out and beat the bushes to get them.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House should be opened for several reasons. I think there are questions and decisions that the House should deal with. For example, the Cabinet has a lot on their plate now and now, with the leadership convention on the go, the hon. ministers involved will be concerned only with trying to achieve the office which they seek, which is understandable.

There are several projects in my district that could be begun immediately, all that would be needed would be a green light from Cabinet. One such project would be the conversion of building 361 for the permanent facility of the Bay St. George community college. The decision of Cabinet should not be that difficult because it would not involve any provincial funds in conversion. The private investor, or the company, Stephenville Development, have put forward a suggestion, put forward a plan to government roughly about two years ago for the conversion of this facility at no cost to the provincial government. They will use their own private funds to convert this building and they will convert it to the plan specified by the community college in conjunction with the Department of Education.

Now, since the last couple of years since this project has been put forward the Department of Education, and I would

MR. MCNEIL: presume maybe the Cabinet, has asked for further study. They have come back and that study is complete. If it is not in the hands of the Department of Education it should be in the hands of Cabinet itself. There is no reason for delay, except that the Moores Administration, or any of the seven candidates who are seeking it, whenever they are elected will form their administration, if they are waiting to use it for election time I think it is wrong politics. I think it is wrong and this is one of the things that has been keeping back this Province so long, that they are using these type of projects for political gain only.

My district, over the last year and a half, two years, has suffered greatly with the closing of Labrador Linerboard. That in itself is an industry that I think that need not have closed down, could have gone into private hands without demoralizing the community, without having it shut down, laying idle for a year and a half. If my memory serves me correctly, about a year before it closed there were several companies looking at that plant to purchase it and I think the government at that time should have proceeded in trying to sell that plant as a viable operation, instead of closing it down and eventually selling it in a fire sale situation. I am very pleased that actually it has been sold. I am pleased that Abitibi Price has taken over the plant.

About a year and a half or two years ago, this side of the House stated very clearly that we believe that the operation could be made viable. The argument that we received from the government side of the House was that the

MR. W. McNEIL: plant was in the wrong location. Now that we see it in the hands of private enterprise we are hearing that the mill is in a very good location, that it is unique in terms that all modes of transportation are at its fingertips. It is also a little bit ironic that the new owners are going to put in a second machine parallel to what is there already, and thank God that the government had the wisdom to state in their contract that the present owners cannot dismantle the kraft line until a period of approximately five years. Thank God they had the wisdom to do that, because I believe that that plant has the capacity of carrying on a kraft line and also going into the paper line.

It really struck me funny this afternoon when I heard the Minister of Forestry mention that he has found a market in Europe for the wood in Labrador. He said it is a very high quality wood and he is very confident that they can find a market in Europe for this wood. Actually, in effect what he is saying is that he is willing to sell to our competitors our best wood and leave us with the lower quality of wood so that the final product we put out will be inferior to another plant that we are possibly competing against. To me it would make more sense if we put maybe a smaller operation in Labrador and sell a final product rather than selling our resources as we are doing with our forestry, especially in Labrador.

I think that the government are dragging their feet with regard to providing incentive to small businessmen, people who are trying to get into small industry for the first time, or even those who have been in it for awhile and want to expand a little. And I refer here to some of the sawmill operators within the Province

MR. W. McNEIL: and in particular in my own district in the Coal Brook area. We have at the present time approximately seven operators in that area. Over the past year and a half the local committee has approached the Department of Forestry to improve the road which is about a sixteen mile link to their operations. The department has agreed to do approximately five miles of road, which actually does not help them in any way because it is a road off their main link referred to as CB7 before they even get to the major access road and beyond an old Labrador Linerboard road on the extreme of their block. So the sawmillers in the Coal Brook area will not be able to harvest or get into the sawmilling operation in a big way this year because they will not have a proper road to take out their product. And this is particularly sad when you see a company that is set up in Stephenville right now, Econocon, which is building a product for the Venezuelan market. They can take all the local lumber that is delivered and the local sawmillers in the area cannot bring out their wood because they do not have a proper road to bring it out on.

Last year I was told by the director of accessroads that that road would be upgraded, they would start it in July. It went from July to August, September, each month, then it was Winter and the snow and they could not do anything because of the snow problem. Now they are saying the Spring, but when we checked



Mr. McNeil: with the contractor who was supposed to do the road, he pinpointed the section of road was to be under construction and it does not help the local sawmiller operator in any way whatsoever. And I would ask the Minister of Forestry if he would spend a few moments of his time, take it out of his campaign, and direct his officials in that department to bring that road up to standard so at least we may be able to see a few jobs created in that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: And I think it is very important that the minister concern himself with providing a few jobs to the people in that area.

The conversion of Building 361, which I referred for the permanent facility of the Community College, at this time while we are waiting for the mill to start its construction, which we are told will probably be June or July, I think if the government gave the green light on that project immediately, the contractor could start the conversion of that building and provide jobs immediately. I think jobs are the concern of most members in this hon. House, and I think we should endeavour to try to create jobs at any opportunity, and when you have projects like this that are before the Cabinet and they are failing through lack of interest or are of no concern whatsoever in a certain district of the Province, I think it is very shameful and it shows the disregard that the administration has for the government of this whole Province and the people of this Province.

In December of 1978 I was told by the hon. Minister of Industrial Development that the whole question of severance pay would be cleared up. The hon. minister stated that he wanted to see this problem cleared up because it was a government problem, and that he did not want to see it carried over to the new owners of the mill. Now we are past December, past January and now we are into the month of February and this

Mr. McNeil: whole problem of severance pay and completion bonus grievance has not been settled. I understand it is before Cabinet, but no decisions have been coming forth. It has been that way for the last several months and I think it is shameful. It is quite obvious that all that has to be done is a clear decision of Cabinet to settle all the matters. There are a lot of irregularities in the whole severance pay question. People received the six months severance pay who only worked at the plant for approximately three months, while other people who worked there over three years did not receive it, because in the whole bumping system some of them who bumped got themselves into a position where they found that their jobs expired before that famous deadline date that the government set.

So I think here is another matter that the government could deal with immediately. They could resolve this whole question by taking a few minutes, a few hours out of their campaigning to resolve this whole question of severance pay. I realize that the Minister of Industrial Development is one of the leading contenders, but if he wants to be Leader of the P.C. Party I would suggest to him that he should clean up his Department of Industrial Development before he leaves it.

Since Linerboard closed down one of the most active

MR. MCNEIL: arms of development agencies in the area have been the Harmon Corporation. And over the last several months they are trying to set up a more efficient system of communications between their own level of operation and the government themselves. And I am very pleased that actually the move to put the Harmon Corporation under the Department of Industrial Development has been completed. But there is still a little bit - well, there are still further decisions that have to be made by the Cabinet and by the minister and I think this could have been done about a month ago and still now we are seeing it dragged over and possibly we will see it going into maybe the Spring of the year or even on into next year.

The whole question of the electrical increases I think deserves attention in this House and it deserves attention immediately. When you have the Hydro Corporation having these annual increases, the ordinary people, the people on fixed incomes, the people who are on the lower wage scale find it virtually impossible to make ends meet. There is no way they can make ends meet, they are on a downhill course. I think this House has a responsibility to debate this whole issue. The government should take the bull by the horns and control Hydro. Hydro is out of control. There is a lot of fat in Hydro. It has to be dealt with. It has to be dealt with and it should be dealt with immediately, not a year from now or when there is a change in the administration, under a new premier. It can be dealt with immediately and there should be an immediate freeze put on any increases.

The Minister of Mines and Energy mentioned today that the increases have to be looked at from a social of view. Well I say to the minister, thanks be to God he finally opened his eyes, and that has probably only been dictated because he is now seeking the leadership of the PC Party. He is now becoming very sensitive to the needs of the people. I was always under the impression, be it foolishly, that politicians at all times should be sensitive to the needs of the people because that is why we are

MR. MCNEIL: elected to office. We are elected to represent the people's views and to govern their affairs.

MR. RIDEOUT: The boss is back.

MR. MCNEIL: Now that we have the outgoing Premier back, maybe he can brighten up the image of the PC Party by making some bold steps and one, the boldest that he could ever make, would be controlling that huge monster of Newfoundland Hydro.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: He has indicated in his farewell address that he would like to evaluate the member's salaries. Well, I think in doing so maybe he should evaluate the people at Hydro's salaries so that it could be more of a balancing act between the two corporations.

PREMIER MOORES: The member's salary should not be doubled?

MR. MCNEIL: No. No. I am saying it should be. But in the process of dealing with that one you should also deal with Hydro so that we can take the fat off Hydro and maybe put some down here.

PREMIER MOORES: You are making conditions.

MR. MCNEIL: No. No. No conditions. No conditions whatsoever.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is where it belongs.

MR. MCNEIL: This is where it belongs.

MR. RIDEOUT: Do you want something? Do you want unanimous consent?

MR. MCNEIL: But if Hydro is to be dealt with in this House, and if the members of this House have the last say on Hydro, well then I think the House should be open. The government could even - tomorrow, the next day - pass a resolution freezing Hydro, helping the ordinary citizens in this Province.

MR. LUSH: Taking the freeze off our own.

MR. MCNEIL: For example, a worker at any small plant is probably only receiving the minimum wage; he negotiates this year for a small increase, maybe five or ten per cent; then along in one

MR. MCNEIL: sweep we have Hydro that states they go to the Public Utilities Board, and the Public Utilities Board is supposed to protect our rights, and in one sweep they knock out that increase that the worker

MR. MCNEIL: has negotiated over the past six months or more and possibly had to go to extreme measures, to go out on strike, out on a picket line. So by his trying to protect his rights, by using the means available to him through labor, Government in its callous way turns a blind eye and lets one of its public utilities, like Newfoundland Hydro, lets it go ahead with unreasonable increases at a time when our economy is at a all time low.

The couple of points that I just brought forward, the Minister of Education by taking initiative immediately can help my district in providing a few jobs immediately. Any jobs created anywhere in the Province helps the Province. The Minister of Forestry, by providing a little bit of an incentive to the sawmillers, in particular in the Coal Brook region, would probably because of that act by upgrading the access road, which is already built but needs a little bit of repair work, would probably create another maybe fifty jobs. So just in these two acts themselves you could probably see anywhere from 100 to 150 jobs created over the next six months. And there is no conceivable reason why the Government should not give the green light towards these two projects. They are only small, but they will help in the overall unemployment situation across the Island. And I also ask the leading contender for the big office if he could, within the next week or two, take a little bit of time out of his schedule, the hon. minister for Industrial Development -

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the minister of Industrial shut down.

MR. MCNEIL: - to take out a little bit of time actually to resolve this whole severance pay question because it is going to haunt him in his leadership. I will make sure of that if he does

MR. MCNEIL: not solve it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MCNEIL: And to act quickly on it with regard to the recommendations that are brought forward to him by the Harmon Corporation Board of Directors. If the minister could possibly immediately move on these two items within the next week or so, I would say that he would be doing - it would be helping himself in trying to achieve the office which he seeks. So I give freely, no charge, a little bit of free political advise.

MR. RIDEOUT: Good advise, too.

MR. MCNEIL: Good advise, right.

MR. RIDEOUT: Make a note of that now.

MR. MCNEIL: The potential actually of the Bay St. George community college is very, very vast really. It is actually left to the imagination of the people who are involved in the whole enterprise. And if I just may for a moment stress the importance of the Minister of Education in moving quickly on providing, giving the green light to start the conversion of building 361, the conversion of that facility, and to also move in providing the heavy equipment section in trying to set up the heavy equipment section as the overall training facility for the Atlantic Region. Now, it is my understanding that the last couple of years there has been a move afoot to try to centralize the whole heavy equipment training section. And it is also my understanding that the heavy equipment school in Stephenville provides per student the cheapest of any other school in the Atlantic Region. Now, two years ago Nova Scotia was in favor of having their pupils

McNEIL: set up by using the facility in Stephenville, and now we have a reverse situation where Nova Scotia is trying to set up their own school and New Brunswick now is in favour of setting up the school in Stephenville. So if the Department of Education is trying to consolidate that programme, that heavy equipment programme training section in the Stephenville facility, they will again create more jobs within the region, they will again add more structure to the Bay St. George Community College and give the college a little bit of permanency within the region. And also the fact that the heavy equipment school is Manpower sponsored in its pupil training, it would take a little of the burden off the provincial Department of Education in trying to provide funds to students on the provincial scene.

I do not intend to take the full time, but I would just like to stress the important matters. I believe that there is no need of the House being closed for the full month of March for the convention. I think that the week prior to the convention and maybe a week after the convention is adequate.

MR. NEARY:

There is no quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

A quorum has been called.

I am informed there is a quorum present.

The hon. member.

MCNEIL:

Mr. Speaker, the entrance of the Minister of Tourism, or the Minister of Housing or whatever minister he is now - the minister without a department just reminded me, with regard to the Department of Recreation, which minister has the Department of Recreation now? Is it in limbo?

MR. NEARY:

It is in tourism.



MR. W. McNEIL: In Tourism? Definitely in Tourism?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. McNEIL: The Minister of Tourism, with regard to his responsibility with recreation, if I may say, is doing one heck of a lousy job. The West Coast training centre, well, right from day one off and on it has had a training specialist. It is a beautiful facility that is under utilized, not being staffed properly, programmes are not being run. If that facility were here on the Avalon Peninsula there would be a great outcry to have it staffed and run properly. I think it is an insult to any recreation department and particularly our own provincial recreation department to have such a beautiful facility and not even a programme offered. It is referred to as the West Coast Training Centre.

AN HON. MEMBER: For whom?

MR. W. McNEIL: For whom?

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody.

MR. W. McNEIL: Well, that is it - for whom?

AN HON. MEMBER: Any particular community?

MR. W. McNEIL: West Coast Training Centre for the whole of the West Coast. But how can they have any training programmes when they do not even have a staff to operate it? They do not even have a specialist. They had one for about three months and then they moved him out again. And I say with regard to recreation and sport in this Province, we are going backwards.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. McNEIL: So in conclusion I would just like to stress that I would hope that the new Premier-to-be, be it the Minister of Industrial Development, that he will

MR. W. McNEIL: take this week to clean up his department, to clean up a few things that relate to my own district so I can try to help out the hon. minister because I think he probably could do a good job but he is on the wrong track right now. He is more concerned with his own personal things than he is concerned with the problems of the people of this Province. So I would ask that he address himself to the few minor problems from his point of view but major ones from my point of view.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, instead of calling the question I just want to advise the Minister of Justice and the Government House Leader that he had better keep his troops around the corridor because that was the first dry run of the night and the minister ought to know what happened the last time we had a couple of dry runs. Certainly the then Minister of Municipal Affairs ought to know what happened the last time we had a couple of dry runs before the real run. So the Minister of Justice, or maybe it should go to the Whip, to keep his people around the corridor because -

MR. W. N. ROWE: At least twenty-one.

MR. RIDEOUT: At least twenty-one. It could be a long night.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that the people of this Province could never have suspected in September, 1975 that they would have been fooled so often by so few people, so few hon. dummies really, as they have to this point in time three or four years later.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Because that is the only conclusion, Sir, you can come to, is that a few hon. dummies who have not had the gall or the gumption to rise in their

MR. RIDEOUT: place on the other side of this House since the House opened at 3:00 P.M., have not had the gall or the gumption to rise in their place, not one, and tell us why it is that this House of Assembly, that this people's House has to close down, has to shut up its doors until the 27th of March. Now, Sir, that is the whole point of the debate tonight. Not one person on the other side has had the honour, really, to stand up and to try to convince us on this side and to try to convince the people of the Province, to try to put forth a reasonable explanation as to why this House, the people's House ought to have its doors barred from sometime tonight until the 27th of March. That is exactly the issue and that is exactly what we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, four years ago the people of this Province went to the polls and they elected a House of Assembly. They elected a new Parliament. That is what they did - they did not elect a government as such; there was not a government group of candidates and an Opposition group of candidates - there were 100 or so men and women running and out of those people the people elected a House of Assembly, a Parliament. Now in our system, Sir, it so happens that the largest group out of that group of people elected forms the government, but they remain responsible to this House until the next election is called, and that to me

Mr. Rideout: is the very heart of the issue that we are talking about tonight. There is no earthly reason why that administration that was formed out of those fifty-one of us who were elected four years ago has to close down the House of Assembly after having it opened for one day just because the party in power decides that they have to have a leadership convention.

MR. NEARY: They found themselves without a leader.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is no reason to close down the House. We would be all for it, we would be quite happy to agree to have the House closed down a week or so before the convention, and remain closed for a week or so after while the new leader is getting a handle on things; there would be no quarrel about that, Sir. But this House closed the 12th. or the 14th. of December, it has been closed all of January, up until the 15th. of February and then they had the gall to bring us in here again today for a three or four hour session and lock the doors again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, it is just too much for members of this House, and too much for the people of this Province too, it is too much for this administration to expect the people of this Province to swallow, and that is why we are here in the state we are at ten minutes past one in the morning. This hon. crowd had the gall to ask members to come in from Labrador for a three hour session of the House of Assembly. I happened to come in from St. Anthony this morning, got here 2:00 o'clock this afternoon for a three hour session of this House. You know, what kind of puppets are supposed to be governing this Province? And that is the whole heart of the issue that we have dug our heels in on, and we want to get the point across that there is no reason and that no member, no one - and as far as I can see no one has any intention of standing on their feet on that side of the House

Mr. Rideout:

and even making an effort, feeble though it might be, to convince the Opposition and to convince the people of this Province that there is a reason to bar the doors of the people's House while they are out politicking among themselves. They have a fairly comfortable majority, Mr. Speaker. There are only seven in the race so far, there are only six members of the House in the race so far. They have a majority of eight or ten. If they mind to wish to work for their money, to sit in their seats, they can hold on to their majority. There is no danger of that. If they want to work out a deal among themselves as to how many ministers are going to be absent at any particular time—they are in the same caucus, they are in the same group—can they not do that? You know, how inefficient or how bungle-prone is this group anyway that the Government House Leader could not bring a proper motion in and get it through the House without ending up into the fiasco that we have now? You know, it has happened so many times over the past four years that it is not even funny.

And you would think, Sir, that there were no problems at all facing the people of this Province. And the only opportunity we have, the only opportunity we have as elected representatives of the people to air any of those problems is, by procedural tactics and wrangling, to really squeeze a few hours out of the administration into the wee hours of the morning—though it might be, so we can attempt in a one-shot deal to bring some of the problems that face our people before the people's House. That is the only way we have, the only opportunity we have, Sir, because this crowd are so prone and they are so eager to put the padlock on the door, because, Mr. Speaker, this hon. crowd do not want

Mr. Rideout: to face the House anyway.

MR. NEARY: They are worn out, boy.

MR. RIDEOUT: If this hon. crowd did not have to face the House, if they had not been so foolish as to put a motion down on the 12th. of December saying that we had to meet today anyway, they would not be here. The Premier had not made up his mind by that time, Sir, that he was going to resign, I suppose, or the motion would have been a lot later in the year than it was.

So, you know, it is just crazy, it is ridiculous the type of thing that has been allowed to happen. There is no reason why, and what galls me the most, Sir, is that no member on the other side got the gumption to get up and try to convince us of any reason why, this Legislature should be closed down, no reason why whatsoever. And the people of this Province are not going to stand by and certainly we are not; we are going to fight until the end, it might be 8:00 o'clock or 9:00 o'clock in the morning when we run out of speakers and run out of tactics and run out of procedural ways to beat this hon. crowd, but we are going to keep trying, and we are going to stay here as long as we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggested already that you would think that there were no problems whatsoever facing this Province. And that is what we are elected for, to deal with the problems of the people. It is the only reason for this House to exist. I will

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

just take a few minutes and concentrate on the things in my own district, only a small part one of the fifty-one districts in the Province but a really major crisis. Take, for example, the town of Roddickton. The town of Roddickton today, Sir, is on bended knees, 100 per cent unemployment in that town today, and we cannot get a chance except in the wee hours of the morning to debate that issue in this House. Now I call that too bad; it is too bad that we have not got a chance to be able to probe the government during Question Period, to be able to speak in debate day after day and really bring home the problem that is facing the people of Roddickton, and it is a very serious problem. It is a serious problem when any community, Sir, has 100 per cent unemployment and that community in my district happens to be in those particular straits today.

Now why is it so? It is so, Sir, because the government of this Province saw fit back in 1974 to take Crown land timber claims and, through an act of the legislature, give them to a company and that company in return would set up a logging operation. And that would have all been fine and dandy if the government had kept on top of the situation and made sure that the situation worked as it was envisioned to work in theory, but it certainly did not. Not four years later we have a situation in Roddickton where the men could no longer work for the company because they cannot make a living under the present conditions. The company says they cannot afford to buy logging equipment and set up a logging operation even though there is a clause in the act that was passed by this legislature, clause five, which says that the company shall maintain a logging and milling operation on standards comparable to anything to be found in the Province. Well, they have never had a logging operation, never since they went to operation in 1974. The Department of Industrial Development, whose act that baby is, has been negligent, Sir, in their responsibility to the people of that area because they passed the act and then forgot about it, obviously. They have not been on top of the act, they have not been watching the Canada Bay Lumber Company Act to make sure that the government from their part, the Department of

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Forestry from its part, and the company for its part and making sure that every condition of that act was kept to the 't'. Now the men are after going bankrupt on a half dozen occasions in attempting to set up logging operations, the company says, "We cannot afford it, you will have to do it yourself." Every poor, ordinary Joe will have to go out and invest \$75,000 or \$80,000 in skidders before he go into the woods. And what man can afford that, Mr. Speaker, especially after the Department of Rural Development in a public meeting in Roddickton the other night told the people that he would not make recommendations to his department to invest any more money while conditions exist as they are in that particular town and in the logging operation there. So the men cannot afford to buy the equipment, they cannot get the financing to buy it, and the company, the poor company says, "We cannot buy it," and sitting right in the middle is the government with a statute, a piece of legislation on the books of this Province setting up the Canada Bay Lumber Company agreement and not having the will, over the last four years, to monitor that situation to ensure that it was working out to the best advantage of the people in the area and obviously to the best advantage of the company; you cannot expect the company to operate without making a profit. Nobody is on an anti-company kick, Sir, but I do not mind taking on companies when I see wrongs that have to be righted I did not mind taking on Advocate Mines over the last four years and I do not mind taking on Canada Bay Lumber Company or any other company that I feel are perpetrating wrongs and injustice in certain part of this Province.

And the people of Roddickton, Sir, have suffered for years! In fact, since Roddickton first came on the map as a town in the 1920's there has been nothing only suffering in the forest industry in that area, Company after company have gone in there, the



MR. RIDEOUT: lowest of wages have been paid, men have gone bankrupt in attempts to buy equipment, agreements have been made with companies that were never lived up to, and the government of this Province, having given away the birthright of the people in the Claims Act in 1974, have since stood by and allowed it to happen! Well, Sir, the people of Roddickton have come to the end of the road and they want those claims back. And I am asking the government, and I have already asked, and I am going to continue to ask the government to take the claims away from Canada Bay Lumber Company and let it revert to the Crown and let any company that wishes go in there if they are interested, or let it be Crown land so that the men could do what they always did, set up their own private sawmills and sell to the competition. Do not leave it tied up there and do not let the birthright of those people be tied up there while the town is on its knees. And Roddickton, Sir, I can assure you, is on its knees today and has been for - they have never made a go of it this last three or four years but it has come to the point now where they cannot exist any longer. It is just useless for them to go in the woods. And I have heard the company talk about the great amount of money that the men could make in the woods on the price they were paying for the timber. And when I went through some of the men's takehome stubs from their settlements - which is the local word for them - and I see week after week, or pay period after pay period, which is ordinarily ten or twelve days, when all the expenses are taken out for the payment on the timber jack, and the gas and the oil and all the expenses come out, I see a zero with a stroke through it, not a cent to take home to their families! Or I see \$47 to take home after eight or ten days in the woods. The highest I have ever seen was \$229. And those people are supposed to exist!

Mr. Speaker, there is no way it can be done. And yet this government, this Legislature had a Canada Bay Lumber Company agreement that was supposed to work to the advantage of the people, to the advantage of the area, and to the advantage of the

MR. RIDEOUT: company. But it was never monitored, Sir. If it had been monitored the government would have known, or they should have known what was going on in the Roddickton area in the forest industry. But it was never monitored. It was an act that was put in place and they were allowed to police themselves. That is the only conclusion I can draw. They were allowed to police themselves. Nobody else cared. The government did not care enough to have a man in Industrial Development assigned to keep a look at that infant industry that they have bormed, that they have caused to be bormed down there - a good idea. It might have worked had it been looked after. It might have worked had it been monitored by the government. It would not cost too much to have an Industrial Development officer to keep an eye on the situation. It does not cost too much at all. But the Department of Industrial Development, Sir, has been so concerned with industrial shutdowns that they have not been able to keep the operations that may have had a chance had they had some help, they have not been able to give those any help and give them a fighting chance to survive. And then you want the House to close down.

I could spend days, Mr. Speaker, talking about the situation in Roddickton. I have been down there three times in the past three weeks listening to the sad litany that has gone on in that town over the past three or four or five years and long before - but there is no good going too far back in history - listening to the sad litany that has gone on in that town with a statute of this Province on the books that was supposed to protect the interests of the people. But it was never monitored and never enforced, only what voluntary enforcement the company gave it themselves. And on top of that the claims were given away.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well I say, Sir, that this government has a moral responsibility to the people of Roddickton to keep this Legislature open and tomorrow, or as soon as it is possible to have an act drafted, to bring an act into this House taking back the claims from that company since they are not prepared to put in a logging operation and since the men cannot afford it. Everybody who has tried has gone bankrupt. Since the company is not prepared to do it, take back the claims, take back the people's resource.

MR. RIDEOUT: This Legislature is supreme. If we gave it away, can we not take it back? My understanding is that we can overturn any act. We only need to bring in another act to amend that one, or to repeal it or whatever, and take those claims back and let them become Crown land. And if the men wish to go in and set up a small sawmill operation they might be able to sell 100,000 feet of lumber a year to IGA, or they might be able to sell 100,000 a year to some other company in Newfoundland that is in the lumbering business. They may well be able to do that, but right now they are caught, Mr. Speaker. If they do not go in and cut for Canada Bay they cannot cut at all. They are not allowed by law to cut one inch of wood on those claims because the company owns them outright and owns them until 1987 or something of that nature. And Roddickton cannot survive on hope until 1987, Mr. Speaker. It cannot do it. A town of 1200 or 1400 people and the only people who are working in it are the few working with Hydro and the few working in the schools and the post office and the wildlife officer, that is about it. Those are the only jobs that are in that town. And Roddickton has always been a town that is dependent on the forestry. And it was pathetic, Mr. Speaker - I have had my dart at the Minister of Industrial Development because that is a department that is really responsible for making sure that act is in force - but it was sort of pathetic to see the Minister of Forestry on television a few nights ago almost indifferently shrugging his shoulders as if he did not know the situation existed, because the man and his staff and a number of us were into that community I guess a little over a year ago and the council presented a brief to us at the time and told us what was happening, so the Department of Forestry was very much aware what was going on in Roddickton. But it was almost pathetic to see the Minister of Forestry, who is charged with the administration of the forestry industry in this Province, almost indifferently shrug his shoulders to the situation that faced those people.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, something has to be done about it. If nobody else can find a reason to keep this Legislature open well then I have given you one, because there are 1200 or 1400 people depending on the actions of this Legislature to take back their birthright so that they can go in the woods and cut timber and sell it to whomever might want to buy it. If they cannot sell it that is all we can do about it. But I know they can sell lumber. They know it and I know it. And because of the export wood market that the minister has talked about over the past number of days, they can sell pulpwood on the export market.

So it is a matter, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Industrial Development getting the heads of his department together and looking at the situation. I have already had some of his people down there. There should be a report on the minister's desk as of last week on the situation. The Canada Bay Lumber Company Act is not very big, it is only two or three pages, and it can be looked at very quickly. What ought to be done should be done, and that is give those people a fighting chance; at least do not keep the claims tied up so that they can look at the trees and starve on the thoughts of it. Now if there is no other reason to keep the Legislature open, that is one. And that could be done, Mr. Speaker, very quickly, and it should not have to wait until the Tory leadership convention is over. It should not have to wait until the 27th. of March. You are not talking about a great big long, entailed piece of legislation. It is a very simple piece of legislation. It gave the company some rights to timber if the company performed certain roles and did certain things under certain conditions. It gave them a lot of rights, Mr. Speaker. It cut the royalties over half. In return they were supposed to do certain

MR. RIDEOUT: things, too, like maintain roads for example. Everybody in forestry, every official will tell you that. But the minister was not so sure when he was on television the other night. It is not written you see, Sir, specifically into the agreement but it was the agreement, that in return for reduced royalties they would maintain forest access roads in the area. But they have had a habit, Sir, over the last few years of making the poor local contractor do that kind of thing.

So there is a reason why the Legislature should not close and it is a very human reason. People are suffering unless this Legislature does something. So what more reason than that do we want?

Mr. Rideout: If I go in the woods and cut a thousand of lumber, Sir, I have got to pay \$7 a thousand royalty; that company, I believe, pays \$3.50. So they have been given advantages by the House, and rightly so. I am not against it at all. But when the crunch comes do not let the people remain there suffering while those claims are tied up. They cannot even go on it themselves let alone bring anybody else in. And the only people that can change that is this Legislature, and it should be done and it should be done immediately, never mind closing her down for another month and a half or so. And then you come back and you get into the budget and you get into this and you get into that. And it will be like it always was, Sir; even if we can convince the government to bring in an Act to change that drastic situation in Roddickton, it will be an Act that will be brought in the last day or so of the session. I have never seen it any better in the four years I have been here yet. All kinds of legislation slapped on your desk the last day or so of the session and then you are supposed to be an intelligent legislator and debate it and pick it apart to see what is wrong with it, propose amendments to it, propose different ideas, propose different approaches. But you are supposed to do all that and be out of here in a day or so, or either the face of the Government House Leader turns so red and drops so far that you would swear he was going to go into fits of convulsion. I have seen it here, and I have seen no better here for four years. What a way to run a Province, Mr. Speaker! You know, you would not run a kindergarten classroom with as much organization as that. And that is the way we have been operating. You close her down the 4th. of July and you bring her back for a week or so in the

Mr. Rideout:        Fall, only because you promised you would, to get her closed down in the first place; and then you have her open for a week and you close her down for another three or four months and you bring her back for a day. Now that is the way, Mr. Speaker, to run the affairs of a half million people! And that is what has been happening and, as I said, it has been no different or no better since I first came here in September 1975.

It is a sad litany, Sir, for the people of this Province that the people they elect to run their affairs cannot do a better job of it than that. As I have suggested, I could go on and talk about the Roddickton situation but I will try to hit a few other topics. And I hope that the government, and I have talked to the minister about it, the Minister of Industrial Development, I hope that they will put a bill on the Order Paper, I hope that they will decide not to close the House. There is no need of it, there is no need whatsoever to close this House until around at least the 9th. or the 10th. of March, and that would give us plenty of time to have a bill brought in, take back those land claims and give them to the people. By the end of March they could probably be in the woods making a buck, whereas if we close this House and walk out of here tonight - as the government says they are going to do, and have not even got the courage to put up somebody to tell us why they are going to do it - if we do that then those people are going to have to continue to sit on their fanny until after the Tory fiasco is over, and after they have a little holiday after the fiasco, and then you have got to come back and you might have to get into the budget or a lot of other things, or you might be into an election, and Roddickton could be sitting in the same boat as it is now until September or October next year.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now that is the ultimatum that face those people, and it is not very pleasant, Sir. It is not very pleasant at all, and if people do not believe me go down there. Like I said, I have spent a lot of time there in the last three weeks because I consider it to be a crisis situation, and I would expect some leadership from the government on it.

Another situation, Mr. Speaker, that we have been facing is the utterly ridiculous turmoil that the most incompetent minister in the administration has perpetrated again on the people of this Province and that is the Department of Transportation and Communications. I have never witnessed anything like it and I was born and raised and grew up on the Baie Verte Peninsula, have never lived a full year anywhere else except on the Baie Verte Peninsula, and I never saw anything like it in my life the things that happened down on the Baie Verte Peninsula this year with regards to the department that that minister is suppose to be responsible for. And as I said to him, Mr. Speaker, in a telegram not very long ago, "The buck stops on his desk."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

You can blame it on the superintendent or you can blame it on inadequate equipment or you can blame it on broke down equipment or you can blame it on the district superintendent or you can blame it on whom you like, but there is the man that we, the people of this Province, hold responsible for highways operation in this Province, and the buck has to stop on his desk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they started off by creating the misery themselves. They went on this stupid - they really tore the guts out of their men - they went on this stupid twelve hour call-back system, which started it all.

The men -

MR. RIDEOUT: of course, did not know anything about it. The supervisors were called in to Deer Lake, and I suppose the same happened all over the Island; I do not know. The supervisors were called in to Deer Lake and they said, 'We are going to put her on a twelve hour call-back shift. You can stay home and sit in your kitchen, read a book, do what you like, but you be available for twelve hours and if we need you we will call you, but we will only pay you for eight. We will only pay you for eight hours, but you be there for twelve. So we will give the Province'- poor old Newfoundland, suffering as she is, and I know she is financially-'we are expecting you to give the Province twenty hours a week free labour.' Mr. Speaker, that is the effect of it. You stay home for twelve hours; do not dare move because we might want you. The minister can laugh, that is true. That is true! I can bring man after man from his department who have told it to me before this House. It is true! They are on shift for twelve hours and get paid for eight if they do not go out. Now what happens if they get called after the tenth hour is up? Well, I will tell you what the supervisor down our way told them: 'If you are not available you will not get paid for any of the eight even though you might have been sitting there for ten.' Now, Mr. Speaker, the guts and the morale of those workers have been shot full of holes. I have never seen it so low in my life. Every morning the first people calling me are people working with that minister's department, and I have never, never experienced that. You always experience the odd person who might be dissatisfied or might have a gripe, but they are coming every day. I suppose it might be a little bit of an exaggeration but not much to say that I do not think there is a man in his department down there who has not complained to me at one time or another this past Winter about the setup. Now that was the first

MR. RIDEOUT:                                problem, the stupid twelve hour call-back system, get people to work some free labour and all that - not work free labour, they are not working, but they are supposed to be on call.

MR. DINN:                                        They are not working.

MR. RIDEOUT:                                No, they are supposed to be on call. Would you stay on call if you were not being paid?

MR. DINN:                                        Oh, I do not know. If I was getting paid I would not mind sitting down.

MR. RIDEOUT:                                They are not working if they are home on call. Listen to the minister now trying in his little sly, weasely way to weasel around words again. He knows very well what I mean.

MR. DINN:                                        I know exactly what you mean.

MR. RIDEOUT:                                Now that was the first mistake,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:                                        So do they know.

MR. RIDEOUT:                                Yes, so they do. Mr. Speaker, that was the first mistake, the stupid twelve hour call-back system. Now they had the answer to that, of course. They were going to let those men stay home on twelve hour call-backs.

MR. DINN:                                        Getting paid for sitting home on call.

MR. RIDEOUT:                                Mr. Speaker, is there any way that jaws could be used to muzzle the hon. Pleasantville lip? Mr. Speaker, if the minister cannot stand the heat he should get out of the kitchen. I thought that the present Minister of Tourism was the most incompetent Minister of Transportation we ever had, but that gentleman there bungled Municipal Affairs, bungled the Regional Government Bill and he would bungle the Province if he decided to run for the leadership and win it, because he is a pure bungler.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now I just explained, Mr. Speaker, the first mistake that they made. The second thing they were going to do, the second thing that that famous brainstorm came up with was they were going to hire a whole new bunch of foremen, and they did. They hired a whole new bunch of foremen, five or six, I believe, on the Baie Verte Peninsula.

AN HON. MEMBER: A hundred.

MR. RIDEOUT: Of course it had the effect, Mr. Speaker, of taking every qualified grader operator they had and making him foreman. They did not think about the consequences of that. But anyway, they made them foremen. Now the men were going to be home on twelve hour call-back shifts, the foreman was supposed to be cruising the roads continuously with a mobile telephone in his truck, and on that mobile telephone, of course, he was supposed to put through the call if the road needed to be ploughed or sanded or whatever and get the operator out. I have come to realize that I believe there are two of the trucks on the Baie Verte Peninsula equipped with mobile telephones to date even though we are a bit late in the season now - two, I believe, are equipped - so the foremen do not have the mobile telephones. They are out cruising the roads. If they leave Baie Verte and drive to Burlington or drive on the Burlington road and find out that a plough is needed or a sand truck is needed, they have to come back to Baie Verte again, use the office telephone to 'phone over to Burlington or wherever the operator is to get the men out on the road. So that is another very efficient operation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: Give it to the foremen!

MR. RIDEOUT: Nobody is complaining about the foremen. How can he make a long distance call from the

MR. RIDEOUT: mobile he is supposed to have when he does not have it? Now that is another thing.

The third thing, Mr. Speaker, is the distance involved. As I said in the beginning, I was born, raised and grew up on the Baie Verte Peninsula, and I have left Baie Verte with the sun shining and got half way to Westport and you were in a blizzard. Now anybody who grew up in that area can tell you the same thing, yet the operator, if he happened to be living in Baie Verte, would know nothing about the blizzard half way over to Westport, but he cannot move, he is

MR. T. RIDEOUT: not allowed to be out, not allowed to do anything like that, he has to stay there until somebody gets in touch with him. The most grossly inefficient operation, Mr. Speaker, not because of the men, not because of the local workers, not because of the local supervisors, but because it was handed down. That system was devised by some pie-in-the-sky bureaucrat and handed down and the minister condoned it. And that is one of the reasons why we have had the problems in the maintenance division of the Department of Transportation and Communications this year. The men are, number one, so browned off morale-wise I have never seen them like it before. Their morale is at the lowest I have ever seen. And then the other two reasons that I have listed. I have never seen the likes of it before.

MR. DINN: It is going to get more attention next year.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Well. I hope it does. I mean, I really hope the minister is right. I am sincere when I say that. Then, of course, we had an unusual year, there is no doubt about that, and anybody would be less than candid and less than honest if they did not admit that we did have an unusual year with regards to weather conditions, especially in that part of the Province. But we also had some unusual equipment breakdowns, Mr. Speaker. I cannot begin to go into them because everytime I send a telegram to the minister - look, I left Baie Verte the Monday before last and I drove to Seal Cove, nine miles, and the grader out on the Seal Cove Road was broke down out in Seal Cove. I left Seal Cove and I came back and I started driving the roads along the La Scie Highway to La Scie. Ming's Bight road was opened with one cut in it. Well, first of all as I got across the bridge after you go down into La Scie the grader that was assigned to that road was broke down, parked on the side of the road. Then I got to Ming's Bight road as I say, with one cut in it and I went a little further and the Ming's Bight plow that is usually

MR. T. RIDEOUT:                   stationed on the Ming's Bight road was on its way to Nippers Harbour. This was 12:30 in the day, Sir, - or about 1:00 I got there. He had been broke down for gas from 12:30 in the day. When I passed him again 5:00 coming back to Baie Verte he was still in the same place, no fuel delivered to him yet, five or six hours, four or five hours of operating time gone. Now what do you call that? So I went on I went down to Nippers Harbour - not opened, had not been opened for four or five days. They had a plow on it they had brought out from Deer Lake. There was really a lot of snow but she was punching away on it. Round Harbour, Snooks Arm had not been opened for four or five days - four days I believe it was. Shoe Cove got open that afternoon, four days later, because they hired the plow from the town council of La Scie. The grader that was stationed on the La Scie end had a wheel blown off and the thing was all twisted up - that was out of operation. The tractor was out in Brent's Cove - Brent's Cove road was not opened - the tractor that was out there had the tracks off it. When they got it going that evening they could not work in the night because the lights would not work. Now you talk about equipment! I mean, Mr. Speaker, I am not fabricating those kind of tales. That is what I saw in one day.

MR. DINN:                               How can you operate on those gravel roads, anyway?

MR. T. RIDEOUT:                   Mr. Speaker, to see the Minister of Transportation on television the first night he came on about this particular problem, talking about how can you operate on those roads. Damn it, Sir, we have operated on them for twenty-five years and we have never had the trouble we have had this year. The La Scie road is paved, Mr. Speaker, what is his excuse for that one? Now come off it.

MR. DINN:                               How did you make it down there that day?

MR. T. RIDEOUT: How did I make it down there?

Because it was open with one cut in it.

MR. DINN: You flew.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: No, I drove in a four wheel drive Bronco and every inch I went I was wishing I had you with me so you could see it yourself because you refuse to believe it, you refuse to believe it when I tell you. And that is your biggest problem, you should start listening to people. You should start listening to people.

MR. DINN: There is no chance of my being caught with you down in Baie Verte.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: No, there is no chance. Mr. Speaker, all the fights and battles I had with the former Minister of Transportation, all the fights and battles I had with him, I will say he was a gentleman, you know, we fought our political battles, and rightly so that is the way it will be and will continue to be, but he was not a sophisticated hon. idiot, he was a gentleman. When he decided to come to visit the Baie Verte Peninsula when first the road problem started to occur down there with regards to asbestos dust and so on, he came twice. Each time he came, Sir, he phoned me well in advance, let me know he was coming and wanted to know if I would like to travel around the area with him. But, no, Sir! As that gentleman just said, "I would not be caught in the Baie Verte Peninsula with you." Well, that is the mentality of the type of gentleman that is running the Department of Transportation in this Province and it matters not whether the buck stops on his desk or not, because if it does he will try to lay it somewhere else.

MR. DINN: And they told me you did not want to be seen with me either.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I would take the minister around in Baie Verte - White Bay any day, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the LRP they barely saved their nomination fee the last time, but let him come. He will save his nomination fee!



MR. DINN: Why do you not come to Pleasantville?

MR.T. RIDEOUT: I have no reason to go to Pleasantville, Mr. Speaker, I am close enough to the hon. gentleman. If I went to Pleasantville he would be a constituent and I would not want that. Now, Mr. Speaker, though the truth may hurt, the truth needs to be told and that is why this House ought to stay open to hear that hon. gentleman saying, "It is the kind of roads you have," and the La Scie highway a beautiful paved road.

MR. DINN: That is one.

MR.T. RIDEOUT: That is one, that is right. What is wrong from the access road down to the town of Baie Verte?

MR. DINN: Tell me about Westport and Purbeck's Cove.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Sure I will tell you about Westport and Purbeck's Cove: they have been kept open for twenty - odd years without the problems that we are having this year. You have bungled it. You have bungled it and then you have the nerve to get on the television - Mr. Speaker, if he had been on the Baie Verte Peninsula the next morning he would have been lynched for sure according to the calls I was getting and the Open Line was getting.

MR. RIDEOUT: And one particular clergyman phoned me after he had heard the hon. gentleman on the Open Line and he said, "Look, it has got to be one or the other. Either the hon. minister is getting wrong information or he is a liar." I am not saying that but that is what the clergyman said, because to hear him talk about what he said was the situation and what that particular gentleman knew to be the situation you would not say you were living in the same world at all.

MR. NEARY: He is still on the payroll of the telephone company, you know that.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well that is where they should have kept him because he cannot do this job.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) conflict of interest.

MR. DINN: That is a lie.

MR. RIDEOUT: Is that parliamentary, Your Honour?

MR. NEARY: Set up a judicial enquiry and we will find out in a hurry.

MR. DINN: A judicial enquiry! Into what? John Doyle.

MR. NEARY: Your being on the payroll of the telephone company. You should resign.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! I think the hon. gentleman is having difficulty. Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, to continue with the few remarks, to have this House closed with those kinds of things happening in the Province, Mr. Speaker, is nothing short of ridiculous. Mr. Speaker, maybe we should talk about the situation -

MR. NEARY: When we get finished (inaudible) the hon. gentleman will be interesting. Taking two salaries, one from the telephone company.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, is there any way to perhaps throw the hon. gentleman out? I know he irritates everybody so I feel for my hon. friend.

MR. DINN: Step outside!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) two salaries.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, maybe we should spend a bit of time I am sure probably talking about the situation that school boards in this Province are facing. I have had two school boards come to me this last week or so -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: (Dr. Collins) I have a loud voice, Sir, but I do not feel like bawling. It is quarter to two in the morning. Could we have some order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member is clearly having his rights impinged upon. The hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation facing school boards in this Province, I know of two particular school boards in this Province, and it is too bad the Minister of Education is not in his seat, who have had the banks call their cheques on them, who are really no doubt about it, facing bankruptcy. Two school boards that I know right now in this Province are facing bankruptcy. The bank will not allow them to write a cheque until they call the bank manager and get it approved, they are sitting with their biggest kinds of overdrafts and no money coming in. Is that not an issue that this administration and this House should face? We could have a half dozen school boards in this Province go bottom up financially any minute at all. But that is not a concern, Mr. Speaker. The biggest concern is to let us get out and have our charade and our circus and see if we can drum up a bit of support. That is a real concern, because if some of those school boards go bankrupt who is going to operate the schools? Is the government going to take it all over? What is going to happen? It is a very real concern and a very real headache to those volunteers, I can tell you, who are sitting on those school boards and who are trying to juggle the bills and who are trying in desperation when Imperial Oil phones them up and says, "You owe us \$80,000 and not another gallon of oil are you getting until we get it paid off," and I know that is a fact. I suppose the Minister of Transportation would react to that in the same way he has reacted to the other facts that I told him tonight. Is that not reason enough to keep this House of Assembly open, Mr. Speaker? I would consider it to be. Thousands of children in this Province could be out of school tomorrow if something is not

MR. RIDEOUT: done to alleviate the financial situation that some boards - I do not know about all, but some, I know of two in particular-are facing in this Province. And they are in it, Mr. Speaker, because when they became consolidated boards and integrated boards, the first thing of course they had to do was the tremendous capital outlay to build new buildings to replace the old one and two room buildings that were falling down, old parish schools and that kind of thing had to be replaced--they had to be, there was no way

MR. RIDEOUT: around it. And now those boards are saddled with that and this government can stand by and have the audacity to ask us not to worry about it, close her up, go on home. And that is a situation where thousands of children in this Province could be out on the street tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, but I have almost run out of time. I could talk about this shemozzle, Sir, I could talk about this shemozzle that the Tory Public Accounts Committee had the audacity to bring into the House of Assembly, and all I can see in it, Sir, as I was looking through it, is the committee was satisfied with this, the committee was satisfied with that. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Tory caucus, the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Municipal Affairs are hardly the crowd that are going to dig into the facts, the little gory, bloody facts of corruption. They are hardly the crowd who are going to dig into that. There is no wonder the report can say the committee was satisfied with this, the committee was satisfied with that. Well the people of the Province are not satisfied, Sir, because the Premier of this Province is not going to answer for it in the polls because he is running away from it, and that is the exact reason why he is leaving, because he knows he cannot win another election. The people of this Province, Sir, are not satisfied with the scuttle job that this administration did on the Public Accounts Committee, the people of this Province are far from satisfied. And then they have the audacity to bring this PAC - I think it should be called Pack; packed full of falsehoods, because that is all that is in it. The committee is satisfied with this and the Committee is satisfied - they should have said the Tories are satisfied with this, the Tory version of the Committee is satisfied, but no way am I satisfied, Sir. No way will I be satisfied while that hon. crowd scuttled the one vehicle that we had in this Province to be able to effectively monitor the public accounts of the Province. I could talk about that for a long while. I could talk about a

MR. RIDEOUT: number of things, Sir, that this hon. crowd have perpetrated on the people of this Province over the last three or four years and the only consolation- they can close her up tonight when we all run out of time, we can only speak once; they can close her up - and the only consolation we have Mr. Speaker, is that, thank God, in another few months they are going to have to meet their masters and meet the political fate which they justly deserve.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Ha ha ha ha.

MR. RIDEOUT: 'Jimmy,' you will never make it.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I also want to lay out some reasons why I think this House should remain open, why I think this House should not close at this particular time. Some of the points will be just the same points that some of my colleagues have made, but some of them will be new points, Mr. Speaker. And I want to talk about the needs of the Province as well as talk about the needs of my district that the people, my constituents, want me to be talking about at this particular time.

It is a great injustice -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we have a quorum call, Sir? There is no quorum in the House.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I am informed the House has a quorum.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it is a most inopportune time for the House to be closed. It is the time of the year when most people in the Province are expecting the Budget to be brought down; the municipalities, in particular, are now applying for the monies that they are going to be getting in this fiscal year. They have all worked very hard to get their requests in, and they are out there now in frustration and anxiety wondering what they are going to get, what monies they are going to get for water and sewer, what money they are going to get for the roads. Many of our unincorporated areas are not there wondering what money they are going to get for the roads, what money they are going to get for artesian wells. And little do they know that nothing in this direction is going on at all, that they are going to be waiting possibly up into June and July before they know what they are going to get, if they get anything.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have already alluded to the unemployment situation in the Province, and I certainly have to spend some time on that most important topic, our number one problem today with an unemployment rate close to 18 per cent, 37,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed in the month of January, 6,000 more than a year ago, 6,000 more than in January of 1978. I wonder how close this brings the government to its plan for development- what was it called?

AN HON. MEMBER: Five thousand new jobs.

MR. LUSH: The blueprint. The blueprint for development, that is it. How close does that bring them to their objective?

Mr. Lush: According to the projections the way I worked it out with the labour force, I think, in their five year programme, by 1982 they projected that our labour force would grow to a little over 200,000. That meant that they had projected the growth in labour force each year to be between 4,000 and 5,000 people. Well for this year alone, in the time period that I have just-referred to of January 1979 back to January 1978, our labour force increased by 11,000 in that first year, 11,000, that is double what the figures projected. So I wonder where that puts them in terms of bringing the level of unemployment down to 10 per cent over a five year period. And, Mr. Speaker, the labour force grew by 11,000. Out of that 11,000 only 5,000 people were successful in getting jobs and this accounts for the 6,000 people more unemployed this January than of the previous January. And the sad fact about this as well, of course, is that this 11,000 people, these new entrants into the labour force, these are young people, these are the young people of this Province. Imagine the frustration and the anxiety of these young people, out of which only 5,000 were successful in getting jobs, 6,000 today are walking around depending on their government now to find jobs for them and then to know that the House of Assembly is going to be



MR. LUSH: closed down for close to two months - no action, nobody working for these young people. The government, whose responsibility it is, whose task it is to find jobs, to create jobs for its people, and here we have 6,000 young people who could not find jobs in this particular year, the year between January, 1979 and 1978 - a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, an utter disgrace. Here are these people, as I have said, looking to this government to provide jobs and yet we are closing the place down so that people can go out to promote their own political ambitions at the expense of these people - a terrible injustice, Mr. Speaker. And again, the minister should tell us how this fits in with the blueprint for development, closing down the House, Mr. Speaker, at this time with rampant unemployment. It shows irresponsibility and shows a lack of initiative by this government and the lack of concern and the lack of interest for the workers of our Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could say other things about creating jobs in this Province and the lack of initiative by the government. We so often hear of the government being concerned about our people, giving preference to Newfoundlanders, preference on every job that is going on in this Province. Mr. Speaker, it would baffle the mind of every Newfoundlander if we were to look into every job situation in this Province and to find out the number of non-Newfoundlanders working on job sites in this Province, working in various places for which Newfoundlanders qualify. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be parochial or narrow-minded with respect to jobs to non-Newfoundlanders, but nothing irritates me more, nothing aggravates me more than seeing non-Newfoundlanders working in this Province at jobs which our people have the expertise and the qualifications to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I raised publicly this particular situation. Some weeks ago I raised publicly the situation with respect to Holiday Inn, something that the government should be very concerned about. Just some months before Christmas when they were doing some decorations there, it was my understanding that this particular group of people had brought in paper hangers from the Province of Quebec to hang paper down at Holiday Inn. And I checked with Manpower, with Statistics Canada and found out that at that particular time we had close to 300 paper hangers unemployed in the Province.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. LUSH:

And these people at Holiday Inn were permitted to bring in paper hangers from Quebec.

MR. NEARY:

Sent them back home for Christmas, brought them back again, housed them at Holiday Inn and fed them at Holiday Inn.

MR. LUSH:

So, Mr. Speaker, that situation in itself is a disgrace and again shows the lack of initiative by the government in trying to look after our own people to insure that in every job in this Province, that in every area of work, our Newfoundlanders are given preference. It is not giving lip service to this sort of policy, Mr. Speaker, but we are doing something about it to insure that our Newfoundlanders are hired in this Province for jobs for which they qualify.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time in our history when every one of us should be here trying to develop programmes and policies to try to create jobs for our people, to try to get something for these people to do so

MR. LUSH: that they too can have some of the amenities of life, instead of going through the frustration and the anxiety which so many of our Newfoundlanders are now experiencing; here trying to develop policies for the full development of our forestry, for the full development of our agriculture, and for the full development of our tourist potential. I mention these because I think these are the three most neglected resource potentials in our Province. These are the most three neglected, certainly in my own district. And look around and see the neglect with respect to forest development, the neglect with respect to agricultural development and the neglect in tourism. And I will elaborate a little further on these a little later, Mr. Speaker.

Another thing I think we should be doing in this particular session instead of closing down until March, I think we should be looking at trying to improve efficiently and productivity within the government and within the public service. I was reading, Mr. Speaker, the other day, I think it is in the Province of Ontario, that they have set up an efficiency committee, I think that is what they call it, to try and increase efficiency and productivity within the public service. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is some lesson for us in that particular thing that the Ontario Government is doing and as I walk around my district and talk to people and try to ascertain their problems, I find out there is a great degree of inefficiency within the various departments of the government. Within the Department of Finance, for example, Mr. Speaker, people who are doing jobs for the government, it takes them months and months before they can get paid. And these people are delayed, they are interferred with, they have got accounts to meet, they have payrolls to pay, people to pay, and they go months and months before they can get money from the Department of Finance.

MR. LUSH: It takes ages to get monies processed and cheques forwarded to the people. Tremendous inefficiency in the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, Crown lands, again another department that causes our people so much anxiety and so much frustration getting title to land, and this is tied up with young people getting mortgages, and I have had people to wait for eight and ten months trying to get title to a piece of land and in the meantime this is hanging up their mortgage. And, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing you can do about it, Call day after day - I waste my time when I could be into things more productive - calling up Crown lands day after day for a young man or some person who is out there completely frustrated trying to get title to the land, gone to the expenses of getting the survey, going here, going there, and still having to wait for ages to try and get title to the land.

The same thing, Mr. Speaker, with respect to getting permits to cut logs and to saw logs. Again this is something that takes ages. It discourages people from getting into it, it takes so long. And we have got these regional forestry offices set up, Mr. Speaker, and until something is done to give these forestry offices some authority that is just a waste of money at this present time the way they are established. They have no authority. If you go to a regional office you cannot get a permit to cut, you cannot get a permit to saw, you still have to come through here in St. John's, and I ask: What are they there for? What are they doing out there? A waste, Mr. Speaker, a waste of money and I would suggest that we should do something similar to what the Ontario Government have done in terms of trying to bring about efficiency and to increase productivity within the government and within the public service by doing this, of setting up some sort of a committee and, as I have said before, I think they have called it an efficiency committee, an efficiency committee in Ontario. But I do not care what they call it as long as it is some committee to try and bring about more efficiency so people do not have to go through so much red tape to get paid if they are working for

MR. LUSH:           the government, for people so that they can  
get a permit to cut and saw logs without growing old in the  
process,

MR. LUSH:

for people to be able to get title to land so that they can build within a reasonable amount of time. Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the areas in which I think the government can improve productivity and become more efficient within certain departments.

Something must be done as well to make the government more accessible to the people. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a member, I have found this to be most offensive, the fact that people cannot get to Cabinet ministers, they cannot get to the people with authority, they cannot get to the people who make decisions. Again, it takes weeks and weeks. Now I quite realize that Cabinet ministers are busy, they have a lot of work to do, but, Mr. Speaker, they have to serve those people who elected them and when these people have a problem, when these people want to see a minister about a road, when these people want to see a minister about water and sewer, they want to be extended that courtesy so that they can come in and discuss these very important problems with the ministers. And I find so many ministers are not easy to get to. They have themselves cloistered in their little offices, Mr. Speaker, almost afraid to face the people. That is not true for all. I must say, it is not true for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the new minister; it is certainly not true for him.

MR. NEARY:

How about Education? Is he hard to get at?

MR. LUSH:

Yes, the Minister of Education is hard to get at. I am going to get down to that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that we can be dealing with in this present House of Assembly. I have talked about dealing

MR. LUSH: with unemployment, I have talked about trying to bring about efficiency within the government. Yes, we need to meet now to talk about some of the problems in education, some of the major problems in education, Mr. Speaker, and one of the biggest problems in education today, of course, is busing. Turn on the radio when you like and they are talking about busing. Of course, it also has to do with bad roads, but it does not all have to do with bad roads; it is the situation of parents, Sir, complaining about having to drive young children, kindergarten children particularly, ten, twelve, fifteen, twenty miles to school, totalling possibly thirty to forty miles a day, leaving their homes at 7:30 A.M. and getting back at 5:00 and 6:00 P.M. - a major problem, Mr. Speaker, and it is something that we have to direct our attention to in the future. And I again last week commended the Exploits Roman Catholic School Board for their policy.

MR. HOUSE: Fine!

MR. LUSH: I did not hear the minister do it. Did the minister commend these people for reversing their centralization policy and trying to have children educated in their home communities in places where it could be done? Now, Mr. Speaker, we must be very careful about this because I think we have to realize that we are going to have buses with us for a long, long time to come, but there are situations in which we can have children educated in their home communities, where we have the student population to support a school, where we have particularly a school there; because there are several communities in Newfoundland that still have school buildings in them and they are good school buildings, but when we

MR. LUSH: started this big programme of centralization we closed these school buildings up and in several places they are being used for nothing now, they are just there deteriorating, not even used for a public meeting. And there are lots of schools like that. And, Mr. Speaker, we have to take a long, hard look at this situation. Certainly, having students educated in their home communities where this can be done, where it is possible to do so, where the student population will warrant this, this will be a solution to the bus problem. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not a problem



MR. LUSH: that we can just laugh off,  
this is a serious problem, a very serious problem.

Grade XII, Mr. Speaker, is another educational matter with a lot of questions to be asked. The people of Newfoundland know nothing about this Grade XII programme at the moment, not a thing in the world. We do not know what kind of programme it is going to be. We do not know exactly what this Grade XII programme is going to be. And maybe the minister will rise and tell us tonight, because there are a lot of people in Newfoundland asking that question: What is this Grade XII programme going to be? Is it merely going to be the extension of another year to the life of a student? Does it mean now instead of going to school for twelve years the student is going to go for thirteen, that the programme is just going to be watered down and expanded sort of thing to keep the student in school for an extra year? Or is it going to be a programme that is going to be expanded, a programme that is going to be enriched? Is it a programme that is going to count as first year university, or is it a programme that is going to eliminate the foundation year at Memorial University? It must be one or the other. Not much point in bringing in Grade XII if the student still finds himself finishing up Grade XII and doing the foundation year. That is not much good. Well, it is time, Mr. Speaker, for the minister or somebody to tell the people just what this Grade XII is all about. It is time for somebody to tell the Newfoundland people what this Grade XII programme is all about and to answer these questions, to answer the question of whether it is just going to be another year added to school or whether it is going to be a meaningful year, whether it is going to eliminate the foundation year at Memorial University - these are the kinds of questions that need to be answered about this Grade XII programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the House of Assembly needs to be open right now to discuss the labour problems in this Province. Labour relations at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, are at an all-time low and I would like to know what the minister has done about this particular aggravating situation with the Newfoundland Farm Products. I did not hear the minister make any statements on this. I have never heard that he has been involved. And it is time that the minister got involved in the labour situation in this Province, to try to improve labour relations, because, Mr. Speaker, we have had a tremendous number of strikes resulting in lost man-days in the past year. I do not know what the figures were, but the last time I checked they were close to 400,000 - close to 400,000 man-days the last time I checked.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did you get that figure?

MR. LUSH: Well, I said close to it the last time I checked, and that was near the end of October, that is the last time I checked it out. And, Mr. Speaker, that was about either the third or the fourth highest in Canada, and if they were taken on a labour force basis they would have been the highest in Canada and probably the highest in North America - 400,000 lost man-days. Mr. Speaker, imagine the loss in productivity, the loss in salary, a tremendous loss, something that this Province cannot afford. And I wonder whether the minister has gone out to look into this situation and find out why this Province had these many lost man-days. I wonder what the minister has done with respect to trying to improve labour relations in this Province. I have not heard of any training programmes of any type, I have not heard of the minister meeting with labour officials and with workers of this Province, I have not heard of him organizing any of these things, because it looks like he has to organize it



Mr. Lush: for union leaders so that they too can be informed about labour matters and collective bargaining and what it is all about. Because believe you me, Mr. Speaker, with all of the strikes and lockouts in this Province in the last few months that the public is losing confidence in our collective bargaining system, and the minister better do something about it. The minister better start moving around this Province talking to union leaders, and talking to the workers of this Province and finding out what kind of labour legislation they want introduced, finding out what kinds of things that have to be done to improve the labour relations in this Province. It has got to be done and the minister would better start working at it or we are going to find ourselves into severe trouble. And as I said before, I have not heard of any activities of the minister in the field of labour in the last few months, not heard of it. And I would hope that in the next couple of months that the minister will get out around, as I said before, talking to the union leaders and the workers and finding out what kind of legislation they want introduced, what kinds of things will make collective bargaining operate the way it is supposed to operate. And the minister will have to start initiating that kind of activity because the direction in which the labour movement is going in the Province today, as I said before, it is not likely he is going to get invited, so he had better get out and start doing something.

I have been out, Mr. Speaker, in the past year meeting with union leaders and workers and finding out what their concerns are, and what their disenchantments are, and what their disgruntlements are. I have been out working with them. I think the minister should do the same because he is in a position to do something about it. The minister should show his concern for the workers of this Province.

What are we going to do about the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, for the workers? We have a private member's resolution to that effect and I hope that something is going to be done about it. And that is something that we could have been doing in the month of February. That is something we could have had passed by the middle of March. So that is something that is probably not likely to get to the House at all,

Mr. Lush: and if it does it will probably be in June or July.

Now, Mr. Speaker, other problems that the House could be dealing with instead of this leadership at this point, instead of six candidates out roaming all over the Province, and the one thing that I hope they do while they are out is drive over some of the roads in rural Newfoundland. Right now I hope they drive over some of the roads in the Terra Nova District, not that they are likely to find too many delegates, but they should drive over the roads, drive over the Jamestown road, drive over the Port Blandford road.

But, Mr. Speaker, that brings me to my next point: this House of Assembly should be open so that we can come up with some equitable programme, some fair programme for improving the level of public services in this Province, public services and utilities. Mr. Speaker, the electricity rates have already been alluded to. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly the responsibility of every elected member to talk about the electricity rates, the continual rise. Mr. Speaker, our people are being put in a terrible position; many of our people throughout this Province cannot afford the exorbitant prices that they are now paying for electricity. We are getting into a position now in many places where people are paying as much for their electricity as they are paying for their mortgage.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, when this situation develops there is something wrong. There is something wrong, particularly in a province where we have so much hydro power, so much electricity. And our people are sick and tired of it; every year, every year increases in electricity. People on fixed incomes, Mr. Speaker, they just cannot afford it; old age pensioners and social assistance recipients, they just cannot cope with these tremendous increases in electricity, cannot do it. And, Mr. Speaker, the government have to show some concern, some compassion for these people who cannot meet these costs. Something has got to be done about it, something has got to be done about it this year, and

MR. LUSH: this House of Assembly should be open, discussing these problems so that members can advance their ideas.

Water and sewer services, Mr. Speaker, water and sewer services, certainly every individual has a right to good drinking water. Well, that is not the case in many areas in Newfoundland and I know it is not the case in the district of Terra Nova. Thirty-three communities in the district of Terra Nova, Mr. Speaker, thirty-three; not one community out of thirty-three, not one community out of thirty-three with a complete water and sewer system, not one out of thirty-three. Terra Nova district, surrounding the Terra Nova National Park, where visitors from all over Canada and all North America, all over the North American Continent, come to visit all of these communities within and on the periphery of the Terra Nova National Park. not a community, not one single community with a complete system of water and sewer, as a matter of fact only started in about four or five. And the rest of the communities, unincorporated areas, no water, no sewer. Imagine the guys from Toronto going down to Bunyan's Cove and seeing people fetching water in buckets, hauling water in their cars and in their trucks. Mr. Speaker, what a spectacle in 1979! What neglect! Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, unbelievable! And an area with so much potential as in terms of agriculture, forestry and tourism itself. If the Government would only open its eyes and see the kinds of infrastructure that has got to be put in there so that these people can benefit from spinoffs! The tourist spinoff generated by the Terra Nova National Park can support a completely self-sufficient area, but it is completely neglected. That is something we can be doing.

Roads, Mr. Speaker, the same situation. In this year there has been an awful lot of protest and demonstrations over bad conditions in roads. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we are all wise enough to know that we had a rather rough year weather-wise with respect to gravel roads, but the weather is not the sole reason for the condition of a lot of these roads. In a lot of cases it was

MR. LUSH: brought about by neglect where there has been no maintenance on these roads, no construction and now, as so many members have mentioned, the roads are down to the bedrock, down to the corduroy because the Government has failed to do anything, because they have no equitable policy of doing road repairs. If the money of this Province, Mr. Speaker, over the last five or six years was spent equitably throughout Newfoundland, I do not think that we would be experiencing half these protests, half these demonstrations we are seeing. The people of my district protest over the condition of the road because they know in Trinity North and Bonavista South the roads have all been paved there over the past three or four years, paved with their dollars, and they wonder why they can not get a little bit of pavement. And I would suggest to the Government they brought on these protests and these demonstrations and they are going to bring on more. They are going to bring on more if they do not come up with some equitable policy in providing public services to the people of this Province. Why should the people in Terra Nova tolerate their tax dollars being spent in another district adjacent to it? No reason at all.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is asking for more of these protests and more of these demonstrations and they are going to get more, and they are going to get more marches on Confederation Building like they had today; more marches for water and sewer, because the people of Newfoundland have had enough and they are going to become more militant and they are not going to accept this discrimination. They are not going to accept this money being spent for reasons other than need and for reasons other than resource development. Our people are catching on and they are not going to tolerate this kind of action any more and, as I have said, if the Government over the past four or five years had been spending their money equitably and fairly throughout the Province we would not be having these demonstrations today for better roads and for water and sewer services. These are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker,

February 15, 1979

Tape 401

SD-3

MR. LUSH:

We do not have a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

A quorum has been called.

ooo

I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.



MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that Cabinet ministers, instead of taking all of this time out on the campaign trail, should be here designing equitable policies for public services in this Province, water and sewer and for roads. Mr. Speaker, lastly, they should be here in this, The International Year of the Child trying to come up with some programmes for the youth of this Province. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what they have done. I understand that other jurisdictions across Canada have initiated some programmes for this, The Year of the Child, and I wonder if the government thinks this is not necessary in this Province?

AN HON. MEMBER: It probably does not.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, if we know about the rights that have been proclaimed, and I just want to talk about two, and to suggest that there is lots of work that we need to do yet in this Province for our young people and one of course is the right to an education, the full development of every child. And, Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go throughout this Province before we provide equal opportunity for the children of this Province, equal opportunities compared with children throughout the rest of Canada. And the other one, Mr. Speaker, is the right of children to recreational facilities. That is a right declared this year, The Year of the Child, the right to recreational facilities. And, Mr. Speaker, when a person walks around rural Newfoundland and sees the lack of recreational activities for our young people it is absolutely disheartening, absolutely disheartening to see the lack of recreational facilities for young people throughout this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is anything funny about it, but many of the ministers, and I see some of them that are not paying an awful lot of attention to what I am saying, but I would hope that some of these leadership hopefuls will get down to the Terra Nova district and see the lack of recreational facilities there, down in Bonavista North and down in Fogo and all through the

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 402

AH-2

MR. LUSH: Northeast coast of Newfoundland you will not see too many Aquarena down there or too many stadia or too many baseball diamonds or soccer pitches, too many swimming pools;

Mr. Lush:

we will not be seeing too much of that, Mr. Speaker. And I would hope this being The International Year Of The Child that we will become concerned about the youth of this Province and try and do something for them, and think about, particularly the leadership hopefuls that will be out campaigning, think about all of the work that we could be doing here in designing and developing programmes for our young people, recreational programmes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They are going to have to declare whether they are pro-life or not.

MR. LUSH: And in this The Year Of The Child, where other provinces have their programmes enunciated and articulated, I have not heard a sound, not a whisper, not a peep from this government what they are going to do in this, The International Year Of The Child. Well, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that we could be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about some of the things that we can be doing in terms of reforming justice in this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave!

MR. LUSH: - in making equitable laws, laws that apply to the rich and to the poor. I would like to talk about that, things that we could be doing in this next six or seven weeks in the way of law reform.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: In the way of having laws that have penalties that suit the crime and having laws that apply equally to the rich as well as the poor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: I could go on, Mr. Speaker, on that but there are other members who want to speak here, there are other members just longing to get and to have a go at this motion. So, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, to wrestle with the problems of unemployment in this Province, to try and bring about some efficiency in the government.

Mr. Lush: and to do something for our youth in this, The International Year Of The Child, for these reasons and other reasons not mentioned I object to this House closing down at this particular time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The motion on the floor, Mr. Speaker, is this side is trying to justify why this House should not close. As I have sat here this past seven or eight hours I am beginning to wonder why, too. I have watched the performances of the ministers and the backbenchers on the government side, having gone through about nine hours and not one of them having the spirit to stand up and defend their administration's performance this past four or five years, then I would make no wonder if the people of Newfoundland would say, never mind why should the House stay open, but why should we be wasting our money on a bunch of hon. duds like we are looking at over there for this past ten hours. The members on this side have gotten up and they have pointed out problems in their districts, they have touched on basic problems of this Province. And what do you have? You have a bunch of ministers running back and forth, standing up making snide remarks and not one minister - and this will be noted - not one minister, not one spokesman for the government has stood up and defended the government's performance in this debate tonight. That is unbelievable.

The Minister of Social Services can smile and laugh. Maybe he should get up and defend his performance as the Minister of Social Services.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mission impossible.

MR. FLIGHT: Mission impossible.

MR. NEARY: They are afraid to let him loose. He might get all riled up like he did down in Clarendville last weekend.

MR. FLIGHT:           The reason the minister is not the Minister of  
Social Services any more is when the Premier decided he had to have  
a Cabinet shuffle he realized

MR. FLIGHT: the minister got himself in so deep and the questions were coming so fast and so furious about the reforms that that particular minister and his department under him that he decided to shift it to the Minister of Health, who seems to have a thick enough skin to be able to take criticism from any direction and it just rolls off like water off a duck's back. If I were the Minister of Industrial Development, a declared candidate for the leadership of the P.C. party, I would be very concerned about the people that I had up front with me.

Let me point out to the minister that the Central Newfoundland Hospital services about twenty districts, all the central districts. The biggest issue in Central Newfoundland today is the Central Newfoundland Hospital. One of the minister's colleagues resigned from the Cabinet because this administration refused the expansion of the Central Newfoundland Hospital. The present Minister of Health, another one of his supporters, was the minister who denied the people of Central Newfoundland the extension to the Central Newfoundland Hospital. The minister himself was Chairman of Treasury Board when the Central Newfoundland Hospital was denied to the people of Central Newfoundland. So I would have been a little more choosy in who I would have been having, particularly if it was going to be televised in the Central Newfoundland area, who I would have had supporting me and standing behind me and saying this is the man I support. I would have been more careful if I were a bit concerned about the support I might get in Central Newfoundland. As a matter of fact I understand that the minister's co-ordinator, the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) has already been served notice that there are no delegates coming out of the Grand Falls district. So I would advise the minister - and it looks like he is a front runner right now, and it looks like they are closing ranks behind him; and of course when he looks down over the seven or eight opponents he realizes he had not got much competition - but that was not good strategy, that will backfire.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me for a minute talk about some of the reasons why this House should stay open and some of the issues that we should be debating. The member for White Bay (Mr. Rideout) spent a good fifteen minutes of his speech on the Roddickton situation, 1400 people on their knees, I can speak for 2500 people on their knees. I will tell you what this government has done over the past three years. They set up a task force and they spent \$200,000 in trying to determine what could be done for Buchans. Now the bulk of that \$200,000 was spent by bringing five or six people from Buchans into St. John's for a week at a time to talk to ministers and top-flight civil servants. Top-flight civil servants were sent from St. John's to Buchans on a monthly basis to talk to the people in Buchans. Civil servants were sent to Scotland; out of that \$200,000 civil servants went all over the globe on the pretext that they were looking at ways of keeping Buchans viable and nothing came of the Buchan's Task Force Report, it was not considered at all. Then the Premier, when the pressure came on, had to send the Minister of Energy out to Buchans to a public meeting and his performance was unbelievable. He stood up and he said this is the problem, I am going to tell the people of Buchans, 400 people, this is the problem, there has been no communication - \$200,000 spent on total communications but there has been no communications. He said, and he used the words - 'Maybe,' he said, 'Frank Moores does not keep his word, but I keep my word. I am noted for keeping my word.' That is what one of the leadership candidates today said at a public meeting of four or five hundred people in Buchans about a month and a half ago. He said, 'I keep my commitments, If the Minister of Health or the Minister of Industrial Development or the Minister of Transportation do not keep their word - and he acknowledged that it was quite possible that they had not kept their word - he said, 'I keep mine.' He as good as told the people there that he was the only minister who did. As of now there will be communications; as of now I

MR. FLIGHT:                   commit' this and that and something else  
and something else. How green does he think the people of Buchans are?  
After spending \$200,000 he stands up and says there are no communications.  
After two and one half years I suppose that is the bulk of what I have talked  
about in this House , the Buchans situation. I have practically given up  
on it in that sense. But this is what a minister of the Crown, a man  
who now wants to be the Premier of Newfoundland, did. The man responsible  
for that town was the man responsible for the mining industry in this



MR. FLIGHT: Province, having avoided Buchans like a plague for two years, having denied them any access to the Hinds Lake construction sites, having been the heavy in the Cabinet that refused them the Buchans Road, goes out behind his Cabinet minister colleagues, says, "I know the Minister of Justice did not keep his word to the people of Buchans, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Tourism, the Premier, Frank Moores," he said, he used the words, "but," he said, "I, Brian Peckford, I keep my word," He said, "From now on there will be total communication." So what has he done? He set up the Action Committee. We have got the task force all over again, the Action Committee back and forth now. The minister is going out, Sealand helicopters landing all over the place with the Minister of Transportation aboard. He did not see fit to drive in from Gander with the Minister of Tourism, who drove in from Gander in what I presume was a rented car. He decided to make a better impression and come in in a Sealand helicopter.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Anything the minister would have had anything to do with in Buchans would not have done any good.

MR. DINN: Is that right?

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. DINN: I will tell him tomorrow morning.

MR. FLIGHT: You can tell him this, the Minister of Highways tomorrow morning too, I heard the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout)

talking about the conditions of the road in his district. Let me tell the minister this what he has done to servicing the roads -

MR. NEARY: Go down and (inaudible) telephone company,

MR. FLIGHT: - he has forced the highway workers to go on two twelve hour shifts and let them -

MR. NEARY: Chiseler. Chiseling two salaries, one out of the telephone company and one out of the taxpayers.

MR. FLIGHT: And let the minister when he is talking about transportation tell the people of Newfoundland that he has now forced the maintenance crews on the Trans-Canada Highway and the trunk road system to work two twelve hour shifts and while a man only gets paid for eight hours but must set out twelve, if he has got to work that twelve hours and his opposite shift, the man relieving suddenly gets sick, that guy is going to be on the highroad seventeen hours a night. Now can you imagine the physical condition and the mental state of a guy operating a plough on the Trans-Canada Highway after punching in seventeen or eighteen hours in a snow storm. And you say you are concerned about the safety of the people of this Province?

MR. W. ROWE: You had better plug up.

MR. DINN: Tell me (inaudible) what you want me to do in Buchans?

MR. FLIGHT: For the good of the people in Buchans the best thing you could do is stay in St. John's.

MR. DINN: All right,

MR. FLIGHT: Okay? Stay in St. John's.

But you should tell your superintendents - and you talk about labour relations, you talk about what this Province has done for labour relations: Last year - you talk about morale in the Civil Service - we had the general service take a strike vote, we had the MOS, maintenance people, also take a strike vote, and within a week it was engineered by Treasury Board to have that strike broken and to have those two unions divided. There was about as much morale in the MOS today, and the Highway workers -

MR. DINN: At least it was not on Bell Island,

MR. FLIGHT: Never mind if there was on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Go down and give the Avalon Telephone Company back the salary you have chiseled for the last two years.

MR. FLIGHT: You have effectively destroyed the morale of the Department of Highways. What would have been wrong with keeping

MR. FLIGHT: the three hour shifts? What would have been wrong? I have gone through, personally myself, one strike. I have gone through personally a strike that was brought on by people demanding the right to work eight hours, five days a week. And this administration has set the labour movement, or tried to set the labour movement back twenty years. Any minister who would permit negotiators on his part to force people today to work twelve hours has got no consideration for the labour movement, has got no consideration for the feelings or the rights of a man to earn a decent living.

MR. NEARY: Go down and give your salary back.

MR. FLIGHT: And that minister allows negotiators to -

MR. DINN: Give us more on Buchans now.

MR. FLIGHT: I will give you some more on Buchans shortly. Here is something on Buchans, the minister inherited from the present Minister of Mines and Energy -

MR. NEARY: Only for the rules of the House, my son. You would never collect your salary from the telephone company again.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, could we have some order now for a minute. It is difficult to continue here.

MR. NEARY: Go down and give your salary back boy. Do you not have any conscience at all?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, could you control us with a ruling now, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. MCNEIL): Order, please! The member has a right to be heard in silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you something about the performance of the present Minister of Transportation. He inherited from the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs an incorporated town in Buchans, a town incorporated after fifty years, and one of the reasons for the incorporation was to bring the two towns existing right together, together as one, amalgamation of the

MR. FLIGHT: two towns. That minister spent two years, whatever time he spent in the portfolio, and they are no closer to amalgamation than they were when he went in. And if anything his actions during his holding the office forced them apart and he may not get amalgamation now. He may not get the results in a plebescite that he would have wanted or that would have been in the better interests of that town and this Province, because of what he allowed to happen in there under his stewardship, under his administration, under his sending his people in.

MR. DINN: Are you in favour or not?

MR. FLIGHT: I am in favour of amalgamation. I am going to speak in favour of amalgamation.

MR. FLIGHT:

But if the minister is in favor of amalgamation would he please stay out of Buchans and not say that he is or not try to bring it about because if he tries to bring it about it will not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have a crack at the Forestry Department. Where is the Minister of Forestry? Mr. Speaker, I have said this already here one time, that that one minister there reminds everybody of the rooster that on waking thought the sun rose just to hear him crow.

Mr. Speaker, the forestry situation in this Province. In the few minutes today that I talked about forestry I hit on a couple of points that I thought were very important. We have a situation - the Premier is out - where he talked in glowing terms about three years ago, about how in the next three or four years, having gone to Europe and taken his Minister of Forestry with him, that we would produce in the forestry industry 5000 jobs over the next three or four years. We have lost 400 to 500 jobs, a net loss of 400 to 500 jobs in forestry related industries in this Province in the four years that we were supposed to have picked up 5000.

Now, the Minister of Forestry, as a stand-in for the Minister of Fisheries, on one day's notice left this Province and went to Europe to head the anti-sealing delegation and within days after arriving in London made an announcement that he had just negotiated and he was looking at picking up newsprint markets in Europe for Newfoundland Newsprint products. What a joke! Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters have not stopped laughing yet. They have got the best staff, the most efficient sales organization in Canada and still the Minister of Forestry in one day is going to go over and do a better job, find markets for our newsprint. And he said in one of his statements that the market for Newfoundland timber is unlimited in Europe, unlimited, no limit to the amount of timber that can be

MR. FLIGHT:

exported to the European markets.

Now I presume we would not have known this if the Minister of Fisheries had gone to Europe to head up the anti-sealing delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the people in this Province, the people depending on the forestry industry, know now - they have known all along - that as long as that administration and as long as that minister is responsible for the development of the forestry potential in this Province, an industry, our second largest renewable resource next to fishery will never produce the jobs, will never produce the spin off, will never come to anything except the private domain of the two paper companies now established in this Province. Sawmills are closed, sawmillers can not get permits. We talk about the spruce budworm damaged timber; The minister knows that by far the great bulk of budworm damaged timber is on Price limits and Bowaters limits. The Department of Forestry is not allowed to go on Price and Bowaters limits to salvage that budworm infested timber or that budworm damaged timber. Price has no intentions. Seven million cords of timber have been infested by budworm. Price and Bowaters between them are going to harvest this year 240,000 cords. That is over 6 million cords that is going to be left not harvested this year.

MR. FLIGHT: If they harvest at the same rate for the next year and for the next four years, at the end of four years that timber will be gone. It will be worth less, you cannot harvest it, it might as well die there. They will have harvested one million cords of a potential five million cords of budworm infested timber on their limits right now. Now, Mr. Speaker, are we going to stand by - if the minister is right, if there is a market in Europe or if the sawmilling potential in this Province could utilize that wood - are we going to stand by and not go in on Price limits or not work out some agreements with Price and Bowaters whereby we go in and salvage that wood or are we going to let it die on the stump and be lost to the economy of the Province?

When the minister gets up and talks about that he skirts it, he uses just vindictiveness. He does not address himself to it. He will not acknowledge the fact that that timber is on the paper company limits, he will not explain to the House or to the Province what he intends to do about it, he will only talk about what he is going to do about the budworm infested timber that is on the Crown limits. And from a forestry point of view the Crown limits left in this Province today are not worth talking about, just not worth talking about. There are sawmills closing down because the limits that they have been given on Crown lands by Forestry cannot sustain their operations. Yet we have five million to seven million cords of budworm infested timber on the paper companies' limits that the paper companies, in fairness to them, cannot utilize. They cannot use it. Even operating at top production they cannot utilize it.

Mr. Speaker, a reason for the House to stay open: we have had presented to Cabinet the reports of the three committees set up to advise government

MR. FLIGHT: whether we should go into another spray programme this year based on the results of last year's spray programme. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, the reports are about three months late, three months overdue. The Minister of the Environment went to a public meeting in Grand Falls and stood up long before he had the report he did not have the report; he may have been briefed on what would be in the report; he may have been advised what might have been in it - but he stood up and he said, 'I want to assure the people of Grand Falls and Newfoundland that the matacil spray in the spray programme had no effect on the environment, did not kill an insect, did not kill a shrew, did not kill a mouse. There are no people dead,' he said, three months after the spray programme. That is how responsible the Minister of the Environment was with regard to the fears of the people in this Province as to what a spray programme might do, what the long-term damage to our environment or to the ecology of this Province would mean. He stood up and blithely said, 'Nobody is dead,' three months after the spray programme had taken place. Well, Mr. Speaker. if the spray programme did not kill an insect, if there was no indication that it killed anything, then I would have to presume that it did not kill the budworm either. I mean, the budworm is not immune. Every other insect in our forests that the matacil has no effect on, certainly if they would survive why would not the budworm survive?

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Environment is not being honest with the people of Newfoundland. We are not getting the full extent, we are not getting the truth of the possible effects of a spray programme on the ecology of this Province. The Minister of Forestry stood up here last year on three or four occasions and tried to ridicule the Opposition by



MR. FLIGHT: naming the five or six agencies of the federal government that test pesticides and insecticides. And we had the spectacle about a month ago of a representative of the federal government saying, 'The only thing we know about the effects of matacil is what the manufacturer of matacil tells us.' The only thing that the people who are using matacil know about the long-term or short-term effects of matacil on the environment, or what the possibilities are for damage to the ecology is what the manufacturer of that chemical tells them. So in effect, Mr. Speaker, this Province now has become a guinea pig for the manufacturers of pesticides. Four or five or six or seven years down the road we will not need the manufacturers to

MR. FLIGHT: tell the federal government or the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment here what the effects of matacil were, we will all know it. But that is the way we will know it, we will know it as quick as the licencing agency knows it.

MR. NEARY: Get them back in the House, 'Graham!' Call a quorum.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment has resigned; I realize that he is not here. It is the official policy I want to talk about. Call a quorum, 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

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

We have a quorum.

The member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I heard the Minister of Housing - I suppose he is the Minister of Housing at this stage, although the department have not been created - muttering about bringing in his housing bill. Well, I can tell the minister if ever there was a can of worms opened in this House wait until the bill comes in to establish the Department of Housing. If the minister is interested in seeing a can of worms opened in this House, wait until the minister brings in his bill to establish a Department of Housing.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been a member I have heard people in the Province say, Who is the minister of such and such a department? or what is such and such a department? But I never heard anyone say until that minister was appointed why a minister of housing? We went through the spectacle last Fall of the Premier standing up there and appointing a Chairman of the Newfoundland - taking probably the best civil servant of this Province, the then Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, and appointing him Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. Within a very short period of time we get a Cabinet shuffle and we have the then Minister of Tourism - the Minister of Tourism who increased, put up the

February 15, 1979

Tape 408 (Night)

PK - 2

Mr. Flight: fee to go into parks from \$1.50 to \$2.50 and justified it by saying, "We want to keep our tourists out of our Provincial parks." It was obvious,

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, he could not have been kept in that department. Mr. Speaker, he could not have been kept in some of the other departments he passed through either. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose when the minister stands up he is going to explain to us how it is that we have a housing policy in this Province administered by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing that can allow a tenant to go \$4,000 in arrears in rent, a person in this Province living in a subsidized rental unit go into arrears over \$4,000 and then officials of his department walk in, and that person probably on social assistance, walk in and serve an eviction notice on that person to either pay up within a given period of time, thirty days, or evacuate that house. Now the minister will have to explain that when he tries to justify the setting up of such a department.

MR. HICKEY: Do you want me to explain right now?

AN HON. MEMBER: When he is Premier.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Yes, when he is Premier. When he is Premier.

MR. S. NEARY: We are doing the best we can. We are sending the balance in.

MR. G. FLIGHT: He will have to explain to us what he is going to do about the situation where at any given time in Newfoundland - Windsor, for example - we can have houses vacant for as high as four months with no revenue coming in, and fifty to sixty applications from people who desperately needs housing. He is going to have to explain how that can exist -

MR. HICKEY: What department are you talking about?

MR. G. FLIGHT: I am talking about the one that you have been muttering about getting established.

MR. HICKEY: The Department of Housing.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Newfoundland and Labrador Housing.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, the department you are taking over.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Yes. And I would presume when the minister gets up to justify why a Department of Housing is necessary -

MR. S. NEARY: Which you are now operating illegally.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - why the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation could not continue on. He will tell how it is a tenant -

MR. S. NEARY: Operating illegally. What he is doing is illegal.

MR. G. FLIGHT: He will tell us how many eviction notices, the minister will tell us, I presume -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right now he is just interested in the leadership.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right. Well, the Minister of Justice confirmed it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The minister will tell us how many eviction notices -

MR. S. NEARY: He is operating illegally.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - how many eviction notices has been served on tenants of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing this past six months? Would the minister bring that figure? He should, he is the minister. That is the type of thing we need a department for.

MR. S. NEARY: Put them all out in the street.

MR. HICKEY: Make up your mind. Do you want a Department of Housing?

MR. G. FLIGHT: We want a Department of Housing properly administered but we have no confidence that it will be administered any better than it would have been under the

MR. G. FLIGHT: present set up now that we know who the minister is.

MR. HICKEY: Let me put my hon. friend on the spot. Do you want a Department of Housing?

MR. G. FLIGHT: We want a Department of Housing that we can have confidence in.

MR. S. NEARY: We want it operated legally.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - and if ever there was a lack of confidence of the Newfoundland people in a housing policy in this Province, it was the day that the Department of Housing was created under the present ministership; a total lack of confidence in Newfoundland and Labrador Housing ever serving any meaningful purpose. The one thing the minister did do since he has been appointed is to blame Ottawa for the housing problems in this Province. He wants to forget that it is officials of his department who administer the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. The regional offices he set up around the Province, the people that go out to these regional offices and talk to tenants who are in desperate need of housing and treat them like dirt, tell them that they will be in to allocate a house next week and shows up three months after and that person drives up and down every day and watches that house being empty and then watches the kids freezing to death in a shack.

MR. S. NEARY: What about Labrador West? Tell us about that.

MR. HICKEY: That is where the department is trying straighten a few things out.

MR. S. NEARY: What about Labrador West?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Was not the minister aware, was not the Premier aware, was not the Cabinet aware of what has been going on in Newfoundland and Labrador Housing this past five years? Is that what you are saying? That is par for the course.

MR. HICKEY: That is a Crown Corporation.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The ministry of this Province is out of touch with what is going on in the department, totally out of touch.

MR. HICKEY: That is not a department, my friend.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The Minister of Mines and Energy - member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) should be interested in this little comment - the minister in debating the Estimates when this House approved two hundred million dollars borrowing power for Newfoundland Hydro, the minister got up and justified that \$100 million of it - I am sorry. \$200 million was approved borrowing authority for the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and \$100 million was justified for funding the Lower Churchill project. I have been advised as recently as this past few days that Newfoundland Hydro has not completed a feasibility study on the Upper Salmon and we have given them the authority to borrow \$100 million to fund the project and the feasibility study is not even completed.

MR. HICKEY: And you are blaming that on Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, I see.

MR. G. FLIGHT: No, I am blaming that on

MR. FLIGHT: another Crown corporation. They are just as much out of touch with what is going on in Hydro as the minister and the Premier and the ministry is out of touch with what is going on in Crown corporations.

MR. NEARY: Well, what happened in Labrador West?

MR. FLIGHT: They are out of touch. If you wanted to phrase, if you wanted to put in perspective one of the big problems of this administration and the ministry it is that they are out of touch with what is going on in this Province and they give the impression to the people they could not care less. What I see happening in housing, what I see happening in Hydro, what I see happening in the Department of Social Services just points to the fact that this ministry, totally, collectively, have lost touch with the departments they are administrating and this Province is being run by the bureaucrats and civil servants.

MR. HICKEY: What department are you talking about? I do not even have one.

MR. FLIGHT: No, and if I had anything to do with it the minister would not have one, and the minister might not have one. Of course, the minister can be Premier. I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, since I am given so much flack by that minister that after 12:00 midnight or 1:00 A.M. you cannot get delegates to attend a leadership convention after that hour of the night because that minister did not show up in the House until something around 12:00. And his colleague, his seatmate, the Minister of Tourism, publicly said in the House that there was no way he was going to be in the House if the rest of the candidates were out soliciting support. And sure enough, the Minister of Tourism arrived around 12:05 A.M. But I have to admire the Minister of



MR. FLIGHT: Industrial Development.  
All night tonight he sat through it. He put the affairs of the Province first and he wanted to hear what was being said.

MR. NEARY: He has it sewn up, you see.

MR. FLIGHT: He has it sewn up and he knows it. And he looks at the competition, the minister now who is spouting back and forth across, and he says, 'Why should I go out? Why bother?'

MR. DOODY: Because I might win.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the Minister of Tourism come in and explain to the people of this House - and it is not a great earth shattering thing - but I would like to have it explained as to why the people in Newfoundland who applied for big game licences in the early Spring and were unsuccessful still had not received their money, \$20, back from this Province three months after they had applied? The moose season was opened: Why? Is that a way the Province has of raising short-term loans, no-interest short-term loans? And that minister tells us how efficient he is going to be in Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Now you really sold me. I am totally convinced as to why the House should continue in session for a whole week after all the reasons just given.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Premier.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Premier. Yes, Mr. Premier.  
Come over and join us, Mr. Premier.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people in this Province concerned. You know, to people who apply for moose licences, twenty bucks is a lot of money to them. They are all average people. They want the licence to kill a moose for meat, not for a trophy, and they can use the \$20. And they send it in and then they wait three months to get that \$20 back from this Province. That is a disgrace.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Absolutely.

MR. FLIGHT: And where is the Minister of Tourism that he cannot come to the House and explain why it is? Maybe there is a logical explanation. I doubt it.

MR. NEARY: He is down in Bonavista, I suppose, looking after his interests. Flying in a helicopter.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Buying up copies of the Daily News.

MR. FLIGHT: Another question for the Minister of Forestry, and if he does not intend to tell us tonight he can tell us in a press release tomorrow. The federal government have just committed \$236 million to help the forest industries of this country and it has already been allocated in some provinces - the provinces that knew, I guess, how to get the allocation and nail down what they would get and knew how to negotiate with Ottawa. Quebec gets \$90 million, Ontario gets \$46 million, \$60 million goes to the Atlantic Provinces. Now will the minister get up and tell us what Newfoundland's allocation of that \$60 million is?

MR. NEARY: Zilch.

MR. FLIGHT: Does the minister know at this stage? Is the minister negotiating with Mr. Lessard? Does he know how much of that \$60 million we are going to get and how we are going to spend it? The minister looks at us, reads his book. Forestry goes down the drain.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is another Premier, I believe.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right, another leadership candidate.

MR. NEARY: The incredible hulk.

MR. FLIGHT: Forest industry goes down the drain. Ottawa is up there begging us to take money, \$236 million for the forest industry.

MR. W. N. ROWE: They say 'Moore's' is getting back in the race again.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, I would not blame him.

MR. RIDEOUT: He is starting to look better every day.

MR. FLIGHT: If the Premier were in here he would probably confirm there may be some truth to the fact that he may be put back into the race.

MR. NEARY: Start a 'Draft Moore's' movement.

MR. FLIGHT: Except for the candidacy of the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, the Premier would have no choice but to come back -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: - and offer himself again.  
He would have no choice.

MR. NEARY: We have to get a townie in charge of her and we are on our way.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word about this fire investigation situation. I had a stadium in the district that I represent in Windsor and Mr. Cardoulis, the fire commissioner, came out to Windsor, walked into a stadium that can seat 1500 people, and said that as of then only 150 people are all that are allowed in this stadium because of various potential fire hazards that exist in this stadium. And he said 200 people, including the hockey players, that was it. There was no negotiation, nothing; he laid down the law. And the authorities operating the stadium accepted his authority and shut down the stadium and confined it to 150 people. That is a very simple thing compared to a major fire. But how is it if Mr. Cardoulis is not competent to investigate a fire, if he does not know what he is talking about, how is it that he is competent to come out and close down a public building in this Province? What is going to happen - and the issue was raised here today - what is going to happen to the people who are serving probably jail sentences in this Province right now on arson charges, charges that were laid and confirmed by the same people who, a few days ago we were told by a magistrate in this Province, were incompetent.

MR. NEARY: Every one of them should be reviewed.

MR. FLIGHT: Will there be a review on every case that had been convicted of arson in this Province, convictions based on the evidence given by the Mr. Cardoulis and his staff?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Farrell and Mr. Sparkes.

MR. FLIGHT: It is worth thinking about, is it not? Is that not worth thinking about?

MR. NEARY: Every one of them should be reviewed.

MR. FLIGHT: If any hon. member of this House today was serving time -

MR. MARSHALL: They are not the only ones that should be reviewed and will be reviewed.

MR. FLIGHT: Fine, But if any hon. member in this House today was paying off a heavy fine as a result of a conviction, a conviction that was brought about based on evidence presented by the fire commissioners in this Province, or if any member of this hon. House had a brother or a son or a father or himself serving time in jail on an arson charge, and that conviction came about based on testimony given by the people in this Province responsible for investigating arson, how would they be feeling? What would they be thinking now? Would they be saying, My God! They convicted me, that magistrate convicted me, that judge convicted me based on the evidence given by the people whom this Province have appointed and given the authority to, but now we are told those people - you know, there is such a thing as innocent people being in jail based on the testimony of witnesses brought in, expert witnesses. We may have, it is not inconceivable to think that we may have people serving time for arson in this Province.

MR. NEARY: The member just told us that they are all going to be reviewed.

MR. FLIGHT: It has got nothing to do, nothing at all to do and I have no desire to bring up the situation that brought this on but it is a fact of life. If ever the people of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling it is not going to be nice, it probably is going to be dirty, but I have a feeling that before this issue is over it is going to become a very, very emotional issue in this Province, it is going to become a very emotional issue in this House. People are not going to be proud of the positions they are going to have to take.

MR. NEARY: Undermining the administration of justice.

MR. FLIGHT: But the position will have to be taken, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Buddy is getting out. He does not care.

MR. FLIGHT: No, Mr. Speaker, you will not get the question yet for a minute.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell about the Howley road.

MR. FLIGHT: You should be ashamed to hear of the Howley road. Where is the Minister of Education? Let me tell the House about the performance of one of their prize ministers, the fellow that has been spouting off all night about grade XII. He goes to his district in Howley, the little town of Howley he represents, and he runs around Howley telling everyone who will listen to him that he recognizes that the most important that could happen to Howley would be the Buchans-Howley road. He tell them that the Hinds Lake project, the jobs they are getting now are short-term, they are only two years and when Hinds Lake is finished Howley will go back flat again with no economy, but if they could get the Buchans-Howley road it would mean passing trade, it would mean the basis of an economy for Howley. He says that in Howley, but what does that minister say in Cabinet? Has he ever stood up publicly and said that we should build the Buchans - Howley road?

MR. FLIGHT: Talk about weaseling ministers!

MR. RIDEOUT: Another 'Morgan.'

MR. FLIGHT: Talk about weaseling ministers. That is what I call weaseling, when a member goes out to his district and says one thing and comes in this House and has not got the gumption to stand up and say it then.

MR. RIDEOUT: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Or has not got the gumption to say it in Cabinet. Or if he has the gumption, he obviously has not got the ear of the Premier. He obviously has not got the clout that is required.

MR. HOUSE: I will say it here tonight.

MR. FLIGHT: Say it here tonight?

MR. HOUSE: Sure.

MR. FLIGHT: The press is not around. At least we will respect him. At least the members of the House will respect him. There is no press here. The Premier could not care less, he is leaving in a couple of months.

MR. NEARY: They are all bailing out finally.

MR. FLIGHT: And he can support whoever he wants to for the leadership. Say it tonight.

MR. NEARY: The ones that are not running are quitting.

MR. RIDEOUT: They are listening, 'Graham'. The press are listening.

MR. FLIGHT: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not bothering him. It is also not bothering him that he cannot stand up in this House and explain to the people of this Province what he is going to do about the school busing situation, how it is that he, the great educator, allows kindergarten students to be bused twenty-one miles in this Province. Twenty-one miles! Kindergarten students, leaving home at eight o'clock in the morning and arriving at five.

MR. HOUSE: Where?

MR. FLIGHT: I told you before where. You know where.

MR. RIDEOUT: The school boards are bankrupt.

MR. FLIGHT: Too bad we did not bring in a bill to bring television into this House. Too bad we have not got television in this House, too bad we have not got television in this House.

MR. HOUSE: Not in Howley.

MR. FLIGHT: That is the responsibility of the minister.

MR. HOUSE: Not in Howley?

MR. FLIGHT: No, not in Howley.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. FLIGHT: In Buchans Junction, twenty-one miles over the worst road in this Province, kindergarten students, you should be ashamed of it.

MR. HOUSE: That is your board!

MR. FLIGHT: "That is your board! That is your board!"

Pass the buck. What has the minister got anything to say about in this Province on education? I have never heard him accept any responsibility for anything in the education field in this House since he has been the Minister of Education. He has not accepted the responsibility for one aspect of education in this Province, from busing, to curriculum, to capital expenditure, to nothing.

MR. HOUSE: Total curriculum.

MR. FLIGHT: No nothing.

MR. NEARY: He is very weak and indecisive.

MR. FLIGHT: What purpose that Minister of Education in this Province serves is a question.

MR. RIDEOUT: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Weakling.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, he did. Yes. And I thank the minister very much. He did. Yes. And it was increased from \$30,000 to \$40,000.

Who is going next? I am out of time.



MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, if the House would permit me, I would just say that this House should stay open. The issues are there and the people want the issues debated and decisions made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, first, before I begin my few remarks, I would like to associate myself with the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) in extending our best wishes to the hon. the Premier and his family on the eve of his retirement from politics. I have known the hon. Premier all my lifetime. We grew up together in our part of Conception Bay and we did become very close friends. In our school days we played hockey opposite each other. We played for the Carbonear school there and we played for Bay Roberts and in that way we began to know him and knew his family quite well and I want to associate myself with these remarks expressing best wishes to him and to his family.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot support the closing of this House at this time. I have been associated with leadership conventions this last ten to fifteen years, and I know what a convention is and the details involved. I remember very distinctly I suppose the biggest convention that was ever held in Newfoundland and that was in 1970 or '71. I know I was involved with that, deeply involved with it, and I am sure time could be found to attend the duties of this House and at the same time be closely associated with running a convention.

I was responsible at that time - you have heard so much about the running of slates - I was the person responsible who brought the idea of slates to the convention. I had the idea twelve years ago and I gave the idea to Mr. Smallwood.

MR. DAWE: I think that was the biggest influence that made him run for the leadership at that time. Like I say, I know what conventions are, I know what is entailed in conventions, and I do not think the people of Newfoundland will accept this as a reason to close the House just because the convention is going to be held. And as I said, I am sure that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and all the hon. members of this House could enter into an honourable agreement with the other members on the other side of the House and time would be provided to the various candidates to visit the various districts for the next two or three weeks and I am sure that no member on this side would want to take advantage and embarrass the government while they are preparing for their convention. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the closing of this House at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: I would like to comment on a few things that I think bear some comment from me, at least as far as I see them, and I would like to first refer to the proposed superport in Harbour Grace. My district is a neighbouring district of Harbour Grace and naturally I feel happy for the people of Harbour Grace that such a development is going to take place. But, Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations with the development of Harbour Grace. I do not think it is going to be proved practical. I do not think that it is going to be a financial success. And if it is a financial success it will be only at the expense of the other neighbouring fish plants. I do not think for one minute that we can support that type of development on the East Coast of Newfoundland without seriously affecting the existing plants.

As I understand it, the idea is to bring in large shipments of fish, then process it, and then at the same time truck this fish in the off seasons to all parts of the Province of Newfoundland. And I will say, Mr. Speaker, to move that fish, say,

MR. DAWE: from Harbour Grace to St. Anthony would cost in the vicinity of \$30 a ton truckage, at least \$30 a ton. And that will apply to the West Coast and will apply to parts of the South Coast and I just do not see it. Probably time will prove that we are wrong. Time may prove that we are wrong but I have associated with a company that has been involved these last few years in moving bulk cargo in large quantities and what we have found, the cheapest way, the most economical way, is to bring your product nearest to the delivery point. And I would suggest it would be better for the government to consider establishing freezing plants in the large fishing centres that we have at present. I would suggest that something should be done probably to enlarge the freezing facilities at St. Anthony. We can move down then to the East Coast, then probably somewhere - Notre Dame Bay, some section, say, of Fogo Island, in that general area and move on then to Bonavista and probably we could have a larger development in Harbour Grace. I say we should have some development in Harbour Grace but not to the extent that would make it the one port and we could move around then, probably somewhere in St. Mary's Bay, and we know all the facilities at Argentia and then some, probably in Hermitage Bay, and we are well within the development of

Mr. Dawe: the fishery in Channel-Port aux Basques and up to Port aux Choix. I would say that would be the safest, in my honest opinion, for fishery development in Newfoundland. Now time may prove us wrong, and the thing in Harbour Grace may be the best thing for the Province. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is only time will tell.

We have had quite a discussion here tonight regarding power cost, power as it relates to the ordinary individual and power as it relates to the Upper Churchill. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to stand here in this House tonight, I will be the only person, and say how glad I was to be a part of a government that developed the Upper Churchill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: In my judgment, Sir, although we know the contract as it is today is not in the best interest of Newfoundland, but be that as it may, Sir, the Upper Churchill took eleven years to be developed, and anything that took eleven years to develop was no giveaway at that time. I am sure it would not take eleven days to develop the Lower Churchill today if you could sell the power for three mils. The power at that time was expensive at three mils. And the unfortunate thing in the contract was it was not foreseen that some opening clause was provided.

But if the government at the time had looked for a better position - who knows? Probably the Upper Churchill may never have been developed and the water may be still running over rocks as it did for thousands of years. So as I look at the Upper Churchill, it is not a giveaway. If you had a mine, when the mine is exhausted and of no benefit to the Province, I say that is a giveaway; but the Upper Churchill you have the water running, still going to run and run forever. And I say we have an asset in this Province today. the replacement costs would be at least \$5 billion. And even if we have to go to the extreme, even to the length of the contract - what is fifty years in the life of a Province? - then we will have an asset that will be worth billions of dollars at some time in the future, cheap electrical

Mr. Dawe: power that cannot be replaced.

And I would suggest one course of action, in my view, that could be taken. I am not familiar with all of the legal ramifications that may be implied, and maybe there are stumbling blocks that might be impossible to do anything with the contract, but as I see it the only sensible approach that could be justified, in my opinion, something that would be acceptable by the bondholders of the bonds, something that would be accepted by the Canadian people, and something that will be accepted by the people of Newfoundland and that is to say that I would try to draw back from the Upper Churchill power as is required by this Province. I would not think, even give it a thought, of developing the Lower Churchill at this time. Thirty mil power is not cheap. Thirty mil power cannot be sold tomorrow. Thirty mil power will only fetch what the market can bear. And thirty mil power is the general price anywhere in Canada today. So to sell the Lower Churchill it has got to be cheap, otherwise you can only get what the market can bear.

But with the Upper Churchill we have three mil power already in place in Newfoundland, and I would say that if a schedule were drawn up,

Mr. Dawe: advanced notice given to all those concerned - to the holders of the bonds, to Hydro-Quebec, and to CFLCo - and say, "Okay, in two years time or three years time we are going to draw back so many megawatts or so many horsepower. We are going to sell this and use this in Newfoundland for the benefit of the Newfoundland people," and they you would be supported all across Canada in that regard. I do not think we can change the contract to look for more money; the contract was signed at the time and that was the position at the time that everyone thought was a good contract.

But I think in the national interest, in the interest of this Province, if the government could come up with a schedule to draw back that power and use that power to be sold and consumed in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, for the benefit of Newfoundland and Labrador, I think that would be accepted and the government would be applauded for it. This would be an inducement to heavy industry to come here, especially with the heavy consumption of electricity to be used, as I understand, in the process of some type of sulphite or sulphur, to develop the wood industry on the Labrador, possibly sometime in the future to develop the iron and steel industry in Labrador and at the same time, once it was brought to Newfoundland, to buy cheap electrical power for the foreseeable future for the people of Newfoundland.

And I think that if I were in charge, the sole person, this is the direction I would be working in. I would try that and I would say to Hydro-Quebec, I would say to the bondholders, "Take us to court. We are doing this in the interest of the people of Newfoundland. We are living up to our contract, but the price of energy is gone so much this last few years, and we cannot afford to develop the Lower Churchill and have our people say thirty mils for their power when we have already in place in Newfoundland three mil power."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: I would like to mention as well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the principle of some assistance to our senior

Mr. Dawe: citizens in the cost of their drugs. I would like to see when the House opens again that some measure will be brought forward, if possible, to assist these people. We all know the hardships they have been placed in. I have been called upon many times to ask the welfare people, the Department of Welfare, to grant some of these people a welfare medical card. These people just cannot afford to buy these drugs on their meager pensions. I think one of the most humane things this House could do when the House convenes, the next leader, whoever he may be on the other side - probably the hon. member who is sitting there now may be the next leader - and I would suggest to him that one of the most humane things you could do is to bring in some sort of a measure, if possible, to relieve these people of this hardship. It is a hardship.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: And I would make that appeal to all members on both sides of this House to give this their most serious consideration in the next session, or the next session of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I think I should refer to a few items within my district; the district itself on the whole is in very prosperous condition. The fishery has been good, the fish plant at Port de Grave had been active last year, the crab plant at Bareneed has been very active, the fishermen got good prices for their fish, they did well with the herring, they did well with the squid, and did well with the mackerel. Business itself is expanding. We have new businesses opening up practically every day - some sort of wholesalers, retailers, loan companies. We have four banks today within the district of Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: A total, I would say of about seventy people are working in the banks in the district of Port de Grave. It is almost amazing actually the business activity that is there. We have some of the largest wholesalers in the Province. Housing construction is maintained at a high level. We have a ready-mix concrete business in the district, one of the largest and most efficient block plants East of Montreal, and they have sufficient work to keep nine mixer trucks busy for nine or ten months of the year. It is amazing that so much activity is going on in the general area, I cite that as an example, to show how much construction and general construction work - housing, business extensions and other things of this nature - to show that these trucks can be kept so busy in the field of concrete distribution.

Schools are at high standard.

There is only two, I suppose, needs I can say -

MR. NEARY: We lack a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Quorum call.

Order, please! I am informed

the quorum is present. Hon. Member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: I was just beginning to make a few remarks as it pertains to my district and one particular need I think I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Communication and Transportation, and that is the condition of the roads of the Roaches Line Access Road. I have mentioned this before here in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I say, as I said before, I doubt if any access road in Newfoundland, except probably two or three that I can think of, probably between Buchans - not Buchans, Grand Falls and Botwood and two or three other roads in Newfoundland more travelled than the Roaches Line Access Road. I would say if the minister did a count on the Arterial Road here in St. John's, on which \$30 or \$40 million is going to be spent, he would not have a bigger traffic count than on the Roaches Line Access Road. It is narrow -

MR. LUSH: It is dangerous



MR. DAWE:

- especially in the winter time -

MR. LUSH:

The Minister of Health knows

about that.

MR. DAWE:

- and if some way could be found even

to straighten the curves, there is no shoulder on the road, there have been two or three bad accidents there this Winter. There are two or three bad accidents every Winter and I point out to the minister that if he did a traffic count on that road, Sir, and did a traffic count on the Arterial Road he would be surprised in the number of cars, the number of vehicles, travelling and here is this road, all down through the years, traffic hazards, dangerous and nothing has been done about it, and yet we spend \$30 - \$40 million on a road here in St. John's. And this can be relieved two ways; if the road into Hodgewater Line - it is six miles that need to be paved - if the rest of that section was paved and straightened this would greatly relieve the traffic on Roaches Line especially for the traffic going West. We are just a few miles from the Access Road to Argentia, quite a few of the trucks that bring fish and other produce into Conception Bay use that road, especially in the winter time, and then quite a few of the wholesalers and other people travelling West, let us say, use that road. They would use that road but they go through, most of them, Roaches Line because all of that is paved and this section of Hodgewater Line is not paved and I am sure that

MR. DAWE: I speak not only for my own district but for the district of Harbour Grace, the district of Carbonear and the district of Bay de Verde. These four districts that use this road continuously would appreciate it as much as the people of my own district, and I would like to bring this to the attention of the minister to see if something can be done in his programme this coming season. And I speak for all in saying that they would appreciate it if something could be done with either one of these roads this year. It is not for me, it is not personal or political in any way, but something drastically needs to be done with this road and I would like for the minister to give this some really serious consideration and see if something can be done with it.

MR. LUSH: It is all done with DREE funds.

MR. DAWE: In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to again say that I think the House should have been kept open. Ways and means could have been found, and I am sure the government or the other members on the other side would not have been in an embarrassing position. We realize that the convention has to be held. It is a normal democratic process, and we would work closely with the members on the other side to make certain that they could carry on the duties of the House and at the same time give all the candidates opportunity to make their views known to the different delegates and to arrange for their leadership convention.

And in closing I say,  
Mr. Speaker, I want to associate my remarks with the hon. the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) in extending my best wishes to the Premier and his family on his retirement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for  
Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my forty-five minutes worth to the debate. I think it is a very important debate we have entered upon. I never thought I would ever see the day when I would have to stand on my feet at around 4:00 A.M., which I am sure the medical profession will confirm is the weakest time you are! I think you will find that that probably is when most people give up the ghost. I do not intend to give up the ghost unless the axe falls, and I am still here. It is an old dog for a hard road, they say, and a young bitch for the gulches. I hope there will not be too many gulches in my forty-five minutes.

I am not particularly thrilled with the fact that we have

MR. J. WINSOR: to be talking at this time in the morning about this thing against closing the House. The fact that the hon. member from Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) who always votes according to his conscience and never is swayed by any other thing only his conscience, agrees with us. I am very happy to hear him say so. He certainly brought out some very important points in connection with his district which is, like mine, predominately fish. I think that is his great concern; it is mine. I feel that the punishment inflicted on the other side tonight is self-inflicted. I am very much surprised that they have been so - I do not think it is quiescent and I am sure they are not struck dumb, but I do not believe there is much fight left in them. They had better get some more fight into them if they are going into a leadership convention. It seems like they have given up and that is sad, because a one-sided fight is no good. We have had very little comeback from the other side. I am surprised at that. They do not deserve too much sympathy because obviously they must have known when they decided to drop the axe and say we are only going to be open for three or four hours and then close and then we are going to enter into our most important leadership convention. We did not need a month and a half for a leadership convention and I do not think the PC party needs a month and a half for a leadership convention. A couple of weeks, as suggested by one of my colleagues earlier on yesterday, a couple of weeks, a week before or a week and ten days after, fine. I think that is the way they should have gone rather than expect us to be so quite and, as I said before, quiescent to their wishes of having a shotgun opening and closing, bang!

My constituents feel, and I have discussed this with a number of them, they could not understand what the planning was - and of course they never could. Nobody in my district could ever understand that kind of an operation. Why now is the Premier resigning? Not why, they knew why, but they do not know why at this

MR. J. WINSOR: particular time. They have known all along that all was not well in the government circle. They have done those things which they ought not to have done and they have left undone those things which they should have done, too many of them. And even though my people do not get the daily papers and follow the news and the goings on in St. John's, which they consider, and I do not like to think of it-as a parasite city, It is a terrible condemnation of what goes on in here. I think we all would have been better off if the seat of government, for instance, had been in Gander. Gander might have been in closer touch with the people in the rest of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. If my people on the South Coast feel isolated from the seat of government, what in the name of heaven must the people in Labrador feel?

MR. MCNEIL: You should go on the West Coast and see how they feel.

MR. J. WINSOR: And the West Coast. The West Coast most certainly feel the same as we do on our coast. We feel that there is a definite need for this House to be open. There are too many issues unresolved. Our people are suffering intensely. They see the cost of living going skyhigh. We cannot blame all that on this government, it is a worldwide state of affairs, but a capable, concerned provincial government of Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. J. WINSOR: can do things to relieve this pressure somewhat. In the area of light and power rates; they have gone to the point of being criminal impositions on our people that are more than they are ever going to be able to cope with. They were nurtured in the early stages to make their homes totally electric because power was cheaper than oil. There is not an awful lot of difference today, but I can assure you that the cost of both light and power and oil have gone up in astronomical jumps. Even where I live on an island, an isolated island, I would say about sixty per cent of the homes are totally electric. Fortunately for the people in Gaultois in particular, there is no unemployment. Everybody is working. But it is still a big drag to pay a light bill of \$150 a month. They are going to have to cut back on their food or clothing or something like that.

MR. NEARY: If my colleague would permit, I would call a quorum to get hon. members out of bed again for a few minutes, to go to the bathroom.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: A quorum call, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not aware that the hon. member has finished speaking. The hon. member still has the floor.

MR. J. WINSOR: I request a quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): It has been brought to my attention that a quorum is now present.

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I presume that the dry speeches are boring to the gentlemen opposite and they have to go have a nap to recover from it. However, as I said they brought it upon themselves.

I was in the area of high rates on light and power. And high drug costs, I run into this very much in my district with the old age pensioners. Some of them

MR. J. WINSOR: have drug bills as high as \$70 each, and \$140 out of your old age pension is tough. It is tough, I do not care how you look at it, and there is quite a bit of this. Social assistance does not certainly meet with the requirements of our people at this time. It is certainly a sad situation. The widows, I think, of all people that I meet in my district who are in real trouble, dire distress are young widows especially who are left with a large family and a home to keep up just cannot make it; they are in trouble all the time. These are things that our government, I am sure, are looking at. What they can do about it I do not know; apparently they cannot do very much. There is always too little money for that but there is still a lot of money for things that are probably not as important as keeping people alive and well and happy. There are many things that the government could do to improve the conditions around this Island Province of ours and I am sure in Labrador. I think it was my colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) who mentioned a well designed programme for the development of communities where employment is non-existent, there just is not anything for them to do. There are not all that many communities like that, but there are certainly some, and a good development programme which is supposed to be in force but I cannot see too much evidence of it when I travel in other areas. People do not have anything to do, therefore they have to go on social assistance. So it is costing the government anyway, whichever way you look at it. Handicrafts could be developed, farming has not been developed to the extent that it should be. I think our great strength lies in the three "F's", fisheries, farming and the forests. These three programmes, resources, huge resources, are not being properly developed. To get lumber to build a wharf in Gaultois, get lumber enough to put a new top on a wharf, took three months to get and we right along side one of the largest sawmills, I suppose, in Newfoundland - which

MR. J. WINSOR:                    apparently was an error in planning, I am sure it was. I remember when it was not there I saw the electrical plans for it in a certain place and I was amazed at the size of the sawmill that was going to be built in Bay d' Esprit. I do know that a certain company had invited Irving to fly over the area and his woods expert - who no doubt was an expert, not a novice - declared there was not enough timber there to support the mill, which was not owned by Bowaters, but the mill still went ahead and we all know what happened to it. They are still trying to get it back on its feet but you are to have to ask Bowaters or Price. Bowaters I think it was owned most of the land there - timber rights, rather - and until that timber is freed up that sawmill is a white elephant and I think that was poor planning. I do not know what rule of expediency dictated to the government - who certainly must have known about these things. As a matter of fact, I am positive they knew about these things - but they still went ahead and I am sure the Minister of Industrial Development, who is no fool by any means, a very wise man, a very straightforward person: as somebody has said before several times, when you get an answer from him it is usually straight from the shoulder, sticks with his promises as far as I am concerned and I hope the people who follow in his footsteps do the same things. They will get a better reputation that way. Now I refer to some roads work that needs to be done. As a matter of fact, it is mentioned here - I am sure you will recognize that, hon. Sir. I remember it well because this goes back to November 1973, the by-election in Hermitage. Hermitage district then was pure and holy, and in a very



MR. J. WINSOR: compact area from Harbour Breton to Grey River, I think it was, if I am not mistaken, which one could cover very easily.

MR. DOODY: You have a great place to go.

MR. J. WINSOR: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: You have a great place to go.

MR. J. WINSOR: Yes. We always treat people like that regardless of their affiliations. We do not ask them what class, creed, colour, or what church they go to - we could not care less. We treat them as gentlemen, which they were, and I think -

MR. NEARY: The just and unjust alike.

MR. J. WINSOR: Yes. It was a most peculiar situation where the Premier could not get anybody to chair his rally and the outstanding Liberal was asked to do it, which I did with great pleasure.

MR. DOODY: You are a gentleman.

MR. J. WINSOR: And a scholar. And I enjoyed several free drinks and whatever went on there; it was a very enjoyable evening. And I was so naive I stayed with the rally! I heard all of the Premier's promises - I was not a fifth columnist or anything; he knew I was there. The Minister of Mines and Energy was sitting at my elbow, and I do not think he was over pleased by my being there, but I will not hold that against him. "Important study underway in Bay d'Espoir" - now Bay d'Espoir was then in Hermitage district, and I do not want to steal the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir's (Mr. Simmons) thunder; I will be ticked off if I do. "Secondary fish processing." The Minister of Industrial Development knows what happened to that secondary fish processing in Bay d'Espoir - if he does not, I do - it never got off the ground. It would have been a great help for that area, and instead of being a place of high unemployment - very high unemployment in Bay d'Espoir currently - they would have had a little industry going. Now it may not have been too practical in the Wintertime, because as an old fellow once said down our way, "The water gets pretty hard there in the winter." I have seen it eighteen inches thick and we have had to put

Mr. J. Winsor: icebreakers in there, but if there was a fish processing facility there no doubt the federal government would have come to our aid and kept it open. I do not think it would have been the most practical thing in the world.

Then, number two: "Potential for secondary fish species. I assume that would be scallops and mussels, a few shrimp, but not very many. There would not be very much in that. "Agriculture including animal husbandry, poultry production, sheep raising, and root crop production." Well, I suppose we could include that under agriculture, could you not? I believe the top soil in Bay d'Espoir is something like twelve feet and there is not a farm in there big enough to keep cabbage on my table, and I do not eat that much cabbage. So something happened to your major programme in Hermitage district. There is very little farming done there. There is good soil in Bay d'Espoir and on the Bay d'Espoir Highway, excellent farmland, so I have been told by an expert who did a study the same time as he studied the forestry and the fish processing facility. Whatever happened to that?

"All types of tourism." We have not got one type of tourism, let alone all types. You have a job to get there in most parts of the Connaigre Peninsula, which would be an ideal place for tourism. Bay d'Espoir, I do not see any tourism potential in there that has been developed. It is there, but it has not been developed. What a beautiful place for a marina! You could have enough boats and

MR. J. WINSOR: yachts in there. They are great boat builders, they could build the yachts in there, and it would certainly keep a few fellows busy. There are no tourist establishments there - plenty of guides, but all you see is the road lined with camper trailers and so on which brings very little revenue into that particular area.

I do not know why I am going back over these old sores, but I just think we should point out the reasons for the House being open so that we could bring them up and you people could be busy working on them. Boat building, another identifiable project, handicrafts, need for recreational facilities, mineral exploration - I have not heard tell of either one of these being done in there. Well, the reason was fairly obvious, of course, that your P.C. candidate was shot down and then you lost interest, but there are still a lot of P.C. people in all those places that we are talking about. You are accused time and again of showing political favouritism in your distribution of road work and everything else. Well, that is shortsighted policy. They are not all Liberals in my district, there are a few P.C.s there. Most of them were converted P.C.s like some of the members over there. Well, that happens, that is nothing against you. But you forget when you do not do a job on our roads you are also penalizing your P.C. followers and the chances are in the next election you are going to find it out the hard way.

I will go up to another section here where the candidate made this announcement: 'The future plans of the P.C. Government call for the upgrading and paving of the remaining thirty miles of the Bay d'Espoir highway.' That was done. It took you three or four years to do it. That is alright, that is fair enough, and it was

MR. J. WINSOR: mostly federal money - we know that, and it has to be. The paving of roads from Hermitage, Seal Cove, Sandyville and Harbour Breton to connect with the Bay d'Espoir highway - thank God, the federal government and the ex Minister of Transportation, 'Thy will be done,' I hope. I know, obviously, that that is in being. The tenders are out, we are very happy to see it, and it is certainly going to be a great help to that district.

MR. DOODY: What about Seal Cove?

MR. J. WINSOR: I beg your pardon, Sir?

MR. DOODY: We have got to do Seal Cove.

MR. J. WINSOR: Well, if you do not do Seal Cove you are in the worst kind of trouble. I mean, you are not responsible now but you have to talk to the little fellow who sits in front of you. And I think you are the fatherly type, you might do that. Because if we do not do the road to Seal Cove - you know, that road, I do not know how many years old it is but I am sure it must be nearly fifty years old and was built with a pick and shovel, and there is no trouble to know it. You flew over it and you have driven over it and there are bridges there that are - well, they are jerry-rigged, temporary bridges that have never been replaced and they are a hazard, and at the rate that the boys from Seal Cove go home on a Friday night, it is a wonder they do not have some of the curves straightened out, because they are in the woods from Monday to Friday and when they leave the woods on Friday evening you had better believe they are bound for Seal Cove and there are not enough Mouncies to slow them down. And I do not think I need indicate to the hon. member how tough the Seal Cove-ers can be. When they get the bit in their teeth you had better watch out. I always back in there so that I am ready to leave.

February 15, 1979

Tape 422

EC - 3

MR. DOODY: My colleague, the Minister of Justice, has a great influence there.

MR. J. WINSOR: Well, I would not doubt they are not even afraid of the Minister of Justice.

MR. J. WINSOR: I assume when the paving of the Harbour Breton Road is done, it is going to relieve a fair amount of forces that the highways have to upgrade the rest of the roads on the Connaigre Peninsula. And, believe you me, these bad roads, I do not need to point out to anybody in this House of Assembly, are holding up the economic development of the total area. And I presented a brief to the Sullivan Transportation Commission and I made the case very strong for that. I pointed out to them that the economic development of that peninsula was being seriously retarded by the fact that the roads were absolutely impossible and the only time they are fit to drive over is when the member for the district announces through Q Radio or CHCM that he is going to be in the district on a certain day, or a certain two or three days, and then he goes down to Fortune Bay and the roads on the Connaigre Peninsula are already graded. They said, "What happened? You did not come here last week but you said you were coming?" I said, "That was so that the roads would be done when I got there. I do not like beating up my car either." You have to be cute to survive in some situations.

But that is a fact, and it is true, that every time the member says he is going to the district the graders get out and go to work. And I do not say that that is the minister's orders.

MR. RIDEOUT: You should go down more often.

MR. J. WINSOR: I would say that that was a little lower, in the area superintendent's aegis.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. J. WINSOR: It is true. Everybody I suppose in Newfoundland knows that. It is a standing joke.

Well that was back in 1973. Five years hence, "Rural development active here." I do not know how active the

MR. J. WINSOR:

rural development is in there.

Health services - I do not think I should let the hon. Minister of Health get off too lightly. We do have problems in our health services, serious problems. When children from Gaultois and Hermitage, are asked to go to Milltown or St. Alban's to the clinic for anything - dental, or eyes, or whatever - it is a very expensive trip. If it is by taxi it could cost them \$50 for the trip, \$25 in and a long wait, because as everybody knows you just do not get in a doctor's clinic the minute you walk through the door. You are not going to be seen right away.

They have a beautiful clinic in Seal Cove. It is closed up because the doctors we are getting today do not want to travel to Seal Cove, twelve miles. But the doctor expects twenty-five or thirty people, usually women, to travel that twelve miles. How? By taxi. I think it makes more sense for one doctor to drive twelve miles than for thirty people to drive twelve miles. And their husbands are gone with the cars, so it has got to be a taxi fare. It has got to be expensive. And the current system they use for appointments they do not have to wait very long in the local clinic in Seal Cove. They could be in and out, cook dinner, do whatever they have to do, look after the youngsters. They have got a nice clinic, I was in it the other day, and it was closed up because it did not have certain facilities, water and sewerage. And I talked with the local development committee there; they are prepared to put the water and sewage in there but they want the assurance from the Minister of Health that the doctor will go up there.

I know the problems you have with doctors and I am not afraid to say it here where there are a number of doctors around. But I am sure the doctors in St. John's work one heck of a

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 423

NM - 3

MR. J. WINSOR:                   lot harder than the doctor in Hermitage  
or Mose Ambrose works, because the pace for the doctors in St. John's  
is unbelievable and theirs is literally a picnic and I do not think  
any of the medical men here would deny that.



MR. J. WINSOR: The doctor and his wife - I suppose I should not say it but I have got to - they come into Gaultois with masks on; the smell is too much for them. But I wonder if the smell is on the money they take away? I live next door to a meal plant and I cannot smell it, and I do not look like a fellow that is pining away. They have said to the people, "What is wrong with you? Are you crazy, living here?" I think that is a terrible condemnation of the medical profession and I am sure the medical men that I am looking at will agree with me. The smell from St. John's Harbour is a hell of a lot worse than the smell in Gaultois, and I have yet to see a doctor getting out off his car down on the Harbour Drive with a mask on and going into Atlantic Place or anywhere else. That is the kind of stuff we have to put up with. The Minister of Health is certainly hearing me and he knows what I am talking about. I intend to have discussions with him tomorrow: he is a very reasonable man and I am sure he will hear me out. The doctors we get down there now are prima donnas. They were not at one time. They went in their little small boat. They still have that small boat there that takes them to McCallum, that is the only place it takes them, and to Gaultois. It is hardly adequate for McCallum on certain days, but if it is a stormy day he does not go, he does not have to, there is no requirement that he does. But the doctor who was there before was kind of a gruff one, a lady, and she decided she did not want to go to McCallum - and I do not blame her. Most of the women do not like the water that well. She did not particularly want to come to Gaultois but she wanted people to go to Hermitage. And only recently a very up-to-date clinic was built over there with that in mind, which bothers me, because that clinic was built to the standards that it is with the view that people from Gaultois would go over there. I think it is wrong. There are just as many people in Gaultois as there are in Hermitage, but they had a very active committee in Hermitage and they did a great job. The building

MR. J. WINSOR: has a dual purpose; it is not only a clinic but it is a community center of sorts. I think that the Minister of Health should be able to require his doctors to do what the old doctors did, because the doctors today are getting far more money and it is not that tough a job. They have got four days a week to work, that would be all that is necessary— Seal Cove, Hermitage, Gaultois and MacCallum. That is a good week is it not? How you fellows would like a four day week and the rest of the time take it easy. Would that not be marvellous?

Now the one in Mose Ambrose, she is in the middle of a fairly extensive area; she goes nowhere, everybody comes to her. I think that is wrong. It is easier, as I said before, for one person to move the total distance as for the people to have to move and it should be done. That is what they are there for instead of moving people all over the place and costing a fortune in taxi fares from Belleoram to Pools Cove going into Mose Ambrose.

DR. WINSOR: How is dental service?

MR. J. WINSOR: Indifferent in that there is a dentist, I understand, in Harbour Breton. There was. I do not know if he is still there or not. I have asked but I have not gotten much information on it. Otherwise you have to go to Bay d'Espoir. I have had to go in there with my daughter and spend a whole blessed afternoon in Bay d'Espoir because the place was packed. Bay d'Espoir is a pretty wide area and there are a lot of kids coming in for dental care—and others of course, not only kids. But the school children have to lose time off school and so on. I see no reason why a mobile dental outfit could not travel to Gaultois. We have a beautiful clinic there, first class. It has everything that a clinic needs apart from such services as dental services. I think there is a denturist comes in there once in awhile but that is not quite what we want, as I am sure you will agree. There is no trouble for a dentist to come in there with his high pressure equipment. If he has not got a compressor he can be given air if it is that type. There is portable equipment that should be in there. I think this service should be extended to a place that is paying its way like Gaultois is. The

February 13, 1979

Tape No. 424

AH-3

FR. J. WINSOR: tax dollars coming out off Gaultois, if I had them here in front of me and quoted them to you, you would be amazed. Your minimum wage is two-fifty, I think it is, currently, and everybody is hemming and hawing about getting it up to three dollars or something like that. Five dollars an hour

MR. J. WINSOR: is the wage in the fish plant in Gaultois, that is a long ways,

AN HON. MEMBER: Who gets that much?

MR. J. WINSOR: That is for young girls in the packing room, Cutters are getting a little more than that; I do not know the exact rate at the moment. That is not small wages. They have not got much to spend their money on really because, you know, what is there? They have very few movies to go to, the odd one, and they have no shopping malls to coax the dollars out of them. But they have everything that they need apart from a ferry service so that they can get back and forth from Hermitage. The three places, McCallum, Gaultois and Hermitage, should be connected by a ferry service. And I am blessed - anybody want me to stop?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. J. WINSOR: Because if they do, I will go on a little longer.

MR. NEARY: An excellent speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. WINSOR: Thank you, gentlemen.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave you can carry on for another hour.

MR. J. WINSOR: Thank you. Well, the money is there, plenty of it; there is nobody out of work. I do not think there is one case of able bodied relief and that is in Gaultois. It could be in Hermitage the same way, and any community around this Island with careful, thoughtful planning, develop their natural skills that they have in every one of these places, but there does not seem to be a cohesive plan to tackle this. We hear about action line and all the rest of the crap, and to me it means nothing only a telephone call and when I see the big chief of action line up in Toronto or Philadelphia announcing a hockey game, I wonder what goes on. However, to get back to my district and the things I should be talking about, I have mentioned the health services, the different things, and I am glad that the hon. Member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) agrees with me that portable equipment could

MR. J. WINSOR: be brought in for a dentist, CNIB are alright, they have that fancy van that comes to Hermitage. Now, I still think - I am not an optician or an optometrist or an ophthalmologist, which I believe is the top of the totem pole - but I am sure that if a dentist can bring his equipment so can they, because the things you use in my mouth take more something behind them than what they do just to look in your eyes and take a test for glaucoma or whatever. I think that should be done. It makes more sense for the dentist to come in to serve - why, we have 170 kids in school and they have not seen a Public Health nurse -

MR. H. COLLINS: I will make a deal with you, I have a mobile unit if you have the dentists to use it.

MR. J. WINSOR: You got the mobile equipment! What do you mean, the dentists do not know how to use it, or to get one to go in there?

MR. H. COLLINS: I am sure a dentist can use the mobile unit.

MR. J. WINSOR: Well, you mean that the dental profession is pretty well locked into what they are doing now and they have not got the time. Well, there is a dentist down in Hermitage. Is he busy all of the time, seven, six days a week, five day a week? I would not think so. If he had mobile equipment up in Gaultois and he could make a fat dollar, which he can do, should go there. I do not think he has ever been approached with that proposition but I think if I were the Minister of Health I would twist his arm a little bit.

MR. H. COLLINS: We have more than doubled the number of dentists in this Province in the past three or four years.

MR. J. WINSOR: Well, except that you need to add a few more because the money is there, the people want the work done. the kids are not getting the attention they deserve and have a God given right to. I think it should be looked at. I am glad that the gentlemen opposite see what I am talking about, I am sure they have heard it before. We will forget this now in five minutes. "Give me Five Minutes More."

February 15th, 1979

Tape 425

SD-3

MR. J. WINSOR:

Well, I was going to talk some  
what about fisheries and fisheries development and I have heard so much  
about the fishery programs in the last year that I am wondering where  
the heck it all went to.

MR. J. WINSOR: I can go from one end of my district to the other and I see nothing that the provincial government has done, a serious statement to make. Unfortunately the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) is having a doze and the Minister of Fisheries is not here. I am sorry, Sir, if I bore you but I think the strain on your ears is taking its toll. The only thing I see done in fisheries is an unloading system provided by the federal government. And they put that in the wrong place, believe you me, on the side of the wharf where the outside man could not cull because when the new nets get down in the boats and they are lifted ashore into the culling rig, the fellow is going to duck and he is going overboard. Fine, if he goes overboard he will not hurt himself or anybody else, but if he goes down in that dory where there is a man he will kill him and break his own back. But I think they have changed that and instead of putting it on the side of the wharf they have it in the middle.

Now the provincial government will not get together with the federal government on bait services. The federal government would love to pass it over to the provincial government, who should be looking after it and giving a better distribution service for fishermen.

MR. H. COLLINS: Under the Terms of Union the federal government have responsibility for it.

MR. J. WINSOR: Terms of Union! That is ancient history, the Terms of Union. Some of these have been changed, some of the clauses. You are always singing out for more money under Term 28 or whatever it is, 29.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are going to get a new constitution.

MR. J. WINSOR: Well, if it is needed, why not? Are we going to go backwards or ahead? I could go on and talk about fisheries from now until - well, it is 4:30. I am sure I could go to 6:30 talking about the things that are not being done in fisheries and how important it is to this country.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. WINSOR:

But what amazes me most of all, if you will bear with me for a few more minutes and the Speaker will not do whatever he does to people, suddenly the fisheries has become the most important industry in Newfoundland, it has only been discovered in 1978. When I was a little boy growing up the fisheries was important to the economy of Newfoundland then, and if the Labrador fishery failed Newfoundland was in trouble. And it is still so; if the fishery fails, and it darn near went to that point where it would fail completely forever, and everybody but everybody forgets Gus Etchegary and his SOFA - Save Our Fisheries Association. He rang the alarm bell years ago and it took a long time for it to sink into the heads of the powers that be, both provincial and federal. Thank God we have the 200 mile limit! Now all the quotas are laid out just so where the government says, 'You can go fish. There is a quota of 10,000 metric tons,' there was no fish. But where you are not allowed to fish, there is plenty of fish. And our boats, for instance from Gaultois cannot go up in the Gulf and get any more cod because that is all cleaned out by the French treaty rights. Fine and dandy! So what are they doing? Fishing for turbot because there is no fish where they are allowed to go, and they have to go all over God's garden to get trip of fish. It is the most bewildering thing - I have been at it for twenty-six years following the different areas that you fish and so on, and it is a complete puzzle to me. You have to fish for a half day in 324 and then he has to go to 302 for another half a day and juggling all over the globe and ducking the large stern trawlers and so on.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. gentleman have leave?



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has not been granted.

MR. J. WINSOR:

But hopefully time will rejuvenate our fisheries. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I stand to speak to this motion because I see no earthly reason why this House should close in this particular situation of a leadership convention. Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why the House is being closed but, Mr. Speaker, I think I will call a quorum. I believe that the members on the other side were talking about the business of the Province. I believe that

Mr. Hodder: they should be here to listen to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A quorum has been called.

I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, there is no justifiable reason for closing the House at this time, but there may be a political reason. And I believe at the present time this House is being used for political purposes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: - partisan political purposes. I believe that business can be carried out, but the government opposite do not want to let the Opposition or the House mar their bid for the hearts and minds of Newfoundlanders, they do not want to take the flak that they may get in this House for their policies and for the way that they have been governing this Province, and they are hoping that the people of this Province will somehow come to the realization in the next three or four weeks that they have actually done a good job, so they would like to close the House. But I would like to tell members opposite that the people of this Province do not really care any more. They have realized already that the whole of the seven candidates who are running for the leadership, if they were rolled into one would not make a proper Premier, so that the whole exercise being carried out by the gentlemen opposite is one that is fruitless and in vain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there are many things that we should be debating in this House at this particular time. One of the things that is most topical, which was brought up here in the House today, is the question of the hydro increases, the 10 per cent which Newfoundland Hydro is asking for this year, and the 10 per cent increase they are asking for next year. Now, Mr. Speaker, if members opposite

Mr. Hodder:            were to perhaps visit their districts and take their minds off this particular little bit of farcical lunacy which they are involved in at the present time, and have a look at the people who are in this Province on fixed incomes and look at the situation that many people across this Province find themselves in already.

MR. HODDER: then perhaps they would be more eager to keep the House open and perhaps more eager to make decisions which would be in the interest of the people of the Province. Now at the present time, Mr. Speaker, there are those who are on old age pensions, those people who are on social assistance, veterans, those people on unemployment insurance, or those people who are working in jobs where they receive only the minimum wage. These people cannot suffer another increase in their electrical rates in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have already come to a situation in the Province where many people in the rural areas of the Province are returning to the wood stove. Mr. Speaker, I will say this, that if these increases are allowed to continue it will not only be the wood stove that they will be returning to, it will be the kerosene lamp as well.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. HODDER: Because in many areas of this Province the people cannot afford the raises. The people cannot afford any more to keep their homes heated adequately, or their homes lit. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the most serious problems that we have facing us in this Province today and I believe that we must take steps to do something about it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should have a very close look at what is happening with Newfoundland Hydro, not whether their profit and loss statement allows them to justify their rate increases but I think we should look at whether the decision making process in Newfoundland Hydro is sound. Just recently it came to my attention that we had had a gas turbine installed in the Bay St. George area in Stephenville which cost some \$6.5 million. Now that was only one of two gas turbines which I understand were brought into the Province at that particular time. Neither one of those gas turbines has been operational and from November 1977 until November 1978 the particular gas turbine that was installed in

MR. HODDER: Stephenville to relieve the power outages in major shutdowns and to give extra power during peak periods, this particular machine was not only improperly designed so that it has not operated for a year, but not only that, Mr. Speaker - I do not have the exact number of gallons of gas. I think the thing uses drums of gas per hour rather than gallons of gas per hour-and while it was probably a small outlay of only \$6.5 million in the whole terms of electrical development, the real cost, and it was cheaper for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to buy, but the overall expense of that particular generator over the years in which it will be used will be much more expensive to the taxpayers of this Province than if the provincial government and Newfoundland Hydro had used an alternate source of energy. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, about the decisions that have been made in the past, the decisions to continue to build up the Holyrood plant rather than to go into hydro electric generation right here in the Province. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the whole decision making process, the whole - I know we have looked at Newfoundland Hydro, but have we ever really looked at Newfoundland Hydro to see what is happening there? Not since I have been a member of this House and not in my memory.

MR. HODDER: Another important issue which is facing the Province today is one which was raised or resurrected again in this year's Throne Speech. I refer to the implementation of Grade XII in the schools in the Province. It took, I think, five years for the provincial government to come around to adopt the policies which our government had adopted in 1971, but yet it was thrown at us in the Throne Speech, and since that particular time nothing has been done to decide what Grade XII will be. Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that some of our policies or some of the way that education is structured in the Province must be changed. If we are going to take advantage of the new opportunities that this Province is about to realize and that the people of this Province will be taking part in, I feel that we must train the students, our young people, to take advantage. Now I am noticing around the Province, particularly in the Bay St. George area and the Corner Brook area and the West Coast area and, I would think, right across the Province from what I understand, that at the moment there is great uncertainty as to what Grade XII will be. Those students who are in the class now who will be the first to take Grade XII are asking questions, 'What will it be? What will we be doing?' Teachers are asking those questions, parents are asking those questions, and, while the issue has not surfaced in the media or we have not had interest groups speaking out yet, people are starting to wonder what is happening. Now I understand that the only thing that the Department of Education has done is to form a committee to look into it. I do not believe that committee has met yet. I feel it is time, Mr. Speaker, that something were to happen. Now I do not think that this is something that the government can arbitrarily do. I believe that there must be public

MR. HODDER: discussion by parents, teachers, public discussion in this Legislature. I feel that this is not something that we can institute immediately. I feel that everyone in this Province should have a say in what is happening.

We did have a great debate on education here in this House last year, but, Mr. Speaker, we did not really accomplish too much. Mr. Speaker, what has happened in this Province is that education has got hardening of the arteries. In the vocational type training that we presently have, we have built such a bureaucracy around education that many of the teachers and the curriculum has cost such a large amount of money that we are now afraid to change it. I will give an example of that, Mr. Speaker. In Stephenville there is a heavy equipment school. That school has been turning out heavy equipment operators for some, I suppose, eight or ten years - I am not quite sure how long, but as long as I can remember. At the present time in my district just about every unemployed person can drive a tractor trailer, just about every unemployed person can use a snow plough. Everybody I know, pretty well, if you ask them when they come to you and say, 'Can you get me a job,' you ask them what their qualifications are, you find out they can drive a tractor trailer, they are good at snow ploughs, they are good on the DS and all that sort of thing and they have all the licences and everything else but they do not have a job.

Now every year that school has its quota of seats and every year they take in students from the area and this sort of takes them off the unemployment rolls, gives them a little salary, but we are over-training. We have enough heavy equipment operators in this Province right now and there is no reason to continue training them.

MR. HODDER:

But because we have so many million dollars worth of heavy equipment sitting at that school, because we have so many trained instructors and all that sort of thing, then we must continue to push those students through. I think this is a good example of what I would consider to be hardening of the arteries in our education system:



MR. HODDER: We are not looking to what skills the Newfoundland people will need in the future, we are not training them in new skills. We are training them in skills but we are over-training and we are turning out too many people with the same qualifications and they cannot find jobs. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this extends right into our school systems. I believe that the course material offered in our high schools, and I do not say our primary and elementary schools, but the course material offered in our high schools today is exactly the same. We are still teaching students to set them for jobs that were available in the forties and we have not changed our curriculum in any way to meet the needs of the seventies, eighties and nineties. And now, Mr. Speaker, we are in a position where we have grade twelve being instituted in those provinces and grade twelve, it seems, will probably continue the same process that is already happening in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows yet whether grade twelve will be something to gear the top ten or fifteen per cent towards the university. We do not know if grade twelve will be something which will be geared towards those students going into vocational schools. We have no idea what that particular new area of education in our Province will be. Now we have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, at this particular time, to show the rest of Canada. We are only a small province. We only have a half million people to train and we are on the verge of perhaps prosperity. But we must educate our people to be able to get the maximum benefits from this and our educational system is the most important thing and the most important area in which we must concentrate. It needs a lot of planning. It needs a lot of thought. And it is not something that can be instituted by a committee. It means something to every man, woman and child in this Province and I believe it is something that should have wide public discussion. And maybe, Mr. Speaker, it should be taken

MR. HODDER: out of the political forum altogether and maybe we should take some time to just find out what the people in this Province need and talk perhaps to the parents, the students, the special interest groups, the teachers in this Province who are interested in what is happening to our students.

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping this year that we would have an early budget. In the district which I represent, and in most districts in this Province, there is a need for improved transportation systems, improved roads, more water systems.

Mr. Speaker, in my district there are unpaved roads. There are people with unclean water, not just hearsay or not just a claim by those people but people whose water is contaminated. Every year since I have been elected in this House of Assembly I have spoken on those matters. I will not go into them in any great detail now but I believe that it is a crime when people's children are sick because of contaminated water, and I know of what I speak. I have seen the health reports and the reports then confirmed by the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I will call a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of lip service paid in recent months about the fishery, and the importance of the fishery to this Province. I saw a white paper recently concerning the fishery, it did not have very much to say, but certainly it had even less to say about the West Coast and what the government plans to do as far as the fishery is concerned there. In the past ten years this government has done very, very little to help the fishermen in any practical way. The fisheries access roads right around the Province get the minimum amount of construction, the minimum amount of work done. Mr. Speaker, we do not even try to maintain the fisheries access roads because each year they deteriorate further and further. And while we saw a budget last year which was supposed to be a fisheries budget, yet when you go into the districts, and when you look at what is being done by the Provincial Government; when you look at what is being done by the Federal Government you see harbours being developed, you see breakwaters being built, you see wharves being built.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. HODDER: Port au Port for one.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the Provincial input it is very, very hard to find. I speak particularly for the West Coast because that is the area of this Province that I know best, that is the area of the Province that I live in; I speak more particularly for my district because neither the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Transportation and Communications or the Minister of Fisheries have done one thing in the past five years to help the lot of the people of that area.

Mr. Speaker, fish handling facilities in the district of Port au Port are no better now than they were ten years ago. I once visited a particular fishing area and took some pictures, I ran

MR. HODDER: across those pictures the other day of the facilities that those fishermen had and I was very, very surprised, I suppose I was not really surprised, but nothing has changed.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of the fisheries that I feel

MR. HODDER:

should be debated in this

House is the way that the Fisheries Loan Board is being handled or the way that the Fisheries Loan Board is throwing out money to fishermen to build longliners when those fishermen are not trained adequately to operate the longliners and if they do know how to operate the longliners, and if they are experienced in the fishery, sometimes they have difficulty receiving the money they should have. But, Mr. Speaker, I know of many, many fishermen now who I do not think really deserve to have longliners. I see so many cases of a fisherman who gets his loan for a longliner, uses it for a few weeks and then it is hauled up on the beach. He neglects to make his payments and the Fisheries Loan Board gets another buyer for that longliner, and then later on the second person to acquire that vessel runs it for a little while and then decides he cannot make a go of it and it is back in the hands of the Fisheries Loan Board again. I have seen other cases, Mr. Speaker, which are just the opposite. I have seen fishermen who would probably make a go of it in the fishery with those larger boats who have not been able to get the financing for one reason or another.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening on the West Coast is that people who have longliners, the new fishermen who are getting those longliners, were small boat fishermen before with boats which were eighteen, twenty-two feet long open boats. Those boats were capable of fishing only in certain areas. I am finding that many of the people who buy those longliners are now taking them and fishing them in the same method and the same way as they fished their small boats. So you have the ludicrous sight of the small boat fishermen and the people who own the longliners fishing in the same area and fishing for the same length of time. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the people who are acquiring these boats have not been trained to use them. They are not trained in using the fish finders, in using the equipment, the Decca equipment and the DOP equipment, and traditionally they have always fished in

MR. HODDER: this particular area and they continue to do so. Mr. Speaker, if you have a longliner and you are fishing in the same way you did a small boat, your expenses are twice as much and that is why many of those fishermen are going out, they are getting their longliners from the Fisheries Loan Board without any knowledge of the boat, without any training and within a season they find that they cannot operate and the longliner is pulled up on the beach and the guy has gotten out of the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have to be more selective to whom these boats go, and not only do we have to be more selective but I feel that there must be training, there must be a proper programme of training to use those particular boats. You cannot take a small boat fisherman, put him into a longliner and expect him to continue to fish in the new way. Most experienced longliner people will follow the fish. They may leave Port aux Basques and they may fish in St. Anthony, they may fish off the Labrador Coast, but here we have the spectacle of people buying longliners and not knowing how to use them, afraid to take them in deep water and they find that the expenses are much higher than in their open boat and they do not do as well as the fishermen who have the open boat.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the whole situation, the whole problem of the Fisheries Loan Board and the way that they are heaving out money - now I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that they cannot spend as much money; what I am saying is that the amount of money they spend at the present time is very often wasted and they are not getting the returns for their expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I saw the latest statistics from Statistic Canada on unemployment in this Province. We of course have the highest unemployment in Canada. The West Coast has the highest unemployment in Newfoundland and I suppose my district has the highest unemployment on the West Coast, and that might make it the district with the highest unemployment in Canada. That does not necessarily follow,

Mr. Hodder: but I would say that we are very, very close to it if we do not have the highest unemployment in Canada. The statistics are done for the West Coast and Labrador, and if we look at the West Coast and Labrador we say we have the highest unemployment in Canada, but yet we have some of the greatest resources perhaps of any geographical area in Canada: we have minerals, we have natural resources, we have forestry, we have two paper mills on the West Coast, we have mines, and Labrador, of course, is a storehouse of riches. And here in this Province we have a geographical area with the highest unemployment in Canada and we have a government who, seven years in office, has never said, "We must bite the bullet, take the bull by the horns, and do something about this situation," particularly when you look at the resources, when you look at the potential of the West Coast and Labrador, and that is the area the statistics are done for, that I think it is a blot on the record of this government that this situation continues; it does not continue to be the same, it continues and gets worse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased that Labrador Linerboard or the former Labrador Linerboard mill has been acquired by Abitibi Price, which is a reputable company, and one that I believe will operate the mill in the way that the people of Bay St. George would like it to be operated and will do all of the best things. Mr. Speaker, this will not solve the unemployment situation in Bay St. George. It will not help the unemployment statistics, only marginally, for the West Coast. And when a government sees a problem, when a government sees a gigantic problem where you have large numbers of people unemployed and all that that entails, something should be happening. Mr. Speaker, the thought now on the Canada Works projects - and if we did not have Canada Works projects I do not know where we would be - but the thought now is that you hire married men first, and I understand why that is, but the sad thing, Mr. Speaker, is that if you hire married men first then you leave your youth unemployed. And I know, I do not have to venture to say or I do not have to guess, I know that the highest

Mr. Hodder: number of the unemployed people on the West Coast of this Province are the young people. These are people who are just trying to get into the job market, these are the people, I suppose, who should be the first target group if we are going to fight unemployment.

I believe it was in 1976, Mr. Speaker, that this government announced a job creation programme. In my district that job creation programme amounted to two and a half weeks work to renovate a building belonging to National Sea, and when that was over that was the end of it as far as my district was concerned. I do not think there was either project anywhere else in Bay St. George, so that was the end of the governments programme to combat unemployment on the West Coast. And I understand that there were several little projects around the Province like that; it lasted for a month or so and then it was all wound up. The year before, of course, the government had cut back by 500 jobs, and I think they tried to create 500 the next year and some of them, I think the longest, would probably be six or seven weeks anywhere in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the record of this government in coping with the problem of unemployment on the West Coast has been dismal. Never once, never once have I had any indications since I have been elected to this hon. House that this government has said, "This is a blot. We have to do something about it. We have to do something about the unemployment." There are other areas of high unemployment in this Province which qualify just as much, but never have this government decided to combat that, to use its influence, to bring every force to bear, both federal and provincial, to do away with those pockets of unemployment which we have in this Province, which are demoralizing our people, which are demoralizing the young people of this Province.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is something that we should debate in this House of Assembly. I believe this is something that should be debated now.



MR. HODDER: I think this government had a good offer today when the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke and said he would give the leadership candidates a week before and a week after. I think that was a good deal. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why we cannot debate in this House while the leadership convention goes on. But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, I think probably one of the reasons is that perhaps the members opposite are so tired and have lost their energy and enthusiasm that they cannot do two things at one time, that they cannot run a little party affair where they elect a new leader and yet sit in the House of Assembly at the same time.

MR. F. ROWE: They cannot do one thing at one time.

MR. HODDER: They cannot do one thing at one time; that is right, as my hon. colleague says.

DR. KITCHEN: Worn out before they were born.

MR. F. ROWE: Born feet first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a few moments on some of the problems as I perceive them in the Department of Social Services. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, in, I believe, 1975 when the cut-backs were announced in the civil service, positions were frozen in various government departments. I do not see much reduction here in the Confederation Building or around St. John's, but where I do see reductions in the civil service is where they are needed most and that is in those civil servants who deal with people, those civil servants who are in the offices around this Province, and I particularly refer to the Department of Social Services.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, right across this Province, the Department of Social Services is in disarray, it is in shambles. There is no morale amongst the staff. If you will notice, Mr. Speaker - I wish somebody would do a study on this - what is happening in the Department of Social Services is that most of the men are getting out of Social Services. They are ceasing to be social workers and more and more you are finding married women becoming social workers. I am not saying that a woman cannot do the job as well as a man, but the thing is very many of those people who are now working as social workers in the Department of Social Services are working for a second income. And I know of three social workers in the Stephenville office who have just left. One did not even have a new job, he just left. He was fed up and he was going. They cannot get out of the office anymore.

Now a social worker, I suppose, is a key person, particularly in areas of high unemployment. He is a key person who must get out and get into the communities to look at people's individual needs to see what the problems are, to see who the real needy are. And because of the restrictions on them, they are not able to get out of the office, and at certain times in the month their car allowances run out and all that sort of thing so that the best they can do is get one day a week. The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that they are understaffed. There are not nearly enough social workers to deal with the situations as they arise in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, most of the new social workers that we are getting in this Province right now are university educated. Most of the administrators are not, oddly enough, but most of the social workers are university educated. They should be the elite of the civil service, because they are the people who must work with the

MR. HODDER: poor and with the handicapped, the sick, the disabled and everybody else. They are the people who must be trained to understand and to handle delicate problems, to understand and handle social situations. They should be the elite of the civil service. They should be as highly paid as teachers in this Province, at the very least.

The other thing that is happening with the Department of Social Services here is that if you get a good social worker he is gone to a hospital, he is gone to another job. At the first opportunity they are out of it. There is no esprit de corps, there is no morale whatsoever.

You see, Mr. Speaker, a social worker must know who deserves social assistance, who does not deserve it, who is really in need. I walked into a house the other day, Mr. Speaker, of a man who - I suppose there are two types of long-term assistance recipients; one is the type who cannot work, or might be able to do light work like a night watchman or something like that, but there are few jobs for night watchmen

MR. HODDER: in many districts in this Province, but cannot work at heavy jobs. So he is on what they call long-term assistance. Then you have the other type of individual who is on long-term assistance because he really cannot work. I was into a house the other day, Mr. Speaker, where the individual that I was talking to had a coronary condition. He could not even lift wood. But he was subjected to the same regulations, the same terms as people who can supplement their incomes, can grow vegetables, can do all that sort of thing. In many of those cases the social worker at the present time cannot get out, they do not know the people whom they serve and they cannot know them because in many cases they are shifted from place to place. One day a social worker is in a particular area, three or four months later he is on corrections and then another social worker is in that particular area, and they cannot know the people who they serve. And I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a department that is very, very important in this Province. If we are going to treat our people justly then I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look at that particular department.

MR. H. COLLINS: We have the best Social Services Department in Canada.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if it is the best Social Services Department in Canada I would not want to see the worst.

AN HON. MEMBER: The worst minister.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, before I sit down - I had many, many things to say but I am running out of time - I would like to say this: I ran into a situation this year, and I guess the lady was probably in her sixties to seventies, over sixty-five, who had been in the hospital, who had left the hospital because the hospital could do no more for her and she was being looked after by a grandson. Her behaviour was not acceptable to enter some types of old people's homes - she was a menace in some ways. Her brain had deteriorated. She showed anti-social behaviour - and this was one of the reasons why the hospital could not keep her there

MR. HODDER: anymore. It so happened that the grandson had to go back to work and it looked like the lady would be left alone. And I sort of pushed the panic button and I phoned deputy ministers and hospital officials and everybody that I could get my hands on, or whom I could contact, to try to find where this lady would go because I found out that there was nowhere, there was nowhere in this Province.

Do you know where she is now, Mr. Speaker? The only place for the person-who was left alone, could not look after herself in any way, showed signs of anti-social behaviour; I will not go into the details - was back in the hospital, Mr. Speaker. And in investigating this I found out that there are many more people in the hospital who are there because there are no other homes to go into. And right across this Province, and I have talked to a number of hospital administrators, right across this Province there are hospital beds, that I think cost \$200 a day now, being used by people and the hospitals are they are not in the hospital for any particular treatment. They are in the hospital because there is nowhere else to go. There are no homes, and I think, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this must be the most expensive way that those people could be cared for and I believe that it is time that we looked at how our hospital beds are being used in this Province and whether we have enough homes for this type of person. Because, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that you have institutions for the old aged, or homes for the old aged which are for just people who reach a certain age and they apply and they get into an old aged home. And then you have sections of those homes where there are people who, as they get older, are looked after and given nursing care. But for this type of patient and for this type of person, Mr. Speaker, we seem to have no place except our hospitals.

MR. J. HODDER: I think, Mr. Speaker, perhaps when we talk about the need for hospital construction if we properly utilize the hospital beds that we have in this Province and perhaps build some new homes.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. J. Winsor): Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. J. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but if we built homes for many of those people who need them, then I think perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that we would be better off and we would save a lot of money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. J. WINSOR): The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all congratulate my colleagues on this side of the House for putting before the House of Assembly a great number of reasons why this House of Assembly should remain open and not be closed down for the PC leadership convention. And, Sir, let me also congratulate the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe), who probably gave one of the most practical and sensible reasons for not closing the House of Assembly. That gentleman, Sir, was embroiled in one of the greatest leadership conventions in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, where forty delegates per district were elected to a great Liberal convention back in 1969. And, Sir, he informed me the House this morning that he could not see any reason under the sun why it would be necessary to close down the administration of this Province for the purpose of holding a PC leadership convention. Sir, I say that because this House is where the action is supposed to be. We have, Sir, now the equivalent of a dictatorship in this Province, a complete dictatorship, where decisions presumably are made, again presumably, at the Cabinet level and I can only assume that these Cabinet meetings would have to be very small with the various Cabinet ministers rushing about the Province looking for the leadership of the PC Party.

MR. F. ROWE:

So, Sir, we have only had a very short session, a very abrupt ending just before Christmas and we are now having a dictatorship of a small Cabinet making decisions for this Province. And many things and many policies and many issues are of interest to the people of this Province and should be debated in this House.

Now, Sir, the hon. the Minister of Justice when he gets on the public airwaves, the House Leader for the Government will talk about us consuming the time of the House in a foolish manner, calling foolish quorum calls and this kind of thing. Let me make one point abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, Practically every member in this House called for a quorum over the last fourteen or so hours, and the reason was this, Sir; we all had concerns and issues in our districts and throughout the Province that we wanted this government to hear and we were virtually speaking to nobody on the other side. There might have been three, four or five people, very few Cabinet ministers if any; most of them out there in the common room snoozing away when we were trying desperately to point out to this administration some of the major concerns of this Province. Sir, it is passing strange, it is passing strange that this administration and the Government House Leader, a so-called intelligent man, a learned gentleman, a lawyer, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance, House Leader, Deputy Premier brings into this House a motion to adjourn until March 27th. and we do not have one single individual from the government side speak in support of that motion, give one reason, establish one iota of rationale for that particular motion.

MR. F. ROWE:

Sir, it boggles the mind. It is a sad day, Sir, and in fact it is cruel and unforgivable as far as the welfare of this Province is concerned when the PC administration put their party activities, their partisan, internal party activities ahead of the welfare of the people of this Province and call a one day session. But there is more to it, Sir, than meets the eye. If this administration, Sir, and the lame-duck Premier of the Province at the present time were sincerely interested—as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs grinning himself away across the floor of the House is—if they were sincerely interested, Sir, in the affairs of this Province, the sensible thing to have done would have been this: The Premier could have carried on and finished this session of the House of Assembly, there is no reason why that could not have been done—brought in the budget, passed some legislation and dealt with the major issues of the Province.

If it was his intention to resign for personal reasons or political reasons, he could have done so, Sir, after the completion of the business of the House of Assembly and the PC leadership convention could have been held after that and we would have the normal, democratic procedures carried out in this House of Assembly. But such was not the case, Sir. What happened? Sir, we had a very short session just before Christmas. I can remember very clearly the running back and forth by members on the other side of the House late one night, and then suddenly the Premier comes in the House and adjourns it. It took us all by surprise. What was going on, Sir? Had the Premier that night lost control of his own colleagues? Were they going to revolt in the House of Assembly that night? That is my theory, that that was the reason for the sudden adjournment. Now let us look at events following, Sir, the sudden adjournment by the Premier; the Gander convention and one Gordon Dawe set up to challenge the leadership of the Premier of this Province; an obvious set-up, Sir, because of the massive support for the Premier at that Gander convention which, I submit, Sir, was engineered by the Premier at his very desk when he



MR. F. BOWE: was meticulously writing out little lists night after night after night. So the Gander convention is held and the Premier gets his unanimous support.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about your colleagues?

MR. F. BOWE: I am not worried about my colleagues. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister should be more worried about his colleagues than I am going to be worried about mine. We can speak for ourselves, we know what we are going to say, we meet regularly. We just hope that the hon. gentleman opposite will listen regularly, which they obviously do not.

But, Sir, we had the Gander convention, to make the Premier look good and then he could resign in so-called grace and then call a leadership convention. I still submit, Sir, that the proper way to have done it was to complete the session of the House of Assembly and then make that announcement. But he was forced, Sir. There was noise opposite, there were rumblings opposite and if the Premier did not get out he was

Mr. F. Rowe: going to be turfed out. In order to go out in grace, they engineered the Gander convention, an endorsement of the Premier's leadership; then he announces his resignation and interrupts the House of Assembly.

Now, Sir, why would they come back for a one day session? It is very simple: they had to. They adjourned the House until February 15. But, Sir, if it was their intention to just simply adjourn again until March 27, why did they not just bring in the motion? No, they had to get a little something else in before that, a little something else in before that. They wanted to announce the setting up of a royal commission. And what is that royal commission all about, Sir? About the economy of the Province? About unemployment? About the educational system? About crime alcohol and drug addiction? About the breakdown of justice in this Province? About the questioning of the competence of so-called experts in the field of arson? Oh, no, Sir, nothing that had to do with the welfare of the people! The great royal commission announced is to try to discover the leaks, hoping to make life embarrassing for somebody on the other side. Sir, we have news for hon. gentlemen opposite; it will be the biggest spike in their coffin, in their own coffin, if they pursue that.

So, Sir, we have seen a complete set up right from the night the Premier was forced to adjourn the House because he had a revolt on his hands. It is as simple as that. And the people of this Province - this is not my theory, Sir. I thought of it, it crossed my mind - but everybody I talked to are saying the same thing, a big set up job right from the beginning. And then, Sir, why did they -

AN HON. MEMBER: To give candidates time to campaign.

HON. F. ROWE: Hon. gentlemen do not need time to campaign. In midcourse they changed the rules for the convention so that four-tenths of the delegates who were at the Gander convention, who supported the Premier, will be at the leadership convention and will obviously back the man who the Premier is backing behind the scenes. So it is one great set up, Sir.

Now, Sir, why do we want to keep the House of

Mr. F. Rowe: Assembly open? I could mention very simple but important things to the people of this Province - the Crown Lands Division; unemployment, that is very important; the educational system; recreation grants to the recreation commissions and what have you - but, Sir, let me focus in on the fisheries. Sir, some months ago the Minister of Fisheries held a conference in which he announced strategies and programmes for fisheries development to 1985. Sir, this great strategy over the next five years is based on a Canadian Kellogg report and a report submitted by some Provincial authorities. Sir, it took two complete years to finalize that report at a cost, Sir, of \$680,000, almost three-quarters of a million dollars. Sir, this report, which was widely publicized at a great conference of a total of 100 fishermen, this brochure and the accompanying booklet were given to these gentlemen, these fishermen; subsequently it was sent out with the picture of the Minister of Fisheries all over the Province and subsequent to that it was sent out by the Premier of the Province himself along with his picture.

MR. F. ROWE:

And, Sir, I said that that conference was attended by only, not more than, no more than, 100 fishermen to announce a \$500 million program and, Sir, these fishermen, these 100 fishermen, were given less than twenty-four hours to study and pass judgement on a report by the Canadian Kellogg Company and officials of the provincial Department of Fisheries that took two years to complete. They were given twenty-four hours to pass judgement on it! Sir, I attended that caucus and the fishermen were very suspicious that they were being used for political purposes, and I will get into that one later. The whole conference, Sir, was shrouded in the greatest amount of secrecy. I do not know if Your Honour realizes it, but the press were barred from the workshops, the press were barred from the workshops, the MHAs, the elected representatives of the people in this Province, the 51 MHAs were also barred from the workshops. We were allowed to attend a dinner where the Premier spoke, were allowed to attend the cluing up session, were allowed to attend the reception but, Sir, the press and the elected representatives of the people were barred from the workshops. And seven or eight reports came out of these workshops, but we could not even get a copy of the reports, Sir, a total copy of the reports. Now, Sir, I submit that any study that costs, over the next five years, \$500 million and is supposed to be one of the greatest fisheries development programs ever produced, should have some debate in this House of Assembly instead of being forced down the throats of 100 fishermen and then being thrown at the general population in a glossy brochure put out by, I think it was Bonnell Public Relations, which happens to turn out to be the self same public relations firm that is now working for the leadership campaign for the Minister of Fisheries. And, Sir, how can we say that the fishermen were consulted when they were told that \$61 million was going to be spent on a superport? Sixty-one million dollars was going to be spent on a superport, 4,500 people were going to be employed, work had already begun on the

MR. F. ROWE: necessary planning, land acquisition and site preparation was to be completed this very year, this very year. I repeat this, Sir: we were told, that conference was told, within that twenty-four hour period, considering two reports that took two years to complete and \$680 million to complete, the fishermen were told that a superport is going out there, \$61 million, it is going to employ 4,500 people, work had already begun on the necessary planning, land acquisition and site preparation to be completed this year - it was a fait accompli, Sir, and the Minister of Fisheries has the nerve to get on TV, radio, open line programs and everywhere else and say that the fishermen were fully consulted. Sir, it is too ridiculous to even talk about. The question we would like to ask, Sir; who is running

MR. F. ROWE: the fisheries in this Province? Is the destiny of the fisheries being decided by the Canadian Kellogg Company or a group of civil servants or should it be more properly decided by the members in this hon. House, Sir? I submit that in this democratic system that we have, such a programme of such great magnitude and importance to the people of this Province, with one of our great renewable resources, with an expenditure of \$500 million, should have had full and complete debate in this House of Assembly. And that is reason alone, Sir, why this House of Assembly should remain open and give the hon. gentlemen opposite the courtesy of a week or two to run off their leadership convention. After all, the Prime Minister of Canada's leadership convention only interrupted the business of the House of Commons for a few days, but here in Newfoundland for some special reason it takes two months. Sir, it is an insult to the people of this Province when through their elected representatives their voices are not heard on such a great, important programme.

Sir, we want to ask ourselves some fundamental questions about all this. What were the terms of reference of the reports? Was the Kellogg Company, for example, asked to identify a superport? Which ports were suggested, if any, for consideration? We still do not have the complete rationale for the selection of the location of the superport. And more importantly, Mr. Speaker, is the concept of the superport the answer to the fisheries in this Province? Should there be greater emphasis on, for example, the development of major regional ports throughout the Province? We had two gentlemen with a great knowledge of the fishery this morning mention the simple fact that the transportation of fish brought in by these trawlers, wet or frozen, to the various parts of the Province would drive up the cost of that fish considerably.

MR. F. ROWE: I have been speaking to a number of small fish plant owners and medium sized plant owners and small independent plant owners, and their concern, Sir, is this: Will they be able to afford to buy the fish from the superport? Now I am not even saying I am for or against the superport; I am merely raising the question that this whole thing should have been debated in the House of Assembly instead of having it shoved down the throats of the people of this Province. Sir, what debate, what consultation did this administration have with the Fish Trades Association, with the union, with the fishermen themselves, with the fish plant workers and the duly elected representatives of this House?

Sir, I do not mind some things being done, some minor things, some minor decisions being made by a government without debate if it is a small thing and an emergency thing. Nobody would question the decision of a Cabinet, for example, to place a number of trailer homes in Harbour Breton after the landslide - they are not going to call the House together for that -

MR. F. ROWE: but when we come to the expenditure of \$500 million and a grandiose five year scheme for the development of the fisheries, the report of which took two years and \$680,000 to prepare, and it does not come before this House, Sir, it is absolutely criminal. And hon. members who represent over 500,000 souls in this Province do not have the opportunity to represent their opinions in this House and that is what it is all about. That is why we are here. We are not here to knock each other. It may appear like that sometimes, but we are really here represent the voices of the people and our districts. Mr. Speaker, here is another case. I said the hon. the House Leader will get up tomorrow and say, "How imprudent of hon. members opposite to be calling these quorum calls." Well, Sir, I am going to call a quorum because I want hon. members to try to take in something of what I have to say and judge it for what it is worth. I call a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A quorum has been called.  
I have been informed there is a quorum present.

Hon. member.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
Mr. Speaker, this five year, \$500 million program: the minister indicated that \$250 million was going to come from the private sector. Now, Sir, we have asked them time and time again to give us some proof of where and who the people are in the private sector who are going to supply this \$250 million. We must raise this question: is this another case of where possibly the Minister of Fisheries and his administration are fronting for the multi-national corporations? Is it or is it not? These are questions that we want answered. Sir, this fish procurement and distribution corporation that has been set up - a Crown corporation, I understand -



Mr. F. Rowe: well, Sir, I only hope that that Crown corporation has more success than other government efforts, such as the linerboard mill where we lost \$224 million and the Lower Churchill where we lost \$110 million. I honestly and sincerely hope that the government will be more successful in operating the fish procurement and distribution centre than they were in operating the linerboard mill and trying to get the Lower Churchill off the ground, which cost this Province a total of \$334 million.

But, Sir, a more fundamental question, and that is this: what is going to happen after a couple of years when the fish procurement and distribution centre ceases to become a Crown corporation? What is going to happen? I am very nervous, because when the question was put to the Minister of Fisheries by a member of the press, "Would you ever entertain another proposal such as the Nordsee proposal?" The Minister of Fisheries said he really could not answer that question. Now are we going to see out there in Harbour Grace a situation where the present Crown corporation, the fish procurement and distribution centre, ends up back under the control of something similar to the Nordsee deal? - a complete sellout to foreign ownership. And you wonder why we argue for the need for strong, central, or federal government control over the fishery. If this hon. crowd had its way, Sir, they would have sold out the fisheries to foreign control long, long ago.

Now, Sir, after the announcement of this great programme costing \$500 million, they still did not indicate where the money was coming from. And on the day the announcement was made by the Minister of Fisheries here, James McGrath up in Ottawa - tipped off, obviously - decided in his wisdom to put a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries and the Environment, the hon. Romeo LeBlanc. Mr. LeBlanc was questioned in the House on the afternoon of November 14 by James McGrath regarding Newfoundland's \$500 million proposal. And Mr. LeBlanc's reply was, "I was not consulted and I do not know anything about the project. I am at a disadvantage

Mr. F. Rowe: because the Province wants me to consult with them, but they will not consult with me." And then the minister expects to go off to Ottawa, after announcing the programme with no consultation, and scoop \$250 million out of Ottawa. Ridiculous, Sir!

And even more despicable, Sir, is the fact that during the announcement of this programme to the 100 selected delegates at that conference, we had a public relations company recording the news briefing, and it turned out to be the same film crew and firm which filmed the recent P.C. Convention that was just held beforehand. Now I am not criticizing the company; they are out getting business and there is nothing wrong with that. A member of the press, Sir, was told, "The PR people were being paid partly by the government and partly by the party." And Mr. Frank Petten, the PR man from the Premier's office, said, "The filming was done for the Department of Fisheries", mind you, now! Later, however, in an interview he admitted that the filming done earlier at the fisheries seminar where Mr. Carter announced the multimillion dollar blueprint for fisheries, could be used for political purposes. Sir, political exploitation of a selected 100 fishermen in this Province.

It makes no wonder, Sir, we do not see the hon. Minister of Fisheries in the House yesterday, last night, or this morning. He is probably home editing out the film for his leadership convention. And it has probably been dubbed off, a copy has been taken off, and the PR men for the P.C. Party are editing out excerpts for the next Provincial election. That can be done, Sir, but you cannot have a debate on that great issue in the House of Assembly.

Sir, the minister

MR. F. ROWE: announces that he is going to put two great freezing or cold storage facilities in the Province, in excess of \$7 million each, I believe. He announces that, sets up a study afterwards to find out whether it is required and where they should be located, and has yet to make the appropriate approaches to where the money is coming from.

Sir, we have a situation in this Province like this: The federal government - let us call a spade a spade - The federal government, Sir, is the instrument that has been successful through very difficult and long-term negotiations in establishing the 200 mile limit. Make no mistake about it, it was the Federal Liberal Government - not James McGrath, not John Crosbie, not hon. members sitting in this House who were up in the House of Commons earlier - it was the Federal Liberal Government, through very serious, difficult and lengthy negotiations with countries all over the world who had long standing treaties and agreements, finally succeeded in imposing the 200 mile limit and all that goes with it.

Sir, it was the federal government last year who poured in excess of \$200 million into the fisheries in this Province. The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) mentioned that all of the fish handling facilities that are on in his district, are all federal activities.

Now let us look at these points, Sir: The 200 mile limit, the necessary conservation measures, the necessary negotiations with foreign countries for quotas, for tariffs, quality control, marketing, all taken care of by the federal government, and the cost absorbed by the federal government. \$200 million, in excess of that, poured into this Province last year for everything, from the building of slipways to marine service centres, freezing units, community stages and you name it, extensions to plants, modernization of plants by the federal government. Sir, the provincial input last year, the net expenditure by the Department of Fisheries in this Province was less than \$19 million.

MR. F. ROWE: Yet the day the Minister of Fisheries was appointed the minister he boarded a helicopter and he pulled off the biggest con job of any politician in this Province. He almost managed - the people can see it now - he almost managed to persuade the fishermen and the people of the Province that all of the great improvements and all of the great advances and all of the great developments in the fisheries in this Province were a result of the Minister of Fisheries in particular, and the PC Provincial Administration in general. Nothing is further from the truth, Sir. In fact, the Minister of Fisheries in this Province has probably done more damage than good because instead - and the hon. Minister of Industrial Development, if he was the one who went, "Tsk, tsk, tsk" -

MR. DOODY: No, I did not go, "Tsk, tsk, tsk," but I can go, "Tsk, tsk, tsk."

MR. F. ROWE: Okay. Well he just did therefore I can refer to the minister. He went up to Ottawa at the constitutional conference but before he went he announced that there was going to be a great confrontation with Ottawa.

MR. DOODY: No.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh yes.

MR. DOODY: No, I did not.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh yes, a great confrontation, Sir.

MR. DOODY: No, not great, just a confrontation.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, a confrontation with Ottawa. Now, Sir, if you want to have a confrontation with those with whom you are going to negotiate, what better way to have a confrontation than to announce it before you go up and negotiate?

MR. DOODY: Exactly!

MR. F. ROWE: And that has been the problem with this administration, Sir. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this administration, the Minister of Fisheries in particular, and now obviously the Minister of Industrial Development and the Premier, who was also present at that conference, have caught the same disease - the Minister of Fisheries has - and that is he cannot resist for one minute trying to take credit for everything that Ottawa has done, but at the same time criticizing Ottawa and confronting Ottawa on every scene when they should be going up there, Sir, and conducting not mediocre, pussycat, weak-kneed negotiations, they should be going up there negotiating in a hard nosed fashion with well documented evidence. The people up in Ottawa, Sir, still ask themselves the basic question: What exactly does the P.C. administration want down here in matters pertaining to the fishery? They do not know.

MR. DOODY: They cannot read.

MR. F. ROWE: They do not know because it was never written down. It was just shouted out over a T.V. set or blurted out at a constitutional conference.

MR. DOODY: Wrong.

MR. F. ROWE: Not wrong.

MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: Not wrong - no.

MR. DOODY: Wrong - yes. The time is up.

MR. F. ROWE: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I keep in touch with people in Ottawa. I do not get confidential information, of course I do not, but I know this, that whatever progress we have had in the fisheries in this Province we can thank Mr. Ottawa for it, Mr. Trudeau, and I would submit that we have lost millions of dollars and we have lost years of progress because of the confrontation politics of this administration.

MR. F. ROWE: and in particular the Minister of Fisheries, instead of a policy of consultation. And then the Minister of Fisheries gets up every time I say something like this and says, 'I am not going to go up to Ottawa on my knees. I am a Newfoundlander, I was born in the outports,' - Was he born in the outports? Yes - 'I was born in the outports, I am a true Newfoundlander,' and all this wishy-washy, tear-jerking foolishness. I was on Open Line with him once, Sir, when his only defence was that 'I am a Newfoundlander', as if everybody else listening to the programme and on the programme were not. Sir, the Minister of Fisheries' bluff has been called and exposed for what it is. He has travelled the Province for two years in a helicopter visiting the people, visiting the communities, visiting the fishermen, trying to take credit for what Ottawa has provided to this Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: And I would submit, Sir, that if he had taken one quarter of that time - and knowing full well, Sir, by the way, what he was headed for, what the objective was: the objective was the leadership convention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: If he had taken one quarter of that helicopter time and consulted in a meaningful way with the officials in Ottawa, we would see even greater progress today. But, Sir, what saddens me is why a \$500 million fisheries programme is shoved at 100 fishermen to be considered in twenty-four hours, have judgement passed on it in twenty-four hours, two reports which took two years and \$680 million to prepare, and not a word of debate in this House of Assembly? And hon. gentlemen opposite wonder why we stand here and say, Keep the House open, for heaven's sake, and let us talk about the issues. Because we have now,

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, in this Province, a dictatorship not even of the full Cabinet; we have a dictatorship of a few people who may turn up at a Cabinet meeting where major decisions are being made. And I would like to know how many are making the decisions in this Province, if in fact any decisions are being made.

So, Sir, I am going to vote against this motion to adjourn the House until March 27th.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: It is ridiculous, it makes no sense whatsoever, and it is passing strange that not

MR. F. ROWE: one single government member put forth one reason, one logical, genuine reason why they found it necessary to adjourn the House for two months. They are putting the PC Party ahead of the people of this Province. Sir, I suspected that they were capable of doing it but I never suspected that they would actually come into the House of Assembly and boldly state it and show it and hold it out in front of the people of this Province that they put their party and their internal squabbings ahead of the needs, the wishes, the concerns, the desires and the welfare of this Province. Sir, it is the saddest day of my life, it is the saddest day of my life, and I hope that some hon. gentleman over there with some integrity will have enough courage to get up and speak against this motion because I am convinced, Sir, that in their hearts not all members opposite are in favour of this particular motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(DR. COLLINS): Is the House ready for the question? The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: I was hoping, Sir, that some hon. member on the other side might get up to speak. One of the most shameful spectacles, I suppose, Sir, that this House has seen in the last two or three years is this great general debate going on about the problems of the Province, and every single member of the party, Sir, now involved in some leadership campaign, every single member of that party, seeking to convince the people that they have the right or should have the mandate of the people to govern every single member, Sir, has remained in his seat, will not get up and speak to these vital issues. I am surprised, Sir, at the Premier of the Province. I do not know if the Premier is around now or not, but I am surprised that a man, Sir, an hon. gentleman who, having announced his retirement to take place a month or so, a month and a half from now, would not try to do in his final days a few things on behalf of the people of the Province; come in here with no axe to grind, nothing to lose, come in and try to grope with the issues, not having any personal ambitions





MR. W. ROWE: data, judgement knowing that he has nothing to loose politically. He should do that but he will not do it. Now we have this, I suppose pathetic spectacle, in a way, of members of the House of Assembly trying to represent their districts, Mr. Speaker, and having to cram into eight or ten hours what should have taken four or five months in the House of Assembly, spread out over a period of time to allow members of the House to make their points and have the press and the people digest what is being said and make sure that the people are aware of what is going on in the House, particularly matters of a positive nature. But no, Sir, We are going to close down the House now in about eighty-five minutes unless somebody over there gets up. And that would be typical of the trickery, to wait until everybody on this side had spoken and then, of course, get up and make some political points by having the last word, or the last several words, or several members speaking. That would be typical, Sir. But the point is that we are here now trying to make a few remarks. The House will close until after the leadership. We may be in the middle of an election. I hope we are, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the hon. gentleman over there or the gentlemen outside the House - there may be another one will come into it - I hope that whoever gets that leadership has the courage to go to the people immediately within a few days after obtaining the leadership so that the people will have the opportunity, which should be their right, the opportunity to elect a Premier and a government or a party which they believe should represent their interests and not leave the policy-making power of a newly appointed Premier to the whims of three or four hundred candidates at a partisan convention. That would be wrong, Mr. Speaker, I hope and I expect an election in April of this year. I expect that and, as I have said earlier, we have publicly demanded that that provincial general election take place. It should take place. Let the people speak. I am quite content as the leader of a party to submit my fate to the

MR. M. SOWE: people of the Province, the electors, the voters of the Province, and so should the leader of that party who will have been by that time recently elected by a handful at a convention who have been cajoled or coerced or in some way talked into or forced into voting for one particular individual. Let us go to the people, Sir, in April of this year and I would certainly welcome that opportunity.

But no, Sir, The members opposite and the government, the Premier especially who is a great disappointment in this regard, will not discuss the issue even though in many respects, regardless of the brave words uttered by the Premier upon his retirement and echoed by some members opposite, regardless of the brave words about the great condition we are in or prosperity being around the corner - all we have to do is wait for it, wait for the pie-in-the-sky, wait for the manna to drop from heaven, regardless. Sir, of those brave words, the fact of the matter is that in many ways we are going through a crisis situation in the Province. We have the highest unemployment in the history of the Province. In 1970-1971, the year before this administration came into office, there was a nine per cent unemployment rate and that was thought to be verging on the brink of disaster. Seven or eight years later under the tender mercies of this government we have an unemployment rate which is just about exactly double what it was when this government took over. And if you counted the actual unemployment, and those wishing to get into the job market but being either discouraged or getting out of it with a sense of desperation, it would be far above that, Sir, at least one quarter

MR. W. ROWE: or more of the working force, or potential working force of this Province; perhaps thirty per cent or even more are unemployed at the present time. And instead, Mr. Speaker, of the government trying to grapple with this, instead of trying to work towards something with the federal government and the other provinces of Canada, work towards some concept which is coming into effect now in many democracies around the world, particularly the European ones, West Germany, Sweden and so on, Denmark, and in the United States, which in many ways is far to the right of the Canadian political situation, instead of working towards some concept of a right to work, an inherent right to gainful employment for all people seeking employment in Canada, instead of working towards that by the proper use of the national wealth, the untold billions of dollars collected every year by provincial and federal governments, instead of working towards that, Sir, we have a situation where the government has apparently thrown up its hands, admits defeat, admits that the government cannot cope with the situation and hopes that the people will not notice that the problem.- they know that it will not go away, they hope the people will not notice or will not hold it against them. Well I will guarantee the government this, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province do hold it against them. They hold against this government the fact that instead of trying to get employment in the Province we have untold millions wasted by means of underhandedness in many dealings, on capital works especially, by way of the skulduggery, by way of wastage, Mr. Speaker, of the worst order, wastage with regard to the multi-million dollar institutions which have been built recently, particularly in the health field, as Your Honour would be very well aware, wastage based on mismanagement, wastage based on corrupt influences, much of which is now coming out before the Mahoney Royal Commission that this government was forced into with the greatest of reluctance a couple

MR. W. ROWE: of years ago. I suppose the only royal commission they have set up, and then with the greatest of reluctance.

The people will hold it against them, Sir, that they will not grapple with the real problems facing Newfoundland and Labrador, and insist instead of merely trying to cling desperately onto power, hoping that they can have a big hoopla now leading up to their convention, a great deal of publicity and perhaps whoever the leader may be then go to the people immediately and squeak in on a tide of publicity based on those goings on.

MR. F. ROWE: Try to flick in a rosy budget.

MR. W. ROWE: Probably bring in a budget in which they will once more promise the world, the moon and the sun to the people of the Province. But it will not wash, Mr. Speaker, this time. I can guarantee you that.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of concern, the discourtesy of the hon. members is evident by the fact that we have three in the House right now on the other side, Sir, and I would like to see a quorum in the House while I am speaking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible) in Quebec.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The hon. minister may find it difficult to form a Cabinet when he becomes Premier pro tem, and I must say that the number of things that one will take into consideration, Mr. Speaker, when one is forming one's Cabinet; for example, energy shown in times of crisis, vigor, loyalty to the cause -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the other point which has been mentioned by hon. members on this side of the House earlier today and tonight is the crisis facing this Province with regard to electrical power, light and power, where we have the commitment, I suppose, by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro that power will be doubled, compared to what it was a year or two ago, it will be doubled in four or five years, and that the people of this Province who were promised relatively cheap electricity, cheap power, many of whom were goaded and cajoled into getting involved with electric heat in their homes, will find, Sir, that in many cases the cost of power is beyond their reach financially, unless they are going to cut into the other basic necessities of life. And as my hon. colleague said earlier, a very serious consideration should be given by any government concerned about the well-being of the Province and the people, consideration should be given to the idea of putting a freeze on the increase in electrical power rates so that people can have a breathing spell, and so that the Province and the government can find out, decide what is going to happen with regard to the Lower Churchill power and with regard to the Upper Churchill power.

And on that point,

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, some very interesting information has come to light and has been obtained by myself through researches and talking to experts in the field, engineers, financiers and so on. For example, Sir, it would be possible technologically and financially at this point in time to use the Upper Churchill power to the greatest extent that one can now in Labrador to further process raw materials there and bring what is left over, and there would be a considerable amount left over at present, across to the Island by way of a tunnel or submarine cable. That is technically feasible; bring it across to the Island, use the power here, Mr. Speaker, that we can for domestic and commercial and industrial purposes and to attract industry, and it is technologically feasible, Sir, to bring the power across the Cabot Strait to the mainland of the North American Continent and, Sir, have that power reach its customers on the mainland, even in spite of the transmission costs, at a price much lower than other competitive sources of power and electricity energy, say nuclear power stations, much lower, Sir, and the surplus power could be sold by this Province at a good profit by way of short-term, recallable contracts, and it could bring every year, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of millions of dollars into this Province that could be used for further industrialization, for the services that are needed, for the hospitals, for the roads, for the water and sewer, other institutions, other public services.

By that expedient alone, Mr.

Speaker, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador could be turned into a Province which is as wealthy in terms of income, public income, as wealthy, proportionately as wealthy, as any other Province in Canada, especially when added to our other resources, the fishery and the other natural resources which we have. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of matter which should be debated in this House, which should be grappled with. That is the kind of policy, Mr. Speaker, which we on this side are prepared to look at, study, and if it bears the light of day, as I believe it does from my researches so far, that is the kind of policy that we should have a Government with the courage and the guts to implement -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

- for the welfare and the benefit of the people of this Province instead of wringing our hands about the legal possibilities, suing Quebec - twenty-five or fifty years down the road maybe it will be resolved, and then perhaps unfavourably. Forget that, Mr. Speaker, We have the right to recall the power, Sir, very few people seem to realize. We have the right to recall the power for our own use and even if we did not have the right, Sir, that contract is so unfair, that contract between Newfoundland and Quebec, to simplify it, is so unfair as a result of the whole foundation having dropped out of the original concept with the rise in energy prices, is so unfair that even if we did not have the right legally, politically, Sir, we should seize the right and the opportunity to reclaim what is rightfully ours. And, Mr. Speaker, I say now, that provided the bond holders under the trust deed could be looked after, and I believe they can, so that we do not be accused, nobody accuses us of being a Banana Republic, if that can be done than we should, as I say, use



Mr. W. N. Rowe: the power of this House, as the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) indicated earlier, used the power of this House, the strength, the force, the legislative supremacy of this House to do what is in the best interest of the Province and the people of the Province, not what is in the best interest of Wall Street and a bunch of insurance companies making money off the bonds, look after their interest, certainly, but put the interest of this Province first and certainly put it ahead of Hydro-Quebec and the Province of Quebec, whom we may wish no harm, but certainly there is no reason why there should be a giveaway programme which operates to our detriment and our disadvantage and causes us to have the highest public debt in Canada, the highest interest rates in Canada, the highest unemployment in Canada, the lowest standard of living in Canada, in economic and financial terms. We do not have to do that. How generous are we! How good neighbours must we be! We do not have to do that, Sir.

And if at the same time we follow the suggestion of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) district, concerning the Lower Churchill, Sir, to develop that and add it to the power from the Upper Churchill and bring it all across, and then across the Cabot Strait, the power we cannot use, Sir, it would have an untold effect in terms of wealth for this Province that this government certainly has failed to imagine even in its wildest moments. We should do that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, certainly we should debate it here, and certainly we should not close down the House of Assembly right in the midst of a power crisis where we have the probability this Summer of power prices going up again to the domestic consumers of the Province and with the Minister of Energy trying to straddle the fence on the issue, Mr. Speaker, saying that it may be necessary for the government to freeze the increase. If I were a leadership candidate over there, like the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), or the hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doody)

Mr. Doody: I would be irritated at such fence straddling, such obvious expediency in an effort to get delegate votes, Mr. Speaker, when really in effect it is weasel words, words which have no meaning and which have no benefit for the people of this Province. That is the kind of policies we should be grappling with, Sir.

Last year in this House I brought in a motion regarding the development of the Lower Churchill and hydro in Labrador generally, and the resources of Labrador generally. My hon. friend the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) was very instrumental in drawing up wording for that policy, because, Sir, that motion that I brought in, a private member's resolution, was based on a motion which we brought up to Ottawa to a policy convention and got the Prime Minister of Canada, Sir, to agree with me privately and to agree with me publicly at the convention, and for the whole delegation from across Canada to vote unanimously in favour of a policy for the development of Labrador. And, Sir, it is as a result of that commitment made by the Prime Minister of Canada and his government and his party unanimously in convention, as a result of that, Sir, that we saw the thrust made by Ottawa some short months later in entering into an agreement with this Province to look into the feasibility of developing the Lower Churchill. That is the reason they did it, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: No thanks to that crowd.

MR. W. N. ROWE: None whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, none. No thanks.

So, Mr. Speaker, the power crisis we are in should be debated before this hon. House, and policies devised. The whole system of justice in this Province, Mr. Speaker, stinks to high heaven, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: - and it has to be investigated

MR. W.N. ROWE: and debated and dealt with by this hon. House because it is not going to be dealt with by the hon. Minister of Justice, such as he is, occupying that chair now - ~~tem~~ who cannot conceal his anxiety to get out of the House of Assembly, get out of the government, get out of public life altogether. Justice is not going to be served by this hon. government, Mr. Speaker, the abuse of justice in this Province is mind boggling and appalling. The breach of the Public Tender Act by ministers of the Crown here was laughed at by the Minister of Justice, and not only laughed at, but the Deputy Minister of Justice, the highest appointed law officer of the Crown in this Province, is dragged out in the political battle, used as a political tool for the defence of this government in its condoning of what has to be characterized as illegal activity, the breaking of an act. Mr. Speaker, if it was some poor fellow in St. John's West or over in Stephenville district he would be collared by two RCMP officers or two policemen and hustled off to jail, given a perfunctory trial and flung in and forgotten about. The people of this Province, Sir, are concerned that there is one law for a privileged few and another law for everybody else, ordinary individuals, and that hon. Minister of Justice - I wish he was in his seat. I do not know if he is outside or gone home in disgust or what - but that hon. Minister of Justice, Sir, is not bringing much credit to his own name by the administration of his department over the last number of months. I remember an occasion last year reported recently in the daily newspapers where my hon. colleague had his office ransacked, searched under a search warrant as a result of activities which he brought to light in this House by tabling documents and making a speech in this House. Okay, you say, so what, Mr. Speaker, so what? So he had a search warrant and his office was searched - well I think I will tell you so what, Sir. In the search warrant, which was obviously drafted or prepared or concocted under the auspices of the Department of Justice - I do not see a couple of police officers doing it and under the auspices of the minister. I would suggest if he did not know about the existence of that search warrant, he should have. It was derelict in his duty not to know - the search

MR. W.N. ROWE: warrant, in order to search the hon. member's office and thereby hopefully from the point of view of the government intimidate him into shutting up—I would say that was a vain effort to say the least -

MR. S. NEARY: He has to get up again.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That search warrant, Mr. Speaker, in order to make it valid, in order to go before a magistrate, a justice and get the search warrant you have to allege the commission of an offence and that there are certain documents in the possession of a certain person bearing on that offence, in the investigation of the offence, that are needed, these documents are needed, As my hon. friends in the House here tonight well know, police officers cannot get a search warrant on the grounds that "I want to search the house of the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) to find out what he has got there, a fishing expedition to see if we can find something embarrassing." That is not allowed, that is not the law of the land, Sir, You have to allege an offence committed by somebody and you must have reasonable grounds to believe that a person may have documents bearing on that offence. It has nothing to do with involving any hon. member or anyone else in the offence itself, but he may have some documents since he referred to it in the House. So a search warrant alleges an offence having been committed, the offence being that a certain person, Davidson is his name, I believe, defrauded the government of a certain amount of money.

MR. W. ROWE: That is the offence alleged which led to the granting by a magistrate in good faith of a search warrant to search my hon. friend's office. The next day, or the very same day - certainly the next day - I or somebody in this House rose and asked the Minister of Finance at the time, now the Minister of Industrial Development, whether the amount of money which was alleged to be defrauded from the government was paid under duress or paid by way of fraud or paid by way of any other criminal activity, and the hon. minister rises and says, "No, an invoice was submitted for work done. The department concerned okayed it and we paid the money."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that does not merit investigation, if that does not raise the ire of the head of the Law Society sitting opposite me here now, Mr. Speaker, what would? Not a word! His partner is not out, the head of the criminal law section, talking about violation of rights. At least I have not heard him. And my hon. friend had the presence of mind to make a complaint to the royal commission enquiring into certain goings on in the administration of justice, and although I have not talked at length with him on it, only shortly with him on it, I understand that he has given them the information. They are going to look into it.

The Department of Justice here would not look into it. My hon. friend wrote a letter to the Minister of Justice and gets the answer back, "Get a lawyer and go to court and have the search warrant declared null and void." What! A year after his office has been ransacked, Mr. Speaker? Justice in this Province! It would be scarcely an exaggeration to say it does not exist any more, Mr. Speaker, and certainly not in the minds of the people of the Province, who are very uneasy and in a state of anxiety about the way justice appears to be administered here.

The Public Accounts Committee, the strongest weapon of the House of Assembly to control government spending and enquire into it, that is disemboweled in a partisan way by direct

MR. W. ROWE: orders from the Premier's Office to government members sitting on the committee. What does the Minister of Justice do at that injustice? Nothing, Sir. He goes along with it and does nothing about it.

And now, Sir, we have a royal commission of enquiry set up into a very important matter, a matter which has already been dealt with internally by the police department, that is, a leak from the police department. We have now a royal commission of enquiry set up into a leak.

Mr. Speaker, when the fisheries scandal broke and charges were laid against certain individuals, and fires are discovered in the Department of Fisheries, and allegations of wrongdoing are flying around the Province is there a royal commission of enquiry set up?

MR. NEARY: About \$5 million in that program.

MR. W. ROWE: Is there a royal commission set up to enquire into that abuse of justice in the Province, Mr. Speaker? No, Mr. Speaker, no royal commission of enquiry set up. We have one royal commission of enquiry set up, as I mentioned earlier, as a result of pressure, force of public opinion brought to bear as a result of actions on this side of the House, the Mahoney Royal Commission into wrongdoings in Public Works. And that is revealing some very, very pleasant and savoury goings on, I must admit. It reveals the whole operation of this government in dealings with contractors, Sir, to be like a bag of rotten, abnoxious gases and rotten bones rattling around, a very unhealthy, unsavoury unjust, unjust situation. We have the Mahoney Royal Commission. Was there a royal commission of enquiry set up to enquire into the Health Sciences Centre? Allegations of wrongdoing, mismanagement and skulduggery! Was there?

MR. W. N. ROWE:

No Royal Commission of Inquiry. The Linerboard mill - Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) knows, because he has lived with it all his life and all his political life, the allegations and the rumours going around concerning wrongdoing and mismanagement in the mill before it finally went under. He witnessed some of the wrongdoing, mentioned it in this House, Mr. Speaker, all kinds of evidence indicating at best mismanagement, at worst crookedness and corruption. Is there a Royal Commission of Inquiry set up, Mr. Speaker? And the great defender of rights and liberties over there across the House, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the head of the Law Society, any Royal Commission of Inquiry? No, Mr. Speaker, none set up, none whatsoever set up.

Justice: Now, Mr. Speaker, a fire breaks out - last April, was it? - at Elizabeth Towers, 150 people in the building, most of them elderly - my own mother and father are residents of the building; an uncle and an invalid aunt of mine are other residents of the building; Lady Walsh, an elderly lady of great dignity and respect, had to crawl on her hands and knees along a corridor assisted by a fireman under billowing smoke, and would say to you today, Your Honour, if you were to ask her about that ordeal, that had it not been for the fortuitous chance or the skill of the firemen she would not have survived; that as a matter of fact she did go to hospital for observation; 150 residents evacuated.

The police reports, which everybody has read by now - they were leaked and the contents were divulged to a dozen sources long before I had any opportunity to even look at them - the police say there that from their investigation it could well

MR. W. N. ROWE: have been a disaster with the loss of many lives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the cause of that fire? Was it accidental? Was it an electrical fault? The evidence of one Jim Farrell, who has been used for fifteen or twenty years by the department and has given evidence, is thrown out by the magistrate, his evidence regarding the possibility of electrical faults or electrical cause. The evidence of other experts, Fire Commissioner Cardoulis, thrown out the window. This fellow - Spark, I believe his name is, who has been on retainer - I do not know if his evidence was even heard before the magistrate or not. I have not heard a word about his name; I have not bothered to read any transcripts. But he is on retainer by a number of provinces as an expert, I understand, was used as an expert here. He is employed, I believe, by the Crime Investigation Bureau of the insurance companies. He had his opinion on it as to whether it was accidental or deliberate. And I hasten to say, Sir, I do not care about personalities in this. I am talking about the fact that 150 people could have lost their lives or been seriously injured.



MR. W. N. ROWE: Is there a magisterial inquiry into the cause of the fire? The Chief of Police was reported as saying, I believe, or indicated to somebody that he has not been authorized or commissioned to conduct any further investigations. I have not heard of any investigation going on by the fire department. I do not know if a battery of Quebec experts have been brought in to investigate it. Certainly the hon. the Minister of Justice has been very, very reticent, silent on the subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Well, I am saying to him, Sir, and I say to the hon. member opposite that that is what should be investigated.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Investigate leaks all you want, I could not care less. I hope I have an opportunity to appear before any such Royal Commission of Inquiry in order to tell what I believe, and my opinions and facts on this whole subject. But, Sir, I would much rather see an investigation into the cause of the fire at Elizabeth Towers, which could have been the worst fire in the history of this Province in terms of loss of life and limb. That is what I want to see and I will continue to demand it, Sir. And if it is not done by this hon. crowd over here, as they have been referred to, I can guarantee Your Honour it will be done. There will be no coverups and there will be no setups that are not uncovered and exposed to the light of day.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: And there will be no toleration by this hon. member of any attempt to use the weight of the law, the Law Society, Royal Commissions of Inquiry, this hon. House partisanly used. There will be no toleration by this hon. member of any such use of those weapons for

MR. W. N. ROWE: political purposes by those hon. members so-called. There will not be any toleration. I am interested in one thing, Mr. Speaker, on this, simple truth and a discontinuance of the abuse of justice in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is there going to be an inquiry into the state of the Department of Justice's ability to investigate fires per se in the Province? We understand from the magistrate, who may be wrong - I do not know where he got his ability to make this kind of an expert judgement, I must say. He may be right, on the other hand, but he may be wrong. The ability of the Department of Justice and its various arms - the C.I.D., the fire department - to investigate the cause of fires, is there going to be an investigation into that so that we will know, I will know as a member of the House, whether we can depend on the results of investigations and so that the people of the Province will know, and so we will know, Mr. Speaker, whether those who have been accused of arson or have been convicted of arson in the past, we will know whether there is a possibility that they may have been wrongly convicted on poor evidence which was accepted by a judge or a magistrate? We need to know that. These are things which should be the subject of commissions of inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

And I would also commend to the hon. the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), who also happens to be the head of the society to which I belong - he is called the treasurer: that may give an inkling, Mr. Speaker, as to the prevailing psychology of the particular society when the head of the society is not called the president. He is called the treasurer, but in any event, Sir -

MR. WELLS: The hon. member knows better than that, Mr. Speaker, (inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, well, Mr. Speaker, I am, you know, making a little pleasantry and so on. If the hon. member is standing on his dignity, and a little poke at his pride evokes a reaction like that, Mr. Speaker, I will remember in the future that he is not to be joked with or treated with levity in any way, a very sombre individual. I expected better.

Mr. Speaker, I like it when the Law Society or the Criminal Law section of the Canadian Bar Association start to play some kind of a role in public;

MR. W.N. ROWE: such as protection of individual rights. I would like to see that happen. I wish it would happen with a little more consistency and I commend this to the hon. gentleman. I wish that every time somebody's rights as an individual are prejudiced by, perhaps, a published report in a newspaper or a radio station or a television station, I wish that the Law Society would come out and speak out against it, you know. For example, a few weeks ago when it appeared in a newspaper, I do not even know which one, as a result of a preliminary inquiry into arson -

MR. NEARY: No, a magisterial inquiry.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It was a magisterial inquiry, was it? Anyway, it was an inquiry which preceded -

MR. NEARY: Not really different.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - it was an inquiry which preceded the trial and so on - I do not recall all the details, I just recall the substance - the substance being that there was a headline - I will not use the man's name - fire happened in Placentia somewhere. "So-and-So" - Smith or Jones - "guilty of arson," I believe was the headline, or something along these lines. Unfortunately, Sir, this great society which I am proud to belong to - both societies, the Law Society and the Canadian Bar Society - did not jump out and say that this man's rights had been prejudiced seriously. I do not know why they would not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: It was evidence given at an inquiry.

MR. NEARY: A magisterial inquiry.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Evidence given at an inquiry and it was then the deduction was drawn, right?

MR. WELLS: Evidence was published illegally?

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am not talking about the legitimacy of publishing evidence, I am talking about the deduction drawn from the evidence in a headline before trial, that is what I am saying. I do not want to quibble on semantics because it is obvious what I am saying. And then, Mr. Speaker, we see a little time later where a bunch of young people in a headline, with names used, I believe, in one or two cases, are accused of gang rape in a

MR. W.N. ROWE: headline and both the prosecuting lawyer and the defence lawyer and the magistrate and so on were at some pains, I believe, at the trial to say that this was too bad, terrible the way this was reported and how a person's rights can so easily be prejudice and may have been prejudice. And the Law Society and the Canadian Bar Association did not jump out to the man's defence. I can only ask why. I mean, we should really be getting into that kind of thing and trying to protect the rights of individuals as best we can. What I am saying, Sir, is that we should not be picking and choosing. We should do it in all cases, but, Sir, with some consistency. We should not really be picking and choosing. I just commend that to the hon. member who is the esteemed head of the Law Society.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making - and I wish the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) were here - is that he is not doing a very good job in administering justice in the Province. He is doing a deplorable job and he has succeeded in doing what no Minister of Justice has ever done in this Province before, and there have been some poor Ministers of Justice over the history of the Province and the Dominion and the Colony, but he has caused, I would submit, Sir, a complete breakdown in confidence in various aspects of the administration of Justice, especially by common, ordinary people who fear or who believe, and you will hear it everywhere you go, that in this Province: "Well, there is one for the rich and another for the poor". Laws are cobwebs to be swept away by the privileged and chains, steel chains for the poor or the less advantaged - a little bit harder to be swept away. You get that impression and I would say it is the direct fault of this Minister of Justice. and the Government that he represents. He has not been at pains to make sure that public confidence in the administration of Justice is maintained as a result of what he has done and what he has not done. And, Sir, perhaps on some other occasion I will have an opportunity to say a few more words on that subject when the hon. minister is in his place because it is an important matter and one which I consider to be among the most important matters

February 15, 1979

Tape 455

SD-3

MR. W.N. ROWE:

facing the Province today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to

another important

MR. W. ROWE: subject, and that is the fisheries of the Province. We have a government and a leadership candidate, the hon. minister will be glad to hear, who has made a name for himself as a result of the publicity actively sought, the publicity which he has managed to get, about his involvement in the fisheries. The unfortunate thing about it, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sending out brochures.

MR. W. ROWE: - that is right, brochures going out. I do not know how much these things cost at 100,000 copies.

MR. F. ROWE: The same public relations firm that is doing his leadership.

MR. W. ROWE: The same public relations firm that is doing his leadership sent this out at public cost to the people of the Province. But he has managed to get himself a great deal of publicity and some superficial attachment by some fishermen in the Province, although if you go below the surface a little bit, look a little bit into the thing more profoundly you will realize that the vast majority of the people and the fishermen of the Province are not sucked in by the hon. minister's glory seeking and publicity seeking. They are not, Sir. Because they know that the hon. minister had made whatever name he may have as a result of two things: One is the fact that he is dedicated to kicking at Ottawa all the time, trying to take credit for things which he had no more to do with than the man in the moon, mind you, which had to do with Ottawa, and kicking out at Ottawa for things which are very often beyond anybody's control and certainly are a matter that should be the subject of negotiation, and consultation between the two governments. That is number one, Mr. Speaker, kicking out at Ottawa which I would say is very counter-productive as far as this Province is concerned, and as far as the fishermen and the fishery of the Province are concerned.

And secondly, Sir, he has made his name by the big announcement; two or three years ago we had a \$900 million programme. The Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, from whom the money was to be obtained, had not heard of it when it was announced, the

MR. W. ROWE: was to be obtained, had not heard of it when it was announced, the \$900 million programme entered into with some alliance between the minister here and the minister up in Nova Scotia.

MR. F. ROWE: A \$45 million trawler fleet.

MR. W. ROWE: There was a \$45 million, a very small big project, a small big project a few years ago, a \$45 million trawler fleet, which came to nothing, to make the big announcement. Now we have something else. We have a \$500 million project now concerning which there was no consultation with Ottawa although the money was supposed to come from Ottawa. The Minister of Fisheries says there was no consultation with Ottawa.

We had another big project there a little while ago which foundered, thankfully, which he was in favour of at the beginning and then came around to it, that was the Nordsee development. The Premier was pushing it for some reason or other for all he was worth and the Minister of Fisheries was on the fence -

MR. F. ROWE: Pretty weak.

MR. W. ROWE: - and then came around. And the thing fell apart, Nordsee pulled out of it. They saw they were running into heavy water, I guess. And thankfully it did fall through, Sir, because there were a great number of pitfalls there and dangers for the people of the Province, the fishermen of the Province, not the least of which was the danger to the whole Northern cod stock and therefore the danger to the Northern and Northeastern and East Coast fishery, the inshore and nearshore fishery of the Province, which needs to be rationalized and built up and protected above everything else, the inshore and the nearshore fishery.

Everything, Sir, that he has put his hand to is either not in the best interest of the Province at all, in the best interest of someone, I am not quite sure who, but not in the best interest of the Province, or is merely lashing out at Ottawa, or is a



MR. W. ROWE:                   big, grandiose announcement that comes to nothing. And those matters will all be scrutinized in the days ahead, particularly, I would submit, if the hon. minister becomes the leader of the party, they will be scrutinized with some particularity, because it is important from our point of view, not only politically but in the interests of truth - it is important that the people of the Province know the truth about the fishery and the fishing developments of this government, and the lack thereof. And, Sir, we shall continue to probe into that.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough merely to criticize the government, I will be the first to admit that, although that is part of our role and our honourable job to criticize where we see criticism is necessary.

Mr. W. N. Rowe: But, Sir, this party and this caucus have been at pains for years to develop policies, forward-looking policies, constructive, positive policies to offer to the people of the Province. We had twelve or a dozen of these policies enshrined in private members' resolutions last year.

One policy, for example, which is very important, is a policy to provide medically prescribed drugs and medications to the elderly in this Province free of cost. And, Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour had been at the Senior Citizen Clubhouse in Deer Lake last Monday where seventy or eighty senior citizens were gathered together, and I had a chance to speak to them and with them and they to make their comments to me and ask questions and make remarks and so on, and if Your Honour had heard the testimony, really, of a number of these senior citizens, a couple of whom got up before the crowd there and said, in one case particularly, living on a fixed income, a pension that was not going up nearly as fast, if at all, not nearly as fast as the cost of living was going up, \$80 a month he had to pay for drugs and medications medically prescribed by the doctor, And in order to do so, Mr. Speaker, because he was outside of the range whereby Social Services would help, in order to do so, Mr. Speaker, he had to suffer discomforts of various kinds, not only in the shelter he had, the roof needed to be done and so on which he could not do, the quality of his food and the heat in his home, electrical heat in his home and so on, he had to suffer real discomfort at the age of seventy-three or seventy-four or something, a man with a combination of ailments and diseases, heart, diabetes, and so on, and here he was, Sir, at that age having made a contribution, having worked his whole life, having raised a family and put them out into the world, We cannot call ourselves civilized, Mr. Speaker, if we do not have a programme and a plan whereby no senior citizen in this Province has to suffer as a result of having to purchase medically prescribed medications and drugs for himself, or his family for that matter. He should not have to suffer, Sir, and therefore we have a policy enunciated in this House and throughout the

MR. W. N. Rowe: Province. When I spoke in Gander a few months ago at the Convention of Senior Citizens I made the same point, Mr. Speaker, that we were right behind that kind of a programme.

Property taxes, Mr. Speaker, for the elderly is something which has been in the air now for a long time, and has now reached a certain degree of public prominence. Corner Brook is one example, where Harrison Cooper over there bringing it to life. Mr. Speaker, our proposal is that we must gather the data, we must make a study and see how much it would cost initially to exempt all senior citizens from the payment of property taxes, and see how much it would cost for this government to reimburse the municipalities involved for that loss of income. Certainly there are exemptions now in many cases, in most cases. But, Sir, the people I talked to do not qualify for the exemption. In one case there for example, a man and his wife would have qualified for an exemption if they made less than \$4,000 a year; if they made more than \$4,000 a year they had to pay a certain amount of property taxes, nearly all, as a matter of fact, 75 per cent or so. But \$4,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, is below the poverty line. And there may be a number of senior citizens in the Province who do have the wherewithal, the income to pay their property taxes, but, Sir, the vast majority do not without encroaching on other basic necessities of life. They do not.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Those that do have the wherewithal are paying income tax, in any event, based on their income. The money finds its way into the public treasury. But, Sir, one thing that we should not be doing is imposing on senior citizens, elderly people in this Province, that most regressive of taxes. Property tax has no bearing on what you are earning. When a man or woman has some pride in their home and work towards increasing the value of the home and the assessor comes along, as he is doing now, and ups the value for tax purposes, he is penalized for what he has done, no relationship to his income whatsoever. It is a wrong regressive kind of tax in any event and certainly in its application to the elderly people of the Province. Mr. Speaker, it should be investigated immediately and see what costs are involved because no one wants to make irresponsible commitments, perhaps we are talking about the area of subsidies rather than total abolition, but let us look at the figures and see what is involved here. I would submit, Sir, based on preliminary research, that the cost would not be all that great. But that is a policy which should be brought in.

Mr. Speaker, in this year's Order Paper, Wednesday's Order Paper, you can see additional policies which we have added. Last year we had the policy on the development of the Churchill river, the Lower Churchill, the policy with regard to the Upper Churchill, the development of Labrador resources and other policies as well. This year in addition to those policies we have a policy on unemployment which mentions that as I mentioned earlier, that unemployment has doubled since 1971 and that half of those unemployed are in the fifteen year old to twenty-four year old age group which, Mr. Speaker, has very grave social consequences, as my hon. friend for the Port au Port district (Mr. Hodder) mentioned a little earlier. And there are tens of thousands unable to find work in our Province and in addition thousands of Newfoundland and Labrador workers have gone out of the Province altogether, some to Iran, by the way, Mr. Speaker. And I was speaking in Stephenville to a couple of

MR. W.N. ROWE: constituents of my hon. friend here who just escaped, I suppose, is the right word, from Iran. One was owed or had lost a combination of about something like \$9,000. That was the figure he quoted. Another person referred to a person who had lost or was owed, which he did not expect to get, \$17,000 plus personal effects as a result of the political goings-on in Iran. Mr. Speaker, that is a dramatic example of what can happen when people leave the Province. We suggested by way of policy that a select committee of this House be appointed to hold hearings throughout the Province and to come up with recommendations with a view to produce either a clear plan for the joint co-operation and action of the federal and provincial governments.

And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile district (Mr. Neary) mentioned a Crown corporation consisting of the federal and provincial government in order to systematically and scientifically, not haphazardly and hit-or-miss, but scientifically and systematically deal with the unemployment problem and use federal and provincial funds to get rid of our unemployment problem in this Province. That is the policy, Mr. Speaker.

My hon. colleague for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) had a policy put into resolution form regarding the fishery which was against the government's present policy which appeared to favour multinational corporations at the expense of the development of the inshore, nearshore fisheries and native Newfoundland and Labrador trawlermen, and that what we needed to get into were policies and plans, actual concrete, comprehensive plans for the development of the inshore, nearshore and the trawler fishery and independent fish plant operators, Mr. Speaker. That is what we should be into, not kicking at the federal government, not coming out with a big \$900 million development plan which never sees the light of day, concerning which there was no consultation or anything else. That is the kinds of policies. The hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen)

MR. W. ROWE: wants a policy endorsed by this party that the policy of Newfoundland and Labradorians first be adopted by the public service, Crown corporations, educational institutions, municipalities, all firms doing business in the Province with regard to the hiring of labour and job preferences. That is a policy we can endorse. Certainly they have endorsed it and followed it in the Province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker. You have very little chance of getting a job if you do not come from Quebec.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) talked about making sure that the Province, acting for the people, should become a partner in the development of all non-renewable resources, with a non-renewable resource contingency fund to be funded by the industrial exploiter, the purpose of the fund being to provide financial relief to areas where non-renewable resources have been exhausted and to help in attracting alternate industry.

Mr. Speaker, what could be more forward looking and progressive than that policy? If it had been followed earlier in the history of this Province we would have been able to alleviate much of the problems, many of the problems that have developed with regard to St. Lawrence, are developing with regard to Buchans.

MR. NEARY: It happened on Bell Island.

MR. W. ROWE: And happened in disastrous proportions on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Right. Right on.

MR. W. ROWE: And will happen in Baie Verte, and will happen in other parts of the Province where we depend on renewable resources.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. W. ROWE: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) mentioned something I mentioned earlier here, that the government should bring in legislation, and we would do it this

MR. W. ROWE: session, to exempt senior citizens from school and municipal taxation. Well I just mentioned that. That is one of our policies. Certainly the study should be made to see how much it is going to cost as well.

The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) talked in terms of the high cost of living, the devaluating dollar and so on, and urged the House to bring in legislation to raise the minimum wage to an amount to put it in line with that received in other Canadian provinces, with a provision for mandatory review every year to ensure that our minimum wage is kept in line with that received in other Canadian provinces. Nothing extravagant, nothing kowtowing to pressure groups who may have irresponsible demands, but something which puts us in line with the rest of Canada, and if necessary, of course, we could be in some cases a leader if it looked like others were lagging behind. But at least we would be in line with the rest of Canada as far as our minimum wage is concerned. A good policy, Mr. Speaker. And so on and so forth.

Policy after policy, Sir, that this party stands for and which will certainly be brought home in no uncertain terms to the people of this Province in the weeks leading up to a general election and during a general election so they will know where we stand. Then they can make their decision based on the policy, based on the candidates, based on the parties. And I hope that comes in April of this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: And we will be putting it out in the Liberal Tide.

MR. W. ROWE: Our Liberal Tide will carry it. The Liberal Tide which is coming in will carry with it our policies.

MR. F. ROWE: Nothing foolish.

MR. W. ROWE: And when it goes out will carry out with it the Tory flotsam and jetsam and there it will stay.

MR. F. FOWE: 'Bill! nothing foolish like, "This land is our land" and then they try to sell it to Nordsee.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not get nasty now.

MR. NEARY: You were all right all day.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, this land is our land

MR. NEARY: Doing great all day.

MR. W. ROWE: This land is our land is going to be our slogan, then after we get in we will sell out the Nordsee the next day. The next day we will sell out the Nordsee, Mr. Speaker, 'if we



MR. W. N. ROWE: follow their example.

MR. F. ROWE: The Liberal tide is coming in.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Other policies, Mr. Speaker;

Having spoken to a senior citizens group in Deer Lake on Monday, on Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of speaking to a group of high school students at Assumption High School at Stephenville Crossing, 250 of them, and we discussed back and forth policies affecting youth. And, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, something which the government is probably not aware of because they do not seem to be too concerned about these matters; Sir, there is a very, very serious feeling of discouragement permeating the young people of this Province as far as job opportunities are concerned - discouragement. They see 60 per cent or 70 per cent or 80 per cent of their fellows unemployed, walking the street, and, Mr. Speaker, the point I made to them, Sir, which has been made by our side in this House on innumerable occasions, is that we should not tolerate and we cannot tolerate any cutbacks in education such as were proposed by the hon. the Minister of Education and this government last year. Here we are with one half the graduates on the average per capita as is found on the average across Canada in Grade XI, one half the graduates on the average per capita compared to the average across Canada, graduating from university and grade schools. And, Sir, this government do not seem to realize that it is on education that everything else depends.

MR. NEARY: What happened to the polytechnical they were going to stick up on top of the hill?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Polytechnical - there have been four or five bills brought into the House on polytechnical institutions.

MR. F. ROWE: And all the residences they were going to construct for the Trades College.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this government do not seem to realize that everything else depends on education, the proper development of our resources and having the qualified skilled workers to go into those jobs. Mr. Speaker, are we going to have hospitals in this Province if we do not have a tax base mainly as a result of skilled, highly paid workers in this Province, based on the fact that they are educated and trained and obtain their skills, their professions and trades? Everything depends on it, Mr. Speaker. And that is the point I was making to the students, one with which they could readily identify, that, no, there should not be cutbacks, there should be increases in a sensible way. We should talk about and study this Grade XII proposition to see if that is good, bad or indifferent.

I talked to the students, Sir, about such problems as alcohol abuse, which is becoming a plague in our Province, perhaps even drug abuse, although my own suspicion, based on inquiries I have made through police sources and through teachers and so on, is that alcohol abuse among young people is the real plague facing us now.

MR. NEARY: And middle-aged and old people.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Well, I mean, the fact that it has been ignored so long and a blind eye turned to it so long has resulted in, as my hon. friend says, middle-aged, young -

MR. NEARY: The biggest curse in Newfoundland society today.

MR. W. N. ROWE: And what do we do, Mr. Speaker? We get-what? - \$40 million a year from the Liquor Commission?

MR. F. ROWE: Thirty-seven million dollars last year.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, \$40 million a year from

MR. W. N. ROWE: the Liquor Commission, the third or fourth single largest item of revenue, is it not, if I remember correctly?

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, I think it is number three.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Number three, I think, in terms of a single item, giving revenue to the Province.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this government spend more money in the right areas regarding alcohol abuse and misuse, imperative, as my hon. friend from LaPoile district (Mr. Neary) said earlier, particularly now among young people - education programmes alerting them to the dangers, not to treat some young person as a criminal who gets involved in the nefarious web probably of peer pressure and doing something he or she knows nothing about, not to be treated as a criminal - education programmes, enlightenment programmes, programmes whereby cure or remedies or help is readily available, rehabilitation is readily available. And that takes money. And it is not going to be had by throwing out a token to one or two of the laudable institutions which we have here in the Province now, trying gallantly but rather desperately to grapple with the problem. It has to be seized head on and dealt with, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: The lowest in Canada.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The lowest what?

MR. F. ROWE: The amount these groups get is the lowest in Canada.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right, the lowest in Canada. It should be a very large proportion of the income which is derived from the sale of booze by the government.

MR. F. ROWE: Ten per cent gives you \$3.7 million.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A very large percentage, Sir, in order to try to combat this plague.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

I was appalled to talk to some teachers about what goes on among thirteen year olds and fourteen year olds. One young girl, seventeen years of age from a part of the Province, President of the Student Union, was highly in favour of their school -

MR. W. ROWE: there was another school going to be built not far away, the school at that present time I think had children from grades seven up to grade eleven, and what she was interested in seeing done, and she had a poll done among the students in the school, she wanted the other school not to be used for another similar school to the one, you know, from seven to eleven, but for the seven and eights to be in this other school and nines, tens and elevens remain in the high school. I asked her why she wanted to do that. She said because the young students coming in in grade seven and eight are being subjected to the unhealthy influences of some older students with regard to alcohol. A seventeen year old girl going to university next year, sensible, Mr. Speaker, as the day is long, that is what she was saying, and giving me chapter and verse which I will not detail for the House at the present time, called up to talk about this problem.

That is what is going on, Sir, that kind of thing and it has to be grappled with. It is something that is easy really to ignore because it can be treated as some sort of underground movement or other, something that can be dealt with by the police or dealt with by parents. But it has to be dealt with by society, Mr. Speaker, it has to be dealt with by this House, expending the proper amount of money to those who know how to cope with the problem or have experience in coping with the problem, in helping young people, and middle aged people and elderly people as well, to cope with the disease of alcoholism and with the alcohol abuse and misuse problems that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I think I only have about ten minutes left out of my ninety minutes. There are many things which I would like to talk about and dearly wish I had the opportunity during the weeks ahead to talk about and hear the comments of some members on the other side concerning them as well. But, Sir, let me mention finally one other policy which is very close to my heart and which was mentioned during the televised session of the House by myself

MR. W. ROWE: as well, and that has to do with hospital construction in the Province.

Last year it was estimated, it may have gone up by now, but last year it was estimated that some \$70 million was needed in order to put the adequate hospital in Channel - Port aux Basques that was needed, number one; to put the adequate hospital on the Bonavista Peninsula, the Clarenville area presumably, number two; the hospital which was needed on the Burin Peninsula and the expansion to the Central Newfoundland Hospital in Grand Falls - \$70 million.

Well, Sir, that sounds like a great deal of money; spread over a three or four year construction period it is not a great deal of money in terms of the capital borrowings of this Province. But, Sir, my solemn commitment made then and reiterated now is that any government that I lead will start the day it enters office to set in train, in motion, whatever machinery is necessary to get these hospitals built. It is disgraceful that they have not been done already and they would have been done, Sir, had this government not wasted and squandered and in some cases, as a result of what might be described as underhanded methods by others outside this hon. House, the money was siphoned off from the public chest in that way, but by these various methods money was wasted or mismanaged and squandered and thrown away.

The \$110 million mentioned

MR. W.N. ROWE: again by the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), \$110 million on a premature, abortive start up of construction of the Lower Churchill, most of which is down the drain, could have been used for it. But, Mr. Speaker, I am saying this, that I consider it to be the top priority to bring the health services of the Province up to par, up to scratch, up to some kind of decent level commensurate with what obtains across Canada and the Atlantic Provinces, And, Sir, as I mentioned at that time, the visit to the hospital there in Port aux Basque, Mr. Speaker, serving - how many people would be served by the Southwest corner there?

MR. NEARY: Including the Codroy Valley, I suppose about 16,000 or 17,000.

MR. W.N. ROWE: 16,000 or 17,000 people; the Baie Verte peninsula has a population of 12,000 - 13,000 people, beautiful little hospital there, lovely hospital, capable of doing just about everything in a routine nature in that it is a - pardon?

MR. NEARY: A Liberal hospital.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A Liberal hospital put there by the Liberal Government with some contribution by the mining company at the time, I do not mind saying. M.J. Boylen was involved in it at that time and, Mr. Speaker - pardon?

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh, they are all fine, all of the miners are fine, all of the mining companies are fine.

MR. NEARY: What about Mr. John Weston? What kind of a prince is he? You should know, he was your buddy.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, he had buddies in the Government.

MR. NEARY: Why do not you ask your colleague the former Minister of Industrial Development? He was his buddy.

MR. DOODY: Everybody needs a buddy.

MR. NEARY: That is right. You do not need that kind of buddy though.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, a rip off artist. But, Sir, let me conclude my remarks.

MR. NEARY: What about Mr. A. B. Walsh? What kind of prince is he?

MR. DOODY: You must know more about him than anybody else. You did enough research on him.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Beg your pardon?

MR. RIDEOUT: You are going to finish your remarks now.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is right. Let me say, Sir -

MR. DOODY: Shovel it out of you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: -that I consider the hospital situation to be a top priority and one which will be met. My hon. friend will have his hospital in Channel-Port aux Basque to serve the people of that area -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear. That will be done.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - up to an adequate level and standard. The people of the Burin Peninsula will have their hospital as soon as possible, as quickly as possible after we form the Government. There are a number of problems involved that I am not going to get involved in. I, as a policy maker, will say, the money is available - the experts, the medical experts and lay experts say that this kind of hospital is needed - I do not make that decision-that this amount of money is needed, I will not make that decision but it would certainly be watched when it is being spent. The location of it is a decision to be made by medical experts, lay experts, Municipal Governments in the area, I do not know if the member would want to get into it or not, members in the area, individuals in the area, that decision will be made.



MR. W.N. ROWE: It is a thorny decision, no doubt about that, but it will be made. The Central Newfoundland Hospital will have its expansion to bring it up to par, up to what is medically needed, and the hospital in the Clarenville area will be provided. And when that is done, Mr. Speaker, the medical services of the Province as far as the capital side is concerned will be in pretty good shape and they should be done. And, Sir, I guarantee, I do not make many commitments, have not made many commitments in my public life, but I would make this commitment, that if there is any money in the public chest - unless we are bankrupt, unless this crowd have got her bankrupt so we would have to bail her out - I doubt if that is going to happen though.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can say that again.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I doubt if that is going to happen.

MR. NEARY: What about it?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that one has to waste one's fragrance on the desert air at 7:30 in the morning. I have just been reminded that I have a minute or two left.

Let me just say that it is disgraceful, I consider it to be disgraceful, that this House is closing. There is no need for it to close; we could have a week or so of recess before the convention, a week afterwards. The Premier, who has announced his resignation to take effect sometime after the convention, and now has no axe to grind, no political ambitions to foster or protect, no political mileage to make or lose, should use the time, Mr. Speaker, between now and then - he does not need all his ministers around all the time; have some of them around some of the time, that is all we ever had in the past

Mr. W. N. Rowe: in any event - the Premier could use the benefit of his experience, this is the point I started off with and would not be saying it again except the Premier has come in. He should use the benefit of his six or seven or eight years of experience, what he has seen. In fact, he is going out now, he is not worried about his political future, spend the next month or so on giving us the benefit of his advice, his experience in this House, what he thinks should be done. Whether it is politically popular for him or not would then be irrelevant. And we could have the benefit of -

PREMIER MOORES: I am writing a book.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh he is going to write books.

PREMIER MOORES: I will (inaudible) the last one.

MR. NEARY: What was that snarky remark?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: But I would like to hear the Premier saying, you know, making some comments as to what he sees in the future and what should be done and some of the problems that he sees, and the pitfalls that we should avoid as legislators, as members of the government and members of the Opposition.

Sir, I know my time has run out. Just let me repeat that it is a shame, it is a disgrace that the House is not sitting, and that we should sit. And when the leadership convention is over let us get rid of the foolishness that has been going on. Let us have an election. Let the new leader go to the people and let the people decide who they want to represent them in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker. And I have no fears personally as to what the outcome will be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A point of order has come up.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not begrudge the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) his speech, but does his speech close the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. ROBERTS: It is his motion, Sir. I am not sure. If he speaks again I would assume that means he closes the debate.

MR. WELLS: I am not sure, but if so -

MR. ROBERTS: Well neither am I, that is why I raised the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: In my understanding, I never heard of an adjournment motion where the debate is closed. Of course, there are very few adjournment motions where one has such a debate or such a lengthy debate. I am not aware that there is a right of reply, -

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think there is, and he has spoken in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: - when a person moves an adjournment motion. And I think in moving the motion he has spoken to it.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

MR. SPEAKER: To the best of my knowledge I am not aware of a right to reply in an adjournment motion. It is a procedural motion, that is to my awareness. If there are arguments to the contrary, I will hear them. One usually thinks of the right of reply in motions which are resolutions on the Order Paper, and bills. But motions which are made of a procedural nature, like an adjournment motion, the previous question, a six month hoist, a motion that the House proceed to reading of the Orders of the Day, these kinds of motions, to the best of my knowledge, when the person makes one, he has spoken and there is no right of reply.

I will hear argument to the contrary.

MR. WELLS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: Your Honour is probably right, I do not know. I was under the impression that when it was simply the moving of the motion without a speech, however short in the process - in other words, I move that so and so - I was under the impression that one was allowed to speak to the motion in the normal way, in the course of debate.

PREMIER MOORES: Or to close the debate.

MR. WELLS: Or to close the debate, as the case may be. However it is a matter entirely for Your Honour.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, above all members of this House my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) adverted, would be the very man to whom that point should not be addressed, because when his Honour was here as Leader of the Opposition he once stood and seconded a motion and it was subsequently ruled, from a point of order raised by the then Premier, that that constituted the Leader of the Opposition's speech in the debate on reply.

But I mean I am sure I speak for my colleagues here, who have been here all night, unlike the second shift who came in, you know, with the dawn, that if the hon. gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) would like to speak we are certainly prepared to grant him leave, Mr. Speaker, to speak for forty-five minutes, as he has not had a chance to enter into the debate in a substantive way, and I am sure he could make a contribution to it. We are in no hurry to adjourn the House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand from the hon. gentleman no exception is taken to his speaking, and therefore if that is the case I do not have to make a definitive ruling on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member.

MR. R. WELLS:

I thank my colleagues. My purpose in speaking, Mr. Speaker, in this debate is to deal with certain matters involving the administration of justice which have been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Now it is not my place nor my wish to speak for the Minister of Justice; he will speak for himself in matters concerning the conduct of the Department of Justice. But, nonetheless, as a man who has worked in the administration of justice for twenty years, I feel that the opinion or the cast, if I may use the word, put upon certain matters by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is certainly not how I see them and I feel that I should express myself on them. Now what happened was that a fire occurred in the apartment of the hon. member who sits to my right. Most of us were here in the House that night or - well, anyway, we know nothing about it; it is a matter for investigators. But what did happen was that some four or five months after the investigation began, and this is a matter of public record, a police report came into the hands of the press and the press published it. Now I felt as a citizen, as a lawyer, as a member of this House, I felt that that was most improper. I felt at the time that what should have happened that whoever got this police report, because obviously I presume a policeman had to give it to somebody and we have learnt afterwards as a matter of public knowledge that a policeman in fact did give this report to another person or persons, but the person, I felt, whoever it might be - we had no idea, nobody at the time, who was given that report - but I felt that the proper thing was for the person to have gone immediately to the Minister of Justice and said, "Sir, I have here something which I ought not to have which is the property of the police department and which I bring to your attention." Now I say that because I think that is the proper course and I will tell you why. Anybody who is familiar with police investigations and the time between the happening of events and the laying of charges if they are going to be laid, realizes that not only months but sometimes

MR. R. WELLS: years take place. The longest one that I personally was involved in, and that was not when this government was in office— and it was an ordinary criminal offence with no politics involved in any way it was about ten or twelve years ago— it was four years between the commission of the events and the laying of the charge. I do not mind saying that the person who had the charge laid got an awful shock and a dart when the charge was made. Most charges where a serious investigation is involved take, in my experience, a year sometimes two years. Take if criminal negligence causing death on the highway; most of these charges, or a lot of them if it is a tricky investigation, take maybe as much as a year and a half. I am dealing with one now that took almost two years.

MR. ROBERTS: I have a fellow now waiting almost fourteen months to go to trial.

MR. R. WELLS: That is right. But even the laying of the charge takes anywhere, very often in a tricky investigation, from a year plus. So that this particular report was leaked, as I understand it from what has been in the public press and emanated from the court, it had to be done within about four or five months. So that anyone knowing anything about the system in receiving such a report, should it be a newspaper or whatever, should in my view have gone to the Attorney General and said, "We have this. We know that not much time has elapsed. What are you going to do about it? If charges are going to be laid that is fine, we will say nothing, if charges are not going to be laid, then we will have our say." And I would think that would be fair enough. Now that is what I feel should have happened when the report came into the hands of people who ought not to have had it, whoever they were.

Now I want to make another distinction because my hon. colleague over there has mentioned that I am the head of the Law Society which is true. He says that the Canadian Bar, Criminal Justice sub-section got involved in this, and so they did.

MR. ROBERTS: And rightly so.

MR. R. WELLS: And rightly so. That Criminal Justice sub-section was a group of about twelve people of all political

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 465 (Night)

DW - 3

MR. R. WELLS:

colours that there are, I  
suppose, and a good many neutrals and they had their say on what  
they thought of the press publishing this.

MR. WELLS: But that, as my hon. colleague knows, had nothing whatsoever to do with the Law Society. The Law Society is the governing body of the profession. I do not mind saying that in my capacity as head of the Law Society I have had a great many calls, I have had a great many calls from members of the press in recent weeks saying, "Is the Law Society going to get involved?" And my answer to that has been, no, unless something specific and concrete is brought to the Law Society concerning a member of the Law Society. Because as long as I am a benchet and Treasurer of the Law Society, the Law Society is not going to get involved in chasing and pillorying anybody and I hope my hon. colleague believes what I say because it is the simple truth. And I do not think that the Law Society has acted improperly in this way, or I as Treasurer of it. In fact, I think we have been scrupulous to keep -

MR. W. ROWE: It was quoted in the Daily News.

MR. WELLS: What I have maintained to these people is this, that a question which could well come before the Law Society would be who disseminated the report in question to the press, the police report in question? If that person is not a member of the Law Society then it is none of the Law Society's business. If that person, whoever disseminated it to the press, were to be a member, or there were evidence that the person was a member, an admission of the Law Society, that could be a different matter. And I think that is a fair and perfectly straightforward statement to make. But I do not know, nor does the Law Society know, nor does anybody, to my knowledge, know, who disseminated that report to the press. If it emerges then that is a different matter. But the Law Society has no business getting involved in this at this stage and I would hope my hon. friend is not suggesting that the Law Society was somehow involved in this or improperly involved in this - or involved in any way, as it has not been. That is the simple truth.



MR. WELLS: So that on this question there is a royal commission now to determine, I gather from the announcement today, to determine various matters about how that report was leaked. Well sobeit. Let it do its work. On the question of whether there should be another commission, or any magisterial enquiry as to how the fire occurred, I cannot see it. Quite seriously, as I see this, whatever resources, were they good or bad, that were available to the local police, the constabulary, were put into the investigation of that fire.

MR. NEARY: Ah ha.

MR. WELLS: I presume so. What they had was there.

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot take it any longer.

MR. WELLS: What they had was there. The police were there. I am not criticizing the police. I do not know if they did a good job or a bad job, but they were there. They were detailed to investigate and I presume they investigated and they had available whatever experts were available from the outside and were brought in and investigated and I presume that the defence in this case had whatever was available and they gave their opinion. I was not there in court. It was none of my business to be there. But the case took place and the magistrate found that there was no case to answer.

MR. NEARY: The case did not take place.

MR. WELLS: The preliminary enquiry.

MR. NEARY: That is not the thing.

MR. WELLS: The preliminary enquiry is the procedure to determine if there is a case to answer and the magistrate found -

MR. NEARY: How often in the last twenty-five years has a charge been thrown out at the preliminary hearing?

MR. WELLS: Dozens of times. I had one in Gander three weeks ago.

MR. NEARY: On arson?

MR. WELLS: No, not on arson.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. How many times on arson in the last twenty-five years?

MR. WELLS: I have not the faintest idea.

MR. NEARY: Zero! Zero!

MR. WELLS: Maybe zero. But the point was that in this case the evidence did not stand up and the magistrate found, which is his right and his duty, as he - because he is supposed to call it as he sees it, and he found there was no case to answer and he threw the case out. Now what I cannot see is if all the evidence that we know of, or at least presumably that the Crown knows of, or that was available to the police was presented at that preliminary enquiry - if there was evidence that they did not present, well then by God they should be hauled before somebody and severely reprimanded - but I presume everything they had they put out and the case fell to the ground and that was it. So I cannot see - and the minister is the one who will answer this, I am sure - but I cannot see at this stage what further investigation into that fire would prove or what it would show. But if anybody has any information, or anything new or fresh to show or to shed on this, then I think they should go immediately to the Minister of Justice or get somebody to stand up in the House for them or whatever and lay it out so that nothing be hidden. But I wanted to make these couple of points, because after I listened to my hon. friend in dealing with this matter I got the feeling that something improper or wrong had taken place and that everything was not according to Hoyle, and if it is not, well it is not and let us lay

MR. R. WELLS:                   it out, but so far as I can see the Department of Justice has acted properly. It laid charges. The time between the happening of the fire and the laying of charges was not long, it was only about five or six or seven months - six months, I think - which is not long in these matters; very often charges are a year and two years before they are laid. So I cannot see anything improper. The magistrate made his determination as a magistrate and provincial court judge, which was his right and his duty, and nobody has been able to come along since and say, 'Magistrate, you overlooked something,' because the prosecution's case collapsed, and it became pretty obvious from what was published by the magistrate that this is so. Anyway, that is all I am going to say on that.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this: This is a motion that this House do adjourn until the 27th of March. One thing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and I agree on, I must say - and this may well be the last time I will ever speak in this House; I hope in some respects it is - on one thing we agree: I think that whoever becomes the Leader of the Conservative Party and the Premier of this Province should go immediately to the Lieutenant-Governor and dissolve the thing and call an election and let the people speak for a change. I have served now for two sessions. The first session we had there was not the kind of acrimonious and bitter debate, not the same attack on institutions, not the same attack on people as has taken place in this session which is now in its fourth year. I do not think in terms of, "Who is to blame?" It is not for me to point the finger, but somehow we have not served the people of Newfoundland, I feel, as they ought to have been served. And I think the House has deteriorated. I think it is like Cromwell said to the Long Parliament,

MR. R. WELLS: 'Be gone,' or whatever,  
'Your time is up,' or you -

MR. HICKMAN: 'In the name of God, go!'

MR. R. WELLS: 'In the name of God, go!'

And that is just about how I feel about this House right now. Because we are not really debating the fundamental issues of this Province, Mr. Speaker. We are attacking its institutions, that is what we are doing, and we are attacking - inside and outside the House - the people who are trying to make the community work or make the House work. That is what is happening. So one hope I express is that the new leader, whoever he is, will go to the people and let the people decide, because if the people want my hon. colleagues on the other side, that is fine with me. If they want this side, as I would hope and pray, fine! Because I feel that with all the shortcomings and all the faults that can be levelled against this government, this government in a lot of respects has done a very fine job. It has preserved freedom, I think. And when you talk about Royal Commissions and investigations and everything that this government has made, it has had a lot of Royal Commissions but most of them have been to investigate itself.

MR. NEARY: And with good reason, too.

MR. R. WELLS: And with good reason? If that is the way it turns out, then that is fine. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for a new House, I think it is time for some new people to bring a fresh standard and a fresh sense of dedication to this House, because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I think this particular House has lost it. So I will vote for the motion, and I think the motion is not only a question of being in order, but I think that it would do no good to this Province to have this House carry on over the next three or four

MR. R. WELLS: weeks, whatever it is, with the kind of thing we have grown accustomed to here. I think it is time for a new House and I think it is time for the people to speak, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly at this hour of the morning will not keep the House for forty-five minutes.

As I was trying to take my turn having a short rest, get up the courage and the energy to meet with the hon. Otto Lang after I leave here today, which will be pleasant I am sure, through the fog I heard some of the statements of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, statements that I am not prepared to allow to go unanswered. The hon. gentleman has stood in his place and he is complaining about the Royal Commission that is being set up to investigate the unprecedented disclosure of a police report, part of the report dealing with an investigation into alleged criminal activity.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Hickman: this sudden concern for the investigative procedures and the concern about a cover up: Is that something that suddenly arose in October when the hon. the Leader of the Opposition found himself in possession of this confidential report?

Mr. Speaker, I would direct hon. gentlemen's attention - and I have them all and I could keep you here all day - to the fact that this fire occurred on April 26. Two days later - two days later! - hon. gentlemen opposite, first led by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and in subsequent days in April and May by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, once by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), kept insinuating by innuendo that there was something wrong with this investigation. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition cannot plead ignorance to the method of investigating arson, because if he will read Hansard of May 29, if he will read Hansard of June 16, if he will read Hansard of May 4, and other days in between, he will see that I set forth in the greatest detail the manner in which cases of this kind are investigated. The simple fact is that the police have, and always will have and have everywhere in this country, the sole and exclusive responsibility for the investigation of crime.

If they are in the field of, we will say, fraud, they will retain experts in the field of auditing, but these reports come to them. If it is in the field of arson or suspected arson, they will retain whatever experts are available, and again they come to them as part of the police package, part of the police report. And hon. gentlemen will recall that time and time again I indicated that in all cases, and certainly in cases where you have this kind of investigation, the reports will come in from the police to the Director of Public Prosecutions, who will either deal with them himself or assign them to a senior prosecutor or a Crown prosecutor. And time after time these reports go back and the prosecutor says, "You have omitted to examine So-and-So, or in your questioning of someone else you forget to ask certain vital questions. I am not in a position to make a decision as to whether or not there is any criminality until you get this for me."

MR. HICKMAN: Now if we ever reached the stage that a policeman who is chastised or has a report sent back to him after one or two occasions could then rush and give it to anyone or make public that part of the investigation because he is not satisfied that the Director of Public Prosecutions or a Crown prosecutor is going back after him for more information and telling him what has to be done, there will be no freedom left in this country, Mr. Speaker. The thing that we have to bear in mind at all cost is that in the Province of Newfoundland, or anywhere where the British system of justice works, we can never allow it to deteriorate to the kind of system that you will find in some of the States South of the Border, where, by the time an accused person comes to trial, he or she has already been tried by the press. If we have that happen, Mr. Speaker, then let me suggest to you that we will have good reason to worry about the administration of justice and the total breakdown of the justice system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the report - or the verbal decision, rather, was given by Magistrate LeClair some time ago - or last week, rather, I distinctly heard a question being put to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition by one of the newsmen on either radio or television, he was asked if he thought that there may be some motion taken against him in this hon. House.

MR. A. HICKMAN: His reply - I do not know if these were the exact words - "Well, I do not know. Anything can happen. I would hope not, because I do not think the House of Assembly, which by its very nature is partisan and must be, is the place or the forum to deal with that kind of an issue. It should be dealt with by an impartial person." Now that we are going to deal with it by an impartial person, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition objects.

MR. S. NEARY: What is it we are dealing with?

MR. W.N. ROWE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. House Leader knows full well that when he made this announcement this afternoon I welcomed it, and when I was making my speech this afternoon or this morning I said, "By all means go to it. It makes no difference to me." What I was objecting to, Sir, if he is going to talk in terms of objection, was the fact that he will not also set up inquiries -

MR. A. HICKMAN: I will deal with that in a minute.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - into the cause of the fire and the state of the investigations of fire in the Province. I could not care less what investigations he sets up, Sir, royal commissions of inquiry. I am not objecting to it, I am not complaining about it; I wish he would go further and deal with the vital issues facing the administration of justice.

MR. SPEAKER: I think hon. members will agree that there is not a point on which I can rule.

MR. A. HICKMAN: I find myself, Mr. Speaker, in disagreement with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition when he says he wants a commission or an inquiry set up to deal with the vital issues. I would say there is no more vital issue that has ever been put before a commission than the leaking and the publication of a confidential police report during the course of a criminal investigation. If that is not vital to the administration of justice, I would like to know what is! And I would think that the government should be commended for its action in setting up a commission to show that there can be no politics involved, to show that it can be dealt with with fine impartiality.



MR. A. HICKMAN:

What more could anyone ask?

Mr. Speaker, would I not be derelict in my duty if I did not ask someone learned in the law or some outstanding Newfoundland citizen not only to review the happenings and the publication and the distribution as related to that report, but also to recommend to government as to whether steps should be taken, and, if so, what steps should be taken to ensure that never again in this Province will the liberty of a subject, will the rights of an individual be violated as were the rights of an hon. member of this House, namely, the hon. member for Humber East (Dr. T. C. Farrell).

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second matter that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition dealt with was the question of a magisterial inquiry, a fire inquiry which can be held under the provisions of the Summary Jurisdiction Act. The Summary Jurisdiction Act provides that whenever a fire occurs and if the Director of Public Prosecutions feels that an inquiry is necessary, he shall direct a magistrate so to do and to find the cause of the fire. Now, Mr. Speaker, the evidence that was led and ruled on before Magistrate LeClair was based upon the evidence of all of the experts who were involved in the investigation of this fire or could make any meaningful contribution thereto. One expert, a Mr. Sparkes who also was involved in the investigation when the evidence came out of Mr. Farrell, the electrical investigator - who, incidentally, has had training in fire schools of investigation - the court decided, with the agreement of both counsel that as Mr. Sparkes' evidence was based on the findings of the electrical contractor that his evidence would no longer be meaningful. And I think it is also relevant to note, Mr. Speaker, for the record that after Mr. Farrell gave his evidence, the fire commissioner very properly instructed the Crown Prosecutor to advise the court that the basis for some of his evidence had been removed and consequently he would have to go back in the box and give further evidence if the court so desired. We had a fire commissioner who had been involved, we had Mr. Farrell, who is an investigator, we had a Mr. O'Keefe, who is a civil engineer, there were two people from the laboratories in Sackville and there was a man from Montreal.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, if the Director of Public Prosecutions orders another fire enquiry, who will he call? Precisely the same people, because they are the only people who could give meaningful evidence on that fire at Elizabeth Towers.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, was the magistrate right when he said there was nobody in the Province who can investigate a fire competently?

MR. HICKMAN: I am not going to comment on the obiter dictum of the magistrate.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, no!

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a third issue but that second issue -

MR. F. ROWE: That is the most imprudent -

MR. HICKMAN: The answer to that second issue, to have another magisterial enquiry with precisely the same evidence called would be not only a waste of a magistrate's time, but I would say it would be an unpardonable abuse of due process of law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the third matter raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition: He is wondering what government is doing with respect to the investigative expertise in arson cases in this Province. Quite some time ago, two or three months ago, as a result of some reading material that came to me concerning the investigative procedures in Canada in arson cases, and which said that only 1 out of 100 arson cases ever result in a conviction - only about 20 ever go to trial because they are mostly circumstantial evidence and they talked about the difficulties in investigation, the difficulties in finding expertise in Canada. I asked officials in my department then to check to ensure that whatever expertise we have in this Province is as good as one can find. There was a mention of a Canadian fire school, which was mentioned with approbation in this material that I was reading, and it was said that police officers who go to that school seem to come out

MR. HICKMAN:

with more expertise.

I find that members of the CID who are involved in this kind of investigation, attend that school, as do members of the RCMP. I found that other of our investigative people in that area have attended that school, or if not a similar one. So what I have said is, "Still continue to find out; see if there is expertise that we can find." Now obviously this gentleman from Montreal is not going to become domiciled in Newfoundland. And obviously - I believe he is an employee of the Government of Quebec - he is not going to be available to come down and investigate every fire. "If you find that there is something lacking in the investigative skills of people in that area of crime prevention, tell me. Tell me if we can find the expertise in this Province, and if we cannot find it, tell me where these people can go for further training and it shall be done. Or do we have to bring in any from outside-if we can find them?"

I have not had the report on that yet.

I have a feeling that the report is going to indicate that they are few and far between.

Now let me allay one other fear that has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in talking about Elizabeth Towers and fire prevention. I would refer him to one of the Hansards during last Spring when that same question was asked. I believe it was asked almost within a matter of two or three days. And I indicated then that the Fire Commissioner had gone into Elizabeth Towers, had imposed the most rigid fire safety and fire controls that could be conceivable for any building of that type, and that they were being implemented at that time. Some of them have cost a lot of money and taken a lot of time, I am told that the total package that was asked for and indeed ordered by the Fire Commissioner is in the process of being finished and will be finished shortly, and then I think there are some plans for internal drill, or whatever it is, within the establishment to ensure that everyone knows

MR. HICKMAN: the fire prevention procedures that are available.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I concur 100 per cent with the comments made by the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) when he indicated what he felt should have been done by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I have heard his comments about his position as a man in public life vis-a-vis his position as a lawyer.

MR. W. ROWE: Right.

MR. HICKMAN: I have never heard him articulate his position as a man in public life vis-a-vis his position as an officer of the court, which he is for life.

MR. W. ROWE: Would you like to hear it?

MR. HICKMAN: Because, Mr. Speaker, as a former Acting Minister of Justice, as he was for three months, as an officer of the court, he should have known the proper role to follow.

Mr. Hickman: All he had to do in October was come in to me and say, "Look, I will not tell you where I got it, I will not tell you how I got it, I will not even tell you if I have it, but I have reason to believe that there is a member of the Newfoundland Constabulary or an investigator" - if he wants to make it even more vague - "or a person who thinks that this investigation is not proceeding rapidly enough. Indeed, they may even feel that there is a cover-up." I am sure that within the confidentiality of my office in less than two minutes I could have satisfied the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that such was not the case.

If on the other hand I could not have satisfied him - supposing he said, "Oh, sure! I know you have to say that - you have to defend your department; you have to defend yourself - but, you know, this is a political game and I am not satisfied" - then I would have expected him to say, "Well, I will give you the benefit of the doubt when you say that it is progressing with all due haste, but if action is not taken by the Crown within a reasonable time, say three months from now, I reserve the right to take further steps."

But I would draw to the attention of the House that one comment that was made after the preliminary hearing by counsel, not Crown counsel, that most definitely the attitude and position of the Department of Justice is not being rushed through the investigation had been vindicated by this case.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Naturally! He won the case!

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, he would then say to me, "How long do you think it is going to take? When do you think the Director of Public Prosecutions will be in a position to make the final decision?" I might say, "Two months." A logical, responsible reply to be made by anyone concerned with the rights and liberties of Newfoundlanders would be, "Fine. I am telling you that if in two months either charges are laid or there is a statement saying they will not be laid, I will take whatever action I deem as a member in public life to protect the public interest." And this is hearsay, because I am quoting from the

Mr. Hickman: items carried and phrasing The St. John's Daily News.  
The St. John's Daily News, I think that was the paper, one of the newspapers came whilst the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was in Mexico, to the envy of all of us, and stated that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was the man who had received the report. And he came back and confirmed that that was a fact.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I said that publicly the day after I got them on CBC Here and Now.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, you may have, but in any event it was carried in the press here during your absence. And then, lo and behold, a couple of days later out came another statement attributed to the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and he said that he had been offered the report but he refused it because he thought it would be improper to accept it, and he is not even an officer of the court. The next day somebody obviously must have had a little chat with him because he came back and said that he was misquoted on the impropriety of refusing the report, and the reason why he refused it was he felt that it would all come out in the wash anyway.

So we know that at least one hon. gentleman opposite did the right thing. And, who knows? When the inquiry is on it may even come to pass that others did. We do know that several hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) I remember distinctly, and the hon. Opposition House Leader said they knew nothing about it, did not know who the advisors were to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition with whom he had shared this report, but they were quite sure it was not any member of the caucus. And again I am sure that will be substantiated under oath before the commissioner.

MR. NEARY: You are going to be dragged in to court.

MR. F. ROWE: You are in for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: So, you know, it is a bit of a mystery.

It is a bit of a mystery, who were these advisors? They were not of the caucus.

DR. KITCHEN: Another Star Chamber! A kangaroo court!

MR. HICKMAN: They were kangaroos? Well, if they were kangaroos then I have some doubt as to the ability of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to chose his advisors. But then maybe I should not have any doubt as to the ability of the Leader of the Opposition

MR. A. HICKMAN: to choose his advisors and may be I should accept the word of the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) that they are indeed kangaroos. I will take that as accepted. I will not in any way dispute that allegation coming from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says, "Why do you not set up more royal commissions? Why is there not one into fisheries?" I am sure that when he had said it he had forgotten that court action had been taken and that cases are still pending and because the matter is still sub judice, Your Honour, that is as far as I can go in saying it. You cannot one day be demanding that there be thorough investigation and prosecution of cases and the next say, "Never mind that prosecution route" - because you cannot have both - "Go the Royal Commission route."

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one other matter that was raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He talked about some correspondence that was exchanged between the two of us. And I will refresh his memory, and I have not got it in front of me, but late one Friday evening there was a letter, a lengthy letter, delivered to my home from the Leader of the Opposition with all kinds of suggestions in it: Why was not the hon. the Premier and his Ministers prosecuted under the Public Tender Act or action taken? Reference was made to a letter from the Deputy Minister of Justice to the Public Accounts Committee which had become public. And the letter, no matter how you read it, suggested that there was some course of action under The Public Tender Act and under the Summary Jurisdiction Act that should have been implemented at that time. Did I have the courtesy from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition whose sole concern is with the administration of justice and



MR. A. HICKMAN: not any political kudos arising therefrom? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker! Monday - Saturday is a holiday, Sunday is a holiday - what appears in the Daily News on Monday morning but a copy of the letter of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to me - This so-called champion of the administration of justice, this hon. gentleman who will only deal with these matters because he is interested in the administration of justice. And then when I replied to him and cleared up the misstatements of law contained in his letter to me, which had referred to another letter from the deputy minister and which I felt I was entitled to annex to my letter to him, I get back another reply and one of the things he did was he expressed great concern, great chagrin over the fact that I would draw the Deputy Minister of Justice into this area which is so charged with politics! And up to that time I was under the innocent assumption that the hon. gentleman's concern was only for the administration of justice, but he gave the show away so we had to close off our correspondence. It was getting great! It was better than Ann Landers! We were becoming real pen pals but I felt that there was no point in continuing on with the correspondence because it was better to buy the Daily News and read it in there.

MR. E. ROBERTS: At least the member gets a reply. That is more than I can say about the letters I have written -

MR. HICKMAN: I am becoming a pen pal of the hon. Opposition House Leader too.

MR. S. NEARY: I got one from the hon. gentleman the other day you would have to be a lawyer to understand.

MR. HICKMAN: That is when the hon. gentleman put the proposal for the closing of the House which we have been debating. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude. I do not quite understand I have been listening sometimes attentively, but after the third speaker it became repetitious and when you

MR. HICKMAN: hear the same thing twenty times from twenty hon. members or however many have spoken. It reminds me of when I used to be an usher at the music festival and you would have to listen to twenty or thirty pieces, the same piece, played by twenty individuals on the same piano. And the orchestration was a little bit better coming from the opposite side than we used to see amongst some four and five year olds in the music festival. I would like to know why the hon. gentleman is so upset. We called the House together in November, something that does not happen that often, we completed the total, for all practical purposes, of the legislative programme

MR. HICKMAN: of the government for the last year.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, but remember the odd circumstances -

MR. HICKMAN: We brought the House back, we completed it. The Opposition were co-operative, most co-operative. I would say, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about debate, the number of hours in this House, the number of days sitting in this House - I can be corrected on this - but I would say that other than Ontario, Quebec, the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of British Columbia, that this Legislature sits longer and for more sitting days than any other Legislatures in Canada. And we sit longer and we debate the issues. So then, Mr. Speaker, having completed last year's legislative programme, we then started a new session, and then we had eight more days debating these issues that have been raised here now. They were the same issues then as they are now. And because six members of this side of the House are all vying for that exalted position of being the next Premier of Newfoundland, an office in which they will lead this country for quite some time, we felt that there is a duty to this Province to let the people of Newfoundland see who their next Premier will be for the next eight years and let them, as they are going to do, travel the country.

And I do not know why - is it the opinion polls which say only 28 per cent of the people of Newfoundland will vote Liberal in the next election? Is that what is upsetting hon. gentlemen opposite? Is that the one that is upsetting them?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Premier's office.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, it is better than the one -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: I am right! I am right, Mr. Speaker! I have touched a sensitive nerve, and now the truth comes out. The whole upset is over these delightful opinion polls which show that the Progressive Conservative Party will go on to a great and glorious victory in the forthcoming general election.

Thank you for being so attentive,

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Is the House ready for the question?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Belle Isle, the Straits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I say, Sir, it is the Strait of Belle Isle district. We all have trouble getting it straight. It is not even the Straits of Belle Isle, it is the Strait of Belle Isle district.

Mr. Speaker, since no other hon. gentleman opposite obviously wishes to speak, I will say just a few words and they will be relatively few. They will not be more than - Mr. Speaker, I am feeling well rested and benevolent, but if the hon. the Minister of Tourism wants to interrupt me.

MR. MORGAN: I am not talking to the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. gentleman is not talking to me. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Tourism is speaking loudly, braying is the correct description, b-r-a-y-i-n-g, braying. Now I would simply say to the hon. the Minister of Tourism -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is completely out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is better served by his solicitor

MR. ROBERTS: than he is by his colleagues in the House and he, too, would be well advised to be quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: All I say to the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South is that I have listened with considerable attention and silence to his colleagues and I would ask that he do the same courtesy to me. If he feels the urge to give vent to his emotions, let him do it outside the Chamber, preferably in the privacy of a small chamber, Sir, which befits that kind of emotion coming from the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! Order, please! I understand that the hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: I think that is the gist of what I am saying, Your Honour, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the Minister of Justice and the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) had to say about this Royal Commission and the events, and I am not going to touch upon it at all, because in due course we will have a Royal Commission report and I would think that is the appropriate time for us to discuss what went on.

I have a very real interest in it, because I guess I am the only person in this House who had any personal knowledge of the fire at Elizabeth Towers, because, as is well known -

MR. ROBERTS: I think it was on the television - I was in the Towers the morning of that fire and I had spent that night at my parents' apartment, which is located two floors above the apartment occupied by the member for Humber East (Dr. Farrell), the apartment where the fire broke out, and it is in the same wing, and obviously there is a legitimate concern. I was present in that wing on that morning, on the seventh floor of the Towers; there were two of my father's sisters who live in an apartment there and they are both -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I already asked the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) if he would please not speak loudly in the House unless he has the floor. Now I do not mind him speaking to his colleague, the Minister of Education, but, Sir, I would ask if he could do it either quietly or outside. I do not really care where.

MR. FLIGHT: He is campaigning for the leadership.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the point I was making is that on that morning in question, late in April, I forget the precise date, but late in the month of April 1978, I was on the seventh floor of the Towers. I was awakened in fact by the fire engines coming up to the front door. When we talk of fire safety, interestingly enough the fire engines could not get close to the front door because of the cars that were parked out in front in the zones marked "Tow Away"; or "No Parking". On that floor at that time there were seven people; two of my father's sisters who live there, my parents, my parent's housekeeper, a lady who has worked with them for - I am thirty-eight - thirty-six years, and that lady's mother, the housekeeper's mother. And it was a frightening experience, to say the least, at how quickly the smoke filled up. In fact, in the time it took to rouse those seven people and get them dressed - what is that? Five or ten minutes possibly - the smoke had billowed up and filled the seventh floor and the seven of us came down the stairs, the exit stairs and got outside and it was only good fortune that there was

MR. ROBERTS: not serious injury. And I think anybody who is not concerned with that ought to examine his conscience very severely because it could have been a very bad fire. Fortunately, and it was more good luck than good management, fortunately there was no injuries. That in itself in a legitimate issue.

I know that Mr. Cardoulis, the Fire Commissioner, has made a lot of recommendations which have been carried through by the owners of the Towers. I have seen some of them. There are new locks on the doors. There are new closures on the doors. I am told there are a lot of other changes that have been made. There are no cars being parked out in front now, other than in the proper parking spaces. I had occasion recently to go to visit my parents and there was a Minister of the Crown's car, a gentleman who is not in the House at present - that exonerates those who are here - parked in the tow away zone and I was rash enough, and I would do it again, to tell the night watchman, the security guard there, that if that car was not gone in fifteen minutes I was going to call the tow-away authorities - whatever they are; the garage or whoever does these things - to come and tow away the gentleman's car because once burned is literally twice warned. But the gentleman did move his car. As I say, he is not in the House at present.

MR. NEARY: He is out campaigning.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if he is campaigning or not, Mr. Speaker. But it is one thing to talk about safety; it is also another thing to talk about the administration of justice. I think that if there was - and I say 'if'; I may have opinions but I have no knowledge - if there was any improper interference in the administration of justice that it is proper that it be exposed and it is proper that it be dealt with.

I do not claim to be the best lawyer in Newfoundland, I have been at the Bar for twelve or fourteen years and this last year or so I have been practicing law. If I was not aware before, and I think I was, but if I was not aware before of the essential and the utmost

February 15, 1979

Tape No. 474

NM - 3

MR. ROBERTS:                    Importance of preserving the rights of  
the individual, I have become very much aware of it in the last  
year or so.

   In our courts individuals do have rights.  
The gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) was charged by a  
private group, the Greenpeace group, with a quasi criminal offence.  
He had certain rights, he and the



MR. ROBERTS: other gentlemen who were charged - Captain Johnson, Captain Gillett, Captain Smarby - followed those rights. The Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Mahoney, recently rendered a decision. I understand it is to be appealed, but again that is an example of individual rights. I think we have to be very tender, very concerned with individual rights, because if there is one lesson that history has taught all of us, Mr. Speaker, it is that when the rights of one individual are jeopardized, the rights of us all are jeopardized. I do not think any member of the House could quarrel with that. It does not matter if the hon. gentleman is a member of the House, or the hon. lady, in the case of my friend from St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac), is a so-called learned member in that archaic term that we use to flatter those of us who are lawyers, we must all be crucially and constantly concerned with the individual rights, the rights of an individual, and paramount among those are such things as the right to a fair trial and the right to be presumed innocent until one is proven guilty, and it is the Crown's job to prove a man guilty beyond any reasonable doubt, to convince a court, be it a magistrate, or be it a judge or be it a jury as the case may be.

We will see what the Royal Commission recommends. I have no idea what they will recommend. I may add I have some personal knowledge of it in that the same detective sergeant who testified that he made public a copy of the report came to see me some months before. It might as well come out now. The police knew about it. I told them at the time. After the police investigation began they came to see me, sent by my friend, I believe, from Twillingate that they should come to see me and I gave them a statement. You know, I

MR. ROBERTS: made a statement as to what I knew. That same detective-sergeant, I believe he then was - I think he is now a sergeant, he has been reduced in the ranks in a disciplinary proceeding - gave me some information. I believe he gave it to the Premier's secretary about the same time. It was much the same, I think the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was probably on an airplane going somewhere, I am not sure where the airplane actually went, but a day or so after, I am sorry?

MR. MORGAN: A day or so.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, a day or so after the trip the Premier's secretary was a passenger on the airplane, the Minister of Tourism was a passenger on the airplane, a day or so after that trip the gentleman came to see me. You know, there are very serious questions that I think must be answered and I certainly think a Royal Commission is an appropriate way to get at it and I would hope we get at it quickly.

I want to raise just one - it is not a question, we have not seen the terms of reference; we saw the Minister of Justice's statement and the statement is, I submit, open to a number of interpretations. There is one that would concern me and I raise it now because I am not sure the Government have it in mind and I certainly hope they do not, and that is the thought that perhaps this Royal Commission will become a inquisition into the press and I would certainly say that was wrong. If the press did anything wrong in publishing information that came into their hands, then the answer is in remedy for defamation. The gentleman for Humber East (Dr. Farrell) has launched defamation suits against the CBC or I believe he has given notice, he is going

MR. ROBERTS: through the procedure. I understand the writ has been served upon the Evening Telegram; there may be others contemplated, there may be others in train but I know of only these two because I believe they have been made public.

If any agency in the press did wrong to disseminate reports, then the remedy will be in defamation and I would think the damages in a case such as this would be very substantial indeed. The gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) was awarded - what? Two thousand dollars by Mr. Justice Noel in a defamation action. Was it \$2,000 against the Daily News?

MR. WELLS: Three thousand dollars.

MR. ROBERTS: Three thousand dollars against the Daily News for a libel - a defamation, a libellous reference to him made by that paper, so found by the court - which was not very serious at all when compared to what seems to have been the case involving the gentleman from Humber East (Dr. Farrell), and I do not want to prejudge the findings of the court. I have no right and no ability to do that.

The point I am making though, Mr. Speaker, is that as far as I can see, and I have followed it fairly closely, the press have done nothing wrong in publishing any information which came to their hands. Just as I am concerned, and I think we must all be, with the protection of individual rights and the necessity to be ever vigilant, I think we must be equally ever vigilant to ensure that the press is free to report whatever they see fit, subject always, of course, to the law of defamation, the law of defamation and, if you wish, the law of contempt - if that was relevant, it is not here which

Mr. Roberts: is a very strict weapon. And I suggest to my friend from Humber East (Dr. Farrell) who has brought defamation action, in my opinion, will win them. I mean, that is only my opinion, I am certainly not a court; in my opinion he will win them, and, in my opinion he will be awarded a substantial sum of damages. And I suggest that is the remedy, that is the control. But I would not want ever to see a situation where a government could classify a document as confidential, and if that document somehow got out - and, of course, in the age of Xerox nothing is secret - if that document somehow got out and was published by a newspaper or by a radio station, or any of the means of publication, that that agency could then be prosecuted. The Official Secrets Act in Ottawa, I think, is a monstrous piece of stuff. I have always thought that. I think the prosecutions now underway against Mr. Worthington, is it? of The Toronto Sun, certainly may not be debatable in law, but are certainly debatable in policy. And I would want never to see in this Province anything approaching an Official Secrets Act. I think that would be extraordinarily wrong in policy.

The Minister of Justice's statement, as I read it and as I heard it, and then I sent for a copy and read it, is open to the interpretation that possibly this may be a matter to be submitted and considered by the Royal Commission. Now I know a royal commission only recommends. Now the Minister of Justice is shaking his head, and I am glad if my interpretation or my concern is ill-founded, but I would hope the terms of reference given to the Commissioner would make it clear. Because if the government are after a witch hunt for the press then, you know, I for one would be the very first, and I am sure every member of the House would say that is wrong. If they are inquiring into whether there was any interference with the administration of Justice, that is a different quintal of fish entirely, and in my view it is something which certainly should be looked into for the reasons which I have outlined. But I am concerned with the interpretation that has been put on it. I was driving in from my

Mr. Roberts: home this morning and I heard Mr. Plaskin on CBC, you know, the morning show at quarter of seven, and he certainly said, you know, this was a concern he had expressed as an individual or as - what do they call it on CBC? - a freelance broadcaster. You know, I think it is something which could be made quite clear in the terms of reference and if the government's intention is not to go on this kind of an Official Secrets Act kick, and I hope it is not, then certainly the terms of reference could be so drafted.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on to talk about the motion, let me simply say that I think anything else on the subject of the Royal Commission may or may not be sub judice. I am not sure it is in parliamentary practice. But I am not sure, equally, there is anything to be gained by any comment until a commissioner - I mean, no commissioner has been appointed to my knowledge. There has been no announcement - but until a commissioner has been appointed, until his terms of reference are gazetted, until he holds his hearings and we get a report, then we will see what the report is. I would hope that the report will be a speedy one. I do not know what investigation or what the ramifications of the matter are, but I would hope it is speedy because I think in a matter touching the administration of justice it is in the interest of the public very much to have a quick and acceptable conclusion and have it brought before the public and before the House as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House is that the House do now adjourn and it adjourn until the 27th. day of March. I shall oppose the motion, and I would suggest, Sir, that the public interest of this Province requires that this motion be defeated, that the House do now adjourn until 3:00 o'clock this afternoon or 3:00 o'clock Monday afternoon if the government and the members, all of us, want to take the weekend off.

I know a lot about leadership conventions, I think most members of the House will grant me that. In fact, it is a distinct pleasure to look forward to seeing a leadership convention for which my

Mr. Roberts: name will not be on the ballot. I have had my share of them, sometimes with more success than other times. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the holding of a leadership convention which justifies the government's decision not to have this House meet for a month or more from this date, nothing at all. And yet that is the only reason we are given. I can see taking a period of time off around the convention, of course I can. And I think my friend for Twillingate, the Leader of the Opposition has already said, what? a week either side, a week before the convention we would certainly consent to, and a week after because a new Premier will certainly want to reshape his administration, possibly invite new men to join, perhaps shuffle a portfolio.

But there is no justification for this House not meeting for a month. There is no justification at all, and certainly no valid reason given if the reason be, as it has been given, that 'we want to hold our leadership convention.' A leadership convention, Mr. Speaker, is a private affair; it is a private affair of a political party. A political party is not an organized body under the corporate law, the corporation of law of the Province.

MR. ROBERTS:

It is a group of individuals who come together for a common purpose. Now there is a public purpose to be achieved in this one because the gentleman, and I assume it will be a man, who is elected leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, will very shortly thereafter become premier. The present Premier will, in a very proper constitutional way, go to Government House, advise His Honour that he has resigned and his administration has resigned with him, and I would think His Honour will then say, "Well, Mr. Premier, do you have any advice for whom I should send? I have to have a government, for whom should I send? Who can command the majority of the House?" The Premier, I would think, would then submit advice that "Mr. So-and-So has been elected leader. A majority of the members of the House of Assembly will support him, Your Honour, therefore I would advise you to send for him." And that message will be sent. The gentleman will come to Government House, will be sworn in as Premier and a new administration will take office, a new Premier, the third Premier of this Province since Confederation.

All right. That is a very public result to a private event but it does not justify this House not meeting for a month. There is business which could be done and there is business which should be done. I am not going to talk about the budget or major legislation, because a new Premier may very well want to put his own stamp on the budget. I am not sure how much there is he can do. I would think that the budget of this Province is—what? ninety per cent of it is spent now, or committed now, and unavoidably committed, unless we are prepared to default on our debt or to close the hospitals or not to pay the teachers or to lay off the Public Service. You know, ninety per cent of the dollars that will be spent; it may be higher than that. The discretionary dollars in our budget are astonishingly small, astonishingly few and getting fewer; I would suggest, each and every year. But there may well be some areas in which a new premier would want to make his mark, so let us put

MR. ROBERTS: off the budget. There may be some legislation on which a new premier might want to put his mark, although the odds are that the new Premier will be a man who is already a member of the Cabinet. There is only one gentleman who has announced to date, who is not the former law partner of my friend from Twillingate, a former member of the House, a man whom I used to taunt with the statement that he was in his first and last term in the House, and he was. My friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) proved with twelve hundred-and-something votes. But the odds are, and it is six to one anyway, six to one that the next Premier will be a man who is already a member of the administration and therefore a man who has already been consulted and agreed to all of the legislation that the government have, they tell us, in their programme.

So I cannot think of anything there. There may be a bill or two in which a man would say, "I agree to it as a member of the Cabinet but now that I am Premier I certainly want to change it." And he might say put it off and the Government House Leader could accommodate himself to that wish. If any one of the leadership candidates, all seven of them came and said, "'Alec' can you not call that bill for debate, please? If I win this thing I want to have a look at it from a different aspect." And I would think the Minister of Justice, the House Leader, would certainly say, "Very well, of course we will play it that way. That is a logical and a sensible and a perfectly reasonable request."

But, Mr. Speaker, what about all the other legislation? What about the Throne Speech? We have had a mini Throne Speech debate over night. What a travesty, what a farce to be forced, as we were on this side, to have to go through this kind of exercise, and members here all night. You know, are we really serving the people of this Province? The concerns which my hon. friends expressed, and I could go through concerns, I could list things in my district and things throughout this Province that I think are important and



MR. ROBERTS: should be debated. But what is the point of it? Nobody here is paying any attention. The whole thing has been a travesty and a farce, a degradation of this House and all for no cause and no reason and no justification. I think it is wrong. I think it is wrong. We should have had a proper Throne Speech debate. The Throne Speech debate traditionally in this Province, and very valuably, has been devoted to members talking about their individual districts. And so at least once in each session we can hear from each member what concerns his constituents. And I talk about the woods situation in Main Brook or the lack of water in Main Brook or the roads running down to Griquet, or the need for improved roads in Labrador, or a new nursing station in Forteau

Mr. Roberts: and I could go on and on, and everyone of us could with his district concerns. These are proper things to bring before the House, Mr. Speaker, proper matters to advance before this Chamber, proper matters to be discussed and debated. We could do that without interfering in any way with the leadership convention. Somebody might say, Well, perhaps the twenty of us will beat the thirty of them over there in a vote. I would be quite willing - I do not speak for our side - but I would be quite willing, I think it would be reasonable to suggest that there should be no votes of confidence during that period unless notice is given so then all of the candidates come in.

We saw a situation in Ottawa in 1968 where the Liberals had a leadership convention underway and because Herman Batten, who was then a member, a good friend of mine, miscounted - or not miscounted; he counted accurately, but the vote was called when it ought not to have been. The Prime Minister was on a holiday in Jamaica, the leadership candidates were all across the country and the government actually lost a vote in the House of Commons on a money bill. And there was some very fast parliamentary footwork, inspired by Jack Pickersgill, and, lo and behold, when the dust cleared Mr. Pearson was still the Prime Minister and Mr. Stanfield was still Leader of the Opposition. Great gamesmanship! It did not really change anything, for when the election was over that Spring Mr. Stanfield was still Leader of the Opposition, and a new Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, had taken office. But, you know, I do not think we should play that kind of gamesmanship here. I do not think a vote in the House is how we decide who the government should be. I agree with my friend for Kilbride (Mr. Wells); it should be the people of this Province who decide who the government should be in a general election, and the quicker the better.

But I think this House could meet for the next month without any hardship, without any difficulty, and I think we

Mr. Roberts: could meet usefully, and I think we would serve the people of this Province by doing so. And I think at the same time the Progressive Conservative Party, the Tories to give them their honourable name - they do not like it, but it is an honourable and an honest name - the Tory Party could go about the perfectly legitimate and perfectly proper business of choosing a new leader, choosing a man who as the leader would become the Premier of this Province. I think both of those aims could be accommodated.

We could have The Election Act - I am told it is in draft form - a critically important bill, particularly when we are on the eve of a general election. I think we all feel, and some of us very much hope there will be a general election this year. I would think there is a very real chance that we may go into the general election without a new Election Act. My friend the Minister of Justice may or may not agree with that. But he told me last year that the House would never adjourn its Third Session without an Election Act coming in, and no Election Act struck the Table of this House, Mr. Speaker, in that Third Session of this General Assembly. Why could we not bring it in now and debate it? Why do we have to go on with the present system of raising money, the cancer rot of the whole democratic system in this Province?

You want to reform it, we are told, and we on this side want to reform it. Let us bring in the bill, I am told it is in draft form, and let us usefully preoccupy ourselves for the next month or so debating an Elections Act. You know, there is lots of work we could do. Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the government have chosen to force this adjournment. I know why we have been here all night - well, I have not been here all night - I know why the House was here all night, because men on both sides got stubborn, because there was some inept procedural footwork, I would suggest, on the government side, but, be that as it may, we have been here all night to no real purpose. All we have done, I think, is lower the House in the eyes of the people. The radio this morning are talking about filibusters.

Mr. Roberts: I do not know what The Daily News says about it or what The Telegram says, you know, the reviews. We are worse in this House than a first night audience in the West End in London or Broadway in New York for looking for our press notices.

DR. KITCHEN: Who cares?

MR. ROBERTS: My friend for St. John's West, (Dr. Kitchen) says, "Who cares?" Well, all I can say is he spends as much time on press as does any member of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I think with as much good effect. And I would compliment him on that.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Daily News says, "Government caught with pants down."

MR. ROBERTS: Does it? The Daily News says, "Government caught with pants down." Are they talking about the House or outside?

MR. RIDEOUT: Well I will let you know after I read the article.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is going to read it.

Mr. Speaker, the point is there has been no need for this. There is no public purpose to be served by adjourning this House for a month. There is no legitimate private purpose to be served by adjourning this House for a month. It serves no valid purpose at all in my view to adjourn this House until the 27th. of March. This House should meet Monday and carry on with the

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Throne Speech, and when the Throne Speech winds its way through and is disposed of in due course, then we should go into the legislative programme and let us begin with the Elections Act, an important act. We are told it is ready, we are told it is drafted, let it come in and let it be studied and let it be debated and then a week or so before the PC convention let us adjourn for a week or ten days or two weeks, which is more than the Parliament of Canada did when the Liberals last elected a leader in Ottawa, Mr. Trudeau, we adjourned the House here, I think, for three or four days so a group of us could go up and the House of Commons in Ottawa, I believe was adjourned for three or four or five days over a weekend, Mr. Pearson was Prime Minister before the weekend and was Prime Minister after the weekend and a week or so after that. He was Prime Minister afterwards but not leader. A week or so after he went to Government House and resigned and Mr. Trudeau was sent for and became Prime Minister and a day or two after that a general election was called. Now the precedents are all for a relatively short adjournment, not for the month or more that we are looking at here. So, Mr. Speaker, quite simply I shall oppose the motion. I shall oppose it because I think it is wrong, I think it is unnecessary, I think it is an abuse of the parliamentary process, I think it is a disservice to Newfoundland and degradation of this House. There is no reason why this House cannot meet, no reason why we cannot do the business which needs to be done or which ought to be done and which we are capable of doing in this House. I think the people of Newfoundland and Labrador would be far better served by our doing that, Mr. Speaker, than by adjourning this House until March 27th. I shall vote against the motion, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the question?

The motion is that this adjourn until March 27th. Those in favour, "Aye", contrary, "Nay". In my opinion the "Aye's" have it. This House stands adjourned until 3:00 P.M. March 27th.